accenture

Change History Log:

March 27, 2001 **In Response Reply to: 01EDU0268S**
Department of Education
Student Financial Assistance
Carol Seifert
Contracts Office Technical Representative

Subject: Contract # ED-99-DO-0002
Task Order #48: Enterprise Portal Strategy and Product Selection
Deliverable 48.1.2: Portal Product Evaluation and Recommendations

Dear Ms. Seifert:

Enclosed is the Portal Product Evaluation and Recommendations that is required by the subject task order. Attached are suggested changes from the reviewers. Future revisions are not planned, but the document will be updated as appropriate.

ACCENTURE, LLP

Deliverable 48.1.2: Portal Product Evaluation and Recommendations					
Suggested Changes/Comments	**Page**	**Author**	**Date**	**Change Made Y/N**	**Comment**
How can there be "no software packages available today for SFA portal requirements?" This sets up a stage for repeated costly evaluations, but SFA is not attempting to do anything that others haven't started doing already. Please re-write this section clarify its meaning.	2, 17	Harry Feely	3/09/01	Y	The section has been re-written to reflect the words for an "evergreen process" instead of a full re-evaluation.
Please remove reference to the Target State Vision document, because it is my understanding this has been presented to the Management Council and has not been accepted. This Evaluation herein makes the TSV sound like a fait accompli.	3	Harry Feely	3/09/01	N	The Target State Vision document has been approved by SFA. As it is kept "evergreen," so too will the portal strategy.
I question that there are only three Web sites to which single sign on is applicable and desirable. How was this developed?	6	Harry Feely	3/09/01	N	There are four core web sites that were identified by the Schools Channel as the highest priority for their customers.
Create column headings for table at top of each successive page.	10-13	Harry Feely	3/09/01	N	This was already done in the submitted version.
First paragraph not clear. Explain what it means to have an "X" in the right-most Portal column. For advanced calendaring, none of the three applications enjoy an X but Portals column does. Does this mean the calendaring function is needed to meet customer business requirements, but that none of the three applications provide it? If so, say so more clearly, please.	10	Harry Feely	3/09/01	Y	The section has been re-written to improve clarity.

accenture

Deliverable 48.1.2: Portal Product Evaluation and Recommendations					
Suggested Changes/Comments	**Page**	**Author**	**Date**	**Change Made Y/N**	**Comment**
It appears that the recommendation is: your basic software is OK for infrastructure but there aren't any applications (or combinations of applications) to actually do what you require. Is this your intent? If not, please re-write.	16	Harry Feely	3/09/01	N	This was our intent.
A synopsis of Section 2 and conclusions should be included in the Executive Summary.	1-2	Steve Allison	3/14/01	Y	This change has been made.
Change third recommendation to "Evergreen the process."	2, 17	Helene Epstein	3/14/01	Y	This change has been made.
Change the name of Appendix A to reflect Autonomy's Portal-in-a-Box" product (versus existing search capability/tool).	15, 18, 19	Helene Epstein	3/14/01	Y	This change has been made.
The Application Architecture in the Target State Vision document has been approved. Update the Portal Strategy graphic to reflect these changes.	1, 7, 8	Steve Hawald	3/15/01	Y	This change has been made.
While you reference the Target State Vision (150 reqs)...there is no mention of the extensive requirements gathering that took place in the Portal Strategy (first deliverable). While the findings may be redundant to the Target State Vision, I think it's important to add a couple of paragraphs that reference the first deliverable. The extensive collection process you went through demonstrates an honest effort at getting the various business segments to participate to the strategy development.	3	Steve Allison	3/19/01	Y	A new sentence was added to reflect that many additional requirements were captured for the first deliverable.
I suggest that you (we) rework the section following the table on Page 13. While I finally understood what you were trying to say, it took several readings of the narrative for me to understand what the table was conveying and what remained to be done.	13	Steve Allison	3/19/01	Y	The section has been re-written to improve clarity.
On page 15, there is a typo in the first full paragraph... 'Vendors/products that **did not** rate highly were not considered for detailed evaluation....	15	Steve Allison	3/19/01	Y	This change has been made.
Also, I think a more detailed conclusion for this section would better drive home the message.	15	Steve Allison	3/19/01	Y	More details were added to the conclusion as well as the beginning of the Recommendations Section.
Correct numbering of Recommendations.	16, 17	Steve Allison	3/19/01	Y	This change has been made.

cc: Janet Scott, Helene Epstein, Steve Allison, Wanda Broadus