

# **True Cost Benefit Analysis Framework**

Pete Pizzutillo Product Management and Marketing pete.pizzutillo@pricesystems.com 856.608.7218



# Introduction

- There are many decision making processes in the marketplace
  - DoD
  - OMB
  - Agency Level
  - Commercial/Industry Processes
- Whether it's an analysis of alternative, alternative analysis, portfolio analysis or cost benefit analysis <u>cost is not enough to support decision making</u>.

What is required is that in the context of a problem or opportunity an analytical comparison of effectiveness / value to cost



# Agenda

- Decision Process
- Scenario
  - Define Problem or Opportunity
  - Develop Alternatives
    - Cost view
    - Benefit view
  - Identify Assessment Criteria
  - Compare & Select Alternative
  - Document & Justify
- Summary



# **Decision Process**

- **1.** Recognize Problem or Opportunity
- **2.** Develop Possible Alternatives
- **3.** Identify Assessment Criteria
- 4. Compare & Select Alternative
- 5. Document & Justify
- 6. Execute
- 7. Post Audit Review







Your company, Look Ma No Hands Corporation, is considering developing a system which will allow automobiles to operate on autopilot.

Look Ma No Hands Inc



# **Develop Possible Alternatives**

As a new player, there are several ways to enter the market. Each alternative has its own set of risks, benefits, business value, technical and programmatic complexities.

#### 1. Go It Alone

- Develop a proprietary offering that is completely homegrown

#### 2. Piggy Back

 Integrate with established products, software or services market share through partnerships or sales channels

#### 3. Mash Up

- Glue existing products, software and services together in a unique offering.

The challenge is getting to an "apple to apple" comparison to determine which is the best alternative.



# **Alternative 1: Go It Alone**

Your company will need to develop and support the infrastructure, software, hardware and services to support this offering.

This involves the development of a display device, the system and software to manage the automobiles position and steering, and infrastructure to support the service (call center, data center, etc)





# **Alternative 2: Piggy Back**

Your company is considering partnering with a popular commercial GPS service and hardware provider to:

- **Reduce barriers of entry**
- Gain access to their customer base
- Access distribution channels.



# **Alternative 3: Mash Up**

Your company is considering an aggressive partnering strategy that leverages the top providers in each hardware, software and services category.





### **Assessing the Alternatives** Cost Perspective

• There are a lot of technical implications within each alternative.

|                          | Go It Alone            | Piggy Back                 | Mash Up                    |
|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| COTS                     | 0%                     | 20%                        | 100% COTS                  |
| New Design               | 100%                   | 80%                        | 25%                        |
| Integration              | Few Integration Points | Some Integration<br>Points | Many Integration<br>Points |
| Stakeholder Involvement  | Medium                 | High                       | High                       |
| Glue Code                | Low                    | Medium                     | Very High                  |
| Familiarity with Product | High                   | Medium                     | Low                        |
| Evaluation & Tailoring   | Low                    | Medium                     | Very High                  |

### But what about the Benefits?



### Assessing the Alternatives Benefit Perspective

### There are many business implications within each alternative

- Leveraging existing products & services could reduce the amount of time to bring an offering to market.
- More partners increase management complexity
- The amount of start up costs or capital investment
- Are there government regulations that may impede the offering?
- Lack market presence or brand awareness
- What is the window of opportunity?

How are these captured, quantified and linked to the estimate?



# There are many documented processes on HOW to do this, BUT not systems to help you do this!





# Challenges

#### Organizations struggle with

- Consistent identification and quantification of risks/benefits.
- Linkage between business choices and their impact on technical approach.
- Quantification of non-financial benefits/risks
- Generating a credible return on investment
- Ability to normalize and evaluate the alternatives



# **PRICE TruePlanning Framework**



# **TruePlanning Value Model**

- A standard models that indicate business value and provides common definition and calculation methodology.
  - Promotes consistent identification and quantification of risks/benefits
  - Linkage between business choices and their impact on technical approach
  - Quantification of non-financial benefits/risks





### **Assessing the Alternatives** Benefit Perspective

|                      | Go It Alone        | Piggy Back      | Mash Up                |
|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| New Market Impact    | No Partner/Channel | Partner/Channel | Many Partners/Channels |
| Cross Selling Impact | No Partner/Channel | Partner/Channel | Many Partners/Channels |
| Time to Market       | 2 years            | 1 year          | <1 year                |
| Revenue              | Low                | Medium          | High                   |
| Risk Impact          | Very High          | High            | Low                    |

Each alternative has pros and cons but... What is important to the organization?



### **Identify Assessment Criteria** Getting to "apples"

Business Value is the benefit for the enterprise, represented in financial and non-financial terms, that is a result of the solution or services, as evidenced by a direct contribution to the corporation's market position or revenue, results that solve customer business needs, customer cost savings or financial benefits, or technology investments that advance the industry.

| B | Business ¥alues |                                |                       |                       |                |          |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|-----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|
|   |                 |                                | Score (1=Low, 5=High) | Weight (Total = 100%) | Weighted Score | Notes    |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | 1               | Support of Strategic Alignment | 2.50                  | 20.00%                | 10.00          | <b>N</b> |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | 2               | Business Process Impact        | 2.50                  | 20.00%                | 10.00          | 10       |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | 3               | Architectural Compliance       | 2.50                  | 20.00%                | 10.00          | 10       |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | 4               | Risk Avoidance                 | 2.50                  | 20.00%                | 10.00          | 10       |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | 5               | Payback                        | 0.00                  | 20.00%                | 0.00           | 10       |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | 6               | Total                          |                       | 100.00%               | 40.00          |          |  |  |  |  |  |

- TruePlanning Business Values defined and quantified at the project level
  - Ability to normalize and evaluate the alternatives
  - Generating a credible return on investment



# **Identify Assessment Criteria**

| N | Notes Results Chart        |       |                                      |                            |                             |                |         |  |  |  |  |
|---|----------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|---------|--|--|--|--|
|   |                            |       |                                      |                            |                             |                |         |  |  |  |  |
|   |                            |       |                                      |                            |                             |                |         |  |  |  |  |
|   |                            | Total | Support of<br>Strategic<br>Alignment | Business Process<br>Impact | Architectural<br>Compliance | Risk Avoidance | Payback |  |  |  |  |
|   | 1 Auto-Pilot Alternative 1 | 60.00 | 4.00                                 | 12.00                      | 20.00                       | 4.00           | 20.00   |  |  |  |  |
|   | 2 Auto-Pilot Alternative 2 | 60.00 | 8.00                                 | 12.00                      | 12.00                       | 8.00           | 20.00   |  |  |  |  |
|   | 3 Auto-Pilot Alternative 3 | 76.00 | 16.00                                | 12.00                      | 2.00                        | 6.00           | 40.00   |  |  |  |  |

#### Based on Look Ma's values we are able to assess the alternatives:

- Assign quantitative assessments for each value category
- Document the justification
- Evaluate the alternatives against each other



| PRICE TruePlanning - [Auto-Pilot Alternative 1]             |                          |                 |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              |               |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------|------|----------------|----------|-----------|-----------------|-------------|--------|----------|----------|--------------|---------------|
| Eile Edit View Tools Window Help                            |                          |                 |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              |               |
|   |                          |                 |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              |               |
| Product Breakdown Structure Chart: Auto-Pilot Alternative 1 |                          |                 |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              |               |
| Simple Detailed Detailed                                    |                          |                 |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              |               |
|   | Auto-Pilot Alte          | rnative 1       |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          | Payback      |               |
| 1 E- Auto-Pilot Alternative 1                               | Cost:                    |                 |      | \$223,256,0    | 640      | 100.00% L | Labor Requirem  | ent:        |        |          |          | 1,145,851.17 | Hours         |
| 3 Dystem  | Project Cost:            |                 |      | \$223,256,0    | 540      | F         | Project Labor R | equirement: |        |          |          | 1,145,851.17 | Hours         |
| 4 Display   | X-Axis:                  | Fiscal Year     | •    | Group By:      | Cost Obj | ect       | 💌 🗹 Show (      | Cumulative  |        |          |          |              |               |
| 5 En Control System   | Chart Type:              | Column          | -    | Chart SubType: | Stacked  | Column    |                 | -           |        |          |          |              | 🔲 Show Legend |
| 6 Mission Planning  |                          | ,               |      |                | -        |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              |               |
| 8 Behavior Generation                                       |                          |                 |      | Fis            | cal Y    | early P   | avback          |             | st Obi | ect      |          |              |               |
| 9 Global Positioning  |                          |                 |      |                |          |           | .,              | ,           |        |          |          |              |               |
| 11 Infrastructure   | \$1                      | 50000000        |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              |               |
| 12 Training   | F 11                     | 0000000         |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              |               |
| 13 IT Enterprise  | - Pir                    |                 |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          | ×            |               |
| 15 Benefics   | \$                       | 5000000 🕂       |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              | 4             |
| 16 • • • Other Revenue                                      | 옹                        |                 |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          | ×        |              |               |
| 17 Cross Selling Impact                                     | 0<br>0<br>0              | \$0             |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              |               |
| 19 Risk Impact  | a <u>v</u>               | 50000000        | ×    |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              | 4             |
|   | l d                      |                 |      |                |          |           |                 |             | ×      |          |          |              |               |
|   | -\$1                     | 00000000        |      |                |          |           |                 | ×           |        |          |          |              | <u>+    </u>  |
|   | -\$1                     | 5000000         |      |                |          |           | ×               |             |        |          |          |              |               |
|   |                          | 0000000         |      | *              | -x       | ×         |                 |             |        |          |          |              |               |
|   | -\$2                     | 00000000        |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              | I             |
|   |                          |                 | 2009 | 2010           | 2011     | 2012      | 2013            | 2014        | 2015   | 2016     | 2017     | 2018         | 2019          |
|   | Auto-Pilot Alternative 1 |                 |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              |               |
|   |                          |                 |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              |               |
|   | Currency in USD (        | (\$) (as spent) |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              |               |
|   |                          |                 |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        | Copy XML | Print Cl | hart 📗       | Copy Chart    |
|   | ,                        |                 |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              |               |
| Ready   |                          |                 |      |                |          |           |                 |             |        |          |          |              |               |















# **Compare & Select**

Even though Alternative 3 has the most Architectural Risk its projected payback and alignment with the company strategic plan make it the Best Alternative.





- Your lawyers tell you that one of proposed partners wants new terms which will add 6-12 months to negotiations and legal review
  - This effectively eliminates the time to market benefit
  - Delays new market, cross selling and other revenue profiles by one year
  - Adds additional Risk due to partner instability
- Your Chief Architect believes that they have an open source solution for the Mission & Motion Planning that will reduce development effort
  - Improve software delivery by 12 months
  - 6 month time to market impact
  - Enable additional units to be sold earlier.

### Now which alternative is best?

# **Compare & Select**

Alternative 2 improves significantly increasing its NPV to \$440M. Alternative 3 maintains a higher NPV of \$546M, however, Alternative 2 has an earlier Payback period.



|   | Metrics : Auto-Pilot Alternative 2 B - [System<br>Folder]<br>Currency in USD (\$) (as spent) | Value       | Units |
|---|--|-------------|-------|
| 1 | Internal Rate of Return  | 27.99       | %     |
| 2 | Discount Rate  | 3.90        | %     |
| 3 | Net Present Value  | 440,485,581 | \$    |
| 4 | Payback Period   | 5.08        | Years |
| 5 | Benefit-Cost Ratio   | 3.39        |       |

|   | Metrics : Auto-Pilot Alternative 3 B - [System<br>Folder]<br>Currency in USD (\$) (as spent) | Value       | Units |
|---|--|-------------|-------|
| 1 | Internal Rate of Return  | 45.73       | %     |
| 2 | Discount Rate  | 3.90        | %     |
| 3 | Net Present Value  | 546,756,986 | \$    |
| 4 | Payback Period   | 6.08        | Years |
| 5 | Benefit-Cost Ratio   | 3.12        |       |



# **Compare & Select: It's a Close Call!**



#### From a business value and financial perspective both options are viable.

#### However, you now have solid quantitative analysis that:

- Is based on a historical data
- Developed in a structured, transparent process
- Consistent method for identification and quantification of risks/benefits.
- Links business choices and their impact
- Ability to normalize and evaluate the alternatives
- Generate a credible return on investment



# **Document & Justify**



# Automatic report generation in Word

- Charts
- Tabular Data
- Notes, Justification,
  Basis of Estimate
  Rational

# Summary

- Organizations must develop capabilities that bring speed, accuracy and confidence to their decision making process.
- In dynamic environments, you need to connect models to decision support tools to make the right decision.
- An analyst (or application) that can only see from a costperspective is not enough to support effective decision making.
- Benefit modeling should be performed by people with the same skills as cost analysis - It requires the same rigor.

#### Have you calibrated your benefits lately?



# **PRICE TruePlanning Framework**

