













Benefits	and Costs
 Crangible Benefits & Readily quantified as \$ values & Readily quantified as \$ values & Examples: > increased sales > cost/error reductions > increased throughput/efficiency > but maybe more important! > business analysts help estimate \$ values & Examples: > increased flexibility of operation > higher quality products/services > better customer relations > improved staff morale How will the benefits accrue? & Where in the organization? 	 Development costs (OTO) Development and purchasing costs: Cost of development team Cost of development team Software used (buy or build)? hardware (what to buy, buy/lease)? facilities (site, communications, power,, Installation and conversion costs: installing the system, training personnel, file conversion, Operational costs (on-going) System Maintenance: hardiware (repairs, lease, supplies,), software (licenses and contracts), facilities Personnel: For operation (data entry, backups,) For support (user support, hardware and software maintenance, supplies,) On-going training costs

University of Toronto	Department of Computer Science
Example: costs for small CI	lient-Server project
Personnel:	
2 System Analysts (400 hours/ea \$35.00/hr)	\$28,000
4 Programmer/Analysts (250 hours/ea \$25.00/hr)	\$25,000
1 GUI Designer (200 hours/ea \$35.00/hr)	\$7,000
 Telecommunications Specialist (50 hours/ea \$45.00/hr) 	\$2,250
 System Architect (100 hours/ea \$45.00/hr) 	\$4,500
 Database Specialist (15 hours/ea \$40.00/hr) 	\$600
1 System Librarian (250 hours/ea \$10.00/hr)	\$2,500
Expenses:	
4 Smalltalk training registration (\$3500.00/student)	\$14,000
New Hardware & Software:	<u> </u>
 Development Server (Pentium Pro class) 	\$18,700
 Server Software (operating system, misc.) 	\$1,500
1 DBMS server software	\$7,500
7 DBMS Client software (\$950.00 per client)	\$6,650
Total Development Costs:	\$118,200
PROJECTED ANNUAL OPERATING COSTS	
Personnel:	
2 Programmer/Analysts (125 hours/ea \$25.00/hr)	\$6,250
1 System Librarian (20 hours/ea \$10.00/hr)	\$200
Expenses:	
1 Maintenance Agreement for Pentium Pro Server	\$995
 Maintenance Agreement for Server DBMS software 	\$525
Preprinted forms (15,000/year @ .22/form)	\$3,300
Total Projected Annual Costs:	\$11,270





nto			Departme	ent of Compu	ter Science					
Net Present Value										
c Measures the total value of the investment										
gures adjust ative PV of al	t ed to pres I benefits -	ent dollar v Cumulative P	v <mark>alues</mark> V of all cost	ts						
Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4						
(\$100,000)										
	(\$4,000)	(\$4,500)	(\$5,000)	(\$5,500)						
1	0.893	0.797	0.712	0.636						
(\$100,000)	(\$3,572)	(\$3,587)	(\$3,560)	(\$3,816)						
(\$100,000)	(\$103,572)	(\$107,159)	(\$110,719)	(\$114,135)						
0	\$25,000	\$30,000	\$35,000	\$50,000						
0	\$22,325	\$23,910	\$24,920	\$31,800						
0	\$22,325	\$46,235	\$71,155	\$102,955						
(\$100,000)	(\$81,243)	(\$60,924)	(\$39,564)	(\$11,580)						
equent year esent value of ars, \$13,652 ars, \$36,168	rs are like f this invest	year 4 ment in the p	project will b	pe:						
	nto Net ne total gures adjust ative PV of al (\$100,000) (\$100,000) (\$100,000) 0 0 (\$100,000) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Net Prese e total value o gures adjusted to pres ative PV of all benefits - Year 0 Year 1 (\$100,000) (\$4,000) (\$4,000) (\$103,572) (\$100,000) (\$133,572) (\$100,000) (\$133,572) 0 \$22,325 0 \$22,325 (\$100,000) (\$81,243) eequent years are like esent value of this invest ars, \$13,652 ars, \$36,168	Net Present Value ne total value of the ingures adjusted to present dollar value PV of all benefits - Cumulative PV Year 0 Year 1 Year 2 (\$100,000) (\$4,000) (\$4,500) 1 0.893 0.797 (\$100,000) (\$3,572) (\$3,587) (\$100,000) (\$103,572) (\$107,159) 0 \$22,325 \$23,910 0 \$22,325 \$46,235 (\$100,000) (\$81,243) (\$60,924)	Ito Departmet Departmet Net Present Value Departmet Departmet <td>Into Department of Compute Department of Compute</td>	Into Department of Compute Department of Compute					

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	1
1	Pavback An	alvsis f	or Clie	nt-Serv	ver Svs	stem A	Iternati	ve	
2			Numbers rou	nded to near	est \$1)				
3									
4	Cash flow description	Year O	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	
5	Development cost:	(\$418,040)							
6	Operation & maintenance cost:		(\$15,045)	(\$16,000)	(\$17,000)	(\$18,000)	(\$19,000)	(\$20,000)	
7	Discount factors for 12%:	1.000	0.893	0.797	0.712	0.636	0.567	0.507	
8	Time-adjusted costs (adjusted to present	(\$418.040)	(\$13,435)	(\$12,752)	(\$12,104)	(\$11.448)	(\$10,773)	(\$10,140)	
	Cumulative time-	(\$449.040)	(\$494.475)	(8444.007)	(#456.004)	(\$467.770)	(\$479.550)	(\$499.600)	
3	aujusteu costs over	(\$410,040)	(\$431,473)	(\$444,227)	(\$450,551)	(\$407,773)	(\$470,552)	(\$400,082)	
10	Benefits derived from								
11	operation of new	\$0	\$150,000	\$170,000	\$190,000	\$210,000	\$230,000	\$250,000	
12	Discount factors for 12%:	1.000	\$0.89	\$0.80	\$0.71	\$0.64	\$0.57	\$0.51	
40	Time-adjusted benefits			A405 400	A4 05 000	A400 500		0100 750	
15	Current of present	\$U	\$133,950	\$135,490	\$135,280	\$133,560	\$130,410	\$126,750	
14	adjusted benefits over	% 0	\$133.950	\$269.440	\$404 720	\$538,280	102 8337	\$795.440	
15			1	\$200,440	3	4000,200	\$000,000	6	
16	Cumulative lifetime time-	(\$418.040)	(\$297.525)	(\$174.787)	(\$51.611)	\$70.501	\$190.138	\$306 748	
17		(#110,010)	(4201,020)	(\$114,101)	(401/011)	\$10,001	\$100,100	4000,140	
18			Par	vback Anah	/sis				
19									
20		\$400,000 T				_			
21		\$200,000 +			-	_			
22	Sie	\$0 -							
23	5	(\$200,000)	1	2 3	4 5	6			
24	°	(\$400,000)	_						
25		(\$600.000) I					_		
26		(******)		Year					
21									













University of	Toronto	De	epartment of Computer Scie	nce
.	Exam	nple matrix		
	Condidate 1 Name	Condidate 2 Norma	Condidate 2 Nome	
Decerintien		Candidate 2 Name	Candidate 3 Name	
Description				
Operational				
Feasibility				
Technical				
Feasibility				
Schedule				
Feasibility				
Economic				
Feasibility				
Ranking				
		-		
© Easterbrook 2004				2

Feasibility Criteria	Wt.	Candidate 1	Candidate 2	Candidate 3	Candidat
Operational Feasibility Functionality . Describes to what degree the alternative would benefit the organization and how well the system would work. Political . A description of how well received this solution would be from both	30%	Only supports Member Services requirements and current business processes would have to be modified to take advantage of software functionality	Fully supports user required functionality.	Same as candidate 2.	
user management, user, and organization perspective		Score: 60	Score: 100	Score: 100	
Technology An assessment of the maturity, availability (or ability to acquire), and desirability of the computer technology needed to support this candidate. Expertise An assessment to the technical expertise needed to develop, operate, and maintain the candidate system.		release of Platinum Plus package is version 1.0 and has only been on the market for 6 weeks. Maturity of product is a risk and company charges an additional monthly fee for technical support. Required to hire or train C++ expertise to perform modifications for integration requirements.	technical staff has only Powerbuilder experience, the senior analysts who saw the MS Visual Basic demonstration and presentation, has agreed the transition will be simple and finding experienced VB programmers will a be easier than finding Powerbuilder programmers and at a much cheaper cost. MS Visual Basic 5.0 is a mature technology based on version number.	technical staff is comfortable with Powerbuilder, management is concerned with recent acquisition of Powerbuilder by Sybase Inc. MS SQL Server is a current company standard and competes with SYBASE in the Client/Server DBMS market. Because of this we have no guarantee future versions of Powerbuilder will Nplay wellÓ with our current version SQL Server.	
		S	S 05	Saama 60	

		0 11 1 1			G 111 /
Feasibility Criteria	Wt.	Candidate 1	Candidate 2	Candidate 3	Candidate
Operational Feasibility	30%	Score: 60	Score: 100	Score: 100	
Technical	30%	Score: 50	Score: 95	Score: 100	
Feasibility					
Economic Feasibility	30%				
Cost to develop:		Approximately	Approximately	Approximately	
		\$350,000.	\$418,040.	\$400,000.	
Payback period					
(discounted):		Approximately	Approximately 3.5	Approximately 3.3	
		4.5 years.	years.	years.	
Net present value:		Approximately	Approximately	Approximately	
•		\$210,000.	\$306,748.	\$325,500.	
Detailed calculations:		See Attachment	See Attachment A	See Attachment A	
		A.			
		Score: 60	Score: 85	Score: 90	
Schedule Feasibility	10%	Less than 3	9-12 months	9 months	
		months.			
An assessment of how					
long the solution will take					
to design and implement.			Score: 80	Score: 85	
		Score: 95			
Ranking	100%	60.5	92	83.5	





























Example Scenario						
<u>Title: Successful meeting scheduled using messaging option</u> Participants: Alice (initiator, not attending); Bob, Carlo, Daphne (attendees)						
Action	Goals satisfied	Obstacles / Problems				
Alice requests meeting, specifying participants, timeframe	Meeting requested; Attendee list obtained	What if selected timeframe is infeasible?				
AS sends participant requests to Bob, Carlo and Daphne	?	Did we miss a goal?				
Bob reads message		Can't detect when messages are				
Carlo reads message	Participants informed	read; what happens if Bob reads the message but doesn't reply?				
Daphne reads message		lite message sur doesn't repij t				
Bob replies with preferences		What if the preferences are				
Carlo replies with preferences	Attendees preferences known	mutually exclusive? Should we allow some to be big				
Daphne replies with preferences	-	priority?				
AS schedules meeting	Room availability determined; room booked					
AS notifies Alice, Bob, Carlo, Daphne of time and location	Meeting announced; Attendance Confirmed (?)	How do we know if they've all read the announcement? What if the schedule is no longer convenient for one of them?				