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What problem are you looking to solve?:
By 2018, our current Nolij document management and workflow automation system will be phased out by the product owner, Lexmark, in favor of their new solution 'Content 7'. Lexmark announced in early 2015 their plans to consolidate both their Nolij and ImageNow solutions into the new Content 7 product. In preparation, Lexmark will cease enhancing the Nolij project and by 2018 will no longer provide support, security patches or product fixes. Over a dozen departments across campus currently use Nolij to store documents and automatically process documents and requests through workflows. Many of these installations are very complicated, involving integration with PeopleSoft, multiple routing points and years of document storage. We expect it could take a year or more of analysis and development to transition to the new solution.

Which departments or processes are affected?:
Nolij is currently in use in all divisions.

Electronic Filing Cabinets used for document storage are in place in:
* Payroll
* CEEE
* Vets
* SDRC
* Housing
* Health Center
* Human Resources
* Sponsored Programs Foundation
* Academic Departments
* Office of the Registrar
Automated workflows are in place in:
* Admissions (Undergrad, Graduate, International, EOP)
* Accounts Payable
* Financial Aid
* Human Resources (Fee Waiver, Appointment Documents, Separation Documents, Medical Files)
* Academic Programs - Integrated Curriculum Committee

While we are still learning about the Content 7 tool and how it will work, it is likely there will be at least moderate changes to some business processes. It is our intention to use this migration as an opportunity to adapt business processes to maximize use of the delivered tool with a minimum of customization and ongoing maintenance.

**What is the consequence of not doing this project?:**

Once the product reaches end of life in 2018, no further security patches, enhancements, or support will be provided for Nolij. ITS follows an industry standard practice of requiring that any service intended for use by the campus ‘enterprise’ be currently supported by the vendor. Any attempt to operate outside of this creates real institutional risk and direct significant negative consequences due to the confidential nature of some data stored in Nolij and for the basic services and transactions that rely on this tool such as Admissions, Financial Aid and Accounts Payable. If we don’t begin planning and building our migration to Content 7 now, we risk being short of time and available programming resources to complete the migration before 2018. While Lexmark claims sufficient consulting staff to support migrations, a certain risk exists by waiting too long and finding consulting resources thin as Lexmark works to migrate Nolij clients and, to a lesser extent, their ImageNow clients as well. Ultimately, we could be left without an operating document storage and workflow routing solution.

**What would a successful solution look like?:**

A successful solution would involve having all departments, documents, and workflows migrated to Content 7 before the end of life date is reached.

Advance work has already been started by ITS management with the vendor, securing transfer of our ‘enterprise’ (unlimited user) license to the new solution at no additional cost. The Lexmark product line is licensed differently than Nolij: where Nolij bundled all features in their enterprise license cost, Lexmark unbundles features into modular-based pricing. We have obtained assurance that most features will transition at no additional cost, although discovery and negotiations are ongoing. This is intended to ensure our initial Nolij investment is not lost during this transition.

Conversations are also underway for consulting support of the migration. Several different approaches will be proposed including: (1) Shared Lexmark / HSU migration: Lexmark installs software and leads/builds one complex workflow and one department document storage - providing a training experience for programmers to then begin building the remaining environments themselves; (2) Full Lexmark Effort: Lexmark leads all design work sessions, completes all builds and conducts knowledge transfer hand-off to HSU staff. While this approach is expected to be expensive, the concern is that a largely HSU-led build could limit our best use of the new product by simply migrating old business practices into a new tool but would also likely consume all programming resources for the next year.

**How else might you solve this problem?:**

ITS management discussed evaluating alternate enterprise content management (ECM) solutions as opposed to just migrating to Content 7. A number of other CSU’s use the Hyland OnBase solution, so discussions were held with several campuses to understand what was involved in implementation time and costs. HSU already has a significant investment in Nolij, including over $130,000 in enterprise license costs and we have Lexmark’s assurance that our enterprise license and the majority of functionality will be transitioned without need to repurchase licensing. A review of the OnBase CSU pricing in the Master Enabling Agreement puts OnBase enterprise licensing at over $200,000 plus the cost of modules, connectivity, training and implementation. Given Lexmark’s licensing offer, the prospect of a new solution becomes cost prohibitive. A copy of the background document on HSU’s selection of Nolij and the research of OnBase is available to the Prioritization Steering Committee upon request.

**Strategic Objective(s):**

Prepare students for sustainable environmental & financial stewardship.

**How does this project align with HSU’s strategic objectives?:**

This project supports a sustainable environment and efficient use of resources both human and material. The continued ability to route and store documents electronically, rather than walking documents around, using digital storage and retention practices rather than physical storage manually maintained contributes to the wise management of University resources. The intention of improving business efficiencies was one of the reasons Nolij was originally implemented; that intention is unchanged by migrating to the next generation of this tool.

**What resources will this project require?:**

So far, all conversations have been at the ITS management level. As more specific details become available, functional and technical resources would be brought into the discussions for sequencing and scheduling the migration.
Consultative: While many of these departments and/or workflows might be migratable without any analysis, we know that several will need some process improvement before they are rewritten. Initially, this support would need to come from Lexmark; once we learn the system, it’s possible Process Improvement personnel could aid in this effort.

Technical: Programming skills will be needed for this migration. System Administration will be needed to set up the new production and development servers. Desktop support will be needed for roll-out and browser and scanner configuration.

Functional: At least one functional expert will need to be involved for each area to participate in the workflow design in the new system. A wider number of functional resources would be required for testing and roll-out.

Training: Training will need to be provided to all new users. Initial training could be contracted with Lexmark; likely ongoing training would need to be provided by APS-HR campus trainers and/or subject matter experts (SME) in respective departments.

Project Management: The migration will need project management to keep things on track and moving forward to completion before the Nolij end of life. It is likely multiple project managers could be required given an expected parallel implementation plan, where multiple migrations could be in progress simultaneously. This may require both contract and internal resources.

It is possible to use Lexmark consultants for much of the Consultative and Technical work.

**What is your deadline?:**
01/01/2018

**And is your deadline a hard deadline?:**
Yes

**Why must the project be completed by this date?:**
Lexmark has so far not announced a specific date in 2018, only that the product end of life will be in 2018. We must migrate before the end of life date.

**Explanation of annual estimates:**
Costs fall into three categories: (1) software license & maintenance, (2) consulting and (3) hardware. We are working closely with the vendor to finalize pricing, expected by end of April; current estimates are listed below:

(1) Software License & Maintenance. As noted above Lexmark’s unbundled pricing model complicates a pricing and feature comparison; our position with Lexmark is that our contract entitles us to certain services and no amendment has been proposed that changes that fee structure. Further, any suggested increase in annual maintenance over our current 5% cap violates our current contract. Conclusion of these negotiations could reduce the cost estimates noted below.
(a) Additional software licenses (capture stations): $30,800
(b) Additional Software License Maintenance Capture Stations (20%): $6,160
(c) Annual Maintenance Increase for Year 1 (10%): $3,254
Note: This will then cause our ongoing annual maintenance increases to be based on a larger amount that our current 5% cap.
(d) TOTAL ADDITIONAL LICENSING AND MAINTENANCE: $40,214

(2) Consulting. To implement this project, we’re investigating two options, although depending on available funds, there could be a third option that is some of both.
(a) Hire Lexmark consultants to do all of the work and provide training. The cost estimate for this is approximately $500,000 but discovery is ongoing, expected to complete by end of April.
(b) Hire Lexmark consultants to do one workflow and provide training. HSU programmers to do the rest of the migrations. The cost for this combined approach would be approximately $120,000. This approach would likely consume all available programmer time for the next year.

(3) Hardware. While every effort will be made to use existing equipment, it is possible new hardware will be required to support 2 development servers (approximately $9,000 each) and 1 production environment ($9,000) for a total cost of $27,000.

Put another way:
Initial: Additional software licenses (capture stations): $30,800 + Hardware $27,000 + consulting ranging from $120,000 to $500,000 = $177,800 to $557,800.

Ongoing: Current annual maintenance @ 5% annual increase = $188,796 which is annually funded by ITS. Increased maintenance over 5 years @ 5% annual increase = $231,822
As noted above, conversations are underway to finalize pricing with Lexmark. ITS has funds available and will adjust the scope of the consulting engagement to align with that budget. By completing negotiations and obtaining pricing proposals from Lexmark by end of April, our intention would be to encumber these funds now for use in 2017+.

**Type:** Replace

**Affected or Related Systems/Modules:**
myHumboldt Portal
Nolij
PeopleSoft Campus Solutions
PeopleSoft CFS
PeopleSoft HR

**Considerations / dependencies:**
We believe that the Admissions workflows could strongly benefit from process analysis before their workflow building begins; this could involve ITS Process Improvement resources but should definitely involve input from Content 7 consultants. We are accounting for this in the proposed timeline.

As stated above, it’s important to note the impact to other projects if HSU programmers are to undertake this work. We expect that this could take up all available programmer time for an entire year, which would leave no time for other projects.

**Information Technology (IT) Feasibility Statement:**
Essentially, this conversion involves three key components:
1. Negotiate contracts which minimize any additional expenses for equivalent functionality in the new Content 7 tool.
2. Analyze the more complicated Nolij workflows to design solutions that take best advantage of the features of Content 7.

We have and are continuing to work with the vendor to provide detailed information about our existing workflows in the interest of contracting all or part of the implementation to the vendor. We envision that performing all migrations in-house could consume all ITS programming resources for an extended length of time, thus rendering us unable to conduct other campus initiatives. New electronic document storage or automated workflows can only be developed in Content 7 and could likely be needed before all Nolij work is migrated. It will be important to balance the resources committed to completing the migration with resources needed to develop any new Content 7 solutions.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:**
Attached is our Nolij Migration Planning document that we have exchanged with Lexmark. This includes our response to their questionnaire, intended to provide them the details needed to better understand our current Nolij installations; a 2nd tab is one version of how work could be distributed between the vendor and HSU resources. As noted elsewhere in this document, analysis is ongoing with Lexmark and the plans for distributing the work to be completed are very much still in progress.