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The following document includes the three-page letter submitted on December $31^{\text {st }}$,outlining the options for either a 12 -month or an 18 -month implementation of the business process redesign. It also includes the Linea RFP response.
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## B. 18-Month Implementation Option

 LETTER
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December 31, 2019
ATTN: Colin Bishop
San Bernardino County Employees' Retirement Association
348 West Hospitality Lane, Third Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0014
cbishopهasbcera.org

Mr. Bishop:
On behalf of Linea Solutions, we appreciate the opportunity to present our alternative plan for the implementation phase of the pension administration software consulting and business process redesign project. This alternative plan was created to provide an option for SBCERA to spend additional time on the implementation to achieve its goals. The following is a list of updates to our project and details about the alternative plan:

- The original plan called for a 12-month implementation phase. The alternative plan would last for 18 months. This allows for extra time to dig deeper and resolve additional priorities that will be established at the end of Phase 1 as the roadmap is built.
- Due to a scheduling conflict with Stephanie Minton, Sanjay Dudaney will be performing Stephanie's duties during Phase 1. At the end of Phase 1, we are still expecting Stephanie to join the project as the testing expert, as was originally proposed. Additionally, we will make Sanjay Dudaney available, at no additional charge, during the transition to Phase 2.
- Lucille Young, one of Linea's most senior PensionGold consultants, will be made available during Phase 1 and 2 at no additional cost. We are expecting to add Lucille to the team for a multi-day PensionGold user interface and module assessment during Phase 1, which will provide additional feedback to the team during the Phase 1 assessment. Additionally, she will be available for additional PensionGold insight during Phase 2.
- Based on SBCERA's needs and the additional information provided during our interview, Linea has presented two options for the project. Linea expects SBCERA can choose the preferred option at the start of the project or wait until the end of Phase 1.

Below are tables showing our original proposed rates and cost and our alternate rates and cost. These rates are all inclusive of travel, overhead, and any other expenses.

OPTION 1: Original Plan Rates and Project Cost by Phase:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Consultant | Title | Rate | Hours | Cost | Hours | Cost | Total |
| Gerard Pappa | BPI Specialist | $\$ 258.02$ | 320 | $\$ 82,566.40$ | 192 | $\$ 49,539.84$ | $\$ 132,106.24$ |
| Stephanie <br> Minton | Senior Business <br> Analyst | $\$ 257.36$ | 240 | $\$ 61,766.40$ | 1152 | $\$ 296,478.72$ | $\$ 358,245.12$ |
| Nicole Naddy | Associate <br> Business Analyst | $\$ 112.13$ | 320 | $\$ 35,881.60$ | 1920 | $\$ 215,289.60$ | $\$ 251,171.20$ |
| Peter Dewar | Security Specialist | $\$ 302.63$ | 40 | $\$ 12,105.20$ | 80 | $\$ 24,210.40$ | $\$ 36,315.60$ |
| TOTAL |  |  | 920 | $\$ 192,319.60$ | 3344 | $\$ 585,518.56$ | $\$ 777,838.16$ |

OPTION 2: Alternative Plan Rates and Project Cost by Phase:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Consultant | Title | Rate | Hours | Cost | Hours | Cost | Total |
| Gerard Pappa | BPI Specialist | $\$ 258.02$ | 320 | $\$ 82,566.40$ | 288 | $\$ 74,309.76$ | $\$ 156,876.16$ |
| Sanjay <br> Dudaney / <br> Stephanie <br> Minton | Senior Business <br> Analyst | $\$ 257.36$ | 240 | $\$ 61,766.40$ | 1728 | $\$ 444,718.08$ | $\$ 506,484.48$ |
| Nicole Naddy | Associate <br> Business Analyst | $\$ 112.13$ | 320 | $\$ 35,881.60$ | 2880 | $\$ 322,934.40$ | $\$ 358,816.00$ |
| Peter Dewar | Security Specialist | $\$ 302.63$ | 40 | $\$ 12,105.20$ | 80 | $\$ 24,210.40$ | $\$ 36,315.60$ |
| TOTAL |  |  | 920 | $\$ 192,319.60$ | 4976 | $\$ 866,172.64$ | $\$ 1,058,492.24$ |

The following changes have been made for the implementation phase:

| Item | Original Plan | Alternative Plan | Change |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Implementation Phase Length | 12 Months | 18 Months | 6 additional months |
| Gerard Pappa | 192 | 288 | 96 additional work hours |
| Sanjay Dudaney / Stephanie <br> Minton | 1152 | 1728 | 576 additional work hours |
| Nicole Naddy | 1920 | 2880 | 960 additional work hours |
| Peter Dewar | 80 | 80 | unchanged |

Our current recommendation is the following:

- If SBCERA chooses to recommend our proposals to its Administrative Committee of its Board of Retirement, it should consider that during our Phase 1 assessment, we will be putting two work plans together based on the gaps and recommendations we make.
- These recommendations will be put forth as a variety of workstreams that combine processes, workflows, and/or functions into logical groupings.
- Our overarching assumption is that both plans will extend beyond 12 , or even 18 , months. However, we believe that our consultants provide the most when we are involved in higher impact, higher value work li.e. more complex, higher risk process gaps) and towards the end of a fixed time period, we train SBCERA staff to continue a culture of continuous improvement (in fact, the reality is that we will be working to develop this cultural shift throughout the Phase 1), and transition our work after momentum is generated.
- At the end of Phase 1 , we will provide two separate Phase 2 plans, one for a 12month work plan, and the other for an 18-month work plan, and SBCERA's executive sponsors can select the plan that it considers more valuable.

We look forward to the opportunity to work with your team on this important initiative. Please reach out to me or Bryce Haws (bhaws®lineasolutions.com) with any additional questions you may have.

Sincerely,

atagawadlineasolutions.com

## C. Proposal Response

## 1.Company

Provide a brief introduction of your firm's history, products and services offered, the firm's primary business activity, and clients served. Additionally, identify affiliated companies of the firm and what differentiates you from your competition.

## Firm History

Linea Solutions is the largest of a group of firms in North America that specialize in public retirement fund consulting. As an organization, we have been engaged by 54 retirement and benefit systems since the company's founding in January 1999. We have over 60 consultants and are in our $21^{\text {st }}$ year of providing such services. Our staff's combined experience is with over 100 pension plans.

Linea began as a consulting firm working with many California public pension funds. While our primary services to the pension industry have remained similar, Linea's client base has expanded to include all types of defined benefit funds including city, county, state, multiemployer, and some of the largest plans in North America. It is this diverse experience across so many pension plans that uniquely qualifies us to bring a perspective to the market that is comprehensive of the challenges, expectations, and opportunities this industry faces.

## Services

Linea has a robust set of services to address the business, organizational, and IT challenges of public pension plans. We have been providing most of these services since the company's founding in 1999. These services can be tied to large project implementations, but also are used in support of assessments or day-to-day operations. Below is a diagram of our services.

## BUSINESS SUPPORT

IT \& Business Assessment Benchmarking Analytics Industry Research
I.T. ADVISORY SERVICES

Mabile Apps
Straight Through Processing
Campaign Management Customer Relationship
Management
CHANGE MANAGEMENT
Organizational Readiness
Employer Readiness
Staff Engagement

## PROCUREMENT

Current \& Future State Analysis System Requirements
RFP Writing
Vendor Selection
Contract Negotiation

## IMPLEMENTATION

 OVERSIGHTOversight Project Management Project Management
Project QA
IV\&V
Risk Management
Resource Management
Vendor Management
Data Analysis \&
Conversion Management

## CLIENT SIDE SERVICES

Design Confirmation
Testing
External System Integration
Administrative Support
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Biographies of Principals

## Akio Tagawa, <br> CEO, Linea Solutions

Akio has been consulting for retirement systems since 1998. He has over 22 years of experience in I.T. and specializes in project management, business analysis, business process reengineering and organizational change management for retirement systems.

As a thought leader, Akio is credited with driving software vendors in the pension industry to deliver solutions using agile software development techniques. He has been working with vendors on these techniques since 2010 to outline better approaches to the delivery of software functionality to the industry. He speaks regularly at conferences and assists clients
 with strategic planning for major initiatives.

## Brian Colker <br> CFO, Linea Solutions

Brian has 22 years of experience in I.T. and benefits consulting. He specializes in procurement, business transformation strategy, transition management, and vendor oversight for public benefit organizations. Brian oversees Linea Solutions' corporate strategy and co-manages Linea's executive leadership team.

His most recent projects include a business transformation project for a state Workers' Compensation fund in Washington, and a large pension administration system implementation for the University of California Retirement
 System.

Akio Tagawa and Brian Colker are co-owners of Linea Solutions, each owning 50\% of the company. Linea Solutions has not gone through any mergers or acquisitions.

## Affiliated Companies

In 2018, Linea Solutions formed a sister company, Linea Secure, to address the growing cybersecurity needs of organizations in our industry. Linea Secure utilizes a risk-based approach to cybersecurity threat mitigation. Linea Secure seeks to maintain the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of data stored by clients, either on premise or in the cloud. Our consultants utilize the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Cybersecurity Framework (CSF) to assist clients in minimizing their cyber risk. Customizing the NIST CSF, Linea Secure performs a risk-based assessment applying and customizing their 17 key controls specifically for public pension funds. We call this our Pension Cyber Security Framework (PCSF).

The PCSF identifies the processes that are specific to each organization, including:

- How member records are secured
- Network segmentation
- Database encryption
- Imaging system integrity
- Self-service application configuration
- Pension Administration Software System (PASS) technology used by the organization
- Security of PASS integration points
- Cloud computing exposure and countermeasures

Linea Secure typically reviews all these processes or a subset, depending on the requirements of the engagement. Applying an internationally recognized standard ensures that a survivable methodology is in place to meet the evolving threats that exist in the cyber realm.

## Peter Dewar CEO, Linea Secure

Peter is a senior strategist with over 25 years of experience in I.T. and cybersecurity. His expertise spans government, energy, not for profit, and health care sectors.

Prior to Linea Secure, Peter spent the last eight years at the District of Columbia Retirement Board (DCRB), providing strategic technology and cybersecurity direction as CTO and Director of Information Technology. Prior to DCRB, he spent 12 years acting as President of DataFlow Systems, an I.T. consulting firm.

Peter has overseen many cybersecurity
 assessments and implementations including cybersecurity frameworks, policies, procedures, and technology. He is a Certified Information Systems Security Professional (CISSP) and has completed the Certificate of Achievement in Public Plan Policy (CAPPP) in Employee Pension.

## What Differentiates Linea from the Competition?

We believe we are the most qualified to provide the requested services to SBCERA for the following reasons:

1. Certified BPR/BPI Experts: Linea has performed BPR/BPI for 30 of our 54 clients over the last 20 years. Our BPI teams have both operational and technical expertise. Because we have both, we can make business process improvements through both business changes and PAS application changes. Our team lead, Gerard Pappa, is a certified Lean Six Sigma Master Blackbelt, the highest certification possible for the Six Sigma BPI toolset. Furthermore, Gerard is currently finishing up a BPI project of striking similarity to the project outlined by SBCERA (similar sized county fund requesting organizational and system process improvements to its PensionGold PAS). Gerard will be able to translate many lessons learned from this recent project into tangible benefits for SBCERA.
2. Testing: Our staff has performed extensive work in testing software on Pension Administration Systems (PAS). We have been doing this with defined benefit pension software since 2000. By our calculation, Linea Solutions staff has spent over 336,600 hours testing PAS software and is fully aware of what types of functionality are higher risk areas. Stephanie Minton, assigned to manage the implementation phase, has led especially challenging testing phases for previous PAS implementations.
3. 37 Act Experts: Linea Solutions has 16 California 1937 Act county clients. Linea knows the retirement laws, including PEPRA/CalPEPRA, and we understand the process by which many of SBCERA's peers have implemented updates. We are also familiar with how ' 37 Act funds have accommodated Internal Revenue Code and updates to GASB. ' 37 Act county funds have statutes and rules that can be as sophisticated as (if not more than) a statewide fund, and we have the knowledge and capability to navigate through this level of sophistication to enable effective solutions. Finally, we have experience coordinating the shared resources among the retirement fund and the county.
4. Security: Our cybersecurity capabilities are, by design, integrated with our oversight and project management approaches. We are the only firm that consults in cybersecurity exclusively for pension systems. Linea believes that it is critical for an organization to consider the risk to its systems and include cybersecurity improvements as part of any BPI initiative. We should also note that security is not just about system architecture. Often, some of the most impactful changes to a pension fund's security are organizational, cultural, "people" based improvements.
5. PensionGold - Customization of PensionGold: Linea has worked on 10 projects involving the PensionGold System from version 1 through version 3, and several
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of Linea's staff know the system, the database, and the data structure extensively. We know LRS's PensionGold product from its beginning to its current state.
5. Open-Minded Approach: Linea's work approach is based upon a foundation of methods, technical frameworks, and business processes that reference what is considered "industry best." While this is a great way to start, we realize each client is different. Our clients have environments, staff (skills and personalities). and requirements that are unique to their organizations. As such, we tune the processes and approach to fit the specific situation of each client. With this focus, we have found that clients are able to solve a problem that precisely fits their business, technical, and cultural needs. A good analysis is more than just a checklist for an assumed set of improvements. We enter a project trying to understand the situation and then look at available alternatives.

## 2.Proposal

## a) Introduction \& Understanding of Project

An overall introduction to your proposal including a description of your understanding of the project.
SBCERA is seeking a firm who, through business process improvement activities, can create a business design and a revised PensionGold v3 application that will more tightly match the member, employer, and organization's needs. At the completion of this process work, SBCERA then desires to implement and test the new design and move the changes to production.

SBCERA has mentioned roughly 70 workstreams and 15 major PASS processes, including:

- new hires (including manual adds and adds via transmittal files)
- transmittal file processing
- reciprocity
- member status changes
- divorce/separation
- refunds
- retirement estimates
- service retirement
- disability retirement
- service audits
- retiree payroll
- death benefit processing
- document imaging
- processing and records retention
- call-center integration

Across SBCERA's organizational, member, and employer processes, SBCERA has emphasized the elimination of manual processes and analysis of automation opportunities where available.

Additionally, SBCERA has emphasized efficiency and simplicity. To that degree, we understand that there may be a number of customizations to the PensionGold v3 PASS which are currently causing more problems than they are solving. While reverting these customizations entirely may resolve some issues, it may be advantageous to convert certain processes to the baseline versions of PensionGold's newest releases to take advantage of newer features and capabilities without the need for extensive customization. SBCERA needs a partner to navigate LRS's modern offerings, including
knowledge of challenges with current modules, and the scope of implementation of such improvements.

We understand that SBCERA might be interested in improving the security of its organization and PASS but is not interested in fundamental architectural changes. Linea believes this is highly possible as there are often a number of cybersecurity "quick wins" achievable through simple organizational change.

SBCERA has listed change management within the scope of responsibilities, which Linea agrees is necessary for adoption and maintenance of the improved processes. We also believe that part of SME and staff training should include training of BPI methods to enable SBCERA to implement continuous business process improvement after project completion.

Finally, SBCERA requests project management throughout the implementation. Beyond oversight, SBCERA requests the proposer work directly with project teams on the design and testing of the new processes.

Linea is confident we can provide the services SBCERA seeks. To most effectively perform the work, we do expect sufficient access to SBCERA's SMEs and managers, especially during the initial 4-month analysis phase since much of the work uncovering gaps and issues will occur through interviews with the staff. Additionally, Linea is assuming either a 12-month or an 18-month implementation of improvements, Depending on the nature of the processes to be improved, Linea may recommend that rollouts of the improvements happen iteratively over the course of the implementation rather than all at once. This iterative approach may allow users the ability to adjust to changes a piece at a time and increases the likelihood of adoption.

Below, we describe our philosophy for performing BPI work as well as our specific BPI strengths and advantages:

## Philosophy

- Linea takes an iterative approach to BPI. We use Six Sigma principles for an Agile-based approach to process and organizational improvement. We have adapted our experience with software development and the use of scrums, and fast, iterative and incremental improvement to process improvement, which is unique in our industry.
- BPI and IT implementation can be done hand-in-hand or can be done separately.
- We try to make very few assumptions. It is important to first understand how the client is organized and how they perform business processes today before moving onto the improvement strategy, and what works for one organization does not always work for others. Therefore, getting a full understanding of the context and environment is critical to our success.
- Data is important. We try to establish Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) early in the project.


## Strengths and advantages

- We know how the business of public pension operates. For 20 years, we have worked with many different types of funds. We know the myriad ways they execute based on their organization size, membership size, member type, number of employers, plan nuances, and service orientation. This knowledge of fund service delivery models allows us to bring a holistic view as we prepare to delve into the detail for each client.
- We integrate organizational change management (OCM) principles with our BPI implementations to build client ownership and staff buy-in for maximized change adoption.
- We believe it is important to define short, medium, and long-term improvements, and apply additional focus where business need dictates. We believe this is also unique in our industry because many changes take very long to occur, so it is important that people can see benefits early on to gain buy-in from staff or managers.
- We have even more change implementation experience than analysis experience. We do not think that there is any other company that has worked with public pension fund executives, managers, or supervisors to get "in the weeds" and effect actual change as we have. Not only does this change make us assess things more realistically, it makes us substantially more effective during the assessment and plan development phase of business process improvement.


## b) Scope of Services

A detailed scope of services, following requirement guidelines and deliverables discussed herein.
Our approach to business process improvement (BPI) and organizational improvement has its roots in a Six Sigma continuous process improvement model and Agile solution development. We use this same approach for implementing organizational change management (OCM) and delivering BPI. Each step ends with a tollgate and approval process with process owners and serves as an approval to move on to subsequent steps. We have broken this process into five steps which cover Current State Assessment and Process Improvement.

## DEFINE

## MEASURE

Six Sigma
Continuous Process Improvement

## ANALYZE

## IMPROVE

## CONTROL

## Scope



Deploy

Figure 2 Approach to BPI and Organizational Improvement
While the nomenclature is different, the steps of this BPI process correlate with milestones outlined by SBCERA in Table 1.

Table 1 Milestones as they relate to Linea BPI Steps

| SBCERA Milestone/Phase | Linea Step |
| :--- | :--- |
| Milestone One: Project Initiation | This step is the same |
| Milestone Two: Operational Assessment | Scope |
| Milestone Three: Gap Analysis | Discover |
| Milestone Four: Comprehensive Business Requirements | Assess |
| Milestone Five: Plan Development | Plan |
| Phase 2: Implementation | Deploy |

We describe each component of this methodology below.

## Phase 1: Analysis, Reporting, and Design

## Milestone One: Project Initiation

The project initiation and high-level planning allows us to work with SBCERA's senior leadership to understand foundational issues that will in turn guide the project. It gives our consultants context and perspective on what is most important to SBCERA. During this step, we focus on the following:

| Priorities |  <br> Vision |
| :--- | :--- | | Known |
| :---: |
| pain points | | Project |
| :---: |
| planning |

The following is an example of some of the detail we typically review:

- Which peer systems resemble SBCERA most closely
- What makes SBCERA unique and how that would impact possible options
- The elements of SBCERA that Executives feel will likely change the most as a result of this project
- Key SBCERA staff and their focus areas in support of the project
- Solidify the timeframe of the project and make known any key Board, Stakeholder, or other milestones
- The degree to which the project and the options/recommendations may impact SBCERA people, process or technology
As part of the initial high-level planning, Linea will develop a communication plan to specifically define how information is released. These plans include communication type, frequency, and audience. We will also establish reporting guidelines: What will go in the bi-weekly status report.

Finally, during this phase, we create a project plan and confirm scope with stakeholders, including which SBCERA resources will be needed and the amount of time they will be needed to complete the evaluation

## Milestone Two: Operational Assessment (Scope)

Scope - identify the operational processes that make up the client organization's line of business.

Identification of the operational processes to be addressed within the scope of the project is performed during an on-boarding meeting with the project sponsor or project governing body. Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) are identified at this point, along with any constraints on their availability. The process by which their time will be reserved is established. High-level business problems and pain-points associated with operational processes are captured and defined in this in this step. along with benefit realization estimates.


Figure 3 BPI - Scope

## Milestone Three: Gap Analysis (Discover)

## Discover - Gather and review all existing documentation.

The Linea analysts will gather and review all documentation associated with the operational processes identified in Step 1. This is done prior to meeting with SMEs, so that we can make the best possible use of staff members' time. It also ensures that the analysts will be "speaking the language" used by the SMEs, reducing the risk of misunderstanding. The documentation reviewed is not limited to process and procedure reference materials, but also includes applicable legal and regulatory framework, bylaws and policy documents key to ensuring compliance in any future state process. The combination of current policy, procedure, bylaws and regulation make up the business rules to which any future state process must adhere.


Figure 4 BPI - Discovery

The Discovery step includes planning and gathering more detailed measurements of the process and magnitude of business problems. The Linea analysts will work with SBCERA to gather data and statistically measure how a process is performing against objectives. These baseline measurements will be included in a process deliverable and will carry forward throughout the life of the project, gauging improvement levels, quality, and attainment of statistical process control. Example process performance measurements are illustrated in the Figure 4.
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Figure 5 Process Performance Measurements
Linea analysts will conduct two-hour work sessions, with similarities to LEAN "Kaizen Events," with SMEs to confirm or gather information in the following areas:

- Process performance goals and objective measurements
- High-level operational process workflow diagram and associated step table
- Business rules
- Process inputs and outputs
- Tools \& System Interfaces
- Known /observed issues and opportunities for improvement
- Anticipated business rules changes pending


Figure 6 Linea consultant facilitating Kaizen Event

The work sessions are highly collaborative, and the SMEs are asked to bring examples and materials used in the process. The Linea analyst will develop a workflow diagram by walking the meeting participants through the steps taken to complete the process. The method used to develop the workflow diagram brings out other areas of information noted in the list above and illustrated in Figure 6.

This method of gathering key information in a SME work session is most effectively done on a white board, enabling collaboration, but other tools may also be brought to bear.

We limit work sessions to two hours because our experience has shown that any time over two hours is less productive. We are cognizant of the fact that SMEs tend to be the most experienced and in-demand staff members, and so we try to be as respectful of their time as possible. Many current state processes can be captured in a single work session, if existing documentation is complete and up to date. More complex processes, or those for which current documentation is not available may require a second or third meeting.

|  | PROCESS GOAL \& OBJECTIVES <br> The goal of the $A B C$ process is to ... <br> Objectives that must be completed to meet this goal are: <br> 1. Complete CDE <br> 2. Reconcile FGH <br> BUSINESS RULES \& POTENTIAL CHANGES <br> 1. If $X$ occurs, then it is necessary that step $Y$ be taken. <br> 2. Statute Sec 123.4 mandates that $A$ and $B$ be processed within 30 days. <br> 3. All Bs must be filed with Department C. <br> 4. Authorization is required if 456 is requested. |
| :---: | :---: |
| INPUTS / OUTPUTS TOOLS \& INTEGRATION POINTS <br> 1. Application Form ABC 1. Core System XYZ <br> 2. XYZ data from 123 2. MS Word <br> system 3. MS Excel <br> 3. Letter EFG 4. Outlook <br> 4. Mema HIJ 5. General Ledger <br> 5. Form QRS   | ISSUES \& OPPORTUNITIES <br> 1. Current system limitations prevent the efficient processing of XYZ. <br> 2. All LMNs must be processed manually. <br> 3. A MS Access database is used to log EFG <br> 4. A backlog exists in this process, currently 4 weeks to complete request <br> 5. Workflow is manual and there is no automated suspense |
| QUESTIONS \& PARKING LOT ISSUES <br> 1. Policy Question: Should TUV change the requirement that ABC must happen? <br> 2. Follow up with 678 Department to determine 456 . | sy |

Figure 7 Discovery Method

Milestone Four: Comprehensive Business Requirements (Assess)
Assess - Meet with process owners, build a straw man future state
Once the current state has been described in the process deliverable document, the analysts will begin to develop a straw man future state process. It is important to note that this is simply a model to be used to help the decision makers and SMEs visualize a future state. This is done by analyzing the issues and opportunities gathered in prior steps, often in the context of modern automation systems projects and operational best practices. Root cause analysis is used to identify the underlying cause of the problems experienced as symptoms by staff members. We often find

## Scope

## Discover



Figure 8 BPI - Assess "common threads" across operational processes with the same root cause, and we look for ways to leverage solutions across an enterprise.

Once the current state has been captured and a future state model mapped out, the Linea analysts will meet with the process owner, who often has a different perspective on the process and organization. The owner's issues in the current process are likely to be somewhat different from those experienced by the staff members, and confidential conversations regarding impacts to organizational structure are held in this setting. The analysts will review both the current state and the model of the future state with the process owner to ensure that the owner's issues and organizational vision are accurately represented.

Staff member adoption and compliance can be a significant impediment to organizational change. We work to develop the future state model collaboratively with process owners, SMEs, and staff. Using the model we develop as a straw man, we help the participants develop a vision of the future state. Once staff members are given the opportunity to contribute to the design of future process and tools, they become stakeholders and champions of change.

The Linea analysts will complete the process document, delivering a draft that typically contains the following segments:

- Overview
- Terms \& Definitions
- Roles
- Timeline
- Workflow
- Business Rules
- System Functional Requirements
- System General Requirements
- Tools \& Interfaces
- Key Data Elements
- Business Process Improvements
- Implementation Strategy
- Process Performance Indicators
- Continuous Process Improvement Plan
- Approvals

During the document completion step, analysts will meet with process owners to discuss performance indicators that will be used to assess the results of process improvement efforts. These will include Critical Success Factors and Key Performance Indicators. We will also discuss the steps and schedule by which the process performance will be monitored as a part of Continuous Process Improvement.

During this step in the process, the Linea consultants will analyze the current business process by comparing the client's processes with other public retirement systems. The practices of other systems stimulate ideas for process improvements. Linea's network of public pension consultants and history of public pension process improvements are an invaluable resource for identifying best practices and process benchmarks in this step.

The draft process document goes through a tollgate review cycle, first with the contributing SMEs to ensure that the content is an accurate reflection of their input. The next review cycle will be with the process owners and any other stakeholders identified during the on-boarding stage. Any needed revisions are made, and a final draft is submitted to the appropriate party for sign-off and approval to move onto the next step.

## Cybersecurity Requirements

In addition to functional and technical improvement requirements, Linea consultants also gather the cybersecurity requirements. We consider technical requirements, compliance requirements, and best practice standards for protecting personally identifiable information, and the technical and business impacts if that data was to be breached, modified, or unavailable.

We cannot emphasize enough how important gathering cybersecurity requirements is, and how important it is to begin before implementation of the improved processes. Security will affect system design and changes to both business and technical
processes. Waiting until after an implementation to address security can be much more time consuming, costly, and risky. Because Linea Solutions has both cybersecurity and pension expertise, we know which processes and systems will require the most attention and we have a better understanding of threat severity levels for our industry.

## Milestone Five: Plan Development (Plan)

Plan - Determine how to implement future state
Once the process documentation is finalized, we work with the client to plan the implementation. This involves creating a work breakdown schedule, identifying new technology to be procured, if any, and calculating and identifying the resources needed for the implementation. Process improvements may need to be piloted and tested in this step before larger scale implementations are pursued. Process performance improvement measurements are a key data point used when deciding to move the changes to production. We review this plan with the Steering Committee, and once approved, set the kick-off date for deployment.

Figure 9 is a sample plan for a recent BPI initiative.
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Figure 10 BPI Workstream Plan

## Phase 2: Implementation and Process Improvements

## Implementation Overview

## Deploy - begin executing the <br> project plan

The final step in the BPI process is to begin the deployment of the new process. This encompasses the entire implementation phase. Though of note, because the BPI process is iterative, the scope through plan steps may occur at any point during the implementation based on new discoveries. This process varies based on the type of process change being implemented. There are three general approaches:

- Changes that do not involve systems. For pure business process / procedure / policy


## Scope

## Discover

## Assess

 changes, we deploy these process changes quickly. They usually involve working with the SMEs and unit managers on one-page executive-level documents. These documents explain the nature of the change, the impact, and the team's recommendation. Once Steering approves the change, we work with the teams on a specific plan to roll the change out to staff.- Changes that involve existing systems. For process changes that involve changes to the current solutions, we first perform the step above, but also include system impact in our one-page document to Steering. We collect cost and duration impact from the IT department or the system vendor. Once Steering approves the process change and system changes, we proceed using the client's software deployment methodology.
- Changes that involve new technology. For process changes that involve new technology, we may have to integrate a procurement process into the steps above - this means we need to collect requirements, formalize them into a bid vehicle, and work with the SMEs and IT staff to assess the most appropriate vendor solutions. We then proceed with the approach used for changes involving existing systems.
These three types of changes are described in detail below.


## Change Type 1: Changes that Do Not Involve Systems

We believe there will be a portion of changes we can make with no changes to any systems. These changes could be any of the following:

- Business rule changes. SBCERA could determine that a business rule is outmoded, irrelevant or unrealistic. For example, Linea Solutions had a client that did not have a specified time frame for searching for a one-time death benefit beneficiary. Staff theoretically could search for a beneficiary for years without being able to 'close' the case. The client determined that a three-year search was enough. This was a rule that did not impact any existing systems.
- Procedure changes. SBCERA could change a process to make it more efficient, clearer, or to institute better controls. In the example above, the client also specified how the beneficiary should be searched for - using Lexis/Nexis, with communications to the last known address on file twice a year for the three-year period, with a final letter sent after the three-year period.
- Role changes. SBCERA may determine that different staff roles are appropriate for a particular process. In many cases, these are associated with procedure and/or business rule changes. In one example, our client had a department section dedicated to retiree health processing. The Director decided that it made more sense for the unit responsible for handling retirements to also handle the healthcare enrollment process, since the enrollments were the bottleneck for the retirement process as a whole. The retirement unit was cross-trained in the enrollment procedures, and the healthcare unit was cross-trained in the general retirement process.

Figure 11 represents the general process of implementing this type of change.


Figure 12 Change Process

## Change Type 2: Process Changes with Changes to Existing Systems

It is quite common to pair process changes with system changes. Business rules, procedures, and roles are usually reflected in the systems, as described below.

- Business rule changes. SBCERA could determine that a calculation rule is inconsistent or outmoded. One Linea client used a different final average salary calculation for non-service connected disability retirements as compared to service retirements. This was a past practice that had simply persisted; it was not written into statute. The client decided to make the calculation uniform, which required a change to their legacy system.
- Procedure changes. Procedure changes can be reflected in changes to the system's workflow, such as the addition or deletion of a step. An example of this type of change is when a retirement system changes the case or task review process, centralizing this activity in a QA unit, rather than relying on peer review or manager reviews.
- Role changes. Role changes are often system and process related; in the example above, the QA role would be a new system role that must be created.

To implement the changes above, the process is depicted in Figure 12.


Figure 13 Change Process, including system changes

Change Type 3: Process Changes that require new systems
Major process changes can necessitate the procurement of new software. These types of changes are as follows:

- New interfaces and/or screens. Some process changes require entirely new interfaces, such as employer or member portals, mobile technology, and the like. For example, CRM solutions can provide new screens to track member calls and emails.
- New processes. New processes can be implemented, such as web-initiated member workflow or document submission.
- Better methods of performing the same tasks. New systems can perform the same functions, but do so in a more efficient fashion, such as real-time updating of member data, rather than periodic batch processing.

In order to implement these changes, we add a procurement step to the process, as depicted in Figure 13.


Figure 14 Changes that involve new systems

## Tools utilized in Process

Linea uses a variety of tools to implement the processes described above in our methodology. We describe them in Table 2.

Table 2 Tools

| Tool | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| Microsoft Visio | Used for creating process flowcharts, organizational structures, <br> and general mapping. |
| CEM benchmark reports | Benchmarking process which compares a fund to a pool of peer <br> funds based on several factors. |
| Linea public pension consultant <br> network | This is the company. Over 60 staff with a high-level of expertise <br> who are available to answer questions and support the project <br> team as needed. This also includes Linea's body of knowledge we <br> have accumulated from 20 years of consulting public pension <br> funds. |


| Tool | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Charter | Used to define the focus, scope, direction and motivation for <br> Continuous Improvement teams. |
| Microsoft Project \& Gantt Charts | Used for project tracking and general project management. We <br> build Gantt charts, timelines, budgeting estimates, resourcing <br> estimates, etc. |
| Benefit Realization Framework | Used to standardize, estimate and capture the benefits of <br> Continuous Improvement initiatives. |
| SIP0C Diagrams | A high-level process documentation diagram used to capture <br> suppliers, inputs, process, outputs, customers and scope <br> boundaries of a process. |
| Key Performance Indicators <br> (KPIs) | A quantifiable measurement used to evaluate process performance <br> and improvement areas. |
| Customer Experience Journey | Online modeling tool land occasionally physical wall-charts and <br> infographics, as needed) used to maintain end-to-end customer <br> lifecycle focus on process improvement's purpose. |
| Mapping | A table outlining who is responsible, accountable, consulted, or <br> informed. Excellent for maintaining high quality communication <br> lines. |
| RACI Charts | Used early in a project to document the impacted stakeholder <br> groups on several different dimensions and generate an impact <br> heat map. |
| Stakeholder Impact Assessment |  |


| Tool | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| A3 Reports | Used to communicate critical information about process <br> performance to Executives, process owners and SMEs, including <br> Pareto diagrams, control charts, and improvement <br> recommendations. |

Below are the specifics stages and milestones used to execute the types of improvements and changes described above.

## Project Kickoff

The project kickoff before implementation is primarily used to finalize the project management plan. The finalized road map and project plan is the result of the work performed during Phase 1, and represents the shared understanding among the project team of the following:

- What tasks are needed for the project
- The duration of each task
- The approximate date the task will start and when it needs to finish
- Who is responsible for each task
- Which tasks depends on which preceding tasks

The project plan document is the result of many hours of collaboration between all stakeholders. Once the plan is agreed to, it implies that there is consensus among all stakeholders on resource assignments, tasks, scope, duration, and schedule. Regular updates to the plan are required to ensure all sides understand what changes have been made to any of these variables.

The project plan is reviewed weekly and updated monthly based on the weekly project management meetings with the SBCERA Project Director.

## Work Sample and Why it Works

Figure 14 is a sampling of screenshots from a project management plan. The value of this plan is that it gets all members of the organization in alignment with the work that each of them will be required to do. This plan is the first step in transitioning the organization from the old model to the future. Some of the most difficult challenges on a project of this scale are related to getting people to move from their comfort zone to the new and improved environment. Thus, we incorporate organizational readiness and change management into as many parts of this plan as possible, so that people understand the "how" and "why" of a transition, rather than just the "what.

| FEDACTED | REDACTED | $\begin{array}{r} \text { V } 1.2 \\ 3 / 30 / 201 . \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Project: REDACTED Pension Administration System implementation |  |
|  | Document: Project Management Plan |  |

## REDACTED Project Management Plan

### 1.00verview

The Project Management Plan provides the rules and guidelines for managing the following areas of the REDACTED Project:

- Scope
- Schedule
- Cost
- Risk
- Quality
- Communications
- Documents

The REDACTED Project Change Management Plan and Issue Management Process are provided in separate documents and can be found on SharePoint in the PAS Documents folder.

### 1.1 Project Management Approach

The Project Managers (Oversight, REDACTED, REDACTED, REDACTED) have the overall responsibility for managing and executing the REDACTED project according to this Project Management Plan and subsidiary vendor project plans. The project team consists of personnel from REDACTED business and IT groups, DIS, Linea, and PAS software (REDACTED) and data migration (REDACTED) vendors. The Project Managers will work with the Project Leads and key project team members to perform project planning and scheduling. All project plans will be reviewed and approved by the REDACTED Project Steering Committee.

The REDACTED project team members from each organization will continue to report to their organizational managers throughout the duration of the project. In accordance with the REDACTED Resource Plan, the REDACTED Project Manager is responsible for communicating with REDACTED organizational managers regarding the project scope and schedule expectations of each project resource.

### 1.2 REDACTED Project Team

The REDACTED Project Team referred to in this document is comprised from the following:

| Role | Project Team Member |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Sponsor | REDACTED |
| Project Director | REDACTED |

### 2.011troject Summary

The purpose of the REDACTED REDACTED project is to convert and replace REDACTED' current pension application system, workflow solution, imaging and, potentially, telephony; as well as implement Customer Relationship Management (CRM) and self-service functions for members and employers. Additionally, as part of the project, REDACTED will be undergoing a data cleansing and data conversion initiative.

At its highest level, the project scope will include the following:

- Project Scoping and Planning
- Requirements Analysis
- Data Assessment
- System Procurement
- Data Cleansing and Migration
- System Configuration
- Hardware Installation and Configuration
- Testing and Verification
- Operational Process Recnginecring
- Training and Documentation
- Production Implementation


### 2.1 Project Scope

The scope of the REDACTED project includes requirements gathering and feasibility assessment, data cleansing and conversion, business process reengineering and the implementation of a pension administration system software package.
2.1.1 Phase 1-Project Assessment and Procurement

The purpose of Phase 1 of the REDACTED Project is to define the project scope, develop detailed project requirements, and conduct procurements for both the PAS software and Data Migration vendors. Following is the scope of the Project Assessment and Procurement Phase:

- Conduct interviews with REDACTED subject matter experts to define the business and technical requirements for the PAS solution and to determine viable options available.
- Document current business processes and initial recommendations.
- Perform and document a PAS solution feasibility study.
- Review REDACTED' current infrastructure and application environments and make recommendations regarding the technical environment that will support the PAS implementation.
- Evaluate REDACTED' current database and develop an RFP for data cleansing and conversion services
- Document requirements and develop an RFP for PAS Software and implementation services
- Contract with Data Migration and PAS Software vendors
2.1.2 Phase 2-Pension Administration System (REDACTED) Implementation This phase of the project includes the planning, configuration, implementation, testing, and cut-over of the pension administration software package, including data migration. Depending on the decision of the REDACTED Steering Committee, this phase of the project could include the installation and integration of new telephony to support enhanced CRM functions.

In addition, Phase 2 will include Business Process Reengineering (BPR) activities to assess current LOB processes and recommend and implement process improvements. BPR activities based on the recommendations will be planned and scheduled as part of planning for the PAS implementation.

### 4.0 Prolect Progress Mcasurement

The goal of measuring project progress is to reduce the uncertainly about what is going on in the project. The Project Management Team is responsible for tracking and reporting on project progress per the following

| Component | Objective | Metric | Measurement Frequency | Commenta |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule | Meet milestone dates agreed to by project team | Variance between target date and forecast date. | Bi-weekly (twice a month) | Components that make up the schedule are: <br> - Work estimates <br> - External dependencies <br> - Speed of risk and issue resolution <br> Metrics to address the components include: <br> - Task completion-ror purposes of reporting task completion, tasks will be considered $50 \%$ complete once they are started and will remain at 50\% until 100\% complete. <br> - Time to review and approve project work documents and deliverables <br> - Time to resolve issues <br> - Longest current open issue |
| Budget | Meet the financial project cost agreed-to and forecasted. | Variance between target cost and forecast cost. | Monthly | Because the bulk of work for the REDACTED Project is provided under fixed price contracts, any changes in the project cost will generally relate to changes in scope and will be managed through the Project Change Management process. Monthly budget reporting will focus on percentage of the budget used to date and will report any budget changes due to requests for new functionality or other changes in scope. |
| Scope | Deliver the agreed upon functionality as defined in the project scope documen | Variance in schedule and budget due to functionality change requests. <br> The measurement mechanism for scope is Project Change | Monthly | Significant variations in time between target signoff dates for functional specifications and the actual sign off dates will be monitored and reported as this can be a leading indicator that there may be scope challenges. |

Quality
Deliver a
product v no unres defects

The purpose of the Document Management Plan is to capture how documents, including all project documentation and deliverables, will be managed throughout the project life cycle. The Document Management Plan describes how to manage document repositories and provides a consistent approach to the creation, update and format of documents.

The objectives of the document management plan are to:

- Provide safe storage of all documents in a project library.
- Provide clarity regarding which version of a document and/or deliverable is the latest version.
- Provide a record of approved deliverables over the life of the project.
- Provide measures to maintain restricted access to confidential documents
- Provide an accurate and complete archive of project documents to REDACTED at the end of the project.

The Project Management Team is responsible for ensuring compliance with the REDACTED Project's document management plan. All project team members are responsible for creating documents, posting completed documents on SharePoint, and for completing any profile information required for that document. Project team members are also responsible for identifying critical hardcopy and e-mail documents that should be retained.
10.1 Types of Project Documents

The following identifies the types of doctiments created, received, and used by the REDACTED project.

| Type | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyses and <br> Recommendations | Documents describing a specific problem or scenario and the anticipated impact <br> and/or recommended course(s) of action (e.g., risks, issues, etc.). |
| Contract Management <br> Documentation | Documents associated with the procurements and contracts of the REDACTED <br> Project vendors. |
| Correspondence and <br> Communications | Documents sent to or received from any organization external to the project, <br> including employers, DIS, etc. |
| Deliverables | Any document identified as a deliverable in the REDACTED project contracts must <br> be reviewed and approved per the procedure in this doc \& posted to SharePoint. |

Figure 15 Sample Project Management Plan

## Design Phase

The design phase is defined as overseeing the translation of SBCERA's functional and technical requirements into the design of the PASS solution, its workflow, and to a certain extent, elements of its usability. Linea's role is to ensure that the requirements can be traced through to the design, and ultimately delivered as a fully functional software solution. Linea's role is also to ensure that the design is usable and intuitive to all users (both line-of-business and portal users), that the processes implemented meet best practices for the industry, and that the processes are as efficient and as integrated as possible.

This includes the following tasks:

## Requirements Confirmation

- Attending confirmation meetings and documenting the results
- Ensuring all requirements are clearly understood and documented lif adjustments or clarifications are needed)
- Following up with SBCERA analysts and SME's to ensure SBCERA's full voice and intent is heard and considered in reviewing requirements
- Identifying and resolving gaps in requirements
- Assisting in the review and approval of the Requirements Confirmation deliverables
- Ensure that the requirement confirmation sessions are completed on time, and all issues are resolved


## Design oversight

- Attending all design sessions during this phase
- Working with LRS to ensure the design process is efficient, that it uses SME time well, and that it produces artifacts that are sufficiently detailed and are written in business- not technical- language
- Ensuring that SBCERA's resources understand the functionality being presented and understand how it would work
- Independently verifying that the software design meets best practices and professional standards for quality
- Confirm the impact that movement away from customizations will improve the process
- Facilitating discussion to ensure all SMEs are active participants
- Working with LRS to resolve issues that may arise with SBCERA staff
- Working with SBCERA staff to resolve issues that may arise with the LRS
analysts
- Ensuring that the communication between the design team and the data team is efficient, effective, and on-going
- Working with all parties to help ensure that the design phase completes ontime, and all issues are resolved


## Testing Phase

The testing process is designed to provide a rigorous, structured method of validating that the improvements to the system will meet SBCERA's needs. Our testing is targeted and prioritized, such that the most critical functions are tested the most. We also focus on collaboration with the client to execute testing. Testing is a unique opportunity to build expertise with the solution. As such, we want the client staff to benefit from this process as much as possible.

## Test Approach

The test approach is comprised of two key components: The test management process, and test execution strategy:

Test management process will include documentation on the following:

- Management tools - Testing artifacts (e.g. test cases, test results) are added, managed, and assigned to testers. The team works from these artifacts in the test management tools.
- Test design - The test design process is included in Figure 15:


Figure 16 Test Design

- Test execution - The test execution process is completed in the test environment and follows the process in Figure 16:


Figure 17 Test Execution

- Test risks and mitigation factors - The management process will define test phase risks including schedule, resources, and unique SBCERA complexities. Key risks will be documented and analyzed to determine likelihood, impact, and mitigation approaches. Table 3 illustrates potential risks along with risk mitigation strategies (sample only):

Table 3 Test Risks \& Mitigation Strategies

| No. | Test Risks | Mitigation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | LRS system testing has not <br> been completed prior to the <br> Scheduled delivery date for <br> SBCERA build | Dependencies will be identified, and progress continuously <br> monitored and reported in regular project management meetings. <br> Linea oversight resources will work with vendor as necessary to <br> ensure build quality. Additionally, Linea will manage defect trends <br> that could result in project delays. |
| 2 | Testers are not available to <br> test per the defined schedule | Dedicated testing management and proactive resource planning <br> will gauge and continually adjust anticipated testing resource <br> needs. |
| 3 | Testers are not adequately <br>  <br> benefits functionality | Resources need to be trained before deliveries occur which need <br> to be tested. SBCERA testing resources will be trained early in the <br> project on testing management tools and will be involved in <br> system requirements gathering and design. |

Test execution strategy will include documentation on the following:

- Test types - A definition of each planned testing type. Examples of test types include system, integration, validation, and user acceptance.
- Entry and exit criteria - Clear entry and exit criteria will be defined for initiating and completing all testing types included in the test plans for both validation and acceptance tests. SBCERA will determine the exit criteria (with our input).
- Defect management (and Issue Management) - The tracking and reporting of defects identified during testing will follow an iterative process. Defects will
be tracked and linked to scripts with severity and status. Defect management is not just about collecting information and reporting on it; it involves ensuring any reported issues and defects are reported appropriately
- Test metrics - Test benchmarks will be established, and test metrics will be captured to measure test progress and quality (defects).


## Project Handoff/Closure

As project completion nears, Linea focusses on two primary tasks:

1) The cut-over to the improved system and all the processes that must take place for this to occur smoothly including conversion, training, IT operations, and operational procedures for how the business will work in the new environment.
2) The closeout. This is about bringing the project to a close and ensuring that all contractual issues are resolved, costs are reconciled, old systems are properly shut down, and postmortem occurs.

We realize that our focus will be only on the major processes and some medium process improvements. SBCERA can continue to perform BPI beyond project close. We intend to train SBCERA's staff throughout the entire 16 months.

Table 4 represents methods Linea uses to complete the activities for closeout.
Table 4 Closeout Activities

| Activity | Linea Approach |
| :--- | :--- |
| Knowledge Transfer | This revolves around three areas: How the business improvements <br> work (both internally and externally), and how the underlying <br> architecture works. |
| Reconcile Costs | We include this in the final report as go-live occurs. Reconciled costs <br> can include internal costs as well as break down by vendor. We include <br> the original budget, change orders, and project variances. |
| Finalize Lessons Learned | Linea provides a final evaluation of the project and will usually hold a <br> postmortem session. Since Linea's overall project focus is on a win-win <br> environment, our lessons learned are not designed to be an exercise in <br> finger pointing. Rather, we believe it is important to identify things that <br> did not necessarity go as planned and what alternatives could be <br> employed to create improved outcomes. |

## Project Management

Linea starts with its standard methodology for public pension project management. We realize this is a robust methodology and we also realize that each client and project are unique. Thus, we make small adjustments to our plan for each client based on a multitude of factors such as internal governance and decision-making structure, staff size, numbers of subject matter experts, internal inventory of skills and knowledge, and some elements related to the detailed scope of the project. Most importantly, although we may adjust our project plans, this does not mean we alter our standard methodology.

As a project management specialty firm with a focus on defined benefit plans, we believe that traditional project management methodology, such as the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK) as incorporated and disseminated by the Project Management Institute (PMI), should serve as a guideline and a minimum requirement for any professional consulting firm.

Our project management approach leverages the PMBOK repeatable, iterative processes, procedures, tools and templates to maximize efficiencies, ensure proper planning, offer successful execution, and provide tracking and reporting of all tasks and deliverables. It includes processes for initiation, planning, execution, controlling, and closing. However, we use this as a baseline for our projects, and continue emphasizing the need to focus on risk mitigation as part of a continuously adaptive methodology that is subject to change based on issues that require resolution.

Our project management centers on four major activities, each of which has four subactivities:

- Risk Management
- Scope management
- Time management
- Cost management
- Issue resolution
- Project Logistics
- Communications planning
- Project planning
- Information sharing
- Physical / virtual space development
- Quality Assurance
- Deliverables review
- KPI metric management
- Acceptance Criteria development and sign-off
- Resource Management
- Project governance
- Project team leadership

| DATE | $1 / 8 / 2020$ | PAGE | 44 of 64 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## - Team Dynamics <br> - Resource utilization

We have included a sample of Linea's project management reporting in figure 18.


Figure 18 Executive Steering Committee Report

## Exhibit A: Page 45

| TITLE | Iinea Response to SBCERA RFP for PAS Consulting and BPR |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | $1 / 8 / 2020$ | PAGE | 45 of 64 |
|  |  |  |  |

Risk Mitigation Tools
Although we emphasize the strength of our experience in risk mitigation, we have a methodology and tool set to help organize and communicate our risk mitigation outcomes. Each risk is assessed according to likelihood and impact, and an overall risk score is calculated. We then graphically depict each risk on a heat map to show the relativity of each risk to each other. Samples are shown in Figure 19.


Figure 19 Risk Heat Map

## c) Project Timeline

A rough estimate of the times that the vendor would realistically be able to meet in completing the project.

Tables 5 and 6 represents our estimated project plan and timeline for both phases including the 12 -month implementation option and the 18 -month implementation option. Note that while this project plan demonstrates a waterfall-style implementation, most likely there will be multiple rollouts of various improvements rather than a single big-bang at the end. The number of rollouts will be determined during Milestone Five (Plan Development) of Phase 1.

## Project Plan with 12-Month Implementation

Table 5 Project Plan with 12-month implementation

| Task Name | Duration | Start | Finish | 믕 |  | - | L |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Business Process Improvement Project | 345 days | 2/1/20 | 5/28/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Phase 1 - Analysis, Reporting and Design | 83 days | 2/1/20 | 5/27/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Milestone One - Project Initiation | 5 days | 2/1/20 | 2/7/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Kick off meeting | 4 hrs | 2/1/20 | 2/1/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Obtain any available documentation from SBCERA | 3 days | 2/3/20 | 2/5/20 | - | - | - |  |
| Inventory/confirm process scope for SBCERA | 2 days | 2/6/20 | 2/7/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Milestone Two - Operational Assessment | 18 days | 2/10/20 | 3/4/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Perform high level review of current operating model | 3 days | 2/10/20 | 2/12/20 | - | - | - |  |
| Create overview map of all SBCERA's business processes | 2 days | 2/13/20 | 2/14/20 | - | - | - |  |
| Perform high level review of all SBCERA's business processes | 4 days | 2/17/20 | 2/20/20 | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ |  |
| Establish preliminary priority scoring of all business processes | 1 day | 2/21/20 | 2/21/20 | $\bullet$ | - | - |  |
| Make recs. for areas that receive highest value for detailed analysis | 2 days | 2/24/20 | 2/25/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Build Organizational Change Management (OCM) Plan | 4 days | 2/26/20 | 3/2/20 | - | - | - |  |
| Train Staff on Lean / Six Sigma | 5 days | 2/26/20 | 3/3/20 | - | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Obtain exec approval for tactical BPI targets - Prioritize processes | 2 days | 3/3/20 | 3/4/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Milestone Three - Process Analysis | 25 days | 3/5/20 | 4/8/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Hold work sessions for each high value process/subprocess identified | 5 days | 3/5/20 | 3/11/20 | $\bullet$ | - | - |  |
| Create detailed flowchart of current state | 5 days | 3/12/20 | 3/18/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Document process [steps, handoffs, interfaces, rules, etc.) | 5 days | 3/19/20 | 3/25/20 | - | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Identify Critical Success Factors, KPIs, Benchmarks | 5 days | 3/26/20 | 4/1/20 | - | - | - |  |
| Identify issues/gaps/opportunities | 5 days | 4/2/20 | 4/8/20 | - | - | - |  |
| Analyze security vulnerabilities and areas for improvement | 4 days | 3/5/20 | 3/10/20 |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |
| Milestone Four - Comprehensive Business Requirements | 21 days | 4/9/20 | 5/7/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Review industry \& Linea best practices | 5 days | 4/9/20 | 4/15/20 | $\bullet$ | - | - |  |
| Create flowchart of target state | 5 days | 4/16/20 | 4/22/20 | $\bullet$ | - | - |  |
| Re-evaluate priority scoring of business processes | 5 days | 4/23/20 | 4/29/20 | - | - | - |  |
| Generate recommendation for short/medium/long term improvement | 5 days | 4/30/20 | 5/6/20 | $\bullet$ | - | - |  |


| Task Name | Duration | Start | Finish | 믄 | . | \# | L |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Compile Requirements in preparation of work streams | 1 day | 5/7/20 | 5/7/20 | - | - | - |  |
| Milestone Five - Plan Development | 14 days | 5/8/20 | 5/27/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Identify and plan work streams | 2 days | 5/8/20 | 5/11/20 | - | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Develop project plan for processes to implement changes | 6 days | 5/12/20 | 5/19/20 | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Build resource plan | 2 days | 5/20/20 | 5/21/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Build project budget | 2 days | 5/22/20 | 5/25/20 | $\bullet$ | - | - |  |
| Train staff on Continuous Process Improvement | 1 day | 5/22/20 | 5/22/20 | - | - | - |  |
| Create Final Report | 2 days | 5/26/20 | 5/27/20 | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Phase 2 - Implementation | 260 days | 6/1/20 | 5/28/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Project Kickoff | 20.5 days | 6/1/20 | 6/29/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Kickoff meeting activities | 7 days | 6/1/20 | 6/9/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Work with Steering to identify team leads \& resources | 8 hrs | 6/1/20 | 6/1/20 | - | - | - |  |
| Establish messaging / goals | 8 hrs | 6/2/20 | 6/2/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Develop presentations | 2 days | 6/3/20 | 6/4/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Hold Kick-Off with Project Team | 4 hrs | 6/5/20 | 6/5/20 | $\bullet$ | - | - |  |
| Plan for all-staff kick-off | 2 days | 6/5/20 | 6/9/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Hold all-staff project kick-off | 4 hrs | 6/9/20 | 6/9/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Project Plan Development | 10.5 days | 6/10/20 | 6/24/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Work with SBCERA PM on master project plan template | 20 hrs | 6/10/20 | 6/12/20 | - | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Establish plans for training, OCM, testing, infrastructure | 32 hrs | 6/12/20 | 6/18/20 |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Work w/ PASS PM to merge software dev plan into master proj. plan | 4 days | 6/18/20 | 6/24/20 |  | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Risk / Issue Management | 1 day | 6/24/20 | 6/25/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Develop risk register | 4 hrs | 6/24/20 | 6/24/20 |  | - |  |  |
| Develop issue register | 2 hrs | 6/25/20 | 6/25/20 |  | - |  |  |
| Establish change control process | 2 hrs | 6/25/20 | 6/25/20 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Vendor Management Planning | 1 day | 6/25/20 | 6/26/20 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Quality Assurance Planning | 1 day | 6/26/20 | 6/29/20 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Project Management Activities | 260 days | 6/1/20 | 5/28/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Steering Committee meeting | 260 days | 6/1/20 | 5/28/21 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Status reporting (weekly) | 260 days | 6/1/20 | 5/28/21 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Project plan oversight | 260 days | 6/1/20 | 5/28/21 |  | - |  |  |
| Resource plan oversight | 260 days | 6/1/20 | 5/28/21 |  | - |  |  |
| Deliverables review | 260 days | 6/1/20 | 5/28/21 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Budget tracking | 260 days | 6/1/20 | 5/28/21 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Issue management | 260 days | 6/1/20 | 5/28/21 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Risk management | 260 days | 6/1/20 | 5/28/21 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Scope management | 260 days | 6/1/20 | 5/28/21 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Change control management | 260 days | 6/1/20 | 5/28/21 |  | - |  |  |
| Overall QA | 260 days | 6/1/20 | 5/28/21 |  | - |  |  |
| Communications (Employer, Staff, Vendor, Board) | 260 days | 6/1/20 | 5/28/21 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Design Phase | 80 days | 6/29/20 | 10/19/20 |  |  |  |  |


| Task Name | Duration | Start | Finish | 믕 |  | $\cdots$ | L |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Review of Requirements | 2 mons | 6/29/20 | 8/24/20 | - | - | - |  |
| Solution Design Oversight | 2 mons | 8/24/20 | 10/19/20 |  | - |  |  |
| Cybersecurity design confirmation | 3 days | 9/7/20 | 9/10/20 |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |
| Implementation \& Testing Phase | 191 days | 8/24/20 | 5/18/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Testing | 140 days | 10/19/20 | 5/3/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Unit and System Testing | 4 mons | 10/19/20 | 2/8/21 |  | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Integration and other testing | 1 mon | 2/8/21 | 3/8/21 |  | - | $\bullet$ |  |
| User Acceptance Testing | 2 mons | 3/8/21 | 5/3/21 |  | - | $\bullet$ |  |
| Cybersecurity testing | 2 days | 11/2/20 | 11/4/20 |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |
| Change Management \& Readiness | 191 days | 8/24/20 | 5/18/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Organizational Change Management | 8 mons | 8/24/20 | 4/5/21 |  | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Training - User | 1 mon | 4/20/21 | 5/18/21 | - | - | - |  |
| Training - Employer | 1 mon | 4/20/21 | 5/18/21 | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ |  |
| Training - Technical | 1 mon | 4/20/21 | 5/18/21 |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |
| Training - Cybersecurity | 5 days | 5/3/21 | 5/10/21 |  |  |  | - |
| Project Handoff/Closure | 19.25 days | 5/3/21 | 5/28/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Go-No-Go Decision | 6 days | 5/3/21 | 5/11/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Verify all requirements delivered \& tested | 2 days | 5/3/21 | 5/5/21 | - | - |  |  |
| Validate all contract terms have been satisfied | 2 days | 5/5/21 | 5/7/21 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Assess existing defects - software and data | 2 days | 5/7/21 | 5/11/21 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Cut-over period | 12 days | 5/11/21 | 5/27/21 | - | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Go Live | 1 day | 5/27/21 | 5/28/21 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Post-Mortem Meeting | 2 hrs | 5/28/21 | 5/28/21 | - | - |  |  |

## Project Plan with 18-Month Implementation

Table 6 Project Plan with 18-month Implementation

| Task Name | Duration | Start | Finish | - | 管 | $\frac{0}{0}$ | ¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Business Process Improvement Project | 475 days | 2/1/20 | 11/26/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Phase 1 - Analysis, Reporting and Design | 83 days | 2/1/20 | 5/27/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Milestone One - Project Initiation | 5 days | 2/1/20 | 2/7/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Kick off meeting | 4 hrs | 2/1/20 | 2/1/20 | - | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Obtain any available documentation from SBCERA | 3 days | 2/3/20 | 2/5/20 | - | - | $\bullet$ |  |
| Inventory/confirm process scope for SBCERA | 2 days | 2/6/20 | 2/7/20 | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ |  |
| Milestone Two - Operational Assessment | 18 days | 2/10/20 | 3/4/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Perform high level review of current operating model | 3 days | 2/10/20 | 2/12/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Create overview map of all SBCERA's business processes | 2 days | 2/13/20 | 2/14/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Perform high level review of all SBCERA's business processes | 4 days | 2/17/20 | 2/20/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
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| Task Name | Duration | Start | Finish |  |  |  | ᄂ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Establish preliminary priority scoring of all business processes | 1 day | 2/21/20 | 2/21/20 | - | - | - |  |
| Make recs. for areas that receive highest value for detailed analysis | 2 days | 2/24/20 | 2/25/20 | $\bullet$ | - | - |  |
| Build Organizational Change Management (OCM) Plan | 4 days | 2/26/20 | 3/2/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Train Staff on Lean / Six Sigma | 5 days | 2/26/20 | 3/3/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Obtain exec approval for tactical BPI targets - Prioritize processes | 2 days | 3/3/20 | 3/4/20 | $\bullet$ | - | - |  |
| Milestone Three - Process Analysis | 25 days | 3/5/20 | 4/8/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Hold work sessions for each high value process/subprocess identified | 5 days | 3/5/20 | 3/11/20 | - | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Create detailed flowchart of current state | 5 days | 3/12/20 | 3/18/20 | - | - | - |  |
| Document process (steps, handoffs, interfaces, rules, etc.) | 5 days | 3/19/20 | 3/25/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Identify Critical Success Factors, KPIs, Benchmarks | 5 days | 3/26/20 | 4/1/20 | $\bullet$ | - | - |  |
| Identify issues/gaps/opportunities | 5 days | 4/2/20 | 4/8/20 | - | - | - |  |
| Analyze security vulnerabilities and areas for improvement | 4 days | 3/5/20 | 3/10/20 |  |  |  | - |
| Milestone Four - Comprehensive Business Requirements | 21 days | 4/9/20 | 5/7/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Review industry \& Linea best practices | 5 days | 4/9/20 | 4/15/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Create flowchart of target state | 5 days | 4/16/20 | 4/22/20 | $\bullet$ | - | - |  |
| Re-evaluate priority scoring of business processes | 5 days | 4/23/20 | 4/29/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Generate recommendation for short/medium/long term improvement | 5 days | 4/30/20 | 5/6/20 | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ |  |
| Compile Requirements in preparation of work streams | 1 day | 5/7/20 | 5/7/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Milestone Five - Plan Development | 14 days | 5/8/20 | 5/27/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Identify and plan work streams | 2 days | 5/8/20 | 5/11/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Develop project plan for processes to implement changes | 6 days | 5/12/20 | 5/19/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Build resource plan | 2 days | 5/20/20 | 5/21/20 | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ |  |
| Build project budget | 2 days | 5/22/20 | 5/25/20 | $\bullet$ | - | - |  |
| Train staff on Continuous Process Improvement | 1 day | 5/22/20 | 5/22/20 | $\bullet$ | - | - |  |
| Create Final Report | 2 days | 5/26/20 | 5/27/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Phase 2 - Implementation | 260 days | $6 / 1 / 20$ | 5/28/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Project Kickoff | 20.5 days | 6/1/20 | 6/29/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Kickoff meeting activities | 7 days | 6/1/20 | 6/9/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Work with Steering to identify team leads \& resources | 8 hrs | 6/1/20 | 6/1/20 | - | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Establish messaging / goals | 8 hrs | 6/2/20 | 6/2/20 | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Develop presentations | 2 days | 6/3/20 | 6/4/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| Hold Kick-Off with Project Team | 4 hrs | 6/5/20 | 6/5/20 | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Plan for all-staff kick-off | 2 days | 6/5/20 | 6/9/20 | - | - | $\bullet$ |  |
| Hold all-staff project kick-off | 4 hrs | 6/9/20 | 6/9/20 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Project Plan Development | 10.5 days | 6/10/20 | 6/24/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Work with SBCERA PM on master project plan template | 20 hrs | 6/10/20 | 6/12/20 | - | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Establish plans for training, OCM, testing, infrastructure | 32 hrs | 6/12/20 | 6/18/20 |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Work w/ PASS PM to merge software dev plan into master proj. plan | 4 days | 6/18/20 | 6/24/20 |  | - | - |  |
| Risk / Issue Management | 1 day | 6/24/20 | 6/25/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Develop risk register | 4 hrs | 6/24/20 | 6/24/20 |  | - |  |  |
| Develop issue register | 2 hrs | 6/25/20 | 6/25/20 |  | - |  |  |


| Task Name | Duration | Start | Finish | 믄 | cos | $\frac{\text { \# }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | L |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Establish change control process | 2 hrs | 6/25/20 | 6/25/20 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Vendor Management Planning | 1 day | 6/25/20 | 6/26/20 |  | - |  |  |
| Quality Assurance Planning | 1 day | 6/26/20 | 6/29/20 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Project Management Activities | 390 days | 6/1/20 | 11/26/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Steering Committee meeting | 390 days | 6/1/20 | 11/26/21 |  | - |  |  |
| Status reporting (weekly) | 390 days | 6/1/20 | 11/26/21 |  | - |  |  |
| Project plan oversight | 390 days | 6/1/20 | 11/26/21 |  | - |  |  |
| Resource plan oversight | 390 days | 6/1/20 | 11/26/21 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Deliverables review | 390 days | 6/1/20 | 11/26/21 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Budget tracking | 390 days | 6/1/20 | 11/26/21 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Issue management | 390 days | 6/1/20 | 11/26/21 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Risk management | 390 days | 6/1/20 | 11/26/21 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Scope management | 390 days | 6/1/20 | 11/26/21 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Change control management | 390 days | 6/1/20 | 11/2b/21 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Overall QA | 390 days | 6/1/20 | 11/26/21 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Communications (Employer, Staff, Vendor, Board) | 390 days | 6/1/20 | 11/26/21 |  | - |  |  |
| Design Phase | 120 days | 6/29/20 | 12/14/20 |  |  |  |  |
| Review of Requirements | 3 mons | 6/29/20 | 9/21/20 | - | - | $\bullet$ |  |
| Solution Design Oversight | 3 mons | 9/21/20 | 12/14/20 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Cybersecurity design confirmation | 4 days | 10/5/20 | 10/9/20 |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |
| Implementation \& Testing Phase | 301 days | 9/21/20 | 11/16/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Testing | 220 days | 12/14/20 | 10/18/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Unit and System Testing | 6 mons | 12/14/20 | 5/31/21 |  | - | - |  |
| Integration and other testing | 2 mons | 5/31/21 | 7/26/21 |  | - | $\bullet$ |  |
| User Acceptance Testing | 3 mons | 7/26/21 | 10/18/21 |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Cybersecurity testing | 3 days | 12/28/20 | 12/31/20 |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |
| Change Management \& Readiness | 301 days | 9/21/20 | 11/16/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Organizational Change Management | 12 mons | 9/21/20 | 8/23/21 |  | - | - |  |
| Training - User | 12 mons | 9/21/20 | 8/23/21 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Training - Employer | 1.5 mons | 10/5/21 | 11/16/21 | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ |  |
| Training - Technical | 1.5 mons | 10/5/21 | 11/16/21 |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |
| Training - Cybersecurity | 1.5 mons | 10/5/21 | 11/16/21 |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |
| Project Handoff/Closure | 7 days | 10/25/21 | 11/3/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Go-No-Go Decision | 29.25 days | 10/18/21 | 11/26/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Verify all requirements delivered \& tested | 11 days | 10/18/21 | 11/2/21 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Validate all contract terms have been satisfied | 4 days | 10/18/21 | 10/22/21 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Assess existing defects - software and data | 4 days | 10/22/21 | 10/28/21 | - | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Cut-over period | 3 days | 10/28/21 | 11/2/21 | - | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Go Live | 16 days | 11/2/21 | 11/24/21 | - | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Post-Mortem Meeting | 2 days | 11/24/21 | 11/26/21 | - | $\bullet$ |  |  |

## 3.Qualifications

Identify the licenses, credentials/designations, affiliations, special knowledge, qualifications, expertise or awards held by your firm and its key managers. Briefly describe how this translates to the service to be provided to SBCERA.

Linea is affiliated with a number of public pension and benefits industry organizations, our consultants carry many relevant certifications for the services we provide, and we have a deep level of expertise and past experience providing the types of services SBCERA requests. When a client hires Linea, they hire the whole company. Our $60+$ consultants share expertise, strategy, and best practices gained from the certifications they have achieved, the conferences they have attended, and the projects on which they have consulted. Thus, this collective knowledge and experience greatly informs the speed and detail with which we can diagnose problems and find solutions for each project, specifically for public pension, and in SBCERA's case, specifically for '37 Act county funds.

## Certifications

One of Linea's primary goals is the continuous professional improvement of our employees. Table 7 is a list of certifications currently held by Linea consultants.

Table 7 Linea Certifications

| Abbr. | Certification | Number of <br> Consultants Certified |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Six <br> Sigma | Six Sigma Certification, including a Six Sigma Black Belt and a Six <br> Sigma Master Black Belt (Highest Cert) in Lean process of <br> eliminating defects and Business Process Improvement | 3 |
| MBA | Master's degree in business administration (MBA) or similar <br> master's degree | 10 |
| PMP | Project Management Professional (PMP) certification from the <br> Project Management Institute | 9 |
| Prosci | Prosci Certified Change Management Professional (CCMP) | 8 |
| CCBA | Certification of Competency in Business Analysis (CCBA) from the <br> Project Management Institute | 3 |
| RMP | Risk Management Professional (RMP) from the Project <br> Management Institute | 1 |
| Agile | Agile SCRUM Master, SCRUM Product Owner, or equivalent | 3 |
| CAPPP | Certificate of achievement in Public Plan Policy (CAPPP) from the <br> International Foundation of Employee Benefit Plans | 9 |
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| Abbr. | Certification | Number of <br> Consultants Certified |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| CISSP | Certified Information Systems Security Professional (CISSP) from <br> the International Information System Security Certification <br> Consortium, also known as (ISC) |  |
| Actuary | Actuarial certification from the Society of Actuaries or from the <br> Canadian Institute of Actuaries | 2 |
| Tech. | Variety of Technical capabilities and certifications (.Net, C\#, <br> MySQL, Java, HTML/CSS, Oracle, Cloud, etc.) | 2 |
|  |  |  |

## Relevant Industry Affiliations

Linea Solutions is a member and sponsor of many public pension organizations. Linea frequently speaks at industry organization conferences, and we have been published in trade magazines for our industry. Our investment in such key industry forums and conferences allows us to understand the key issues facing pension and benefit funds as well as the potential legislation that could impact the industry. Table 8 lists conferences we have recently attended for the pension, health \& insurance, and technology industries.

Table 8 Industry Conference Attendance

| Conference | Organization | Industry |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AASCIF | American Association of State Compensation Insurance Funds | Health \& Insurance |
| ACPM/ACARR | The Association of Canadian Pension Management | Pension |
| CALAPRS | California Association of Public Retirement Systems | Pension |
| CPBI | Canadian Pension \& Benefits Institute | Pension |
| Gartner IT Expo | Gartner Symposium | Technology |
| IAIABC | Intl. Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions | Health \& Insurance |
| IASA | Insurance Accounting \& System Association | Health \& Insurance |
| IFEBP | International Foundation of Employee Benefit Plans | Pension |
| IFEBP Canada | International Foundation of Employee Benefit Plans [Canadal | Pension |
| LIMRA | Life Insurance and Market Research Association | Health \& Insurance |
| NASRA Administrator's Meeting | National Association of State Retirement Administrators | Pension |
| NASRA Annual Conference | National Association of State Retirement Administrators | Pension |
| NCCMP | National Coordinating Committee for Multiemployer Plans | Pension |
| NIRS | National Institute on Retirement Security | Pension |
| NIRS Visionary Circle | National Institute on Retirement Security Visionary Circle | Pension |
| NPEA | National Pension Education Association | Pension |
| NWCDC | National Workers' Comp and Disability Conference | Health \& Insurance |
| PRISM | Public Retirement Information Systems Management | Pension |
| PSHCRT | Public Sector Healthcare Roundtable | Health \& Insurance |
| SACRS Spring Conference | State Association of County Retirement Systems | Pension |
| SACRS Fall Conference | State Association of County Retirement Systems | Pension |
| SALGBA | State \& Local Government Benefits Association | Health \& Insurance |
| Vitech V3 Conf | Vitech Annual Conference | Pension |
| WCI | Workers' Compensation Institute | Health \& Insurance |
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| Conference | Organization | Industry |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NCTR | National Council on Teacher Retirement | Pension |
| NCPERS | National Conference on Public Employee Retirement Systems | Pension |

## Minimum Qualifications

- The respondent must have provided like services with at least three public agencies in the past three years. Experience with California-based retirement systems or pension systems operating under the provisions of the County Employees Retirement Law of 1937 ("CERL" or the "1937 Act") is a plus.
- The respondent must have provided like services with at least three service-driven organizations with membership sizes larger than 15,000 within the last three years.
- The respondent must have more than five years of experience with Business process re-engineering.
- The respondent must have more than five years of experience with Project Management.
- The respondent must have more than five years of experience with the identification and implementation of best practices.
- The respondent must answer all questions included in this RFP in their entirety.

Linea meets all minimum qualifications outlined in the RFP. Table 9 is Linea's full client list along with dates of engagement, types of experience relevant to this project, whether the client is a ' 37 Act fund, and whether they have over 15,000 members. Additionally, SBCERA requests that respondents have provided similar services to three public agencies in the past three years. To highlight this qualification, we have included a number of stories detailing our BPI consulting at other organizations.

Table 9 Relevant Experience

| Client | Year Began | Year Finished |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \text { N} \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | 듳 | $\text { Gu!nnsuog soj!pวe.d } 150 \text { g }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alameda County Employees' Retirement Association | Aug-99 | Apr-09 | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | - | $\bullet$ |
| Alaska Department of Retirement and Benefits | Feb-19 | Present | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas Public Employees Retirement System | Sep-12 | Jun-19 | - |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - |
| British Columbia Pension Corporation | Sep-17 | Jut-19 | - |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| California Public Employees' Retirement System | Aug-13 | Apr-14 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| California State Teachers' Retirement System | Nov-16 | Present | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |
| City of Tampa - Fire \& Police Pension | Oct-16 | Mar-18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Tampa - General Employees' Retirement Fund | Oct-16 | Present |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contra Costa County Employees' Retirement Association | Dec-04 | Feb-05 | - | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cook County Pension Fund | Apr-17 | Present | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |
| District of Columbia Retirement Board | Jul-12 | Mar-18 | - |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  | $\bullet$ |


| Client | Year Began | Year Finished |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \text { た } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\bar{\alpha}$ $\stackrel{c}{\infty}$ $\frac{c}{n}$ $m$ |  |  | 듳 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ed. Employees' Supplementary Rtmt System of Fairfax County | Feb-19 | Present | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fresno County Employees' Retirement Association | Apr-09 | Jan-17 | - | - | - | - | - | $\bullet$ | - |
| Hawaii Employer-Union Health Benefits Trust Fund | Mar-19 | Present | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Imperial County Employees' Retirement System | Feb-08 | Present |  | - | - | $\bullet$ | - | - | $\bullet$ |
| International Association of Machinists Benefit Trust Fund | Jun-18 | Present | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| International Association of Machinists National Pension Fund | Mar-16 | Present | $\bullet$ |  | - | - | - | - | $\bullet$ |
| Intl Union of Painters and Allied Trades General Sec/Treas Office | Oct-18 | Present | - |  | - |  |  |  | - |
| Intl Union of Painters and Allied Trades Industry Pension Fund | Aug-13 | Dec-17 | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | - |
| Kern County Employees' Retirement Association | Dec-08 | Nov-13 | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | - | - | - | - |
| Los Angeles City Employees' Retirement System | Jun-11 | Oct-19 | $\bullet$ |  | - | - | - | - | - |
| Manitoba Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund | Mar-17 | Present | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| Marin County Employees' Retirement Association | Jun-07 | Present |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Massachusetts State Retirement Board | Aug-15 | Oct-19 | - |  |  | - | - | $\bullet$ |  |
| Mendocino County Employees' Retirement Association | Jan-11 | Jun-16 |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Merced County Employees' Retirement Association | Mar-08 | Jan-15 |  | - | - | $\bullet$ | - | - | - |
| Missouri State Employees' Retirement System | Mar-17 | Present | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Motion Picture Industry Pension \& Health Plans | Sep-10 | Sep-13 | - |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |
| New York City Police Pension Fund | Apr-18 | Present | - |  |  | - | - | - | $\bullet$ |
| Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System | Feb-17 | Oct-18 | - |  | - |  |  |  | - |
| Ontario Pension Board | Apr-18 | Sep-18 | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |
| Ontario Retirement Pension Plan | Jut-15 | Jul-16 | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |
| Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan | Feb-17 | Feb-18 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Orange County Employees Retirement System | Jan-04 | Jun-18 | $\bullet$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Oregon Public Employees Retirement System | Oct-16 | Feb-19 | $\bullet$ |  |  | - |  |  |  |
| Public Employees Retirement Association of New Mexico | Jun-15 | Dec-18 | - |  | - | - | - | - | $\bullet$ |
| Public Schools \& Education Employee Rtmt Systems of Missouri | Sep-09 | Mar-10 | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sacramento County Employees' Retirement System | Jan-16 | Present | - | - | $\bullet$ | - |  |  |  |
| San Diego City Employees' Retirement System | Apr-04 | Jun-11 | - |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | - | $\bullet$ |
| San Diego County Employees Retirement Association | Dec-06 | Feb-15 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Joaquin County Employees' Retirement Association | Jan-02 | Jun-05 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| San Mateo County Employees' Retirement Association | Apr-04 | Apr-04 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seattle City Employees' Retirement System | Aug-13 | Present | $\bullet$ |  | - | - | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |
| Sonoma County Employees' Retirement Association | Dec-05 | Apr-07 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Carolina Public Employee Benefit Authority | Jan-15 | Present | $\bullet$ |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| Stanislaus County Employees' Retirement Association | Oct-15 | Present |  | - | - | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |
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| Client | Year Began | Year Finished |  |  | 袬 |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { g }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ | 号 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Steamfitters' Industry Fund Office | Feb-17 | Apr-17 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teachers' Retirement System of the State of Illinois | May-18 | Feb-19 | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas County \& District Retirement System | Jun-11 | Jul-17 | $\bullet$ |  | - | - | - | - | - |
| United Church of Canada | Jan-18 | Present |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of California Retirement Plan | Jun-13 | Present | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | - | $\bullet$ |
| Ventura County Employees' Retirement Association | Dec-03 | Present | $\bullet$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Washington State Department of Labor \& Industries | Feb-15 | Present | - |  | - |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |
| Winnipeg Civic Employees' Benefits Program | Mar-19 | Present |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 4.Team Make-up

Provide an organizational chart indicating roles of all individuals involved in projects. Include a curriculum vitae/biography for each team member, including the hourly rates proposed to be charged to SBCERA for each team member. What experience does the team have working together?

## Guiding Principles

As with most strategies, there are key guiding principles that are the basis to achieve superior project outcomes and maximum client value, at a fair price. Below, we have specifically called out some key guiding principles of our proposed staffing plan:

- Propose staff with deep knowledge and experience with public retirement.
- Propose a team with the experience to provide industry best practices and approaches, business process design and improvement, including experience on BPI initiatives to improve existing pension administration systems and experience with BPI at an organizational level.
- Formulate a team that has experience with design confirmation and testing on major pension administration system implementations, including implementations with customization.
- Propose a team with training skills to guide SBCERA toward readiness of the initiative improvements and changes as well as the training necessary to sustain continuous process improvement past project completion
- Propose a team that has the ability and desire to guide and collaborate with SBCERA staff throughout the project.


## Team Overview

The proposed Linea team is comprised of high-performing pension industry experts. Gerard Pappa will be spearheading Phase 1 of the project and will be overseeing BPI throughout the project. He is a Six Sigma Master Black Belt and business process specialist. Gerard is currently finishing up a very similar project, performing a BPI assessment and roadmap for the Educational Employees' Supplementary Retirement System of Fairfax County, a public pension organization of similar size to SBCERA looking to upgrade similar types of processes as SBCERA following a similar timeline. Gerard has more than 20 years' experience performing such initiatives and has run BPI projects involving more than 750 people.

Stephanie Minton will be joining Gerard for the BPI assessment and planning in phase 1, and then will take over as project manager and project lead during phase 2 due to her extensive experience with PAS implementation projects including running testing for the Arkansas Public Employees' Retirement System. Both Gerard and Stephanie will be
assisted by Nicole Naddy, who will be providing additional analysis, document support, deliverable support, and reporting. Nicole has experience working on two large California pension funds, CaISTRS and UCRP, and has experience implementing process change.

Peter Dewar runs Linea's cybersecurity division, Linea Secure. He will join the team specifically to analyze SBCERA's security systems, practices, and processes to determine potential security-specific improvements. He will also provide confirmation of security improvements throughout the implementation. Peter is a CISSP certified cybersecurity consultant and was the Chief Technology Officer of the District of Columbia Retirement Board prior to creating Linea Secure.

Finally, Bryce Haws will serve as the account executive for this project to guide overall quality assurance, act as client liaison, and to handle contract matters. Bryce has over three decades of experience in the pension industry and provides executive oversight for Linea's many ' 37 Act clients.

Figure 20 represents the organizational make-up of the team for both phase 1 and phase 2.


Figure 20 Team Organization

We have built this team based on their excellent capabilities specifically matched to this project. Gerard, Stephanie, Nicole, and Peter have not worked together on past projects, but have worked efficiently on similar Linea teams.

Table 10 lists each team member, their role, and the number of years of experience they have in fields relevant to SBCERA. It also includes the hourly rate of each team member.

Table 10 Employee Experience

| Employee | Project Role | IT | Pension <br> Industry | Project <br> Mgmt. | Business <br> Analysis | Hourly <br> Rate |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Average |  | 19.3 | $\mathbf{1 1 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 7}$ |  |
| Gerard Pappa | Business Process Improvement Specialist | 20.9 | 0.8 | 20.9 | 20.9 | $\$ 258.02$ |
| Stephanie Minton | Senior Business Analyst / Project Mgr. | 6.4 | 8.8 | 8.3 | 18.7 | $\$ 257.36$ |
| Nicole Naddy | Business Analyst | 1.2 | 6.2 | 2.7 | 8.2 | $\$ 112.13$ |
| Peter Dewar | Security Specialist | 26.9 | 9.9 | 26.9 | 26.9 | $\$ 302.63$ |
| Bryce Haws | Account Executive | 40.9 | 30.0 | 33.9 | 38.9 | $\$ 258.02$ |
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## c) Services Agreement Sample

Provide a sample professional services agreement.
We have attached a full sample of our professional services agreement as Attachment A at the end of this response.

## 5.Litigation

Identify any past, pending or threatened litigation or administrative or state ethics board or similar body proceedings to which the organization is a party and which would either materially impair your ability to perform the services described herein or, if decided in an adverse manner, materially affect the financial condition of your organization.

Linea has not been involved in any past, pending, or threatened litigation or administrative or state ethics board or similar body proceedings which would impair our ability to perform services for SBCERA or affect the financial condition of our firm.

## 6.Conflicts of Interest

Disclose the nature of any past, present, or pending relationship with any SBCERA Board Member, consultant, or staff. How have you reviewed this potential engagement for conflict of interest? Were there any conflicts, potential conflicts, or other issues that could raise a reasonable appearance of a conflict of interest?

Linea has no relationships with any SBCERA Board Member, consultant, or staff. Linea has no relationships with any people or parties which would constitute a conflict of interest.

## D. Proposed Fees/Costs

The Firm shall provide a final fixed price to complete Phases 1 and 2 designated in the Scope of Services. The fixed price cost proposal shall include:

## 1.Breakdown of Costs

A breakdown of staff hours and associated cost required to complete Phases 1 and 2, respectively.
Tables 11 and 12 represent a breakdown of costs by milestone along with date of completion estimates. Table 11 represents the 12 -month implementation option and Table 12 represents the 18 -month implementation option.

Table 11 Project Milestones - 12-Month Implementation Option

| Phase | Milestone | Completion Date | Cost |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | Milestone One: Project Initiation | $2 / 7 / 2020$ | $\$ 9,615.98$ |
| 1 | Milestone Two: Operational Assessment | $3 / 4 / 2020$ | $\$ 38,463.92$ |
| 1 | Milestone Three: Gap Analysis | $4 / 8 / 2020$ | $\$ 57,695.88$ |
| 1 | Milestone Four: Comprehensive Business Requirements | $5 / 7 / 2020$ | $\$ 57,695.88$ |
| 1 | Milestone Five: Plan Development | $5 / 27 / 2020$ | $\$ 28,847.94$ |
| 2 | SUBTOTAL |  | $\$ 192,319.60$ |
| 2 | Droject Kick-off | $6 / 29 / 2020$ | $\$ 29,275.93$ |
| 2 | Implementation and Testing Phase - Unit \& System | $2 / 8 / 2021$ | $\$ 175,655.57$ |
| 2 | Implementation and Testing Phase - Integration Testing <br> 2 | $5 / 3 / 2021$ | $\$ 193,221.12$ |
| 2 | Project Handoff/Closure - Project is Complete | $5 / 2020$ | $\$ 128,814.08$ |
| 2 | SUBTOTAL |  | $\$ 58,551.86$ |
|  | TOTAL |  | $\$ 585,518.56$ |

Table 12 Project Milestones - 18-Month Implementation

| Phase | Milestone | Completion Date | Cost |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | Milestone One: Project Initiation | $2 / 7 / 2020$ | $\$ 9,615.98$ |
| 1 | Milestone Two: Operational Assessment | $3 / 4 / 2020$ | $\$ 38,463.92$ |
| 1 | Milestone Three: Gap Analysis | $4 / 8 / 2020$ | $\$ 57,695.88$ |


| Phase | Milestone | Completion Date | Cost |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | Milestone Four: Comprehensive Business <br> Requirements | $5 / 7 / 2020$ | $\$ 57,695.88$ |
| 1 | Milestone Five: Plan Development | $5 / 27 / 2020$ | $\$ 28,847.94$ |
|  | SUBTOTAL |  | $\$ 192,319.60$ |
| 2 | Project Kick-off | $6 / 29 / 2020$ | $\$ 43,308.63$ |
| 2 | Design Phase Complete | $12 / 14 / 2020$ | $\$ 259,851.79$ |
| 2 | Implementation and Testing Phase - Unit \& System <br> Testing Complete | $5 / 31 / 2021$ | $\$ 285,836.96$ |
| 2 | Implementation and Testing Phase - Integration <br> Testing \& UAT Complete | $10 / 18 / 2021$ | $\$ 190,557.98$ |
| 2 | Project Handoff/Closure - Project is Complete | $11 / 26 / 2021$ | $\$ 86,617.27$ |
|  | sUBTOTAL |  | $\$ 866,172.64$ |
|  | TOTAL |  | $\$ 1,058,492.24$ |

## 2.Rates \& Staff Hours

Hourly rates for each professional and administrative staff person who will be committed to this Project, including fringe and overhead costs.

Tables 13 and 14 include the rates for each consultant proposed for this project along with the hours and costs by phase and total cost. These rates are all inclusive of travel, overhead, and any other expenses. Table 13 represents the 12 -Month Implementation Option and Table 14 represents the 18-Month Implementation option.

Table 13 Rates and Project Cost by Phase - 12-Month Implementation

|  |  |  | Phase 1 |  | Phase 2 |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consultant | Title | Rate | Hours | Cost | Hours | Cost |  |
| Gerard Pappa | BPI Specialist | \$258.02 | 320 | \$82,566.40 | 192 | \$49,539.84 | \$132,106.24 |
| Stephanie Minton | Senior Business Analyst | \$257.36 | 240 | \$61,766.40 | 1152 | \$296,478.72 | \$358,245.12 |
| Nicole Naddy | Associate <br> Business Analyst | \$112.13 | 320 | \$35,881.60 | 1920 | \$215,289.60 | \$251,171.20 |
| Peter Dewar | Security Specialist | \$302.63 | 40 | \$12,105.20 | 80 | \$24,210.40 | \$36,315.60 |
| total |  |  | 920 | \$192,319.60 | 3344 | \$585,518.56 | \$777,838.16 |

Table 14 Rates and Project Cost by Phase - 18-Month Implementation

|  |  |  | Phase 1 |  | Phase 2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consultant | Title | Rate | Hours | Cost | Hours | Cost | Total |
| Gerard Pappa | BPI Specialist | \$258.02 | 320 | \$82,566.40 | 288 | \$74,309.76 | \$156,876.16 |
| Sanjay <br> Dudaney / <br> Stephanie <br> Minton | Senior Business Analyst | \$257.36 | 240 | \$61,766.40 | 1728 | \$444,718.08 | \$506,484.48 |
| Nicole Naddy | Associate <br> Business Analyst | \$112.13 | 320 | \$35,881.60 | 2880 | \$322,934.40 | \$358,816.00 |
| Peter Dewar | Security Specialist | \$302.63 | 40 | \$12,105.20 | 80 | \$24,210.40 | \$36,315.60 |
| TOTAL |  |  | 920 | \$192,319.60 | 4976 | \$866,172.64 | \$1,058,492.24 |

## 3.Fees

The prices proposed within the submission must be valid from the date of the submission through the end of the contract, and must include any/all costs expected to be paid by SBCERA. Provide a schedule of any incidental fees that may be commonly charged in your industry. Once a firm has been selected, negotiations of the fee(s) may become necessary. In no case will the negotiations result in a fee that is higher than the fee contained in the proposal, unless SBCERA determines the Scope of Services must be substantively altered.
Linea does not expect any fees beyond the project costs listed above. The cost listed at the beginning of this section represents Linea's complete fixed cost price including all travel and other relevant expenses.

## E. WARRANTIES

Indicate any warranties and guaranties for any service or materials that your firm provides.
Our standard Master Services Agreement includes a warranty for our provided services. The warranty is as follows:

Section 7.1 - Representations and Warranties. Linea warrants that all work performed under this Agreement shall be of good quality, and that it shall use reasonable commercial efforts to satisfy its responsibilities set forth in the Statement of Work. Linea shall correct any work not in compliance with this warranty, provided that Client provides Linea written notice of defective

