<...>

This document provides an evaluation of [Solution-B] with respect to its suitability to purpose for the website currently in development for [-----]. In addition this document addresses the dollar and time costs that would be incurred if we were to switch to the [Solution-B] platform at this time. <...>

Our team reviewed in detail all available documentation of [Solution-B] and then followed up with [Solution-B] project management and technical personnel. Our findings with respect to the capabilities of [Solution-B] were then examined in light of the previously defined requirements for the [-----] website. Our conclusion is that [Solution-B] is, in general, as well or better suited to the project requirements than the [Solution-A] platform currently in use, and contains no "deal breakers;" i.e. an inability to support any essential functionality. <...>

The Comparison: [Solution-A] vs. [Solution-B]

In the original evaluation we looked at ten different solutions before recommending [Solution-A] as a development environment over other choices such as [Brand-F], [Brand-G] and [Brand-E]. In this evaluation we are looking only at one solution [Solution-B], and only in the context of how it compares to [Solution-A]. <...>

Shown below is a table that compares [new Solution-B] to the current [Solution-A] environment. The points of consideration are the [functional requirements] that we [identified] in the initial technology evaluation, as described and defined in the Requirements section of this document.

<...>

{Chart of Comparative Ratings Removed}

As shown above, [Solution-B] rates as:
- Better than [Solution-A] in 4 out of the 8 primary considerations
- The Same or Better than [Solution-A] in 5 out of the 8 primary considerations
- The remaining 3, currently rated as Worse, will be rated The Same once [Brand-C Product] is fully integrated and available. <...>

In the main, both [Solution-A] and [Solution-B] fulfill (or will fulfill when [Brand-C Product] is successfully integrated into [Solution-B]) the major requirements of the [-----] website.

<...>

[Solution-B]'s technical suitability to purpose is a necessary pre-condition to our endorsing its use. But its potential benefit to [-----] rests as much in the fact that it is a supported standard within the larger [Parent-Corp.] organization. The benefit of

adopting such a standard is significant cost savings for shared resources, including hosting facilities and evolutionary advancement of features and functions.

Additionally if properly supported by [Parent-Corp.], the [Solution-B] environment will likely allow for the creation of websites that are more robust and less prone to failure.

Its main drawback is that individual brands (such as [-----]) can become dependent on larger organizations (such as [Parent-Corp.]) and so must accept a role of being only a part of a larger agenda and initiative. As a result:

- o To the extent that corporate and brand goals and objectives align well, brands benefit from the support of the corporation, and can often achieve objectives that they couldn't afford to fund on their own.

- o To the extent that corporate and brand goals and objectives diverge, brands can suffer from the need to stand in line behind other higher-priority corporate initiatives, or to abide by the often slower response times of larger and/or potentially overtaxed IT organizations.

<…>

That said, however, there are significant differences in the short and long-term implications of choosing either architecture over the other.

- o [Solution-B] will enable us to deliver a more robust, extensible site – although it will take longer to deliver the first release, which may or may not include rules-based content management. [Solution-A] will allow us to deliver a release 1.0 site approximately 2 months sooner, and it will include some rules based content management.

- o With the integration of [Brand-C Product] the [Solution-B] environment will support rules based content management and also e-commerce. We do not have any near-term plans to integrate an e-commerce engine into the [Solution-A] architecture as [Partner] will handle the only current e-commerce application.

- o Over the longer term, adopting [Solution-B] will allow you to cost-effectively leverage for the [-----] brand any upgrades [Parent-Corp.] may make in core [Solution-B] functionality on behalf of all of its brands that are using [Solution-B]. However, in general, getting anything but content changes into production will take longer. This is because changes to functionality done in [Solution-B] must be suitable for - and tested against - the entire universe of [Solution-B] based websites. If the [-----] website is not part of the [Solution-B] software environment, [-----] will have to carry the full cost of future developments, but will only need to validate decisions against its own needs, and only test changes against its own website.

MATTLIN MANDELL

Excerpt from Technology Assessment

o Adopting the [Solution-B] architecture will allow us to utilize less expensive programming resources on certain aspects of future site development. Other aspects of development may require equally expensive resources, but for less time. Both of these factors should reduce the cost to [-----] of future evolutionary development work on the site. However those savings may be negated by the likely longer development cycles necessitated by working in a shared, corporate IT environment.

In Conclusion

As configured, with planned near-term version upgrades, overall [Solution-B] is as well or better suited than [Solution-A] to the defined requirements.

<…>