

Data Warehouse/Business Intelligence Vendor Recommendation

Executive Summary

The Data Warehouse Program Team performed an evaluation of leaders in the "Hybrid" enterprise data warehouse space in the Spring of 2010. This assessment details the evaluation and selection process for recommending a vendor that will partner with LUC to create a Hybrid Enterprise Data Warehouse/Business Intelligence solution.

The evaluation of enterprise data warehouse vendors began by contacting companies that provide solutions that were recommended in the higher-education community. Of these companies researched, 6 were selected to participate in the RFP process; Ciber, iStrategy, Oracle, Phytorion, Resilient Business Solutions, and Sntial. These vendors were selected because of referrals from peer or aspirational schools, identification on Gartner's magic quadrant for DW solutions, or because of research in top performers in the marketplace. Resilient chose not to respond to the RFP process citing a lack of resources to build a data warehouse solution that fit our requirements. After careful analysis and review of the RFP responses from Ciber and Sntial the Program Team eliminated these vendors for further consideration citing a lack of experience building higher education data warehouses. RFPs were scored by the Program Team in July of 2010 with vendor presentations concluding in August 2010 (See **Chart #1**).

Recommendation

The recommendation from the Data Warehouse Program Team is to enter into negotiations and an eventual contract with Phytorion to provide an Enterprise Data Warehouse solution. This vendor will assist LUC in building the data warehouse using Loyola specific tools. The total solution this vendor can provide, when compared to the other "Hybrid" firms, provides LUC with the best functionality, price, and shortest time for installation with a long term view towards expansion and innovation (See **Chart #1**).

Analysis Summary

The RFP included 120 requirements, leveraging an existing evaluation template from the LUC Project Management Office. The requirements were broken up into 5 areas as follows: 19 business and functional, 44 technical, 29 service and support, 13 vendor profile, and 11 product pricing. The analysis of the requirements included scoring each solution on a scale of zero to five based on the solutions ability to meet a requirement and were labeled as Critical, Required, and Nice-to-have for requirement weighting.

The requirements were analyzed by the DW/BI Program Team for each vendor and scored individually and averaged and summarized by Institutional Research (See **Charts #1 and #2**). Outliers were identified and discussed and corrected as necessary. The Pros and Cons of the vendor solutions are found in **Chart #3**.

A consistent theme throughout the analysis was Phytorion's solution scored consistently higher than all of the other solutions. Not only did they score higher overall, but 3 of the 5 members of the DW/BI Program Team individually scored the Phytorion solution higher than the other two vendors. The analysis consistently ranked Phytorion higher in the 'Critical Requirements' and lower in the 'Nice-to-have' requirements. This led to their higher overall score when compared to Oracle and iStrategy. Oracle and iStrategy both scored higher with the 'Nice-to-have' requirements, which are weighted lower, and scored lower on 'Critical' requirements, a higher weighted requirement (See **Chart #1**).

Chart #1 Requirement Scoring Summary

Requirement Response Scoring (Scale 1-5)			
ITEM & SECTION WEIGHTED	iStrategy	Oracle	Phytorion
Critical	2.81	2.80	3.39
Nice	2.85	2.98	2.70
Required	3.04	3.06	3.06
Total	2.93	2.95	3.11

Out of 120 requirements

Chart #2 Section Scoring Summary

Vendor Summary RFP Response Scoring (Scale 1-5)			
WEIGHTED	iStrategy	Oracle	Phytorion
Business and Functional	3.03	3.14	3.02
Product Pricing	2.42	2.95	4.04
Services and Support	2.95	2.98	3.07
Technical Requirements	2.90	2.89	2.92
Vendor Profile	3.72	2.57	3.58
Item & Section Weighted Total	2.93	2.95	3.11

Data Warehouse/Business Intelligence Vendor Recommendation

Chart #3 Vendor Summary

PROS	CONS
iStrategy	
Quick install of supported modules	Expanding the solution beyond iStrategy delivered functionality is complex and must occur outside of the solution
Thorough RFP response	Purchase cost is extremely high; no product, implementation, or service discounts
Solution includes data architecture, analytics, ETL, Data Dictionary, and BI tools	3 rd party software would need to be purchased separate from the solution
	Not a true enterprise data warehouse solution; includes only 2 student modules
	Responsibility of LUC to map data to Finance and HR modules
Oracle	
Easy integration into our current environment	RFP response did not include other higher-ed institutions as references
Large discounts on products and services	Not a true enterprise data warehouse solution; includes only 1 student module
	Solution does not include Finance and HR data marts
Phytorion	
Lower total cost of solution; utilizes current toolset	No formal yearly maintenance – must purchase consulting hours
Solution includes detailed requirements gathering by the vendor	Solution does not include Finance and HR data marts
Breadth of solution – includes many functional areas not included with other solutions	3 rd party software may need to be purchased separate from the solution

Chart #4 Vendor Pricing Matrix

Item	iStrategy	Oracle	Phytorion	Comments
Software/Hardware	\$315,00	\$324,259	\$100,000	
Maintenance and Support	\$63,000	\$34,064	\$33,000*	Phytorion does not have formal maintenance and support (not productized). \$33,000 is estimated for 200 hours of consulting work that LUC can use for support and future enhancements.
Implementation	\$90,000	\$178,526	\$90,000	
Additional Costs	N/A	N/A	\$100,000*	The cost savings of the Phytorion solution will allow LUC to pursue purchasing advanced analytical products to more effectively utilize the data warehouse.
Total Solution Price	\$468,000	\$536,849	\$323,000	*Are estimated figures