	Incremental Projects & Infrastructure Changes	Interim Interfaces: What we can feasibly attain	
ision: Idmap	2009 Bill Pay 2.0 (DTD Enhancement) Inter-FI Payments Phase 2 (Payroll) Inter-FI DDA Transfers Phase 2 (Payroll)	1 MMS CX 2009 End State	
012 V ic Roa	2010 (P2P RTN & Acct. No.)	3 MMS CX 2010 End State	
MMS 2 Strategi		5 MMS CX 2011 End State	
Primary Goal/Business Case	 Continue to enhance exiting features an add new functionality Improve performance. Maintain scalability and reliability 	 2009 End State Goals: Increase use of MMS. Increase MMS transactions by number and volume Increase awareness of different Bill Pay and Transfer options: show customer their different options. Increase customer retention 2010 and 2011 End State Goals: Stepping stone to 2012 Vision move towards the 2012 vision by making interim improvements to the Customer Experience based on what we know is feasible and realistic for a given year Get funding for the following year's projects Need to know what we need to do at the platform level (Bill Pay, Transfers [OPS], etc.) Need to know what we need to be demonstrated Increase in enrollments Increase in the volume of transactions Increase in Revenue to ISG 	 Buil Ho Shi Dete Bus Bus path
Primary Team / Stakeholders ICS: CX, CI, BO Arch Business Tech		 2009 End State Core Team: Andrew, Vicki, Greg, Robin/Pamela Stakeholders: Platform Owners Product Owners LOB 	 Stee Resp Accord Cons Infor
Approach Design Research Architecture	2010 Vision informed by end-state roadmap	 Business Approach: Each project writes its own business case at the component level (Technical Complexity, Organizational Knowledge, Business Value) End-states are funded projects rationalized with the direction of the 2012 vision and a synthesis of the customer experience across projects The gap analysis exercise needs to be executed each year for planning for future work threads. Additionally, revisions of the long term 2012 Vision will need to occur after incremental end states have been completed. 2009 = collection of 2009 projects already planned Suggestion: look at the learnings (not design solutions) from the work Native Instincts helped with and do a fit gap against projects and intent to identify what should be included in the 2009 end state. Incorporate learnings into hybrid concept and conduct usability tests 2010 = Look @ 2012 vision, identify gaps + overflows, and start building architecture to support changes Q1-2 2009 Task: Gap Analysis Objectives: Identify deltas between 2012 Vision and 2010 Roadmap Identify deltas between 2010 Roadmap and 2009 End-State Determine if 2010 Roadmap needs to be revisited to incorporate deltas found in first two activities. 	 Desi Busi Reso
Scope			 Time Targ Cha Con be e 2010 Biz a - Ca - Sys
Assumptions		 2010 End-State depends on 2012 Vision being at least 75% complete the assumption to date is that we can complete the 2012 Vision before starting the budget planning and definition of the MMS CX 2010 End State. 2011 End-State depends on 2012 Vision being complete and revised 	• This • Only
Open Issues		 Greg: How do we scope size and price (if we don't know enough detail) of this 3 yr. or yr. by yr. effort? Vicki: There are current projects that have CX components included . Need clarification of what 2009 work thread may consist of. 	 Nee Nee Nee

MMS CX 2012 Vision: The Value of an Integrated System			
MMS CX 2012 Vision			
High-level concept supported through research and testing			
4 Informs the Interim Interfaces			
Evolves with feedback from Interim Interfaces			
Build excitement around vision			
 How do we tell the story? Build energy Shiny and cool impulse buy Determine level of investment and secure funding to realize 2012 Vision 			
Determine roll-out costs. High-level sizing/pricing. Business case based on common sense - Business value will be determined yr. by yr. incrementally (at each step of			
path)			
Steering Committee: Jim, Secil, Product Advisory Board			
Responsible: Core Team: Mai, Vicki, Greg, Christina, Robin Accountable: Adam and Mark Consultative: MMS Product Managers, Andrew Diggdon and OLBI			
Informed: Product Teams, Dev. Partners Design: User-Centered Design Methodology: Clarify customers			
Clarify tasks/goals Clarify PROFILES			
Rationalize end-state architecture w/ yr. by yr. roadmaps Research: Concept test hypothesis. Not a full-blown usability test.			
Timeframe: 3 years Target Audience: Consumers (Biz and TPB considered later) Channel: Online/WIB (not mobile)			
Conceptual Prototype: level of detail should be "medium" level, but should be enough to inform the roadmap and budget planning for the subsequent 2010 and 2011 end states.			
Biz Architecture: - Capabilities - Systems			
This is a living and evolving vision Only high-level sizings can be given for the vision			
Need clarity on fundamental business model Need to level set on User-Centered Design process Need to marry markets (e.g. consumer or small business) to profiles			

WELLS FARGO WELLS FARGO Confidential 2008

MMS Rationalization: MMS 2012 Vision Strategic Roadmap Document Version 5.0 Created by: Vicki Huynh Last Updated: 06-23-2009