

Type: Mail
From: CN=Matthew St. John/OU=HomeOffice/O=KofC
To: CN=Logan T Ludwig/OU=HomeOffice/O=KofC@KofC;
CN=Linda B McLane/OU=HomeOffice/O=KofC@KofC;
BCC:
Subject: UKnight Update
Sent On: 11/25/2015 08:51:47 AM -0500 (EST)
Attachments: UKnight Update Memo_112515.pdf;

Worthy Deputy Supreme Knight,

Attached is a memo from myself, Denise, Tanya, and Chuck. If possible, we would like to meet with you sometime next week to discuss our options for moving forward.

Have a wonderful Thanksgiving!

Best,

Matt

Matthew A. St. John
Director, Insurance Marketing
Knights of Columbus Supreme Council Office
1 Columbus Plaza | New Haven, CT 06510-3326
Phone: 203-752-4633
Email: matthew.stjohn@kofc.org



MEMORANDUM

To: Logan T. Ludwig, Deputy Supreme Knight

From: Chuck Lindberg, Tanya Nobile, Denise Serafini, and Matt St. John

Subject: UKnight Committee Update

Date: November 25, 2015

Worthy Deputy Supreme Knight,

We have now had the opportunity to review the proposals submitted by UKnight in their entirety. We have also received and reviewed independent analyses of UKnight's proposals from Ian Kinkade, Corporate Business Improvement, Information Technology, and eBusiness. Each of the four reports suggests that we investigate other vendors and/or options. We concur.

While we do believe that a partnership with UKnight could – after successful negotiation – be achieved at a reasonable cost, we believe that gaps in their management and technical ability would expose us to a level of risk that would only be justifiable if there were no other feasible options.

It is our contention that our original assessment, given this summer, of a partial buyout being the best possible path forward with UKnight remains valid, theoretically speaking. But the additional time spent evaluating and investigating UKnight has served to further validate Leadership's decision not to pursue majority ownership in UKnight, as it would tie us too closely to an entity that is not without significant problems.

Subsequently, we believe there are three possible paths forward:

- 1. Investigate different vendors.** We could evaluate other vendors to confirm or deny our suspicions about price and functionality relative to UKnight. We would need to decide how formally we would want to go about this process, and would need to seek legal guidance to make sure there are no intellectual property concerns.
- 2. Investigate different technological solutions.** We could evaluate other technology platforms, which we could then incorporate into UKnight's business, allowing them to manage the platform on our behalf, with more sound and current technology.
- 3. Negotiate with UKnight.** If the first two options do not uncover workable solutions, we could negotiate with UKnight and propose a path forward to the Board of Directors for consideration. In addition to cost, we would need to minimize risk by obtaining a higher level of specificity (including contractual requirements) on technology upgrades, and a more muscular Advisory Board mandate.

We recognize that this will require a considerable investment of time above and beyond what was projected. However, we still firmly believe that the Order should pursue an umbrella web platform for local K of C entities, and that in the ever-changing web services world, finding the right long-term partner is more important than finding the right short-term solution.

As your schedule allows, we would like to meet with you to discuss these options.