bluecrane

MANAGEMENT CONSULTING FOR STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

EXECUTIVE ADVISEMENT

QUALITY ASSURANCE

PROJECT OVERSIGHT

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION (IV&V)

RISK REDUCTION

Quality Assurance Report

for the

State of Washington

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)

SC-CMS Project

April 30, 2014

Prepared by
Bluecrane, Inc.

bluecrane ®

Corporate Headquarters
210 Avenue I, Suite E
Redondo Beach, CA 90277-5608
www.bluecranesolutions.com
310-792-6241

April 30, 2014

Honorable Mary Fairhurst, Justice
Washington Supreme Court

Ms. Callie Dietz
Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts

Dear Justice Fairhurst and Ms. Dietz:

bluecrane has completed its Quality Assurance Assessment of the SC-CMS Project for the month of April 2014.

This document is structured as follows:

1. Executive Summary and Assessment Dashboard.
2. An explanation of our approach for those readers that have not seen one of our assessments previously.
3. A detailed report of our SC-CMS assessment as of April month-end. Each assessed item in the detailed report begins with a summary table for the reader's quick reference that provides an impact statement, recommendations, and status. The summary table is followed by a more detailed assessment across project planning, project execution, and achievement of expected results.

Please contact me with any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Allen Mills

Table of Contents

Part 1: Executive Summary and Assessment Dashboard 1

Executive Summary 1

bluecrane QA Assessment Dashboard..... 3

Part 2: Review of *bluecrane* Approach 9

Part 3: *bluecrane* Detailed Assessment Report for April 2014 13

Part 1: Executive Summary and Assessment Dashboard

Executive Summary

This report provides the April 2014 quality assurance (QA) assessment by Bluecrane, Inc. ("*bluecrane*") for the State of Washington Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Superior Court – Case Management System (SC-CMS) Project.

Our report is organized by assessments in the project areas of:

- Project Management and Sponsorship
- People
- Application
- Data
- Infrastructure

For April, we continue to identify three risks that have been raised in prior months:

- **Schedule risk.** The SC-CMS Project has dependencies on integration components that are being developed as part of the Information Networking Hub (INH) as well as two projects under the umbrella effort known as Commercial-off-the-Shelf Preparation (COTS Prep). To meet the pilot go-live date of May 2015, the construction of integration components and system modifications must be completed by November 1, 2014. In order to help ensure the tracking of the dependencies between AOC SC-CMS efforts, Tyler SC-CMS work, INH, and COTS Prep, it is necessary to have (1) project schedules for each individual project that are at a level of detail adequate to determine resource requirements to achieve timing commitments and (2) an integrated view of the schedules that provides a level of confidence that dependencies between and among the individual projects are being tracked and coordinated so that the overall combined efforts are on-track for timely completion.

  While each project currently has a schedule, we are concerned that the amount of detail in some cases is not adequate to provide the level of confidence of timely completion that the Executive Sponsors should have. Moreover, an integrated view with tracking of the interdependencies between the various projects is missing.

  To be clear, we are *not* advocating that all of the project schedules (AOC SC-CMS tasks, Tyler work, INH, COTS Prep, and possibly other related efforts) be combined into a single, monolithic schedule. Creating and maintaining such a schedule is not likely to produce results worth the effort required. What we are suggesting is that a single integrated view of key milestones (from each of the efforts) needs to be created and maintained, and frequent, regular management reviews of the integrated view need to be conducted. Creating and maintaining the single integrated view and providing the staff work for the regular reviews will require a dedicated resource who will require input from multiple sources in AOC. Establishing the initial mechanisms and reviews is likely to be a fairly intense effort that will become less so over time.

- **Application architecture risk.** The alternatives to implementing document management for the SC-CMS project have been narrowed to two, one preferred by the Clerks that utilizes third-party document management software and one preferred by the judges and administrators that uses the Odyssey document management feature. Discussions are continuing regarding the cost to integrate third-party document management products.

- **County ancillary systems that duplicate the functionality of Odyssey.** The purchase by counties of products that provide the same functionality as Odyssey components results in duplicated functionality and costs, and needs to be addressed by AOC, and potentially, the JISC. AOC is developing a policy with regards to ancillary systems.

bluecrane QA Assessment Dashboard

Area of Assessment	Urgency	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	Summary Status/Recommendations
Project Management and Sponsorship					
Governance	**Urgent Consideration**	Risk Being Addressed	Risk Being Addressed	Risk Being Addressed	Currently, AOC does not have a policy regarding the support of county ancillary systems that duplicate the functionality of AOC systems that are in the process of being implemented. The purchase by counties of products that provide the same functionality as Odyssey components duplicate functionality and costs. This is a risk that should be addressed by AOC, and potentially, the JISC. If counties or courts continue to implement custom-developed or purchased systems that have overlapping functionality with SC-CMS, then the scope, complexity, and cost of SC-CMS will almost certainly increase, adding risk to the project. Counties would bear not only the one-time implementation costs of the one-off, stand-alone software, but would have on-going maintenance costs for the software as well. Likewise, AOC would incur on-going maintenance costs for custom interfaces if one-off, stand-alone systems are implemented. Failure to mitigate this risk now with a defined policy and approach fosters a continuing high degree of uncertainty. AOC is developing an ancillary system policy that will provide guidance to counties on the implementation of software that provides overlapping functionality.

Area of Assessment	Urgency	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	Summary Status/Recommendations
Scope	Urgent Consideration	Risk Being Addressed	Risk Being Addressed	Risk Being Addressed	The risk of duplicated functionality (and associated costs) discussed above under Governance, has ramifications related to Scope as well. Replacement of these ancillary systems with SC-CMS functionality is an important aspect of the SC-CMS implementation in order to realize cost savings and improved reliability inherent in an integrated system. If counties continue to implement custom-developed or purchased systems that have overlapping functionality with SC-CMS, then the scope, complexity, and cost of the SC-CMS project will almost certainly increase, adding risk to the project.
Schedule	Urgent Consideration	Risk Being Addressed	Risk Being Addressed	Risk Being Addressed	The SC-CMS Project has dependencies on integration components that are being developed as part of the Information Networking Hub (INH) as well as two projects under the umbrella effort known as Commercial-off-the-Shelf Preparation (COTS Prep). To meet the pilot go-live date of May 2015, the construction of integration components and system modifications must be completed by November 1, 2014. In order to help ensure the tracking of the dependencies between AOC SC-CMS efforts, Tyler SC-CMS work, INH, and COTS Prep, it is necessary to have (1) project schedules for each individual project that are at a level of detail adequate to determine resource requirements to achieve timing commitments and (2) an integrated view of the schedules that provides a level of confidence that dependencies between and among the individual projects are being tracked and coordinated so that the overall combined efforts are on-track for timely completion. While each project currently has a schedule, we are concerned that the amount of detail in some cases is not adequate to provide the level of confidence of timely completion that the Executive Sponsors should have. Moreover, an integrated view with tracking of the interdependencies between the various projects is missing.

Area of Assessment	Urgency	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	Summary Status/Recommendations
Budget	Serious Consideration	Risk Being Addressed	Risk Being Addressed	Risk Being Addressed	Discussions are underway to determine the level of AOC support for local preparation and implementation costs. A list of potential categories of costs has been developed. The SC-CMS Feasibility Study estimated the costs for local preparation and implementation costs to be approximately $1.9 million dollars, and this amount of funding has been allocated to the project budget over the implementation timeframe. The newly reformed SC-CMS Steering Committee will continue work on this issue in May.
Communication	N/A	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	The project utilizes several approaches to communicate information to project stakeholders. Project status is communicated to AOC management, project team members, and other AOC stakeholders in multiple weekly meetings. Project Steering Committee Meetings are conducted monthly. Information is provided to representatives of the Judges, Clerks, and Administrators associations who pass information to the association members through their normal communication paths.
Staffing and Project Facilities	N/A	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	The INH Project completed a procurement to hire an additional developer resource for the project in March. The developer contract was executed April 1.
Change Management	N/A	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	The scope and budget have been baselined.
Risk Management	N/A	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	Consistent with the Risk Management Plan, the project is identifying and managing risks.
Issue Management	N/A	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	Consistent with the Issue Management Plan, the project team is identifying and tracking issues.

Area of Assessment	Urgency	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	Summary Status/Recommendations
Quality Management	N/A	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	The project team has developed a Quality Management Plan.
People					
Stakeholder Engagement	N/A	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	Stakeholder engagement and organizational change management activities are underway. Thurston and Lewis counties have been selected to participate in the project as “pilot sites”. Yakima, Klickitat, Benton, Franklin, and Walla Walla were selected as “early adopter” counties.
Business Processes/ System Functionality	N/A	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	Process flows that represent the current state of court business processes have been developed and reviewed by the CUWG. The business processes will be utilized configuration activities to identify how Washington courts processes will be supported by Odyssey.
Contract Management / Deliverables Management	N/A	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	The list and schedule of vendor deliverables are identified in the Tyler contract and are being managed by the project team.

Area of Assessment	Urgency	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	Summary Status/Recommendations
Application					
Application Architecture	**Urgent Consideration**	Risk	Risk Being Addressed	Risk Being Addressed	Two of the four document management implementation options have been identified by the representatives of the clerks, judges, and administrators as viable. One option, preferred by judges and administrators is to use the Odyssey document management functionality as it exists in the product and the other, preferred by clerks, is to require existing, third-party document management solutions to be accessible within Odyssey via a "link." The first option can be implemented with existing Odyssey functionality. The integration with third-party document management solutions will cost an additional $150,000. The two options were presented to the JISC in April as being viable options that each county could select from. However, there is not currently agreement on the source of funding to integrate the third party systems Additional meetings will be conducted in April to identify the source of funding.
Requirements Management	**N/A**	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	The CBO and CUWG will document Use Cases for the To-Be processes as needed.
Application Interfaces	**N/A**	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	The Information Networking Hub (INH) and COTS-Prep Application projects have been defining and preparing AOC interfaces using SC-CMS information that was available prior to the selection of Tyler as the SC-CMS vendor. Further definition of the interfaces started in November, 2013 with a series of integration sessions that resulted in design details for the integration at of Odyssey with AOC and local county systems. AOC and Tyler will collaborate on a collection of translation components that will be constructed to facilitate the transfer of data between the SC-CMS Odyssey system and the AOC legacy systems.

Area of Assessment	Urgency	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	Summary Status/Recommendations
Data					
Data Preparation	**N/A**	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	The AOC Data Quality Coordinator will coordinate preparation of data in AOC and local court applications. One of the activities is the development of a data profiling report which will identify anomalies in data stored in JIS.
Data Conversion	**N/A**	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	Conversion extracts for Thurston and Lewis counties were executed to allow Tyler to begin data analysis. The first data load is planned for June when conversion and application testing begins.
Infrastructure					
Statewide Infrastructure	**N/A**	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	The statewide server infrastructure was installed in the AOC data center in November ahead of schedule.
Local Infrastructure	**N/A**	Not Started	Not Started	Not Started	This activity has not yet started.

Part 2: Review of *bluecrane* Approach

We began our Quality Assurance engagement for the AOC SC-CMS Project by developing an understanding of the project at a macro level. We started by analyzing the following five "Project Areas":

- ***Project Management and Sponsorship***
- ***People***
- ***Application***
- ***Data***
- ***Infrastructure***

It is not our practice to duplicate Project Management activities by following and analyzing each task and each deliverable that our clients are tracking in their project management software (such as Microsoft Project). Rather, we identify those groups of tasks and deliverables that are key "signposts" in the project. While there are numerous tasks that may slip a few days or even weeks, get rescheduled, and not have a major impact on the project, there are always a number of significant "task groups" and deliverables which should be tracked over time because any risk to those items – in terms of schedule, scope, or cost – have a potentially significant impact on project success.

We de-compose the five Project Areas listed above into the next lower level of our assessment taxonomy. We refer to this next lower level as the "area of assessment" level. The list of areas of assessment grows over the life of the project. The following list is provided as an example of typical areas of assessment:

- ***Project Management and Sponsorship***
    - Governance
    - Scope
    - Schedule
    - Budget
    - Communication
    - Staffing and Project Facilities
    - Change Management
    - Risk Management
    - Issue Management
    - Quality Management

- ***People***
  - Stakeholder Engagement
  - Business Processes/System Functionality
  - Vendor Procurement
  - Contract Management/Deliverables Management
  - Training and Training Facilities
  - Local Court Preparation
  - User Support
- ***Application***
  - Application Architecture
  - Requirements Management
  - Implementation
  - Application Interfaces
  - Application Infrastructure
  - Reporting
  - Testing
  - Tools
- ***Data***
  - Data Preparation
  - Data Conversion
  - Data Security
- ***Infrastructure***
  - Statewide Infrastructure
  - Local Infrastructure
  - Technical Help Desk

For each area of assessment within a Project Area, we document in our QA Dashboard our observations, any issues and/or risks that we have assessed, and our recommendations. For each area we assess activities in the following three stages of delivery:

- **Planning** – is the project doing an acceptable level of planning?
- **Executing** – assuming adequate planning has been done, is the project performing tasks in alignment with the plans the project has established?
- **Results** – are the expected results being realized? (A project that does a good job of planning and executing those plans, but does not realize the results expected by stakeholders, is a less than successful project. Ultimately, r*esults are what the project is all about!*)

Assessed status is rated at a macro-level using the scale shown in the table below.

Assessed Status	Meaning
Extreme Risk	**Extreme Risk:** a risk that project management must address or the entire project is at risk of failure; these risks are "show-stoppers"
Risk	**Risk:** a risk that is significant enough to merit management attention but not one that is deemed a "show-stopper"
Risk Being Addressed	**Risk Being Addressed:** a risk item in this category is one that was formerly red or yellow, but in our opinion, is now being addressed adequately and should be reviewed at the next assessment with an expectation that this item becomes green at that time
No Identified Risk	**No Risk:** "All Systems Go" for this item
Not Started	**Not Started:** this particular item has not started yet or is not yet assessed
Completed or Not Applicable	**Completed/Not Applicable:** this particular item has been completed or has been deemed "not applicable" but remains a part of the assessment for traceability purposes.

We recognize that simultaneously addressing all risk areas identified at any given time is a daunting task – and not advisable. Therefore, we prioritize risk items in our monthly reports as:

1. Very Urgent Consideration
2. Urgent Consideration
3. Serious Consideration

Given the current phase of the SC-CMS Project, these priorities translate to:

1. Very Urgent Consideration – Potential Impact to Configuration of the System
2. Urgent Consideration – Potential Impact to Project's Readiness for Implementation
3. Serious Consideration – Potential Impact to the Successful Management of the Project

Rating risks at the macro-level using the assessed status and urgency scales described above provides a method for creating a snapshot that project personnel and executive management can review quickly, getting an immediate sense of project risks. The macro-level ratings are further refined by describing in detail what the risk/issue is and what remedial actions are being taken/should be taken to address the risk/issue. The result is a framework for AOC SC-CMS management to evaluate project risks – in terms of business objectives and traditional project management tasks.

We summarize the *bluecrane* QA Dashboard in Part 1 of our monthly report for review with client executives and project management. Part 3 of our monthly report provides the detailed QA Dashboard with all of the elements described above.

Part 3: *bluecrane* Detailed Assessment Report for April 2014

bluecrane Quality Assurance Dashboard for the Washington AOC SC-CMS Project	
Project Area Summary	
Project Area	**Highest Level of Assessed Risk**
Project Management and Sponsorship	Risk Being Addressed
People	No Risk Identified
Application	Risk Being Addressed
Data	No Risk Identified
Infrastructure	No Risk Identified

		Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**	**Risk Being Addressed**	**Risk Being Addressed**	**Risk Being Addressed**
Area of Assessment:	**Governance**			
Urgency:	**Urgent Consideration**			

Observation/Risk: Currently, AOC does not have a policy regarding the support of county ancillary systems that duplicate the functionality of AOC systems that are in the process of being implemented. The purchase by counties of products that provide the same functionality as Odyssey components duplicates functionality and costs. This is a risk that should be addressed by AOC, and potentially, the JISC.

Risk/Impact: If counties or courts continue to implement custom-developed or purchased systems that have overlapping functionality with SC-CMS, then the scope, complexity, and cost of SC-CMS will almost certainly increase, adding risk to the project. Counties would bear not only the one-time implementation costs of the one-off, stand-alone software, but would have on-going maintenance costs for the software as well. Likewise, AOC would incur on-going maintenance costs for custom interfaces if one-off, stand-alone systems are implemented. Failure to mitigate this risk now with a defined policy and approach fosters a continuing high degree of uncertainty.

Recommendation: AOC and/or the JISC should adopt a policy regarding the implementation of ancillary systems by counties that provide duplicative functionality of systems being implemented by AOC. Existing policies should be reviewed to see if modification of a current policy would provide the necessary guidance for counties. If an existing policy cannot be modified, then a new policy should be adopted to outline the AOC support guidelines for county systems.

Status: AOC is developing an ancillary system policy that will provide guidance to counties on the implementation of software that provides overlapping functionality.

		Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**	**Risk Being Addressed**	**Risk Being Addressed**	**Risk Being Addressed**
Area of Assessment:	**Scope**			
Urgency:	**Urgent Consideration**			

Observation/Risk 1: The scope of the SC-CMS project is established in the SC-CMS RFP requirements and deliverables as established by the SC-CMS contract with Tyler Technologies. The risk of duplicated functionality (and associated costs) discussed above under Governance has ramifications related to project scope as well.

Risk/Impact: Over time, several Washington counties have implemented ancillary systems to supplement the lack of functionality in the legacy systems that SC-CMS will replace. Replacement of these ancillary systems with SC-CMS functionality is an important aspect of the SC-CMS implementation in order to realize cost savings and improved reliability inherent in an integrated system. If counties continue to implement custom-developed or purchased systems that have overlapping functionality with SC-CMS, then the scope, complexity, and cost of the SC-CMS project will almost certainly increase, adding risk to the project. Duration of the project may also have to be extended. Counties will bear not only the one-time implementation costs of the one-off, stand-alone software, but will have on-going maintenance costs for the software. Likewise, AOC will incur on-going maintenance costs for custom interfaces if one-off, stand-alone systems are implemented.

Recommendation: AOC should work with counties to help them understand the capabilities of Odyssey components, including SessionWorks Judges Edition and the functionality, integration, and cost advantages of using Odyssey components.

Status: AOC is developing an ancillary system policy that would provide guidance to counties on the implementation of software that provides overlapping functionality.

		Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**			
Area of Assessment:	**Schedule**	**Risk Being Addressed**	**Risk Being Addressed**	**Risk Being Addressed**
Urgency:	**Urgent Consideration**			

Observation/Risk 1 – Lack of Schedule Decomposition and Integration: The SC-CMS Project has dependencies on integration components that are being developed as part of the Information Networking Hub (INH) as well as two projects under the umbrella effort known as Commercial-off-the-Shelf Preparation (COTS Prep). To meet the pilot go-live date of May 2015, the construction of integration components and system modifications must be completed by November 1, 2014. In order to help ensure the tracking of the dependencies between AOC SC-CMS efforts, Tyler SC-CMS work, INH, and COTS Prep, it is necessary to have (1) project schedules for each individual project that are at a level of detail adequate to determine resource requirements to achieve timing commitments and (2) an integrated view of the schedules that provides a level of confidence that dependencies between and among the individual projects are being tracked and coordinated so that the overall combined efforts are on-track for timely completion.

Impact: Because the SC-CMS has significant dependencies on the successful completion of the integration components noted above, a delay in the completion of those components could result in a delay of the SC-CMS pilot go-live date.

Recommendation: The SC-CMS, INH, and COTS-Prep projects should complete detailed estimates of the development and implementation effort and use the estimates to produce detailed project schedules. A detailed list of the tasks to complete the project work will allow AOC to determine the resource requirements necessary to complete the work on schedule and provide a detailed tracking capability to closely monitor progress of project activities. One method of providing focused monitoring of the schedules is to assign a dedicated schedule management resource to maintain the respective schedules and interdependencies between the schedules. The schedule manager would have intimate knowledge of the status of near term project activities and overall knowledge of the detailed tasks needed to meet the pilot county schedule.

To be clear, we are *not* advocating that all of the project schedules (AOC SC-CMS tasks, Tyler work, INH, COTS Prep, and possibly other related efforts) be combined into a single, monolithic schedule. Creating and maintaining such a schedule is not likely to produce results worth the effort required. What we are suggesting is that (in addition to developing detailed schedules for each project) a single integrated view of key milestones (from each of the efforts) needs to be created and maintained, and frequent, regular management reviews of the integrated view need to be conducted.

Status: While each project currently has a schedule, we are concerned that the amount of detail in some cases is not adequate to provide the level of confidence of timely completion that the Executive Sponsors should have. Moreover, an integrated view with tracking of the interdependencies between the various projects is missing.

Observation/Risk 2 – Schedule Management: Project work is planned and tracked in the SC-CMS project schedule and in a list of integration development tasks in SharePoint. Although the project schedule identifies many high level project activities and the SharePoint list identifies integration work, there are a significant number of project activities that are not being tracked in a project schedule. Additionally, the activities that are being tracked are lacking properties that have been identified in the SC-CMS Schedule Management Plan as necessary to adequately plan and track progress toward successful completion of project deliverables. Examples of schedule management variances include high level activities that should be further decomposed, activities that do not list an assigned resource, and lack of a schedule baseline.

Impact: Identifying and tracking project activities with a project schedule provides the project team with a tool to monitor progress and identify potential problems such as over-allocated resources, inaccurate effort or duration estimates.

Recommendation: The SC-CMS project schedule should be reviewed using the criteria in the SC-CMS Schedule Management Plan to determine gaps. A plan should be developed to bring the SC-CMS project schedule into compliance, modify the SC-CMS Schedule Management Plan to remove content, and/or document risks for non-compliant properties of the schedule.

		Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**			
Area of Assessment:	**Budget**	**Risk Being Addressed**	**Risk Being Addressed**	**Risk Being Addressed**
Urgency:	**Serious Consideration**			

Observation/Risk 1 – Withdrawal of King County: In late January, King County announced their withdrawal from the SC-CMS project. At that time, we identified a risk that funding for the SC-CMS Project could be significantly reduced or even withdrawn completely. We also noted the likelihood of project success could increase with the removal of King County – as long as funding was not affected.

Status: The budget risk that we raised in February (and January) is all but gone.

Observation/Risk 2 Local Costs: Discussions are underway to determine the level of AOC support for local preparation and implementation costs. A list of potential categories of costs has been developed. The SC-CMS Feasibility Study estimated the costs for local preparation and implementation costs to be approximately $1.9 million dollars, and this amount of funding has been allocated to the project budget over the implementation timeframe. Estimating local implementation costs is difficult because of varying county needs. Although it is reasonable for counties to receive some assistance in implementation costs, it is also reasonable that counties would incur some of the preparation and implementation costs based on the benefit that they will derive from the implementation since the software license fees and overall implementation costs for the statewide system are being waived for all counties.

Impact: If a decision is made to fund the local costs that exceed the $1.9 million currently allocated for local implementation, then additional funding will have to be transferred from elsewhere such as reduction of SC-CMS scope, additional appropriation from the legislature, or reduction of funding for other AOC projects.

Recommendation: The alternatives for resolving this issue should be documented with an analysis of advantages and disadvantages, impacts, and costs from both a local and statewide perspective. This analysis should include the likelihood of each alternative being implemented. For example, although reduction of SC-CMS scope may be an alternative, the likelihood of being able to reduce scope may be low. The project team should develop a recommendation and vet the decision through the SC-CMS governance structure. It is important to adopt an approach soon in order to reduce the uncertainty of future costs (and likely ripple effects to SC-CMS scope and timeline) that not addressing this risk perpetuates.

Status: The SC-CMS Steering Committee reached agreement on cost categories in December, and there was further discussion of estimated

costs associated with each category in the January Steering Committee meetings. Further analysis was scheduled to be performed in February to estimate county costs associated with the cost categories, including estimating the number of county systems that require conversion and the cost for typical conversions. However, efforts to resolve the local costs issue was postponed to focus on the King County withdrawal issue. The newly reformed SC-CMS Steering Committee will continue work on this issue in May.

Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**	**Feb 2014**	**Mar 2014**	**Apr 2014**
Area of Assessment:	**Project Communications**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**
Urgency:	**N/A**			

Observation: The project utilizes several approaches to communicate information to project stakeholders. Project status is communicated to AOC management, project team members, and other AOC stakeholders in multiple weekly meetings. Project Steering Committee Meetings are conducted monthly. Information is provided to representatives of the Judges, Clerks, and Administrators associations who pass information to the association members through their normal communication paths.

Status: The SC-CMS project publishes a weekly status report. Tyler provides a monthly status report.

Recommendation: Although there are multiple approaches to communicating project status and organizational change management information, it would be advisable for the project to conduct periodic surveys to determine the effectiveness of the various forms of communication being utilized. Effectiveness could be measured by gauging the project-related knowledge of internal and external stakeholders at all levels. Based on the results of surveys, approaches to project communications can be revised. Some approaches may be eliminated if they are found to be ineffective, or supplemental communications may be necessary to augment the current forms of communications.

		Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**			
Area of Assessment:	**Staffing and Project Facilities**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**
Urgency:	**N/A**			

Observation 1 Integration Staffing: The INH Project completed a procurement to hire an additional developer resource for the project in March. The developer contract was executed April 1.

Observation 2 Project and SME Staffing: The Project Staff Log is used to track current and planned staffing assignments. All staff needed for this timeframe are in place. The Configuration Plan identifies roles for AOC Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) and Local SMEs. The AOC SMEs have been identified. Pilot SMEs have been identified.

		Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**			
Area of Assessment:	**Change Management**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**
Urgency:	**N/A**			

Observation: The scope and budget have been baselined. All requests for changes to scope or budget will go through the SC-CMS change management process.

		Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**			
Area of Assessment:	**Risk Management**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**
Urgency:	**N/A**			

Observation: Consistent with the Risk Management Plan, the project is identifying and managing risks.

		Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**			
Area of Assessment:	**Issue Management**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**
Urgency:	**N/A**			

Observation: Consistent with the Issue Management Plan, the project team is identifying and tracking issues.

		Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**			
Area of Assessment:	**Quality Management**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**
Urgency:	**N/A**			

Observation: The project team has developed a Quality Management Plan.

Category:	People	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Area of Assessment:	Stakeholder Engagement	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified
Urgency:	N/A			

Observation: Stakeholder engagement and organizational change management activities are underway. Thurston and Lewis counties have been selected to participate in the project as “pilot sites”. Yakima, Klickitat, Benton, Franklin, and Walla Walla were selected as “early adopter” counties in December. Counties selected as an “early adopter” will implement the solution after the pilot counties have been implemented.

Category:	People	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Area of Assessment:	Business Processes / System Functionality	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified
Urgency:	N/A			

Observation: Process flows that represent the current state of court business processes have been developed and reviewed by the CUWG. The business processes will be utilized configuration activities to identify how Washington courts processes will be supported by Odyssey.

Category:	People	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Area of Assessment:	Contract Management / Deliverables Management	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified
Urgency:	N/A			

Observation/Risk: The list and schedule of vendor deliverables are identified in the Tyler contract and are being managed by the project team.

Category:	Application	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Area of Assessment:	Application Architecture	Risk	Risk Being Addressed	Risk Being Addressed
Urgency:	Urgent Consideration			

Observation/Risk: In the past several months, county clerks have expressed concerns with using the integrated Odyssey document management solution that the State is offering through the SC-CMS Project.

Impact: If the clerks do not use Odyssey to store copies of documents, then there will be additional costs to integrate third-party document management solutions. The integration of third-party solutions introduces additional risks (technical, schedule, and scope) to the SC-CMS Project.

Status: Four alternatives for the implementation of document management in SC-CMS that will meet the clerk's requirements were developed in February and presented to representatives of the county clerks in March and to representatives of the judges and administrators in April. Two of the four options have were identified by the representatives of the three groups as viable. One option is to use the Odyssey document management functionality as it exists in the product and another is to require existing, third-party document management solutions to be accessible within Odyssey via a "link." The first option can be implemented with existing Odyssey functionality. The integration with third-party document management solutions will cost an additional $150,000. The two options were presented to the JISC in April as being viable options that each county could select from. However, there is not currently agreement on the source of funding to integrate the third party systems. Additional meetings are being conducted to identify the source of funding.

		Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Category:	**Application**			
Area of Assessment:	**Requirements Management**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**
Urgency:	**N/A**			

Observation: The project's business analysts have loaded the SC-CMS requirements into the Rational Requirements Composer (RRC) requirements management tool that is being used to document requirements and for traceability. The CBO and CUWG will document Use Cases for the To-Be processes as needed.

		Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Category:	**Application**			
Area of Assessment:	**Application Interfaces**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**
Urgency:	**N/A**			

Observation: The Information Networking Hub (INH) and COTS-Prep Application projects have been defining and preparing AOC interfaces using SC-CMS information that was available prior to the selection of Tyler as the SC-CMS vendor. Further definition of the interfaces started in November, 2013 with a series of integration sessions that resulted in design details for the integration of Odyssey with AOC and local county systems. AOC and Tyler will collaborate on a collection of translation components that will be constructed to facilitate the transfer of data between the SC-CMS Odyssey system and the AOC legacy systems.

Category:	Data	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Area of Assessment:	Data Preparation	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified
Urgency:	N/A			

Observation: The AOC Data Quality Coordinator will coordinate preparation of data in AOC and local court applications. One of the activities is the development of a data profiling report which will identify anomalies in data stored in JIS.

The AOC System Support Technician will prepare and extract SCOMIS data for each superior court and county clerk office in the format that Tyler can import into Odyssey.

Category:	Data	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Area of Assessment:	Data Conversion	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified
Urgency:	N/A			

Observation: Conversion extracts for Thurston and Lewis counties were executed to allow Tyler to begin data analysis. The first data load is planned for June when conversion testing begins.

		Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Category:	**Infrastructure**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**
Area of Assessment:	**Statewide Infrastructure**			
Urgency:	**N/A**			

Observation: The statewide server infrastructure was installed in the AOC data center in November ahead of schedule.

		Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
Category:	**Infrastructure**	**Not Started**	**Not Started**	**Not Started**
Area of Assessment:	**Local Infrastructure**			
Urgency:	**N/A**			

Observation: This activity has not yet started.