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

July 31, 2014

Prepared by

Bluecrane, Inc.

bluecrane ®

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

July 31, 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 July 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 July 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 July 2014.....13

Part 1: Executive Summary and Assessment Dashboard

Executive Summary

This report provides the July 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 July, we continue to identify three risks that have been raised in prior months:

- **Schedule risk.** Successful completion of the SC-CMS Project requires the ability to estimate and plan the work required to complete the project, monitor the plan as the project progresses, and make adjustments to keep the project on track. Additionally, the SC-CMS Project has dependencies on integration components that are being developed as part of the Information Networking Hub (INH) Project as well as two projects under the umbrella effort known as Commercial-off-the-Shelf Preparation (COTS Prep). All of this project work must be planned and monitored, and adjustments made as needed to meet the pilot go-live date of June 2015. As an interim milestone, the construction and discrete testing of all components and system modifications must be completed by November 1, 2014.

  In order to ensure adequate tracking of the 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.

  Currently the project schedules do not contain an adequate level of detail and do not have adequate dependencies identified due to (1) a lack of schedule management resources, (2) schedule work being documented and tracked in different formats, and (3) related project work being tracked by different people.

  In the past, resources allocated to project scheduling activities have been inadequate to provide the detailed information required for a high-level of confidence that the schedule is achievable. In July, the project allocated additional resources to scheduling activities, and we plan to review the results of the increased efforts in August.

As we've said in the past, 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. We suggest, in addition to developing detailed schedules for each project, that a single, integrated view of key milestones from each of the efforts needs to be created and maintained. The integrated view should also have frequent and regular management reviews conducted.

- **Application architecture risk.** As noted in our prior report, the alternatives to implementing document management for the SC-CMS project have been narrowed to two, one preferred by the Clerks' Association that utilizes third-party document management software and one preferred by the judges and administrators that uses the Odyssey document management feature. Pilot counties were requested to select their DMS option by August 1. Lewis County has selected Odyssey for their document management solution. Thurston County has requested an extension for the decision to complete their analysis. The early adopter counties have been requested to select a DMS option by September 1.

- **County ancillary systems that duplicate the functionality of Odyssey.** As noted in previous reports, 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. A meeting with AOC IT managers was conducted in July to discuss the issue, and a policy has been developed that will be presented to the JISC in September.

bluecrane QA Assessment Dashboard

Area of Assessment	Urgency	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Summary Status/Recommendations
Project Management and Sponsorship					
Governance	**Serious 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. A meeting with AOC IT managers was conducted in July to discuss the issue, and a policy has been developed that will be presented to the JISC in September.

Area of Assessment	Urgency	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Summary Status/Recommendations
Scope	Serious 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	Risk	Risk	Currently the project schedules do not contain an adequate level of detail and do not have adequate dependencies identified due to (1) a lack of schedule management resources, (2) schedule work being documented and tracked in different formats, and (3) related project work being tracked by different people. If project work is not adequately planned, the amount of work to complete project activities may be underestimated or resources may be over-allocated. If inaccurate estimates are not identified until late in a work activity, a delay in the completion of those components could result in a delay of the SC-CMS pilot go-live date. While each project currently has a schedule, we continue to be concerned that the amount of detail in some cases is not adequate to support the high-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. In July, the project allocated additional resources to scheduling activities, and we plan to review the results of the increased efforts in August. We'll update our assessment of the risk in this area at that time.

Area of Assessment	Urgency	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Summary Status/Recommendations
Budget	N/A	Risk Being Addressed	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	When information/results are available from the Pilot Court implementations, the Steering Committee will reassess the local cost framework.
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	Urgent Consideration	No Risk Identified	Risk	Risk	Resources allocated to project scheduling activities have been inadequate to provide the detailed information required for a high-level of confidence that the schedule is achievable. In July, the project allocated additional resources to scheduling activities, and we plan to review the results of the increased efforts in August.
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	The project risk log has a list of identified risks.
Issue Management	N/A	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	The project issue log has a list of identified issues.
Quality Management	N/A	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	The project team has developed a Quality Management Plan.

Area of Assessment	Urgency	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Summary Status/Recommendations
People					
Stakeholder Engagement	**N/A**	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	Stakeholder engagement and organizational change management activities are underway, however these activities are not being tracked in a project schedule.
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	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Summary Status/Recommendations
Application					
Application Architecture	**Serious Consideration**	Risk Being Addressed	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. If the courts 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. If, on the other hand, the Odyssey document management solution does not meet all of the identified document management needs of the courts, court personnel may experience the inability to efficiently perform their responsibilities. Lewis has selected to use Odyssey for document management. Thurston requested an extension for the decision to complete their analysis. The early adopter counties have been requested to select a DMS option by September 1.
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.

Area of Assessment	Urgency	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Summary Status/Recommendations
Application Interfaces	Urgent Consideration	Risk	Risk	Risk	The Information Networking Hub (INH) and COTS-Prep Application projects are preparing AOC interfaces to Odyssey. 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. Integration work activities are being tracked in multiple schedules and lists by multiple project managers. In the past, the project schedules have not been sufficiently decomposed and dependencies have not been adequately tracked. In July, the project allocated additional resources to scheduling activities, and we plan to review the results of the increased efforts in August.
Data					
Data Preparation	N/A	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	The pilot courts have communicated that they would like the opportunity to clean up their data prior to going live.
Data Conversion	N/A	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	Conversion activities continued in July.
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	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	The project team has begun discussions with the pilot counties on local infrastructure readiness activities.

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 July 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**
People	**No Risk Identified**
Application	**Risk**
Data	**No Risk Identified**
Infrastructure	**No Risk Identified**

		May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**	**Risk Being Addressed**	**Risk Being Addressed**	**Risk Being Addressed**
Area of Assessment:	**Governance**			
Urgency:	**Serious Consideration**			

Observation/Risk 1: 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: A meeting with AOC IT managers was conducted in July to discuss the issue, and a policy has been developed that will be presented to the JISC in September.

Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**	**May 2014**	**Jun 2014**	**Jul 2014**
Area of Assessment:	**Scope**	**Risk Being Addressed**	**Risk Being Addressed**	**Risk Being Addressed**
Urgency:	**Serious 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: A meeting was conducted in July with AOC IT managers to discuss the development of an ancillary system policy that will provide guidance to counties on the implementation of software that provides overlapping functionality.

		May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**			
Area of Assessment:	**Schedule**	**Risk**	**Risk**	**Risk**
Urgency:	**Urgent Consideration**			

Observation/Risk – Lack of Schedule Decomposition and Integration: Successful on-time delivery of the SC-CMS Project requires the ability to estimate and plan the work required to complete the project, monitor the plan as the project progresses, and make adjustments to keep the project on track. Additionally, the SC-CMS Project has dependencies on integration components that are being developed as part of the Information Networking Hub (INH) Project as well as two projects under the umbrella effort known as Commercial-off-the-Shelf Preparation (COTS Prep). All of this project work must planned, monitored, and adjustments made as needed to meet the pilot go-live date of June 2015. As an interim milestone, the construction and integration testing of all components and system modifications must be completed by November 1, 2014.

In order to ensure adequate tracking of the 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. Although quite a lot of the work has been identified at a high level, the project schedules and various tracking lists do not contain an adequate level of detail and do not have adequate dependencies identified between individual tasks to provide a high-level of confidence that project milestones including the June Go-Live date can be met. 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 do not have an assigned resource, and lack of a schedule baseline.

There are several causes to the current schedule situation:

- There is lack of resources to adequately develop and maintain the schedules to the level of detail required to use the schedules and lists to accurately determine the probability of meeting milestones leading up to pilot go-live in June.
- The schedule work is documented and tracked in different formats including Microsoft Project schedules, Excel spreadsheets, and the whiteboard in the project room. Related activities are tracked in different schedules and lists, making the tracking of dependencies very difficult.
- Related project work is being tracked by different people making it difficult to get a holistic view of the project work.

Impact: The amount of work to complete project activities may be underestimated or resources may be over-allocated. If inaccurate estimates are not identified until late in a work activity, a delay in the completion of those components could result in a delay of the SC-CMS pilot go-live date. Additionally, lack of identifying dependencies between work activities may result in delayed milestones or unintentional misrepresentation of scheduled activities.

Recommendation: A concentrated effort should be undertaken to identify the necessary work details to determine the achievability of the current timeline. 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.

Dedicated schedule management resources should be assigned to maintain the respective schedules and interdependencies between the schedules. The schedule managers should have intimate knowledge of the status of near-term project activities and overall knowledge of the detailed tasks needed to meet the pilot go-live schedule.

All of the detailed work for the various projects should be tracked together with linked dependencies. For example, all of the work required to complete the INH case and party replication should be tracked by one person in one format to provide a holistic view of the work and to easily identify interdependencies. This includes the activities to complete Party Replication Logs (PRLs), design, development, testing (unit, system, integration, performance, UAT), and deployment. Work performed by the BAs, CBO, SC-CMS project team, AOC testing team, AOC M&O team, AOC infrastructure team, and Tyler should be included.

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. We suggest, in addition to developing detailed schedules for each project, that a single, integrated view of key milestones from each of the efforts needs to be created and maintained. The integrated view should also have frequent and regular management reviews conducted.

Status: While each project currently has a schedule, we continue to be concerned that the amount of detail in some cases is not adequate to support the high-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. In July, the project allocated additional resources to scheduling activities, and we plan to review the results of the increased efforts in August.

		May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**			
Area of Assessment:	**Budget**	**Risk Being Addressed**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**
Urgency:	**N/A**			

Observation: When information/results are available from the Pilot Court implementations, the Steering Committee will reassess the local cost framework, potentially revise the framework based on the Pilot Court experiences, and then make a recommendation to the JISC for cost sharing between the State and the local levels for the next phase of SC-CMS.

		May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**
Area of Assessment:	**Project Communications**			
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.

		May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**			
Area of Assessment:	**Staffing and Project Facilities**	**No Risk Identified**	**Risk**	**Risk**
Urgency:	**Urgent Consideration**			

Observation/Risk: Resources allocated to project scheduling activities are inadequate to provide the detailed information required for a high-level of confidence that the schedule is achievable.

Impact: As detailed in the Schedule assessment area, the lack of dedicated schedule management resources has resulted in inadequate tracking of project activities.

Recommendation: Additional resources should be allocated to develop the level of schedule detail required to adequately manage project activities and estimate resources and time required for future work. A temporary focused allocation of resources would result in the development of a detailed schedule. Schedule management resources could then be dropped to a lower level after the detailed schedule was in place.

The project work could be divided between several schedule managers. For example the INH Project Manager could be responsible for tracking all of the INH and Odyssey application integration work being performed by the AOC software developers, the Tyler software developers, the SC-CMS business analysts, the CBO business engineers, and the SC-CMS, and AOC testing analysts.

Status: In July, the project allocated additional resources to scheduling activities, and we plan to review the results of the increased efforts in August.

		May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 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. Many of the work activities in the project schedules have not been baselined.

		May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**
Area of Assessment:	**Risk Management**			
Urgency:	**N/A**			

Observation: The project risk log has a list of identified risks.

		May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**
Area of Assessment:	**Issue Management**			
Urgency:	**N/A**			

Observation: The project issue log has a list of identified issues.

		May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014
Category:	**Project Management and Sponsorship**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**
Area of Assessment:	**Quality Management**			
Urgency:	**N/A**			

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

Category:	**People**	**May 2014**	**Jun 2014**	**Jul 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, however these activities are not being tracked in a project schedule.

Category:	**People**	**May 2014**	**Jun 2014**	**Jul 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**	**May 2014**	**Jun 2014**	**Jul 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.

		May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014
Category:	**Application**			
Area of Assessment:	**Application Architecture**	**Risk Being Addressed**	**Risk Being Addressed**	**Risk Being Addressed**
Urgency:	**Serious 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. If, on the other hand, the Odyssey document management solution does not meet all of the identified document management needs of the courts, court personnel may experience the inability to efficiently perform their responsibilities.

Recommendation: The project team should ensure that the entire set of court document management requirements are understood and will be adequately met by the Odyssey document management solution.

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 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 is estimated to cost an additional $150,000. Pilot counties were requested to select their DMS option by August 1. Lewis choose to use Odyssey for document management. Thurston requested an extension for the decision to complete their analysis. The early adopter counties have been requested to select a DMS option by September 1.

Category:	**Application**	**May 2014**	**Jun 2014**	**Jul 2014**
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.

		May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014
Category:	**Application**			
Area of Assessment:	**Application Interfaces**	**Risk**	**Risk**	**Risk**
Urgency:	**Urgent Consideration**			

Observation/Risk: 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. A decision was made in 2013 that 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.

There is concern that the integration components will not be completed in time to begin User Acceptance Testing in November, 2014. The project schedules for each of the integration projects: SC-CMS, INH, COTS-Prep are not sufficiently decomposed and do not have adequate dependencies identified to determine if the planned schedule can be met.

Impact: If integration UAT does not begin on schedule, the planned go-live dates for pilot counties may not be met.

Recommendation: A planning meeting should be conducted to identify all of the detailed work packages required to implement the integration components. The estimates for completing work packages should be re-evaluated based on the effort required thus far to increase the accuracy of the planning. Based on the re-planning results, the remainder of the SC-CMS project should be re-planned as well to determine realistic milestone dates.

Status: Integration work activities are being tracked in multiple schedules and lists by multiple project managers. In the past, the project schedules have not been sufficiently decomposed and dependencies have not been adequately tracked. In July, the project allocated additional resources to scheduling activities, and we plan to review the results of the increased efforts in August.

Category:	Data	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 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.

Status: The pilot courts have communicated that they would like the opportunity to clean up their data prior to going live.

Category:	Data	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014
Area of Assessment:	Data Conversion	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified	No Risk Identified
Urgency:	N/A			

Observation: Conversion activities for the pilot counties continued in July.

		May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014
Category:	**Infrastructure**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**
Area of Assessment:	**Statewide Infrastructure**			
Urgency:	**N/A**			

Observation: No infrastructure activities were planned for July.

		May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014
Category:	**Infrastructure**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**	**No Risk Identified**
Area of Assessment:	**Local Infrastructure**			
Urgency:	**N/A**			

Observation: The project team has begun discussions with the pilot counties on local infrastructure readiness activities.