Judicial Information System Committee Meeting June 24, 2016

DECISION POINT – Appellate Court Enterprise Content Management System Change to Scope and Schedule

MOTION:

I move to adopt the Appellate Court ECMS Project Executive Steering Committee recommendation to authorize a contract amendment to remove case management from the project's scope and add 8 months to the project's schedule starting in July, 2016.

I. BACKGROUND

The Washington appellate courts currently have no common electronic document management system. The Supreme Court uses a paper-based system, and each division of the Court of Appeals uses its own system. The appellate courts require a statewide enterprise content management system that provides robust document management, allows for the creation of user configurable business workflows, and provides integration with other business tools such as Microsoft Outlook.

In 2011, the JISC approved the purchase of an Electronic Document Management System (later renamed Enterprise Content Management System, ECMS) for the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court, with an estimated cost of $980,000. The system's requirements were refined, and in June, 2012, the JISC approved an integrated enterprise content management system that would provide document management, business workflow, and include the functionality of the Appellate Courts Records and Data System (ACORDS). With the information available at that time, it was believed that an integrated system could be acquired within the previously approved allocation.

In November, 2012, AOC released a request for proposals (RFP) for an appellate ECMS. This RFP had a cost cap of $850,000. Two vendors responded to the RFP, and neither response met the minimum qualifications. The project Executive Steering Committee removed the cost cap, refined and clarified the RFP requirements, and released a second RFP on January 29, 2013.

On February 22, 2013, the JISC approved an increase in the project funding allocation to $1.5 million dollars to cover contractual costs.

On March 4, 2013, the JISC approved the selection of ImageSoft as the Apparent Successful Vendor.

A contract was signed with ImageSoft Inc. on September 13, 2013 with a maximum amount of $1,420,070 excluding applicable taxes.

II. DISCUSSION

In March 2015, during the configuration of Iteration B (case management and associated workflows), the Vendor raised a significant issue regarding scope and cost, mainly around the case management component. After months of discussion and attempts to both resolve the issue and understand the viability of using OnBase for case management, there was agreement to place Iteration B through user training and user acceptance. Ultimately Iteration B was not accepted by the appellate courts.

In subsequent discussions, the vendor suggested case management be removed from the project's scope. AOC and the appellate courts insisted that any continuation of the contract would have to involve a complete change to the way the project was being conducted. Both parties agreed that changing the approach to one that is highly iterative and employed a single, combined Washington/Vendor team would be more likely to succeed.

Using the iterative approach, the length of the schedule extension will consume the balance of the project budget.

The two-week iterations are grouped into three releases:

- Release 1 – Migrate documents from the three existing COA document management systems into OnBase. Finalize a document management system for the Supreme Court.
- Release 2 – Integration of OnBase and ACORDS.
- Release 3 – Added workflows for high-priority processes.

Appellate ECMS Steering Committee Recommendation

The Appellate Enterprise Content Management System Project Executive Steering Committee recommends to the Judicial Information System Committee that the change request to remove case management from the project and extend the project schedule be approved.

OUTCOME IF NOT PASSED –

The contract with the Vendor will end. The Court of Appeals Divisions will continue to use disparate document management systems. The Supreme Court will continue to be paper-based.