| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|---|---|---|
| 37-02 | Workers' Compensation Court | Court Re-engineering – Adjudication |

## SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

This is a multi-year project that will procure, develop, install, and support Court Re-Engineering enhancements in the Adjudication section of the court. These enhancements will be based upon the results from current internal re-engineering analysis and the recommendations from a consultant engaged in Fiscal Year 2006-07.

From the current internal analysis and court priorities, the first software products to be introduced to the court will be from one or more of the Key Technologies currently identified in the internal analysis that cannot be achieved with existing resources.

This projects key technology is Computer Managed Workflow.

Project Update

An RFP was issued and awarded for a workflow consultant. With the assistance of the consultant, court will issue an RFI and RFP for the purpose of selecting and procuring workflow software by the end of the biennium. The court will have also started the initial installation and training on this software with the goal of having completed a pilot implementation.

## FUNDING SUMMARY

**Adjudication Re-engineering**

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

| | Estimated Prior Expended | Request for FY2007-08 (Year 1) | Request for FY2008-09 (Year 2) | FY2009-10 (Year 3) | FY2010-11 (Year 4) | Future | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Personnel Costs | | | | | | | $ - | |
| **2. Contractual Services** | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Design | | | | | | | $ - | |
| 2.2 Programming | | | | | | | $ - | |
| 2.3 Project Management | | | | | | | $ - | |
| 2.4 Other | $ 25,000.00 | $ 75,000.00 | | | | | $ 100,000.00 | **2.4 Other** |
| | | | | | | | | Professional Contract Services to assist in the completion of the installation, configuration, etc. of purchased software |
| 3. Supplies and Materials | | | | | | | $ - | |
| 4. Telecommunications | | | | | | | $ - | |
| | | | | | | | | **8.1a Hardware - One Time** $30,000 |
| 5. Training | $ 16,000.00 | $ 10,000.00 | | | | | $ 26,000.00 | Servers & Server Replacements (Prod & Test) $30,000 |
| 6. Travel | $ 8,000.00 | $ 4,000.00 | | | | | $ 12,000.00 | |
| 7. Other Operating Costs | | | | | | | $ - | *** |
| **8. Capital Expenditures** | | | | | | | | |
| 8.1a Hardware - One Time | $ 30,000.00 | | | $ 30,000.00 | | | $ 60,000.00 | |
| 8.1b Hardware - Cont | $ 4,200.00 | $ 4,200.00 | $ 4,200.00 | $ 4,200.00 | $ 4,200.00 | $ 4,200.00 | $ 25,200.00 | **8.1b Hardware - Cont** $4,200 |
| | | | | | | | | CIO Data Center Footprint $4,200 |
| 8.2a Software - One Time | $ 355,000.00 | | | | | | $ 355,000.00 | |
| 8.2b Software - Cont | | $ 71,000.00 | $ 74,550.00 | $ 78,277.50 | $ 82,191.38 | $ 86,300.94 | $ 392,319.82 | |
| 8.3 Network | | | | | | | $ - | *** |
| 8.4 Other | | | | | | | $ - | **8.2a Software - One Time** $355,000 |
| **TOTAL COSTS** | $ 438,200.00 | $ 164,200.00 | $ 78,750.00 | $ 82,477.50 | $ 116,391.38 | $ 90,500.94 | $ 970,519.82 | |
| General Funds | | | | | | | $ - | Workflow Software $355,000 |
| Cash Funds | $ 438,200.00 | $ 164,200.00 | $ 78,750.00 | $ 82,477.50 | $ 116,391.38 | $ 90,500.94 | $ 970,519.82 | |
| Federal Funds | | | | | | | $ - | *** |
| Revolving Funds | | | | | | | $ - | |
| Other Funds | | | | | | | $ - | **8.2b Software - Cont** $71,000 |
| | | | | | | | | Annual License Renewals, Subscriptions, Maintenance Agreements $71,000 |
| **TOTAL FUNDS** | $ 438,200.00 | $ 164,200.00 | $ 78,750.00 | $ 82,477.50 | $ 116,391.38 | $ 90,500.94 | $ 970,519.82 | |
| | | Biennium Total | $ 242,950.00 | | | | | *** |

## PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 13 | 11 | 11 | 11.7 | 15 |
| 4: Project Justification / Business Case | 21 | 21 | 18 | 20.0 | 25 |
| 5: Technical Impact | 18 | 16 | 16 | 16.7 | 20 |
| 6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 7 | 5 | 6 | 6.0 | 10 |
| 7: Risk Assessment | 9 | 8 | 7 | 8.0 | 10 |
| 8: Financial Analysis and Budget | 15 | 15 | 18 | 16.0 | 20 |
| | | | TOTAL | 78 | 100 |

## REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| 3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | - Good description of workflow benefits.<br><br>Good description of metrics.<br><br>Clearly tied to agency technology plan.<br>- Application of workflow management on activities of court.  Properly applied, activity should result in productivity gains.  Continuation of long term improvements to overall system. | - Still a bit unclear as to what the specific goals of this specific project proposal are...<br>- Desired outcomes not expressed in measurable terms.  Limits ability to develop cost/benefit analysis.  Workflow directed at adjudication. No mention of reusability of workflow manager on other tasks.<br>- Until the consultant completes the work on the RFI and RFP for the workflow software it will be difficult at best to fully answer this section. |
| 4: Project Justification / Business Case | - Good explanation of the reasons to consider moving to some new technology solution.<br>- Identification of weaknesses of current system processes.  Workflow manager should improve those processes.  Strong narrative description of desired outcomes. | - Limited explanation, at least in any detail, of specific benefits that will be attained from this project - especially given the significant financial investment for this project.<br><br>Overly general description of options reviewed in the course of formulating this project.<br>- Outcomes described in generic terms. Implied redesign of current system without impact analysis of other processes.  No measures for return on investment.<br>- Again, this reviewer feels that without the actual workflow software known, the benefits are very weak or questionable at best. |
| 5: Technical Impact | - Good description of how new technology must fit within existing environment.<br><br>Evidence of "good faith" efforts to consider and meet all appropriate standards and guidelines.<br>- Describes incorporation of workflow manager into existing environment. Describes benefits within computing environment.<br>- This section part 7 was done very well. | - Not much available detail, since the project is still early - "pre-RFP results"....<br>- Describes desired outcomes, but does not address detailed requirements to achieve outcome.  Financial request appears to support hardware/software purchase.  This reviewer cannot find estimates, other than training, for the level of programming and business analysis necessary to achieve described outcome.<br>- In this section part 8 was again limited and weak as the actual workflow software is unknown and the statement reads "Computer Managed Workflow must prove to be highly reliable..." .  How can one know that when the software has not been |

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| | | selected? |
| 6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | - Good general description of what needs to occur in the overall project.<br><br>Appears to be a solid project team.<br>- RFI/RFP process correctly described after analysis and evaluation of architectural requirements. Courts project team identified. | -Still early in project to provide specific and/or detailed project plan information.<br>- This section scored low because budget request and narrative is for purchase of workflow manager, but implementation section appears to address alternative technologies. The reviewer would assume that alternatives would have been evaluation before decision to purchase workflow manager. While court project team has been identified, no estimates for contract resources appear in the document or budget request.<br>- Project Plans are tentative and may be revised based on a consultant's recommendations. |
| 7: Risk Assessment | - Thorough identification of both technical and people-based risks - along with approaches to mitigate those risks.<br>- General risks identified and response appropriate. | - Two general risks are inherent in project. First is risk associated with the selection of product on which to build workflow managed solution. This seems to be addressed. The second is risk associated with the process of reengineering the adjudication process. Since the request seems to document the selection process, the risk associated with development has scant documentation.<br>- This reviewer had a difficult time understanding the format of the barriers/risks and the strategies to minimize the risks. The format used consisted of bullet points and sub-bullet points. |
| 8: Financial Analysis and Budget | - Reasonable financial estimates.<br>- Budget is well documented for software/hardware acquisition and training. Costs over time are identified.<br>- Not requesting General Fund dollars. | - Still early in project - financial estimates could still vary significantly<br>- Budget is for hardware/software and training. Contract services are not identified, and the level of service required is not documented in narrative nor budget. Other than hardware/software, no budget information for cost or impact for development. |

## TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

| Technical Panel Checklist | Yes | No | UNK | Technical Panel Comment |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The project is technically feasible. | ✓ | | | |
| 2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project. | ✓ | | | |
| 3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget. | ✓ | | | |

**STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS**

- The State Government Council recommends this project be categorized as a [Tier 2] project.

**NITC COMMENTS**

- Tier 2 (Recommended. High strategic importance to the agency and/or the state.)

## APPENDIX

## AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| 3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | - Good description of workflow benefits.<br><br>Good description of metrics.<br><br>Clearly tied to agency technology plan.<br>- Application of workflow management on activities of court. Properly applied, activity should result in productivity gains. Continuation of long term improvements to overall system. | - Still a bit unclear as to what the specific goals of this specific project proposal are...<br>- Desired outcomes not expressed in measurable terms. Limits ability to develop cost/benefit analysis. Workflow directed at adjudication. No mention of reusability of workflow manager on other tasks.<br>**Response: The primary need is in Adjudication and is the business driver for the project. Workflow will be implemented in other sections of the court where workflow management is appropriate.**<br><br>- Until the consultant completes the work on the RFI and RFP for the workflow software it will be difficult at best to fully answer this section. |
| 4: Project Justification / Business Case | - Good explanation of the reasons to consider moving to some new technology solution.<br>- Identification of weaknesses of current system processes. Workflow manager should improve those processes. Strong narrative description of desired outcomes. | - Limited explanation, at least in any detail, of specific benefits that will be attained from this project - especially given the significant financial investment for this project.<br><br>Overly general description of options reviewed in the course of formulating this project.<br>- Outcomes described in generic terms. Implied redesign of current system without impact analysis of other processes. No measures for return on investment.<br>- Again, this reviewer feels that without the actual workflow software known, the benefits are very weak or questionable at best. |
| 5: Technical Impact | - Good description of how new technology must fit within existing environment.<br><br>Evidence of "good faith" efforts to consider and meet all appropriate standards and guidelines.<br>- Describes incorporation of workflow manager into existing environment. Describes benefits within computing environment.<br>- This section part 7 was done very well. | - Not much available detail, since the project is still early - "pre-RFP results"....<br>**Response: Project proposals by nature are "weak" in detail. A project proposal should represent at the most 10% of the total project effort. To have full detail would require having completed full requirements, general design, and possibly some detail design. At that point, up to 60% of the allocated project time would be completed.**<br><br>- Describes desired outcomes, but does not address detailed requirements to achieve outcome. Financial request appears to support hardware/software purchase. This reviewer cannot find estimates, other than training, for the level of programming and business analysis necessary to achieve described outcome.<br>- In this section part 8 was again limited and |

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| | | weak as the actual workflow software is unknown and the statement reads "Computer Managed Workflow must prove to be highly reliable..." . How can one know that when the software has not been selected? |
| 6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | - Good general description of what needs to occur in the overall project.<br><br>Appears to be a solid project team.<br>- RFI/RFP process correctly described after analysis and evaluation of architectural requirements. Courts project team identified. | -Still early in project to provide specific and/or detailed project plan information.<br>- This section scored low because budget request and narrative is for purchase of workflow manager, but implementation section appears to address alternative technologies. The reviewer would assume that alternatives would have been evaluation before decision to purchase workflow manager.<br>**Response: Alternatives were evaluated. The court analyzed the build alternative for workflow. As a change management approach it has implemented "work queues" with no automated rules engine. The users make the decision about what the next task is. In contrast, a complete workflow system has robust rule engines and metric measurement systems. Workflow is a product that is mature.**<br><br>While court project team has been identified, no estimates for contract resources appear in the document or budget request.<br>**Response: Contract resources for professional implementation services are identified in 2.4 Other under 2 Contractual Services.**<br><br>- Project Plans are tentative and may be revised based on a consultant's recommendations. |
| 7: Risk Assessment | - Thorough identification of both technical and people-based risks - along with approaches to mitigate those risks.<br>- General risks identified and response appropriate. | - Two general risks are inherent in project. First is risk associated with the selection of product on which to build workflow managed solution. This seems to be addressed. The second is risk associated with the process of reengineering the adjudication process. Since the request seems to document the selection process, the risk associated with development has scant documentation.<br>- This reviewer had a difficult time understanding the format of the barriers/risks and the strategies to minimize the risks. The format used consisted of bullet points and sub-bullet points. |
| 8: Financial Analysis and Budget | - Reasonable financial estimates.<br>- Budget is well documented for software/hardware acquisition and training. Costs over time are identified.<br>- Not requesting General Fund dollars. | - Still early in project - financial estimates could still vary significantly<br>**Response: The final cost could come in considerably less than the budgeted amount. The cost estimates in the original request were developed through** |

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| | | **information gathered from high-tier, middle-tier, and low-tier workflow manufacturers. A probable cost was calculated. The Workflow Consultant has reviewed the estimates and is comfortable that our budget is adequate.**<br><br>- Budget is for hardware/software and training.<br><br>Contract services are not identified, and the level of service required is not documented in narrative nor budget.<br>**Response: Contract resources for professional implementation services are identified in 2.4 Other under 2 Contractual Services.**<br><br>Other than hardware/software, no budget information for cost or impact for development.<br>**Response: The court has existing development staff that will be assigned to the project.** |