

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #37-03
Page 1 of 6

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Adjudication		\$ 534,066

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

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

FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Future	Total
2. Contractual Services						
2.4 Other		\$ 100,000.00				\$ 100,000.00
5. Training		\$ 36,382.50				\$ 36,382.50
6. Travel		\$ 12,127.50				\$ 12,127.50
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.1 Hardware		\$ 30,000.00			\$ 20,000.00	\$ 50,000.00
8.2 Software		\$ 355,556.25	\$ 103,607.44	\$ 108,787.81	\$ 109,790.00	\$ 677,741.50
TOTAL COSTS	\$ -	\$ 534,066.25	\$ 103,607.44	\$ 108,787.81	\$ 129,790.00	\$ 876,251.50
Cash Funds		\$ 534,066.25	\$ 103,607.44	\$ 108,787.81	\$ 129,790.00	\$ 876,251.50
TOTAL FUNDS		\$ 534,066.25	\$ 103,607.44	\$ 108,787.81	\$ 129,790.00	\$ 876,251.50

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	10	10	10.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	16	15	17	16.0	25
V: Technical Impact	17	14	14	15.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	5	7	6.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	8	5	6	6.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	15	12	15	14.0	20
TOTAL				69	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The primary outcome of the project appears to be a strategic plan for improving the workflow of the Court and its external stakeholders. The Agency Comprehensive IT Plan has an excellent discussion of the Court's overall strategy. - Project is tied directly and tightly to comprehensive technology plan - Workflow is one method used to make 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some of the outcomes should address business process improvements, with corresponding metrics. - Likely because this project will be based on results of internal analysis and consultant recommendations (to be completed at a later date), specific goals, outcomes, measurements and assessments are unclear.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	<p>computing systems more efficient. This proposal contemplates the adoption of workflow technology into the adjudication system of the Worker's Compensation court.</p>	<p>- This reviewer is having a difficult time finding enough specificity in the proposal to make a recommendation on the merits of the proposal. The goals are listed as Process Management OR Adjudication System Replacement.</p>
<p>IV: Project Justification / Business Case</p>	<p>- Workflow is a key technology that can improve a computing system's ability to perform. To be effective, it should be used to support the business objectives of the court. The presumption is that the backend systems will remain in place.</p>	<p>- The business case would be much stronger if Section IV included specific information about existing problems that would be improved. The information for question 5 cites increased staffing, data quality, and a backlog. An explanation of these or other problems with supporting data would be helpful. In other words, what is wrong with doing things as they are today? - No other potential solutions identified - The lack of specificity of the project hinders this reviewer's ability to make a evaluation or recommendation.</p>
<p>V: Technical Impact</p>	<p>- Workflow would maintain the existing back-end systems.</p>	<p>- There should be more discussion of web-based options, especially given the implied objective of serving external stakeholders (question 1). Although the project proposal makes a good case that the functions of the Workers' Compensation Court are unique, there should be some discussion of how the underlying technology, especially workflow, and electronic filing relate to other systems purchased or developed by the state. - Specificity limits this reviewer's ability to comment on the impact of the project. Integration of workflow within the existing business process will have a different impact than integrating workflow AND replacing the adjudication system.</p>
<p>VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation</p>	<p>- The project proposal identifies the project team. - The workflow design team is well qualified to examine the business processes to be incorporated into the workflow product.</p>	<p>- I don't understand the information in the table in question 9. The recommendations of the consultant should be added to the list of milestones in question 10. - Timeline seems overly optimistic. IT staffing on project may be too light. Internal analysis and consultant recommendations are pending, so plan contains little detail. - The implementation plan calls for the procurement of a workflow product in the first year, with business engineering following. A better implementation plan might be to evaluate the workflow, the role of web-services, and the evaluation of new business processes developed as a result of the analysis before the workflow product is purchased. This approach might allow the court the opportunity to evaluate or replace the adjudication system without incurring workflow software costs.</p>
<p>VII: Risk Assessment</p>	<p>- A good start to listing potential risks. - The introduction of workflow will have both intended and unintended consequences on the court's computing systems. These risks are identified.</p>	<p>- Some other possible risks might include: rejection by external stakeholders and dependence on the software provider for support, functionality and future licensing costs, if a third party Adjudication Replacement System is chosen. (Are there any lessons learned from implementing NIS that are relevant here?) - Project relies on results of "recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006". There appears to be a risk that the consultant engagement either is not funded, or is unsuccessful...either would impact this project. - Unintended risk could be better managed by completing workflow analysis independent of the software purchased to support the workflow. This</p>

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		<p>could result in a wiser purchasing decision. It may also result in a recommendation to use existing workflow products rather than the purchase of additional workflow products specifically for the courts.</p>
<p>VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget</p>	<p>- This reviewer presumes that the hardware/software costs are accurate.</p>	<p>- Some explanation of how the estimated costs were determined would be helpful. How does one know that \$355,556 is even the correct order of magnitude for either a workflow application or an Adjudication Application? Is \$100,000 adequate for assistance with implementation? Also, the cost of the consultant's study in FY2006 should be reflected in the analysis.</p> <p>- This is a large project - probably needs project management resources. Budget seems to be built on an assumption of software purchase, but narrative suggests that COTS software is likely not a viable solution. Software maintenance costs seem high.</p> <p>- The possibility of replacing the adjudication system is not reflected in the cost of the project. Project costs are listed as hardware/software/training for the workflow product. The court should review the possibility of using existing workflow software products rather than developing their own.</p>

APPENDIX**AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS****37-03 -- Court Re-engineering - Adjudication****Reviewer(s) Comments**

- Some of the outcomes should address business process improvements, with corresponding metrics.
- Likely because this project will be based on results of internal analysis and consultant recommendations (to be completed at a later date), specific goals, outcomes, measurements and assessments are unclear.
- The business case would be much stronger if Section IV included specific information about existing problems that would be improved. The information for question 5 cites increased staffing, data quality, and a backlog. An explanation of these or other problems with supporting data would be helpful. In other words, what is wrong with doing things as they are today?

WCC Response:

Seven Analysis documents are available that contain detailed problem and objective definitions. They are titled: Adjudication Re-engineering - Clerk's Office; Clerk's Office to Other Court Sections/Adj Assistants/Judges; e-Filing; Judges Section; Miscellaneous; Public Access; and Motion Practice Automation. These documents are available for review.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- There should be more discussion of web-based options, especially given the implied objective of serving external stakeholders (question 1).

WCC Response:

The following statements were included about Web Services: "Web Services may have a place if they can integrate effectively and efficiently with our current technology. Web Services may allow us in the future to extend from Client / Server to an Internet-based application.." In addition, Microsoft is evolving to a ".NET" platform. If the selected solution is the implementation of a base workflow application, then court developed applets that will integrate into workflow will be developed in Borland Delphi which supports both Win32 and .NET.

Reviewer(s) Comments

Although the project proposal makes a good case that the functions of the Workers' Compensation Court are unique, there should be some discussion of how the underlying technology, especially workflow, and electronic filing relate to other systems purchased or developed by the state.

WCC Response:

At the point of when the project defines requirements and issues Requests For Information and/or Requests for Proposals, IMServices (and possibly other state agencies) will be given the opportunity to reply so that the court can evaluate what currently is in use in the state. Just because such systems exist do not mean that there are enterprise licenses available that would cost the court nothing. These existing "in-state" options will be evaluated at the same level as other options.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- The lack of specificity of the project hinders this reviewer's ability to make a evaluation or recommendation.
- Specificity limits this reviewer's ability to comment on the impact of the project. Integration of workflow within the existing business process will have a different impact than integrating workflow AND replacing the adjudication system.

WCC Response:

This preparer is unsure what the reviewer is expecting in quantify and detail that would satisfy his/her needs.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- I don't understand the information in the table in question 9 (VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation).

WCC Response:

The tables intent is to "Describe the project team, including their roles, responsibilities, and experience."

Reviewer(s) Comments

- Timeline seems overly optimistic. IT staffing on project may be too light.

WCC Response:

The milestone "Installation, training, planning for deployment, design of initial re-engineered workflow and development of functions associated with workflow" was intended to communicate that this "initial re-engineered workflow" would be the first of several re-engineered work processes. Additional processes would be re-engineered into the work flow in subsequent fiscal years and should have been included as milestone. A reading of our Comprehensive IT Plan does explain that the majority of our IT Staff is development resource. We plan and schedule our projects within the constraints of those existing resources. \$100,000 is also requested for Professional Contract Services during the first Fiscal Year.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- The implementation plan calls for the procurement of a workflow product in the first year, with business engineering following. A better implementation plan might be to evaluate the workflow, the role of web-services, and the evaluation of new business processes developed as a result of the analysis before the workflow product is purchased. This approach might allow the court the opportunity to evaluate or replace the adjudication system without incurring workflow software costs.

- Unintended risk could be better managed by completing workflow analysis independent of the software purchased to support the workflow. This could result in a wiser purchasing decision. It may also result in a recommendation to use existing workflow products rather than the purchase of additional workflow products specifically for the courts.

WCC Response:

Approximately nine years ago the court completed an extensive process analysis project of Adjudication. Not much has changed in the nine years. These process flow diagrams are still available for use. The court is already in discussions with IMServices about web services with respect to other projects and plans to have an understanding of these services and .NET technology before Fiscal Year 2006. In addition, the courts application development environment, Borland Delphi, can generate web services and .NET applications in addition to Win32. While this application development environment can deliver web services and .NET, there is major piece that it cannot, the intelligent process diagramming tools and workflow engine that will integrate with development and production implementation. The court is watching closely for such a toolset and if available at the time the project begins will evaluate as an additional alternative. The IT Manager attended this years Borland Conference looking for such a toolset.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- Some other possible risks might include: rejection by external stakeholders and dependence on the software provider for support, functionality and future licensing costs, if a third party Adjudication Replacement System is chosen. (Are there any lessons learned from implementing NIS that are relevant here?)

WCC Response:

In Section 4.C. Future IT Projects of the courts Comprehensive Information Technology Plan, the court has the following project listed for completion in Fiscal Year 2005: "Adjudication Re-engineering Focus Study with External Stakeholders - The Court realizes that to be successful, its external stakeholders must be engaged in the re-engineering effort. Focus sessions are planned." Dependence upon outside vendors is always a risk whether with purchased turnkey systems or application development systems. This is one of the reasons that the court has focused much of its IT resources on custom development and have such a high concentration of development resources in the IT section.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- Project relies on results of "recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006". There appears to be a risk that the consultant engagement either is not funded, or is unsuccessful...either would impact this project.

WCC Response:

The consultant is being funding out of existing continuation dollars. The court has tentatively identified several candidate consultants who already have a proven track record in the work that is being requested.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- Some explanation of how the estimated costs were determined would be helpful. How does one know that \$355,556 is even the correct order of magnitude for either a workflow application or an Adjudication Application?
- The possibility of replacing the adjudication system is not reflected in the cost of the project.

WCC Response:

Three of the leading workflow software vendors that would incorporate whose technical matches our environment were contacted. Each vendor provided an initial cost estimate based upon information provided by the court. Their estimates ranged from \$150,000 to the \$355,556. The only known turnkey "court" software vendor that complies with our technical environment was also contacted. Their pricing model is currently based upon large scale implementation and their cost estimate was over \$1,000,000. There current price model is out of line for the court. This vendor did leave the door open that over the next two years their pricing model may change to allow for smaller implementations.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- Also, the cost of the consultant's study in FY2006 should be reflected in the analysis.

WCC Response:

The consultant is being funding out of existing continuation dollars.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- This is a large project - probably needs project management resources.

WCC Response:

Project management is handled by the Lead Application Developer assigned to the project with close assistance from the IT Manager.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- Budget seems to be built on an assumption of software purchase, but narrative suggests that COTS software is likely not a viable solution. Project costs are listed as hardware/software/training for the workflow product. The court should review the possibility of using existing workflow software products rather than developing their own.

WCC Response:

(COTS - commercial off-the-shelf, adjective that describes software or hardware products that are ready-made and available for sale to the general public. For example, Microsoft Office is a COTS product that is a packaged software solution for businesses. COTS products are designed to be implemented easily into existing systems without the need for customization.)

Based upon the definition above, the comment is correct. A purchased software package will need integration and customization into our current data/application environment. A bedrock of workflow is intelligent process/workflow diagrams. The intelligence of this software is the workflow engine with user queues that manage the events based upon processing rules associated with event. The court is looking to purchase a either generic Workflow system that integrates with court-developed applets or a court management replacement system that includes the above critical elements of workflow.