

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Adjudication (REVISED)		\$ 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. These enhancements will be based upon the results from current internal re-engineering analysis and the recommendations 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. This projects key technology is Computer Managed Workflow.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Future	Total
<b>2. Contractual Services</b>						
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
<b>8. Capital Expenditures</b>						
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
<b>TOTAL COSTS</b>	\$ -	\$ 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
<b>TOTAL FUNDS</b>		\$ 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	14	10	13	12.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	23	20	20	21.0	25
V: Technical Impact	19	16	20	18.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	7	8	8.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	10	7	8	8.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	19	18	18	18.3	20
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>86</b>	100

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Good discussion of potential measurement/assessment methods</li> <li>- This proposal describes the use of workflow tools to manage and respond to events in the WCC. The proposal seeks to overlay workflow on its existing case management system.</li> </ul>	

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Good discussion of alternatives considered</li> <li>- Project justification are documented.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provided explanation of problems with current process, not benefits of proposed process</li> <li>- With the exception of computer assisted decision process and event triggers, the problems listed to be addressed by workflow appear to be systems design issues. There is no discussion as to how the WCC will overlay workflow on its existing system design. A task driven system can be achieved without investment in workflow tools. This should be reflected in a ROI analysis.</li> </ul>
V: Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Good understanding of technical strengths and weaknesses</li> <li>- Proposed workflow solution integrates well with existing systems.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vision appears to include customer (attorney/claimant, etc) self service at a future point. Not sure scalability has received enough attention, if this is future expectation.</li> <li>- The state has selected an enterprise workflow tool that is recognized in the project proposal. Narrative appears to discount the use of that tool in the WCC architecture. This sets the stage for workflow software that operates only in the WCC architecture. A ROI analysis should clarify this business decision.</li> </ul>
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Selection process and implementation plan are well documented.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Timelines seem reasonable for a "buy", but too short if a "build" solution is chosen. Difficulty of implementing new business process ("changes in mindset") may be understated.</li> <li>- In an earlier review of this project, this reviewer noted that software selection took place before completing the workflow analysis. This proposal is now in keeping with that observation.</li> </ul>
VII: Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The impact of the introduction of workflow management is well documented, with appropriate planning to minimize risk.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technical risks and business process acceptance risks may be understated</li> <li>- This project describes the acquisition and assimilation of workflow software within the computing environment of the WCC. Without a thorough understanding of other initiatives, it is difficult to assess how this technology will mesh with other technologies of the WCC. The answer appears to be one of the outcomes of the engagement of the consulting engineer. The document mentions the evaluation of an in-house solution using existing software and workflow feature inherent in Oracle. This evaluation should be completed before purchasing additional software.</li> </ul>
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dollar estimates seem low to me but the budget appears to be well documented.</li> <li>- Current and future hardware and software costs are identified in the proposal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Budget appears to assume purchase of COTS system...if a build decision is made costs will likely be higher</li> <li>- Cost model does address ROI. Software maintenance at 30% of initial purchase seems high, but the figure must be trusted.</li> </ul>