

Judicial Project Investment Justification

*A Statewide Standard Document for Information Technology Projects
for the Arizona Judicial Branch*



City of Phoenix



Project Title: ***Phoenix Municipal Court Case Management
System Replacement Project***

Prepared by:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Jennifer Gilbertson</i>
<i>Court</i>	<i>Phoenix Municipal Court (PMC)</i>
<i>Date</i>	<i>October 2009</i>
<i>Version</i>	<i>1.1</i>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 4

 A. DOCUMENT INFORMATION 4

 B. PROCEDURE 4

SECTION I. BUSINESS AND TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT..... 6

 A. MANAGEMENT SUMMARY 6

 B. PROPOSED CHANGES AND OBJECTIVES, “TO BE” 7

 C. EXISTING SITUATION AND PROBLEM, “AS IS” 10

 D. PROPOSED TECHNOLOGY 11

 F. MAJOR DELIVERABLES AND OUTCOMES 14

 G. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES 14

 H. OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED..... 15

 I. SUMMARY PROJECT MANAGEMENT SCHEDULE 17

SECTION II. PUBLIC VALUE AND BENEFITS A. VALUE TO THE PUBLIC 18

 B. BENEFITS TO THE STATE AND LOCAL JUDICIARY 19

SECTION III. FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT..... 20

 A. DEVELOPMENT COSTS 20

 *ALL PMC IST FTE’S WHO CURRENTLY PROVIDE SERVICES FOR EXISTING OPERATIONS WILL PARTICIPATE IN THE LJCMS REPLACEMENT PROJECT. THEIR SALARIES AND ERE WERE NOT INCLUDED ON THE ‘DEVELOPMENT COSTS’ LIST TO AVOID DUPLICATING COSTS. 20

 **DETAILED BREAKOUT OF CATEGORIES AVAILABLE IN APPENDIX A., ‘ITEMIZED LIST WITH COSTS’ 20

 ***CITY OF PHOENIX MS EA PENDING, BUT OFFICE 2007 UPGRADE INCLUDED B. OPERATING COSTS 20

 B. OPERATING COSTS 21

 C. TOTAL PROJECT COST..... 22

 D. FUNDING TIMELINE 22

 2. *Funding Source*..... 22

SECTION IV. RISK ASSESSMENT 23

 A. RISK SUMMARY 23

 B. RISK EVALUATION 24

 1. *Strategic*..... 24

 2. *Management* 25

 3. *Operational*..... 26

 4. *Scope and Requirements*..... 27

 5. *Technology Competency*..... 28

 6. *Infrastructure Dependencies*..... 29

 7. *Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity Planning*..... 30

SECTION V. PROJECT APPROVALS 31

PROJECT APPROVALS 31

APPENDICES..... 31

 A. ITEMIZED LIST WITH COSTS 31

 B. CONNECTIVITY DIAGRAM..... 31

 C. PROJECT SCHEDULE 31

 D. PROJECT WORK PLAN..... 31

 E. COMMUNICATION PLAN 31

 F. RISK PLAN..... 31

Judicial Project Investment Justification Version 1.0
For Arizona Judicial Branch Automation Projects-PMC LJCMS

G. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY	31
H. PMC INTEGRATION/DATA FLOWS DOCUMENT	31
GLOSSARY	32
DOCUMENT INFORMATION.....	33

Introduction

An Information Technology (IT) project is defined as a specific series of activities involving the implementation of new or enhanced IT systems. This document is used for two purposes:

1. A Judicial Project Investment Justification (JPIJ) document is completed for all projects of \$250,000 or more in development costs.
2. It is also used as part of the documentation to request an exception to standards as defined by the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration 1-501 and 1-505.

Project information includes operating costs to enable life cycle analysis. Life cycle analysis is an evaluation of costs and benefits over a prescribed period not greater than 5 years.

A. Document Information

Information is included in each section to assist in preparing the JPIJ document. The JPIJ format presented here [adapted from the State-standard Project Investment Justification (PIJ) document maintained by the Government Information Technology Agency (GITA)] is the Arizona Judicial Branch standard for project and/or standard exceptions justification and must include all required sections in the order specified in the Table of Contents. Information about the GITA PIJ including the PIJ Policy, Standard and Procedure can be found at the GITA web site at http://www.azgita.gov/project_investment_justification/. Although not required under statute, the Arizona Judicial Branch is using this modified version of the standard state document to capture information for court projects.

Section I. **Business and Technology Assessment** provides a project overview; describes the existing situation and problem; defines the proposed changes and objectives; outlines the proposed technology and enterprise architecture compliance; illustrates viable alternatives; lists major deliverables, personnel roles and responsibilities; and defines the project schedule.

Section II. **Public Value and Benefits** describes the improved management or performance that brings new value to the citizens. This section identifies quantitative and qualitative benefits that may be gained by completing this project.

Section III. **Financial Assessment** identifies the development and operating costs, summary of costs, special terms and conditions, funding timeline and funding source.

Section IV. **Risk Assessment** measures the impact of the project on the court in six key categories. Each category is described and contains questions pertaining to risks. A “Yes” answer receives a score of 1 point. A low score indicates high-risk.

Section V. **Project Approvals** provides a management review checklist and an area for the court management to approve the project by signature, establishing accountability. The Presiding Judge will review and sign all JPIJ documents.

The **Appendices section** provides attachments to the JPIJ document. An itemized list of costs is required to substantiate the Financial Assessment. A connectivity diagram and a Gantt chart indicating major project milestones are also required.

B. Procedure

The review cycle is not more than thirty (30) working days from the date received. During the review staff may be in contact with you to request additional information. Please include your email address and

FAX number to facilitate communications. Review by the Commission on Technology will occur at its regularly scheduled meetings.

The Commission on Technology will issue a response letter to the submitter in the submitting court indicating the results of the review and a recommendation. ***Approval of a project does not approve funding or procurement of technology projects.*** It is the responsibility of the court to secure additional approvals that may be required by local or other funding bodies.

Section I. Business and Technology Assessment

<i>Court Name and Address</i>	<i>Contact Name, Phone, FAX, email</i>
Phoenix Municipal Court 300 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85003-1611	Jennifer Gilbertson 602.495.2035 (office) 602.262.7156 (fax) jennifer.gilbertson@phoenix.gov

<i>Project Investment Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
PMC LJCMS replacement project	October 2009

A. Management Summary

The purpose of the Limited Jurisdiction (LJ) Case Management System (CMS) replacement project for the Phoenix Municipal Court (PMC) is to provide a fully automated, state-of-the-art, case management system that will be offer the same baseline functionality as the current legacy CMS, and provide a consistent application with the state judicial standard while offering integration opportunities PMC does not currently have in place.

To help clarify the terminology used throughout this request, the overall project or program name is the Limited Jurisdiction Case Management System (LJCMS) replacement project. The name that the LJ court's use to describe the statewide vendor's LJ software application is Arizona Integrated Case Management System (AZiCMS). Currently, the General Jurisdiction (GJ) courts refer to their statewide vendor's software application as Arizona Judicial Automated Case System (AJACS).

Program management for the new statewide LJ CMS is the responsibility of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and the Commission on Technology (COT), which will operate with the assistance of its employees, various elected officials, consultants and local governmental units. Program management for the PMC LJ CMS will consist of split responsibilities. PMC will manage their own infrastructure (servers, local area network (LAN) and database), while working closely with the AOC, the COT and the selected vendor on needed large volume application enhancements.

The PMC LJ CMS project includes scoping out the full project framework, setting up a test, conversion, development and production environment, development of large volume court application enhancements and local integration partner web services, conversion of legacy system data, training (both technical support training and user training), and application deployment. The elements of the CMS implementation will include the ability to integrate and/or interface with other state agencies including, but not limited to, the Arizona Motor Vehicle Department (MVD), the Department of Public Safety (DPS), the Department of Corrections (DOC), the National Crime Information Center (NCIC), the Supreme Court Data Warehouse, the Fines/Fees and Restitution Enforcement program (FARE), the Department of Revenue (DOR), outside collection agencies and other entities as determined by the AOC. The application will also have the ability to comply with the Supreme Court Minimum Accounting Standards (MAS) requirements and CourTools reporting.

The new CMS will meet the functional requirements established by the AOC and PMC. The supplemental gap session for large volume courts will outline those additional enhancements needed in addition to the baseline AZiCMS product and some of those functional requirements

include integration with local municipal partners such as the Police Department, Neighborhood Services, Development Services, Fire Department, Streets and Transportation, Public Works, Finance and the city's Law Department. The PMC will be moving its legacy CMS into a code freeze status by the end of 2009. This will allow the technical resources more time to begin concentrating on all of the dependency projects associated with this implementation. (conversion, local interface development, testing, setting up new infrastructure, etc.)

Is this project mandated by law, court case or rule?
<u>No specific law, court case or rule exists, but Arizona Code of Judicial Administration § 1-501 specifies that Arizona Court Automation Project (ACAP) courts shall use the statewide standard case management system. The system described in this document has been approved for statewide use by the Arizona Judicial Council. Although PMC is currently not an ACAP court, the need to upgrade to a new CMS is necessary and moving forward with a statewide partnership with the AOC appears to be the most advantageous option at this time.</u>

The following table contains summary information taken from the other sections of the JPIJ document.

Description	Section	Significance
Value Rating	II. A. Value to the Public	25
Economic Benefits	II. B. Benefits to the State	31
Total Development Cost	III. A. Development Costs (project costs)	\$3,829,000 <i>*estimated</i>
Request for authorization to use local JCEF monies	Appendix A: Itemized List with Costs	\$2,974,000
Total Operating Cost	III. B. Operating Costs	\$20,119,000
Total Project Cost	III. C. Summary of Costs by Year	\$23,948,000 <i>*includes operating costs</i>
Score for Risks	IV. A. Risk Summary (Maximum 37)	33

B. Proposed Changes and Objectives, "To Be"

The PMC implemented the current legacy CMS in the late 1990s. Over the past ten years, the application has been enhanced greatly and has served PMC quite well. Due to the large volume of transactions, the legacy system manages compliance processing, warrants, automatic data feeds, and complaint entry through automated batch processes. In 2004, PMC embarked on a collaborative project with the AOC and became the first FULL FARE court in the state. These automated processes must be replicated in AZiCMS.

PMC now stands on the brink of a second wave of automation along side many other courts needing to transition to a new CMS. The approach being undertaken is standards based, component based, and focused on re-use of building blocks across various systems that can be modified and flexed. Doing so requires clear standards in both technology and business processes. The systems are designed from the standpoint of innovation more than generation; most of the data courts work with comes from somewhere else. The court acts as a hub of information more than an originator. Second-generation systems pick up information from law enforcement and attorneys' systems, reducing workload by moving the responsibility for input to the source, thereby getting the court out of the data entry business. New systems contain

workflow right out of the box, providing an inherent standard business process, removing the need for understanding the entire process before being able to perform any part of it. They also are exception based, triggering alerts whenever items fall outside specified parameters.

After further review, user assessments and business analysis, it has become clear that while the larger courts may process larger volumes of cases, all limited jurisdiction courts utilize or would benefit from the same standardized business processes and automatic case processing workflows.

On October 9, 2008, the LJ CMS sub-committee recommended and received COT approval for the AmCad AiCMS application to be the chosen baseline product for the Limited Jurisdiction courts. They further recommended that “favored functionality” developed within the Tempe Municipal Court application be incorporated into the AiCMS application. This solution will meet 100 percent of the 300+ functional requirements defined by customers of the current statewide CMS, AZTEC, and utilize systems analysis and design that has already been defined and developed by Tempe Municipal Court.

As the PMC legacy CMS exceeds the current functionality in the statewide AZTEC application, PMC plans on contracting with AmCad to ensure that the large volume LJ courts’ needs are identified and PMC’s requirements are addressed so that the new application can meet and even exceed the existing legacy application.

PMC is committed to working closely with the AOC and AmCad to ensure that requirements needed for the large volume court will not interfere with the state AZiCMS baseline product or the AJACS application. The goal is to have one AZiCMS application, not two.

PMC will spearhead the large volume court supplemental gap session in early 2010; therefore, the large volume court needs have not been fully identified yet. All large volume LJ courts will be invited to participate in the supplemental gap session that PMC will be hosting. The plan is to take the best processes and functionality from all large LJ courts and incorporate that into the statewide product. The PMC enhancements derived from the supplemental session will be developed in the statewide application and will be available to all Arizona courts that opt to use the functionality. It is anticipated that some of the enhancements identified will be useful to many mid-sized LJ courts as well.

PMC has opted to take a leadership role in the development of AZiCMS for the large volume LJ courts for several reasons:

- PMC has a need for a fully functional CMS replacement system by 2012
- PMC currently uses the most complex proprietary system in the state
- PMC is the only Full FARE integrated court in the state
- PMC uses advanced case scheduling and work load leveling
- PMC uses advanced batch processing
- PMC processes the largest volume of LJ cases in the state
- PMC will have approximately 25 IT staff dedicated to the project
- PMC has a commitment of \$6M to ensure AZiCMS has full functionality

Documented pros and cons of this blended application approach are:

Blended	
Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No license costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional requirements from gap analysis will produce an unknown product
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to standardize some of the large volume processes for municipal courts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make up and management of oversight team more AOC focused than PMC focused
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tailored to meet Arizona business processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specification for AZ could isolate or diminish the vendor's ability to continue to offer enhancements in the future
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judicial contractual maintenance and enhancements in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More coordination needed to enhance the application for PMC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available resources will improve the capacity to have multiple tasks accomplished within a given timeline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conversion experience for non-ACAP courts is unknown
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conversion experience with ACAP courts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliance on vendor for all future enhancements reduces control of courts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statewide code distribution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More coordination for enhancements
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline AZiCMS application will be built, PMC to add to baseline for large volume LJ needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application enhancements could take longer due to necessary coordination
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration opportunities between courts through statewide ESB portal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less PMC customization
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mature development and quality assurance 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future proof (sustainability) – enhancement of the product will continuously be available to Arizona courts 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A product that will benefit all LJ courts will yield a more significant commitment from LJ Court community 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best of both applications (AmCad product and Tempe) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk and Resource sharing 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less focus on fixing the CMS and more time working with local integration partners and local needs 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application maintenance, including legislative changes, reporting requirements handled by AOC. 	

Use of this vendor system within the limited jurisdiction courts will provide the same benefits as have been defined for the general jurisdiction implementation:

- **Ensure ongoing maintenance support** from both software and hardware vendors.
- **Increase the return on the technical investment** by leveraging existing functional components, as well as sharing newly developed components.
- **Maximize return on investment** by providing the ability to 'plug' market developed functionality modules (e.g., calendar) into in-house developed applications.
- **Enhance decision support capabilities** by standardizing reporting within the application to be consistent with the AOC architectural standard ad-hoc reporting tool.
- **Enhance standardization and increase the feasibility of information sharing and interoperability** by using the justice XML and COT architectural standards.
- **Increase the assurance of availability of skilled development staff** by moving to a current development language and contracting the vendor to provide skilled resources that PMC can leverage.
- **Increase the ability to exchange data** between related automation systems based on the new system architecture and information exchange standards.
- **Reduce the risk** of utilizing obsolete and non-sustainable technology

On October 22, 2008, AJC approved the budget to implement the vendor solution in Arizona Limited Jurisdiction Courts.

American Cadastre, LLC, "AmCad" has been contracted to develop basic enhancements to its existing feature rich system for statewide deployment of the GJ CMS. The AOC has negotiated to obtain the source code for the AiCMS product, ensuring the product will be supported even in the unlikely event the vendor should exit the market and the right to deploy the system in limited jurisdiction courts with no additional license costs. The case management system has been developed within the .NET framework standard adopted by the Judiciary utilizing SQL Server as the database.

This LJ CMS solution takes advantage of a great opportunity to consolidate the number of case management systems currently being utilized in the limited jurisdiction courts. Approximately 10 separate and distinct case management applications are currently utilized within the Arizona LJ court community. This solution would consolidate this number to four (4) at implementation and remaining courts would be consolidated as their current applications age and become unsupported. PMC is one of the four courts mentioned.

This collaboration among large volume, non-AOC supported courts will leverage resources, funding, and business analysis, to build upon the existing AiCMS application and develop an application that meets the needs of all LJ courts, large or small, rural or metropolitan.

PMC believes this collaboration would result in the creation of a consortium of courts with well defined by-laws, operating procedures and oversight processes.

C. Existing Situation and Problem, "As Is"

In order to continue to meet business and public service objectives, the court must obtain and implement a replacement for the current legacy CMS. The CMS is written in JAM (the precursor to Panther which AZTEC is written in) and runs on an Informix database. The technology platform is old, the user interface is not intuitive and PMC needs to move toward a long term solution that will replace the legacy CMS and position the court in a sustainable support and maintenance model that will bring forth integration opportunities as well as long-term

sustainability. The court has been planning for an interim solution over the past few years, knowing that the ultimate goal is to align with a statewide solution when a statewide Limited Jurisdiction (LJ) CMS is available. The reasons the court would prefer a statewide solution is that it will offer the court many additional benefits such as; risk sharing, maintenance and support, resource sharing, and integration opportunities with other courts and criminal justice partners. As the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) will manage the state courts Enterprise Service Bus (ESB), as well as the statewide LJ CMS and GJ CMS application maintenance, it will allow PMC to focus on local court needs, leverage operational support and have access to many integration opportunities that are not available today. Therefore, instead of being charged with building and maintaining a critical business application and all of the associated maintenance, support and integration points, by collaborating as a court development partner in conjunction with a statewide a LJ CMS solution, PMC can focus on enhancements specific to its' court, which will better serve the users and ultimately the citizens of Phoenix.

D. Proposed Technology

AmCad is a full service application solutions provider for local government agencies with a focus on Clerks of the Circuit Court and their court and land records applications. AmCad was formed in 1986 to work with government in the development and implementation of “automating” technologies –specifically in the realm of public records. The company is dedicated to the management of court and public records and the systems and solutions that facilitate the smooth transition to new technology to increase workflow, staff efficiency, and improve constituent service. AmCad is extremely familiar with the complexities of working with the Arizona court system already having several CMS installations in place with the Arizona GJ courts.

Completed in 2006 on a state-of-the-art Microsoft .NET architecture that takes advantage of the latest server, network, and data technologies, the system, AiCMS, has been developed within the .NET framework utilizing MS SQL Server as the database. AiCMS combines the ease of deployment of a web application with the presentation layer and performance strengths of a thick client application. It uses Smart Client distributed tools at the presentation layer to deliver a friendly and intuitive interface to the user. This approach allows AiCMS to deliver optimal performance at the presentation, business, and data layers but utilizing the strengths of both the client and the server while maintaining a web-based environment and deployment. From the presentation level the application communicates with a local SQL Server Express database to maintain performance and prevent loss of information due to an interruption of the session or network connection, accidental closing of the browser window, or external events (such as a power outage). The data is then transferred upon saving back to the server via a middleware service running on the server serving as the business layer. The middleware service processes the data, communicating with the main SQL Server 2005 database, and returns any values or information back to the client as necessary.

The following network protocols are necessary for the client to run the application:

1. HTTP/HTTPS
2. TCP/IP
3. SOAP
4. MSMQ

AiCMS fully supports all Microsoft technologies and utilizes court-standard Microsoft Word for forms, signatures, and importing outside documents.

AiCMS complies with architectural and security guidelines outlined by the Commission on Technology, a standing committee of the Arizona Judicial Council which sets standards for judicial automation (<http://www.supreme.state.az.us/cot/>).

The application is written within the .NET framework, complying with the court target development environment. The backend database is SQL server, a court target technology. Hardware (including the operating system), communication equipment (including software), database, and application development tools will all be maintained at a vendor-supported version to ensure long-term supportability of this enterprise application.

E. Enterprise Architecture

Enterprise Architecture (EA) Technology Domain Definitions	Project EA Conformance (Yes/ No)	List EA Standards reviewed for this PIJ
Network: Defines policies and standards for the State's communications infrastructure, which includes the various topologies and protocols necessary to facilitate the interconnection of server platforms, mainframes, intra-building and office networks (LANs), and inter-building and mall/campus networks (WANs).	YES	Compliant with the Arizona Judicial Branch Enterprise Architecture (see Appendix D).
Security: Identifies security technologies, policies, and standards necessary to protect the information assets of the State and to ensure isolation and confidentiality of information, integrity of data, and the availability of IT resources to the State's workforce and citizens, as appropriate.	YES	Compliant with the Arizona Judicial Branch Enterprise Architecture (see Appendix D).
Platform: Defines policies and standards for IT devices and associated operating systems, which include mainframes, mid-size computers, servers, storage devices, client platforms (PCs, workstations, PDAs, telephony, etc.).	YES	Compliant with the Arizona Judicial Branch Enterprise Architecture (see Appendix D).
Software/Application: Defines policies and standards for software applications, application development tools, productivity software tools, etc.	YES	Compliant with the Arizona Judicial Branch Enterprise Architecture (see Appendix D).
Data/Information: Defines policies and standards for the organization of information related to citizens, locations, and objects the State must collect, store, maintain, and access.	YES	Compliant with the Arizona Judicial Branch Enterprise Architecture (see Appendix D).
Service Oriented Architecture Planning and Implementation		Y/N
1.	Does this project qualify as an SOA application by improving application delivery for technology reuse, and/or application reuse and/or services reuse?	Y
2.	Can this project provide reuse benefits to other agencies, departments and/or divisions within state government as an SOA application through web services?	Y
3.	Can this project provide reuse benefits to other political sub-divisions via Internet web services?	Y
4.	Can this project provide reuse benefits to the private sector or the Federal government through web services?	Y
5.	Can this project eliminate redundant processes and/or services as an SOA application through web services?	Y

Judicial Project Investment Justification Version 1.0
 For Arizona Judicial Branch Automation Projects-PMC LJCMS

6.	Can this project, as an SOA application improve efficiencies and effectiveness in state government for increased productivity and performance and/or by eliminating waste and fraud?	Y
7.	Does the agency have the necessary technical skills, application suites, tool sets, workbenches, etc., to implement this project as an SOA application?	Y

1. Security

Hardware, Software, and Data Access will follow the security guidelines as adopted by the Arizona Supreme Court’s Commission on Technology. In addition to application level auditing and security, AiCMS maintains a set of user application rights that can be assigned to a specific user or group. These rights help ensure that no user can access a part of the application that they do not have rights to, or even a case type that they are not allowed to view.

2. Conversion

Extensive data conversion will be necessary as PMC has a very large customized database. The PMC will begin a series of database clean-up activities (including data purging) in 2010 in preparation for conversion after the legacy CMS code freeze begins at the end of 2009. The PMC will contract directly with AmCad for data conversion technical assistance. Documentation will be created by both the vendor and PMC to ensure the process and application of data conversion is complete and understood. AmCad will provide the following deliverables, a Data Conversion Strategy Report, Data Conversion Assessment Report and Data Conversion Plan.

3. Training and Documentation

- **Technical and Business Staff Training:** Technical training will include training and mentoring on .NET framework development and the CMS code itself, since AOC has negotiated full rights. Business Staff training will include training and mentoring on business requirements, configuration, design, user test scripts, and the conversion tool(s) developed.
- **Technical Documentation:** Source control, change management and development standards are included as deliverables within the project plan.
- **User Documentation:** User documentation will be integrated into the application itself as much as possible, using hover help and online help text.
- **Training Documentation:** Training documentation will be developed both for traditional instructor led, interactive training and for CDs for refreshers and new staff training. PMC will collaborate with AmCad to develop customized, PMC role-based training scenarios. As PMC has many specialized positions, the court management team felt it would be the most efficient method of training.
- **Training:** Training will be provided to PMC staff via the face-to-face method. Training documentation will be updated with each ongoing release and posted to the AOC LJ CMS intranet site for online review and download. Training will be conducted initially by the vendor of the case management system to approximately 40 internal PMC staff members. PMC supervisor’s analysts/trainers will be trained by the vendor as part of the development phase of the project, and will then train the court users during the deployment phase in conjunction with the vendor. The vendor will be contracted to provide role-based training in conjunction with PMC staff. The goal is to have two to three PMC court staff in every training to ensure business process questions can be addressed aside from the application.
- **AmCad will provide all training for the technical staff of the PMC to become completely self sufficient on the maintenance and delivery of the CMS software as developed.** PMC technical staff will continue to gain knowledge and understanding

of the process by collaborating with the AOC, participating in on-line technology training through AppDev as well as outside technical training vendors and working with the AmCad.

F. Major Deliverables and Outcomes

The replacement CMS is built upon state-of-the-art architecture and therefore provides citizens and court users with a long-term, sustainable solution using improved technologies. The new CMS also supports improved court business processes and will provide significantly improved case processing. Ensuring that the project is successful will be determined by acceptance criteria outlined within the established contract and detailed in the project schedules and comprehensive project plan. Critical milestones will include initial acceptance of the vendor software, modified to ensure that it meets Arizona limited jurisdiction statewide business requirements prior to the implementation of the first pilot court. This software acceptance sets the baseline for the system that will be enhanced for PMC.

Deliverables for the project will include the modified software that has been developed via a carefully detailed review of the vendor-supplied, base case management system and a comparison process to the COT-developed requirements matrix. The comparison resulted in a gap analysis document that formed the basis of modification. The baseline LJ requirements are stated in the AOC LJCMS Replacement project contract and detailed in the AOC project schedule and plan will be required of the vendor during the development phase of the project. For the baseline AZiCMS, the major system enhancements will include ease of case processing and significantly improved interfaces with other data systems such as JOLTSaz as well as other agencies such as MVD, DOR, and the DPS criminal history system.

A series of documented deliverables will be developed during the large volume LJ court supplemental gap session after the AZiCMS baseline product is complete. It is anticipated that the supplemental gap session will begin in the first quarter of 2010.

G. Roles and Responsibilities

Name	PMC Court Role	Project Role
Judge Song Ong Judge Jeffery	Chief Presiding Judge Asst. Presiding Judge	Project Sponsors
Doug Pilcher Ester Reeves Dianna Noli-Hill	Executive Court Administrator Court Controller Civil Division Administrator	Project Stakeholders
Jennifer Gilbertson	Information Systems Officer	Lead LJCMS PMC Project and Change Mgt Manager
Randy Smiley	IT Project Manager	Local development Project Manager
Zona Cecil, Rick Modisette	IT Systems Specialists	Database Administration/Conversion
John Melisko, Jared Harvey and Tanya Gray	User Technology Specialist	Desktop management
Technical Support Staff: Janet Barbeau Chris Krum Jat Saini Sesh Pilla Sita Burada	CMS programming support	Integration programming Conversion programming Report programming Testing

Judicial Project Investment Justification Version 1.0
For Arizona Judicial Branch Automation Projects-PMC LJCMS

Name	PMC Court Role	Project Role
Stephanie Roberts Linda Minton-Altiveros		
Business Support Staff: Rebecca Mietzner Jeannette Passaretti Mike Ricuito Jerri Allen Wayne Reger Stephen Miller Michelle Lowman	CMS business analysts	CMS documentation Conversion analysis Gap analysis Testing Training
CMS User Support Staff: Al Jones Michelle Lowman	IT Service Specialist- HelpDesk	HelpDesk support IST Webpage support/maintenance

Name	AOC LJCMS Project Role
Adele May	LJCMS Project Manager
William Earl	Statewide CMS Change Control Manager
Jim Scorza	LJCMS Steering Committee Chair

Name	AmCad LJCMS Project Role
Jeanette Gnecco	Large Volume LJ Court CMS Project Manager
Mike Pontius	LJ Court CMS Project Manager
Alex McCall	Arizona CMS Manager

H. Other Alternatives Considered

The software solution to be implemented statewide for the limited jurisdiction courts had two possible products - the **Tempe CMS** application currently deployed in the Tempe Municipal Court and/or **AmCad's AiCMS**, a vendor-developed, integrated case management system that has been selected as the second-generation general jurisdiction courts (GJ) case management system (CMS), replacing AZTEC.

Tempe Municipal Court began development of a case and financial management system to replace its outdated, legacy application in October of 2004. This effort would move the Tempe Municipal Court from their COBOL/Hewlett Packard Turbo Image implementation to a system utilizing Visual Basic.NET/Microsoft SQL Server. In this process, the court's present application would be re-architected to a component-based, multi-tiered design with a graphical user interface (GUI) to be developed as a replacement for the application's existing character-based user interface. The Tempe Municipal Court's current application, including all current functionality, would serve as a baseline for initial deployment of the proposed case/financial management system development. Additionally, the initial deployment was anticipated to include some enhancements, like improved calendaring functionality, specialized electronic disposition reporting to the Arizona Department of Public Safety, nightly export of information to the state judiciary's data warehouse, and the ability to integrate with the FARE project.

From the onset, Tempe Municipal Court staff has been working closely with staff from the AOC to better ensure that the application under development would have the potential to be part of a

statewide deployment, should such actions be ultimately agreeable to both the AOC and other limited jurisdiction courts. Tempe's original date for implementation was February 2007. Various issues delayed implementation to July 2009. During the delay period, COT selected AiCMS to be the replacement CMS for GJ courts and requested that its applicability to LJ courts be investigated as a candidate system in addition to the Tempe CMS.

In order to reach a decision between the two candidate applications, a number of assessment activities were facilitated by AOC staff. Hands-on user assessments were conducted that invited participants from LJ courts across the state to come in and see scenario-based demonstrations to provide the means to compare the user friendliness and system functionality of both candidate applications. Participants were required to provide feedback on general likes/dislikes, pros/cons of each system, and scorecards/surveys of both systems. The results of these assessments indicated a split in users' preference and tabulated results indicate neither application to be the clear choice of users.

On September 5, 2008, a presentation of the LJ assessment activities was given to the Commission on Technology with the request for approval to form a special sub-committee to further review and recommend a final LJ CMS direction and decision. Both application suppliers were provided with a specific list of system "must haves" and were asked to demonstrate meeting these requirements to the new sub-committee.

Much discussion on the pros and cons of each system ensued and the committee agreed that both applications had strong case management functionalities and both applications required additional programming/development in order to be implemented in all statewide limited jurisdiction courts. The final decision and recommendation was that of a hybrid solution that combined the best of both applications into a product that will benefit all LJ courts and will yield a more significant commitment from the LJ court community.

An additional option would be to do nothing and keep the existing and aged PMC legacy application. This option is not viable as no vendor support is available for this product and all future maintenance and upgrades would be limited and would increase the risk of an application failure. Additionally, this product utilizes and runs on old technology not compliant with the enterprise architecture and does not provide a good platform for continued aggressive integration efforts with various external court agencies.

Finally, an option for PMC to **rewrite the existing CMS application into Java** was seriously investigated on a few occasions, but the project never managed to get off the ground. After working on the rewrite for almost a year, the two solutions; Tempe and AiCMS were proposed, which both appeared to be more viable than embarking on an isolated rewrite project. With this in mind, the PMC rewrite project was cancelled in August 2008 and the focus shifted toward one of the proposed statewide solutions.

I. Summary Project Management Schedule

PMC LJCMS Replacement Project High Level Milestones:

- **Phase 1: Project Planning (March 2009-January 2010)**
 - Deliver Implementation Strategy-*completed*
 - Deliver Project Work Plan-*completed*
 - Deliver Project Schedule-*completed*
 - Deliver Communication Plan-*completed*
 - Deliver Risk Plan-*completed*
 - Deliver Hardware Configuration Plan, set up Test Environment-*completed*
 - Update user hardware-memory and monitor upgrades

- **Phase 2: Requirements Validation and Analysis/Prepare hardware/Start meeting with local integration partners (February 2010-August 2010)**
 - Pre-gap training
 - Supplemental Gap Analysis
 - Deliver System Requirements Specification – Supplemental Gap
 - Deliver Requirements Traceability Matrix – Supplemental Gap
 - Move all desktops to Office 2007
 - Gather requirements for local integration partner web interfaces

- **Phase 3: Design/Infrastructure set-up/Integration development (September 2010-December 2011)**
 - Deliver Internal External Design Document – Supplemental Gap
 - Deliver Interface Strategy Document
 - Deliver Logical & Physical Database Design
 - Purchase/install production and development databases
 - Development of local integration partner web interfaces

- **Phase 4 Data Conversion (March 2011-August 2011)**
 - Deliver Data Conversion Plan
 - Conversion Iterations #1, 2, 3, 4
 - Conversion testing

- **Phase 5: Testing, Training, and Configuration (September 2011-February 2012)**
 - Deliver new features from Supplemental Gap Sessions to Test Environment
 - Deliver Testing Strategy Document
 - Deliver Completed Test Scripts
 - User Acceptance Agreement of Critical & very High Defects Only
 - Deliver Training Needs Assessment (Matrix) to PMC
 - Deliver Training Schedule
 - Deliver Training Plan
 - Deliver Training Documentation
 - Conduct User Training

- **Phase 6: Deployment (March 2012)**
 - Deliver Successfully Converted Data
 - Deliver Live Production System
 - Post-Implementation Support

A copy of the project schedule (as of 09/10/2009) is included as Appendix C. Please note the schedule shows an implementation date of November 2011. PMC has added some additional time to the overall project schedule to allow for FULL FARE analysis and testing as it is imperative that this functionality is included in the statewide AZiCMS product. PMC remains the only FULL FARE court in the state, therefore, resources from PMC will be needed to ensure the requirements are provided to the vendor.

Section II. Public Value and Benefits A. Value to the Public

Score: 0=None, 1=Minor, 2=Moderate, 3=Considerable, 4=Substantial, 5=Extensive.

<i>Description</i>	<i>Score</i>
Client Satisfaction: Rate how stakeholders may respond to anticipated improvements. This could apply to health and welfare services, quality of life or life safety functions.	4
Customer Service: Rate anticipated improvements to internal and external customer service delivery. Give consideration to faster response, greater access to information, elimination or reduction in client complaints.	4
Life Safety Functions: Applies to public protection, health, environment, and safety. Consider how this project will reduce risk in these functions.	4
Public Service Functions: Applies to licensing, maintenance, payments, and tax. Consider how this project will enhance services in these functions.	4
Legal Requirements: Consideration should be given to projects mandated by federal or state law. Other consideration could be given if there are interfaces with other federal, state, or local entities.	5
Product Quality: Applies to the information and services delivered to internal and external customers and the public.	4
Other: List any other applicable value or benefits.	
Total	25

Detail Description of Project Benefits

Client Satisfaction: Once the CMS is deployed, and personnel are trained, there will be significant improvements in the ability to initiate cases in the system, manage all aspects of the data being input and stored, provide information out of the system to the users, and interface to many other agencies and clients.

Customer Service: The system enables vastly improved customer service using the Internet through electronic filing and electronic access to filed documents as well as case-related documents, moving requests for court documents and services from “in line” to “online.”

Life Safety Functions: The new software is being integrated with other court and law enforcement systems to ensure more timely and wide communication of justice-related information. Getting more complete information to law enforcement faster reduces public risk.

Public Service Functions: The new system will contain improved financials in the receipt and distributions as well as accounting that the current system does not contain. Because of this functionality, the licensing and payments functions will be improved. The system will also have FARE, a court collections system, embedded in the software such that the courts will be able to improve the collection of monies owed to it and better enforce judicial orders.

Legal Requirements: The case management system has at its foundation the requirement to address all legal mandates on the courts in a systematic, standardized manner. More maintainable code reduces the risk of making legislated changes.

Product Quality: The case management system that will be deployed is based on the latest .NET architecture and therefore will be supportable well into the future. Also, most of the user interfaces will be improved such that the user can conduct business more rapidly and efficiently. It interfaces with the court-standard electronic document management system and provides for electronic filing right out of the box.

B. Benefits to the State and Local Judiciary

Score: 0=None, 1=Minor, 2=Moderate, 3=Considerable, 4=Substantial, 5=Extensive.

<i>Description</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Savings</i>
Agency Performance: The extent to which duties and processes will improve or positively affect business functions. Consider reduced redundancy and improved consistency for the agency.	4	
Productivity Increase: The improvements in quantity or timeliness of services or deliverables. Consider improved turnaround time or expanded capacity of key processes.	4	
Operational Efficiency: Rating may be based on improved use of resources, greater flexibility in agency responses to stakeholder requests, reduction or elimination of paperwork, legacy systems, or manual tasks.	4	
Accomplishment Probability: The extent to which this project is expected to have a high level of success in completing all requirements for the division or agency.	5	
Functional Integration: The impact the project will have in eliminating redundancy or improve consistency. Consider the impact of information sharing between departments or divisions, or between agencies in the State.	4	
Technology Sensitive: The implementation of the right types of technology to meet clear and defined goals and to support key functions. Consider technologies and systems already proven within the agency, division, or other similar organizations.	5	
Other: List any other applicable benefit.	5	
Total	31	

Section III. Financial Assessment

A. Development Costs

Fiscal Year						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY09/10</i>	<i>FY10/11</i>	<i>FY11/12</i>	<i>FY12/13</i>	<i>FY13/14</i>	<i>Total*</i>
The number of FTE and third-party positions						
1. IT FTE Positions	0	0	0	0	0	(Do not use)
2. User FTE Positions	0	0	0	0	0	
3. Professional and Outside Positions	0	0	0	0	0	
4. Total Positions *	0	0	0	0	0	
The development costs in thousands (\$000)						
5. IT FTE COST (Include ERE)	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. User FTE COST (Include ERE)	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. IT Services (Professional and Outside Cost)	305	180	1870	380	<i>Maintenance Mode MM</i>	2735
8. Hardware	23	390	40	200	<i>MM</i>	653
9. Software:	12	12	12	0	<i>MM</i>	36
10. Communications:	0	0	0	100	<i>MM</i>	100
11. Facilities	0	0	0	0	<i>MM</i>	0
12. Licensing and Maintenance Fees	0	172	10	0	<i>MM</i>	182
13. Other-training	10	78	25	10	<i>MM</i>	123
14. Total**	350	832	1957	690	<i>MM</i>	3829

*All PMC IST FTE's who currently provide services for existing operations will participate in the LJCMS replacement project. Their salaries and ERE were not included on the 'Development Costs' list to avoid duplicating costs.

**Detailed breakout of categories available in Appendix A., 'Itemized List with Costs'.

***City of Phoenix MS EA pending, but Office 2007 upgrade included

Judicial Project Investment Justification Version 1.0
For Arizona Judicial Branch Automation Projects-PMC LJCMS

B. Operating Costs

Fiscal Year						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY09/10</i>	<i>FY10/11</i>	<i>FY11/12</i>	<i>FY12/13</i>	<i>FY13/14</i>	<i>Total**</i>
<i>The number of FTE and third-party positions</i>						
1. IT FTE Positions <i>(two SA vacancies)</i>	12	14	14	14	14	(Do not use)
2. User FTE Positions <i>(one BA position vacant)</i>	8	9	9	9	9	
3. Professional and Outside Positions	2	2	2	2	2	
4. Total Positions *	22	25	25	25	25	
<i>The operating costs in thousands (\$000)</i>						
5. IT FTE COST (Include ERE)	1580	1944	2041	2143	2250	9958
6. User FTE COST (Include ERE)	930	1094	1149	1206	1267	5646
7. IT Services (Professional and Outside Cost) Includes: enterprise network support, enterprise business application support, Oracle maintenance support, Informix licensing, data entry services, enterprise disc storage, technical systems support	103	108	113	119	125	568
8. Hardware Note: Per B&R instructions/budget reduction efforts, zero funds were budgeted/used for FY09-10 computer replacements	145	152	159	167	176	799
9. Software	125	132	138	145	152	692
10. Communications Includes: telephone, telecommunications, cellular phone charges, pager charges, long distance charges, telephone install & engineering, port connectivity network, telephone system maintenance	10	10	11	11	12	54
11. Facilities Includes: facilities management charge, facilities security charge (note: 2008 data used)	60	60	64	68	71	323
12. Licensing and Maintenance Fees:	133	140	147	154	152	726
13. Other: Includes: disaster recovery services, ATT data entry services, offsite data storage, moving services, postage, photocopy equipment rental, printing services, City Clerk access charges, office supplies, janitorial	245	257	270	283	298	1353
14. Total	3331	3897	4092	4296	4503	20119

*Note: 5% cost increase per year projected for FTE costs, hardware, software, communication, facilities, licensing and maintenance and other operating expenses.

**This estimated operating budget is the PMC Information Systems Technology division budget only.

C. Total Project Cost

<i>Fiscal Year (\$000)</i>						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY09/10</i>	<i>FY10/11</i>	<i>FY11/12</i>	<i>FY12/13</i>	<i>FY13/14</i>	<i>Total</i>
1. Development Costs	350	832	1957	690	MM	3829
2. Operating Costs	3331	3897	4092	4296	4503	20119
3. Total Project Costs	3681	4729	6049	4926	4503	23948

D. Funding Timeline

<i>Five Year Total (\$000)</i>						
<i>Court</i>	<i>FY09/10</i>	<i>FY10/11</i>	<i>FY11/12</i>	<i>FY12/13</i>	<i>FY13/14</i>	<i>Total</i>
1. Available Base Funding <i>*figures listed are baseline balances minus projected development costs for the PMC LJ CMS Replacement project</i>	12000	11555	10724	8766	8077	12000
2. Additional Appropriations <i>*CTEF base fee increasing in 11/2009; estimates</i>	0	300	300	300	300	1200
3. Other Funding Source: <i>*General Fund-budgets not determined yet; estimates included that entail our projected operating budgets over the next 4 years.</i>	3331	3897	4092	4296	4503	20119
4. Special Funds	0	<i>unknown</i>	<i>unknown</i>	<i>unknown</i>	<i>unknown</i>	<i>unknown</i>
5. Total Funding (*)	15331	15752	15116	13362	12880	33319

2. Funding Source

<i>Funding Source (\$000)</i>			
<i>Name of Funding Source</i>	<i>Available Base</i>	<i>New Appropriations Request</i>	<i>Total</i>
1. Local JCEF	5167		
2. CTEF	4415		
3. FTG	2325		
4. General Fund	<i>To Be Determined</i>		
5. Funding Source Total (*)	11907		

Section IV. Risk Assessment

A. Risk Summary

<i>Category</i>	<i>SCORE</i>	<i>Description</i>
1. Strategic	6	Aligns with Court and Statewide Enterprise Architecture, goals, objectives, policies, standards and IT strategic plan.
Comment:		
2. Management	6	Senior and intermediate management is involved in, and supports, the project. A steering committee/project team is in place.
Comment:		
3. Operational	5	Adverse effects on current operations are unlikely or contingency plans are in place. Supports Agency Performance Measures.
Comment:		
4. Scope and Requirements	4	Scope and requirements are, or will be, clearly defined and approved. Effect on business processes has been assessed.
Comment:		
5. Technologies Competency	7	Agency has available, or will secure appropriate skills to implement the project. Organizational readiness has been assessed.
Comment:		
6. Infrastructure Dependencies	5	All key elements are included to fully implement the project. No additional costs are anticipated to deliver benefits.
<p>Comment: As part of our scope and framework phase, PMC contracted with the selected vendor to complete a risk assessment. Our overall risk is medium as this is a large project and there are many unknowns since the supplemental gap analysis has not taken place. However, because we are collaborating with the AOC and other LJ courts, our long term sustainability is increased and our risk is decreased. Our Risk Plan is included as Appendix F.</p>		

B. Risk Evaluation

1. Strategic

The project aligns with Agency and Statewide Enterprise Architecture, goals, objectives, policies, standards and IT strategic plan.

<i>Score 1 Rating Point for a "Yes" Answer</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No*</i>
1. Does this project directly accomplish a strategic goal as outlined in your agency IT strategic plan?	<u>Yes</u>	
2. Is there a written assessment of short-term and long-term effects the project will have on operations?	<u>Yes</u>	
3. Is the project technology already in place in your agency so that IT/user training is minimized?	<u>Yes</u>	
4. Have you evaluated implementations of this technology in other States, agencies or businesses?	<u>Yes</u>	
5. Will this project accommodate business operations, without additional upgrades, for the next 3-5 years?	<u>Yes*</u>	
6. Will the project meet or exceed statewide Enterprise Architecture standards?	<u>Yes</u>	

Total Rating Points	6
----------------------------	----------

*Explain all "No" Responses:

*The vendor contract stipulates that normal software upgrades be made available by the software provider. Neither AOC nor the vendor has control over legislative changes that necessitate software changes. The software is available to all Arizona courts without additional license charges.

2. Management

Senior and intermediate management is involved in, and supports, the project. A steering committee/project team is in place.

<i>Score 1 Rating Point for a "Yes" Answer</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No*</i>
1. Are Agency Performance Measures supported by the project?	<u>Yes</u>	
2. Does this project have a senior management sponsor?	<u>Yes</u>	
3. Has an IT Steering Committee been formed, comprised of senior management, business area experts and technical personnel?	<u>Yes</u>	
4. Are project planning and project management practices in place?	<u>Yes</u>	
5. Are managers prepared to commit user time necessary for training?	<u>Yes</u>	
6. Has the designated Project Manager successfully implemented projects of this scope in the past?	<u>Yes</u>	
Total Rating Points		6

*Explain all "No" Responses:

3. Operational

Adverse effects on current operations are unlikely or contingency plans are in place. The project supports Agency Performance Measures.

<i>Score 1 Rating Point for a "Yes" Answer</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No*</i>
1. Can technical personnel continue maintenance/support and implement the project concurrently?	<u>Yes</u>	
2. Has, or will, a user acceptance-testing plan been devised and approved by user departments?	<u>Yes</u>	
3. Has the project's effect on current operations been thoroughly assessed?	<u>Yes</u>	
4. Does the system affect one location only? If not, is a statewide roll-out plan in place?	<u>Yes</u>	
5. Has a disaster recovery or contingency plan been devised in the event of project failure or delayed implementation?	<u>Yes*</u>	

Total Rating Points	5
---------------------	---

*PMC is currently working on updating their Disaster Recovery (DR) SunGard contract. As the court is upgrading its infrastructure during this project, all of the new hardware will have to be added on to the DR contract. PMC will host a full copy of production and the legacy system will be available in the event the conversion is not completed in time for the new system implementation. A 'mock implementation' has been included as part of the pre-implementation planning steps.

4. Scope and Requirements

Scope and requirements are, or will be, clearly defined and approved. Effect on business processes has been assessed.

<i>Score 1 Rating Point for each "Yes" answer</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No*</i>
1. Have Management and the Project Team approved a Requirements Document?		<u>No</u>
2. Have deliverables been clearly identified and appropriately scheduled?		<u>No</u>
3. Have critical success factors been identified and agreed to by user departments and the Project Team?	<u>Yes</u>	
4. Is there a Change Management process in place?	<u>Yes</u>	
5. Have "In Scope" and "Out of Scope" items been identified and agreed to by all stakeholders?		<u>No</u>
6. Have technical personnel documented core business processes?	<u>Yes</u>	
7. Have all data conversion/data entry tasks been defined and time allocated in the implementation plan?	<u>Yes</u>	

Total Rating Points	4
---------------------	---

The Supplemental Gap requirements doc for the large volume court has not been completed; however, the baseline LJ product requirements have been defined and will be completed before the start of the supplemental gap session for large volume courts.

5. Technology Competency

Agency has available, or will secure, appropriate skills to implement the project. Organizational readiness has been assessed.

<i>Score 1 Rating Point for each "Yes" answer</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No*</i>
1. Do project technical personnel possess required skills?	<u>Yes</u>	
2. Has adequate training been included for both users and technical personnel?	<u>Yes</u>	
3. Have technical personnel developed other systems using the proposed platform/language?	<u>Yes</u>	
4. Are technical personnel fully versed in core business operations?	<u>Yes</u>	
5. Do all technical personnel possess sufficient experience developing systems using the proposed technology?	<u>Yes</u>	
6. If a vendor is involved, is the vendor financially stable and well established?	<u>Yes</u>	
7. Has the assigned project team delivered projects of similar complexity on time and on budget, in the past?	<u>Yes*</u>	

Total Rating Points	7
---------------------	---

The vendor employs knowledgeable personnel having experience delivering successful projects of similar, or greater, complexity on time and within budget constraints. AOC and PMC personnel assigned to this project have participated in a wide range of projects having similar requirements and project deliverables, including the previous CMS development/rollout and the FARE program.

6. Infrastructure Dependencies

All key elements are included to fully implement the project. No additional costs are anticipated to deliver benefits.

<i>Score 1 Rating Point for each "Yes" answer</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No*</i>
1. Will the project deliver full functionality without future upgrades and additional development cost?	<u>Yes*</u>	
2. Is all existing technology compatible with the proposed system?	<u>Yes</u>	
3. Have all environmental, electrical and security concerns been studied and addressed in the plan?	<u>Yes</u>	
4. Is key hardware/software available within the project plan constraints?	<u>Yes</u>	
5. If key services will be replaced, has the impact on users been evaluated, and have users agreed to the changes?	<u>Yes</u>	
6. Have all current and future operating costs related to the project been included in the JPIJ?		<u>No</u>
Total Rating Points	5	

* It currently unknown what additional supplemental gap items will be needed to ensure the application is sufficient for the large volume LJ Courts. PMC has made a commitment to its stakeholders and users that the application will not be deployed unless it meets current functionality used in the legacy CMS today.

* On-Going operating costs have not been factored into to this JPIJ. We are still working with the vendor on assessing these on-going operational costs.

7. Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity Planning

<i>Score 1 Rating Point for a "Yes" Answer</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No*</i>
1. Are Agency Data and Data Flows well understood and documented?	<u>Yes</u>	
2. Are adequate system backups regularly scheduled and carried out consistently?	<u>Yes</u>	
3. Are system backup and restore processes adequate and fully functional?	<u>Yes</u>	
4. Are system backup storage media stored in a secure location off site?	<u>Yes</u>	
5. Are system backup and restore procedures tested and verified on a regular basis?	<u>Yes</u>	
6. Is there a backup or alternate process to restore telecommunications in the event of a failure?	<u>Yes</u>	
7. Has your agency established an alternate site for emergency operations?	<u>Yes</u>	
8. Is there an IT Disaster Recovery Plan in place?	<u>Yes</u>	
9. Have manual workarounds been established for Critical Business Functions related applications, data, infrastructure, and staff?	<u>Yes</u>	
10. Has your agency emergency communications plan been tested and verified on a regular basis?	<u>Yes</u>	

Total Rating Points	10
---------------------	----

Section V. Project Approvals

Project Approvals

Project Title: PMC LJCMS Replacement Project

<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Approval Signature and Title</i>	<i>Date</i>
Chief Presiding Judge:	Roxanne K. Song Ong	
Clerk of Court/Executive Court Administrator:	Doug Pilcher	
Information Systems Officer/Project Manager	Jennifer Gilbertson	
Assistant Presiding Judge/Project Sponsor	Eric Jeffery	

Appendices

A. Itemized List with Costs

B. Connectivity Diagram

C. Project Schedule

D. Project Work Plan

E. Communication Plan

F. Risk Plan

G. Implementation Strategy

H. PMC Integration/data flows document

Glossary

- **ACAP** – Arizona Court Automation Process
- **Acceptance Test Plan (ATP)** – Document that details the plan for acceptance testing, how deficiencies will be tracked and defined, and the criteria for system acceptance. The Acceptance Test Plan (ATP) is an **AmCad Team** Deliverable.
- **AiCMS** – AmCad Integrated Case Management System
- **AZiCMS** – Arizona Integrated Case Management System, application name being used by LJ courts
- **AZ AOC** – Arizona Administrative Office of the Courts
- **CCB** – Change Control Board
- **CTEF**-Court Technology Enhancement Fund
- **Data Conversion Services** - Services that include developing a data conversion plan, extracting data from the legacy system, performing testing and exception reporting, and importing valid data into the new system.
- **FTG**-Fill the Gap fund
- **GJ** – General Jurisdiction
- **JAD** – Joint Application Design. Refers to joint workshops held to perform detailed analysis and screen design.
- **JCEF**-Judicial Collections Enforcement Fund
- **JPIJ**- Judicial Project Investment Justification
- **LJ** – Limited Jurisdiction
- **LJ AJACS** – Limited Jurisdiction Arizona Judicial Automated Case System (referred to in older AmCad documentation; new name is AZiCMS for the LG CMS application).
- **LJ CMS** – Limited Jurisdiction Case Management System
- **MAS** – Minimum Accounting Standards
- **Other large volume LJ courts** – Tucson, Scottsdale, and Mesa Municipal Courts
- **PMC** – Phoenix Municipal Court (PMC)
- **Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM)** – A document that identifies how requirements are related to software development deliverables and to other requirements and shows the related

requirements and the forward and backward lineage to project deliverables.

- **Supplemental System Design Document (SSDD)** – Document that details the exact requirements, business rules, and screen design of the new, proposed system.
- **Supplemental System Requirements Specification (SSRS)** – Detailed requirements listing for the proposed system; every system requirement must be delivered, and demonstrated to be functional prior to system acceptance. Phoenix Municipal Court LJCMS Large Volume Court Project Work Plan: Emphasis Phoenix Municipal Court
- **Training Documentation** – Training materials are a set of instructions and “lab exercises” for the purposes of training end users that will also be helpful as a User’s Guide.
- **Training Plan** – Document that details the plan for training PMC staff on AZICMS

Document Information

Title:	Judicial Project Investment Justification Version 1.0
Originator:	Phoenix Municipal Court Jennifer Gilbertson, Information Systems Officer
Date:	October 2009