

PROJECT ANALYSIS WORKSHEET
EDMS WORKGROUP ANALYSIS
10/3/2002

EXPLANATION

This worksheet is an analysis tool. It was developed to assess the factors to consider when determining whether automation of a selected court project is a candidate for some degree of coordination. The responses are subjective and the scores are not definitive but indicative.

It is meant to be used in conjunction with the "Project Analysis User" form which allows a proposer of a project to record a general explanation of the proposed project.

NOTE: The actual solution is not determined in this worksheet. Just the analysis of whether a there is potential for a coordinated solution or approach.

DEFINITIONS

"Enterprise Leveraged Automation" is defined as a business process solution using technology to consolidate some or all functions ranging from centralized operation sites to standardized policies and processes to a coordinated purchasing arrangement. .

"Project" is intended to be generic and could refer to an EDMS, jury, video conferencing, e-filing "project", or a collections or payment processing function.

CRITERIA:

- 1 COST OF OWNERSHIP
- 2 BENEFIT TO PUBLIC AND JUDICIARY
- 3 COMMONALITY OF GOALS
- 4 SYSTEM ACCESSIBILITY
- 5 COMPETENCY
- 6 INTEGRATION
- 7 OTHER FACTORS

INSTRUCTIONS: Scoring the Responses:

Respond to each statement below on a scale of 0 through 5, where 5=Very Strongly Agree with statement, 4=Agree Considerably with statement, 3=Agree with statement, 2=Somewhat Agree with statement, 1=Very Minor Agreement with statement, and 0=Not Applicable

Degrees of Coordination:

The higher the score, the more the project leans towards the highest degree of coordination. The degrees of coordination are as follows:

Centralized Data Centralized Process

Centralized Data Local Process

Standardization Efforts

Local Data Local Process (opportunistic)

1 COST OF OWNERSHIP

SCORE

a Return on Investment

There is a quicker return on investment if the project is leveraged than if several local courts implemented individual solutions.

b Availability of state, federal, third party funding

State, Federal funding for integration, standardization projects is available to courts. By responding with a 5, 90% of project is funded with state/3rd party sources; 4=50% with state/3rd party sources; 3=25%-50%; 2=<25%; 1<=10%; 0=only local funds are being used.

c Economies of scale can be realized by leveraging implementation.

Project could possibly build off existing or shared solutions, infrastructure, staff and/or process to achieve some economies of scale. (Cost of Project is ____ % of individual court's IS budget, including hardware, application software, and training.)

d Economies of scale can be realized by leveraging maintenance.

Project requires on-going hardware/software upgrades, maintenance contracts and support. (note:Roughly 75% of IS budget is spent maintaining existing systems.)

e Court staff required to support the develop/support project.

Additional FTE (technical, administrative) and/or consulting services required to operate, modify and maintain proposed project.

f Stable vendors or vendor solutions exist to address the implementation.

There are vendors with proven solutions to fit this project's specifications who can provide the staffing, the application and the interface, saving the court the associated development/staffing costs.

TOTAL

0

2 BENEFIT TO PUBLIC AND JUDICIARY

a The project scope offers greater or improved services to the public.

This project implements remote electronic services for the public (i.e. web access, IVR, electronic filing).

b The project offers improved public safety through greater timeliness and accessibility of information.

This project requires integration into the court's centralized repository of civil/criminal information from all courts, offering the public immediate access of reliable information.

c This project supports a legal or judicial mandate for a technical solution.

There are technical solutions for the proposed project (such as electronic data or juror management) that support the court process enhancement initiatives for Arizona's courts.

d This project supports the public's view of the judiciary as a single entity.

There is an opportunity for this project to create or adhere to standardized forms or business processes of other courts statewide to provide uniformity to the public.

e "Leveraging" will provide more jurisdictions an ability to offer a higher level of service.

This project lends itself to centralizing processes or information that can provide advanced service offerings to the public or to the court that are not available or not affordable at the local level.

TOTAL

0

3 COMMONALITY OF GOALS

a The project is aligned with the IT Strategic Plan.

The proposed project has strategic agenda components that align with the vision of the Arizona Judiciary.

b Indications are that many jurisdictions will be implementing a similar project in the next three years.

Based on their 3-year strategic plans, other jurisdictions will need the same project services/solutions. This allows for the leveraging of investment costs, technical skills if standardization of project services/solution occurs.

c There is an existing infrastructure or project in place which is scalable.

One court may have a solution successfully implemented into which other courts could integrate, such as a data repository or a jury/electronic management, to avoid replicating costs of identical systems and processes.

d Other jurisdictions are ready to accept a new solution.

Other jurisdictions may have tried the proposed project solution, without success, and are looking for another, more enhanced or more efficient solution. There may be opportunity for leveraging.

e The project would support a framework to develop shared processes and best practices.

The project can leverage current standards, reusable components or cooperative group efforts to encourage efficiencies and effectiveness of court information, processes and practices.

f There is consensus and support for centralization.

Local and regional agreements for centralized processes exist, or there is support on a local and statewide level for some degree of centralization of data and processes.

TOTAL

0

4 SYSTEM ACCESSIBILITY

- | |
|--|
| a Data needs to be shared at the state/public/external agency level (i.e. beyond local) |
| The project will maintain court business information that can be standardized, shared and accessed through the various technology mediums or access methods. |
- | |
|--|
| b Optimum accessibility is 24 hours per day/7 days per week. |
| The project requires high availability of the right information to the courts, the public and other agencies beyond normal business hours. |
- | |
|--|
| c System redundancy and immediate disaster recovery ability is required. |
| This project's data or documents are business critical and require high availability and a high level of security and replication. |
- | |
|--|
| d Standard data descriptions, codes and common vocabulary are critical. |
| The proposed project can adopt existing standards for court data descriptions, codes and common vocabulary to provide for consistency and accessibility of information to other courts, the public and other agencies. |
- | |
|--|
| e Information can be stored in an off-site, but local processing is critical. |
| Data generated from project can be stored/archived off-site, but requires immediate access for local processing. |

TOTAL

0

5 COMPETENCY

- | |
|--|
| a The project will likely require a high level of technical competency to support it. |
| Highly-skilled technical staff or consultants would need to be added to operate, maintain and troubleshoot the solution after implementation of the project. |
- | |
|---|
| b Technical support of the project is complex and/or resource intensive. |
| The project solution requires constant and extensive administrative, technical support and maintenance from existing staff and/or puts a strain on the court's hardware or network bandwidth. |
- | |
|---|
| c Statewide technical expertise is limited. |
| The expertise required to implement and service the project is specialized and limited due to the "leading edge" or complex nature of the solution. |
- | |
|---|
| d Technical competency or skill set is likely to be concentrated and not widespread. |
| The skill set required for this project is most likely to be found in the information technology marketplace of the larger metropolitan areas of the state. |
- | |
|---|
| e A high level of competency is required to use the process or solution. |
| The users of the proposed project's process and solution would need to have either past experience in this process or solution, or a high technical aptitude to perform their duties. |

TOTAL

0

6 INTEGRATION

a Consolidation provides for less complexity in an information resource sharing environment.

The project can avoid the pitfalls incompatible database structures, poor quality and integrity of data and processes and business rules that hinder data collection, manipulation and transmission by enabling some consolidation of processes.

b The implementation will require redundant data entry.

The project lends itself to consolidating data and processes which would offer the courts a single point of entry and eliminate redundant, incomplete or unorganized data.

c Integration standards exist and could be leveraged.

Integration will reduce the complexity or number of network interfaces required for the proposed project processes.

d Data transfers to/from existing systems are needed.

Interfaces to existing systems are required for this project to move the data to and from a central data repository.

e Statewide data integration reduces redundant data entry across all affected entities.

The project can support data flows between local agencies and with state agencies, thus reducing the need for agencies to manually enter data into their own systems.

TOTAL

0

7 OTHER FACTORS

a Implementation timeframe is not critical.

The project is in its infancy and will allow for time to explore partnership opportunities with other courts pursuing similar projects.

b Centralized model has been done successfully elsewhere.

Other jurisdictions, outside Arizona, have successfully implemented a similar project (e.g. outsourcing or state-hosted centralization for projects like jury, centralized citation processing, EDMS).

c Routine function(s) can be outsourced.

There are opportunities in this proposed project to hand off routine functions that could permit the limited IT and administrative staff to focus on core business issues.

d The technology and business value is stable and proven.

The proposed project makes good business sense and the technology solution is mature and consists of standardized and widely-accepted technical components.

TOTAL 0

TOTAL POINTS (Highest Possible Score =180): 0

Project lends itself to Centralized Data Centralized Processes 0

Project lends itself to Centralized Data Localized Processes 0

Project lends itself to Standardization Efforts 0