King County

Department of Judicial Administration

Electronic Court Records (ECR)

APPENDIX 8:

Project Evaluation Model

presented by SMG/Columbia Consulting

January 1998

Paul Sherfey
Director and Superior Court Clerk

Roger Winters
Electronic Court Records Manager

This document was developed under grant number SJI-96-06D-A-220 from the State Justice Institute. The points of view expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the State Justice Institute.

SJI State Justice Institute

Project Evaluation Model

This document includes materials provided by the State Justice Institute (SJI) supported consulting firm advising the King County Department of Judicial Administration on how best to provide for ongoing tactical and strategic evaluation of the Electronic Court Records (ECR) project. Included as Attachment 2 is a Project Review Instrument, a form which can be used for project evaluation by a Quality Assurance Reviewer at key points in a project's development.

Introduction and Overview 4
Purpose of Project Evaluation 4
Approach to Project Evaluation 4
Project Life Cycle 4
Tactical v. Strategic Perspectives 5
Project Complexity 7
Risk Management Focus 8
Project Evaluation Process 8
Role and Responsibilities of the Project Evaluator 8
Appointment of Quality Assurance Reviewer 8
Relationship with ECR Implementation Project Team 9
Baselines for Project Evaluation 9
Tactical Evaluation 9
Strategic Evaluation 10
Inputs to Project Evaluation Process 10
Project Evaluation Cycle 11
Overview of Evaluation Process 11
Evaluation Cycle Activities 11
Project Review Process 11
Project Review Instrument 11
Project Review Schedule Guidelines 12
Initial Project Reviews 13
Project Review Tasks 13
Interview Guidelines 14
Project Evaluation Deliverables 15
Estimated Resource Requirements 15
ATTACHMENT 1 16
Project Review Topics 16

ATTACHMENT 2 21
Project Review Instrument.....21

Introduction and Overview

This first section of this document outlines the conceptual framework of the evaluation model for the ECR Implementation Project. Subsequent sections describe procedures for assessing the project based on the framework.

Purpose of Project Evaluation

Project evaluation is a central element of risk management for information technology and process redesign projects. These evaluations are intended to identify the main risks associated with the project so they may be avoided or the impacts mitigated. In particular, periodic assessments of the ECR project should be carried out to address the following questions regarding the project:

- Should the Department of Judicial Administration continue to carry out the project?
- Are changes required to ensure the success of the project?

By periodically "stepping back" from the details of the project and considering these fundamental issues, the Department can minimize the risk that the ECR Project is misdirected. Project evaluations may lead to changes in the ECR Project's objectives, scope, approach, work plan, schedule, or other aspects of the plan.

Please note that this type of approach to project evaluation is more basic than the typical "compliance-oriented" assessment. Compliance-oriented reviews focus on contract administration, execution of work plans, financial controls, and so forth. This approach, while valuable, does not adequately consider whether a project should be undertaken or whether it is likely to achieve the intended business results.

Approach to Project Evaluation

The approach to evaluating the ECR Project proposed here is based on the following concepts:

- Phases of the project life cycle.
- "Strategic" and "tactical" perspectives.
- Project complexity.
- Risk management orientation.

The impact of these concepts on project assessment is discussed in the following sections.

Project Life Cycle

Project evaluation differs depending on where in the life cycle the project is assessed. The "project life cycle" is variously described, but typically includes the following phases:

1. Vision building.
2. Project planning.
3. Design.
4. Development and/or procurement.
5. Implementation / integration.
6. Conversion.
7. Post-implementation support and modifications.
8. Ongoing operation and maintenance.

As one proceeds through a project life cycle the ability to control outcomes *decreases*. This is due to the fact that as scope and design decisions are made, as funds are expended, and as time passes, material changes in direction require more "rework" to implement. It is very important that during the initial stages of a project particular attention be given to ensuring that the basic decisions concerning objectives, scope, and approach are well founded. The focus of evaluation is prospective, i.e., it considers whether future activities are appropriate and likely to be successful.

As a project proceeds into the more substantive, structured phases of the life cycle, project evaluation becomes more "retrospective", i.e., on whether activities completed were appropriate and successful. Compliance-oriented assessments are more important in these later phases of the life cycle.

The ECR Implementation Project is now in the planning phase. The focus of project evaluation, therefore, must be on ensuring that the project work plan is achievable, reflects a realistic assessment of the constraints facing the Department, and promises to meet the business objectives of the Superior Court, DJA, and related agencies and users.

Tactical v. Strategic Perspectives

The "strategic perspective" focuses on long term objectives such as why the project is being carried out and what is being undertaken. The "tactical perspective" focuses on planned versus actual results.

Prior to 1997, the ECR initiative was in a preliminary phase focused on developing a vision and building support among interested parties. During 1997, the ECR project team focused on defining the scope for the project. A work program for implementing the envisioned system and related business processes is being finalized at this time.

In the planning phase, the focus of project evaluation is on the appropriateness of the plans, not implementation. The "appropriateness of project plans" can best be assessed in terms of the objectives of the project, strategically and tactically:

Strategic Perspective:

- Have strategic objectives been defined?

- Are the defined objectives consistent with business constraints, including the capacity of the organization to undertake the necessary changes?
- Are the defined objectives consistent with the strategic objectives of the organization?
- Do the strategic objectives address fundamental challenges facing the organization?
- What are the fundamental barriers to achieving the objectives?

Tactical Perspective:

- Has a realistic project work program been developed?
- If executed successfully, does it appear that the work program will produce the desired results?
- Does the organization have the capacity to carry out the defined work program?
- Have the major risks been addressed with specific action steps in the work program?
- Have competent individuals and teams been put in place to direct and manage the project?

As the project enters the next phase of the project, implementation of the "core" ECR system, the focus of project evaluation should change. The next phase of the project is more substantive; both project management and project evaluation must be more structured. The type of project evaluation questions which may be asked include:

Strategic Perspective:

- Have the strategic objectives of the project changed? If so, are they clearly defined?
- Do the strategic objectives remain achievable?
- Has the business strategy of the organization or its environment changed, indicating the need to modify the objectives or plans for the project?
- What are the major obstacles to the success of the project? Are these addressed by tasks in the project work plan?
- Can DJA continue to attract adequate funding?

Tactical Perspective:

- Is the project proceeding in accordance with the project work plan:
    - On budget?
    - On schedule?
    - Resourcing?

- Are project management mechanisms in place and effective for:
  - Contract administration?
  - Budget management?
  - Deliverable/schedule tracking?
  - Issue tracking?
  - Quality control?
- Do deliverables meet specifications?
- Does the system installed meet the performance and reliability requirements?
- What are the major issues the project is facing? What actions will resolve these issues?

DJA plans to develop the full ECR system in a series of phases over the next few years. This suggests that the work plans for the project will be revisited and revised during its course. This will be necessary in order to reflect the interim achievements (and problems) of the ECR Implementation Project as well as changing circumstances and requirements. In other words, project evaluation will need to assess both planning and execution during the course of the project.

Project Complexity

Another consideration which affects the approach to project assessment is complexity in the project plan when there are more than one distinct subproject, as is the case in the ECR Project.

The ECR Project has several distinct subprojects. These include the core project (i.e., technical architecture and standards development, scope definition, work plan development, business case development), the microfilm replacement project, and stakeholder involvement activities, Criminal Case Demonstrations, policy and rules review, and more.

Further, the ECR Project is part of a broader initiative to “reengineer” court system operations. There are other current or planned projects at the local, county, and state-wide levels which may affect the ECR Implementation Project.

The ECR Implementation Project subprojects include microfilm replacement scanning, stakeholder involvement, a policy and legal issue review, plus the core system implementation. The ECR Implementation Project also must be developed in light of the CMIS project, JIS initiatives, implementation of the digital signature law, and the Law, Safety, and Justice Integration Initiative.

Complex projects with close connections to other separately managed projects are more difficult to manage and evaluate. The success of the project is influenced by events outside the control of the Department. Project evaluation in this environment must take note of external issues and actions affecting success.

Risk Management Focus

The emphasis of project evaluation is risk management. Specific (strategic or tactical) risks should be identified and strategies implemented to mitigate them.

Project evaluation should be part of a broader risk management strategy. Aspects of risk management which are beyond the scope of project evaluation include financial controls and legal / contractual protections.

DJA has several risk management strategies in place at this time. Those that are tactical in nature include project status reports, regular meetings of the Steering Committee, expenditure and budget controls, etc.

DJA has also developed mechanisms to help minimize strategic risks to the ECR Implementation Project. These include involvement in state-wide committees developing rules and statutes affecting electronic records and King County committees responsible for information technology standards and funding.

The project evaluator should assess the internal controls that DJA has implemented to manage project risks. To the extent, the controls are appropriate and being applied, the extent of detailed analysis to evaluate tactical and strategic risks can be reduced. If this is not the case, more effort will be required to assess risks and develop appropriate recommendations.

Project Evaluation Process

This section describes a proposed process for evaluating the ECR Implementation Project, based on the approach described above. This independent project evaluation process does not obviate the necessity for DJA to conduct internal assessments of the ECR Implementation Project.

Role and Responsibilities of the Project Evaluator

Appointment of Quality Assurance Reviewer

In order to carry out a systematic program of project evaluation, DJA should appoint an independent “Quality Assurance (QA) Reviewer”. The QA Reviewer should be selected by and report to the Project Sponsor (i.e., the Director of the Department of Judicial Administration). The QA Reviewer will be responsible for assessing the project and periodically presenting findings and recommendations.

The QA Reviewer should have the following capabilities, qualifications, and qualities:

- Understanding of information technology generally and ECR-related technologies specifically.
- Knowledge of and experience in large-scale systems integration projects within the public sector.
- Familiarity with the court and justice system environment.

- Understanding of operations improvement and business process redesign.
- Experience conducting independent assessments of similar projects.
- Independence and objectivity.

It may not be possible to identify a single individual with all of the requisite skills demanded by this role. In this circumstance, other individuals with specific abilities or experience may assist the QA Reviewer. The QA Reviewer must be free of all real or perceived conflicts-of-interest and biases.

In addition to presenting the QA findings and recommendations to the Project Sponsor, the reviewer may be directed to present these findings to a variety of other stakeholder groups such as the ECR Steering Committee, the Advisory Committee, etc.

Relationship with ECR Implementation Project Team

To be effective, the QA Reviewer must be in regular contact with the ECR project team. This would include reviewing deliverables and status reports, attending selected meetings, informal discussions with project team members, etc.

The QA Reviewer should document issues of concern and recommendations for discussion with the Project Manager or other project personnel. Strategies for resolving issues should be developed co-operatively with the project team. Only when agreement is not reached and where the issues are not resolved, should these matters be "escalated" to the Project Sponsor.

The QA Reviewer will periodically prepare comprehensive assessments of the project. The findings and recommendations arising out of this activity should be reviewed informally with the Project Manager before being finalized. This provides an opportunity to confirm the facts underpinning the assessment. In addition, this will allow the Project Manager to respond to the points raised in a timely fashion.

Baselines for Project Evaluation

Tactical Evaluation

The purpose of tactical evaluation is to assess the extent to which the project work program for the current phase of the project is being followed. The baseline information required for tactical evaluation is:

- A clearly defined statement of the scope of the current phase of the project.
- Defined deliverables for the current phase of the project.
- A detailed work plan for the project that identifies project tasks and resource assignments.
- A schedule for the work plan which defines interim and final milestones for the current phase of the project.

- An expenditure plan which describes the plans for expending the budget for the current phase of the project.

For each phase of the project, the ECR project team should document this baseline information. If, at a future point, several subprojects are conducted concurrently, then this information must be defined for each.

Strategic Evaluation

The baseline evaluating the ECR Implementation Project from a strategic perspective consists of the following:

- A description of vision for the full ECR system. This is provided by the "Design Statement" at this time.
- An analysis of the costs and benefits, financial and non-financial, of the ECR system.
- A summary plan for implementing the complete system in a series of phases over several years.

At this time, DJA has not documented an analysis of the expected costs and benefits associated with the ECR Implementation Project. In addition to assisting project evaluation, this analysis would assist DJA justify continued funding of the project.

Inputs to Project Evaluation Process

The QA Reviewer must have access to the "baseline" information described above. In addition, the QA Reviewer should receive, on an ongoing basis, full access to all project management documentation, including:

- Work plans.
- Project status reports.
- Project expenditure tracking information.
- Issue papers.
- Project correspondence.

The QA Reviewer should also have access to all interim and final work products, including documents, software, test results and so forth.

The QA Reviewer also must regularly meet with the Project Sponsor, Project Manager, project team leaders and other assigned personnel, vendor personnel, and any other individuals assigned to the ECR Implementation Project.

Project Evaluation Cycle

Overview of Evaluation Process

Project evaluation includes two types of activities. The first is ongoing liaison with the Project Manager and other members of the project team. This allows the QA Reviewer to be proactive in identifying and seeking resolution of potential problems in a co-operative manner. Furthermore, by monitoring the project on an ongoing basis, periodic assessments can be conducted efficiently and effectively.

The other type of project evaluation activity the QA Reviewer will perform is preparation of comprehensive assessments of the ECR Implementation Project at scheduled points during the project. At each review point, the QA Reviewer should evaluate the achievements during the previous period and the plans for the subsequent one.

Evaluation Cycle Activities

During each period between project reviews, the following cycle will be completed:

- In consultation with the Project Sponsor and Project Manager schedule future project reviews (see "Project Review Schedule Guidelines" below).
- Adapt the review instrument (see Attachment 2) to reflect the phase of the project, previous evaluation findings, and project plans for the period.
- Monitor project progress and review work products during the evaluation period.
- Two weeks before the scheduled review, arrange interviews and other project review activities (see "Project Review Process" below).
- Conduct a review of the ECR Implementation Project.
- Document results and present findings and recommendations (see "Project Evaluation Deliverables" below).

After each project review, the schedule of future reviews may need to be modified.

Project Review Process

This section describes the work activities required to complete a periodic project review.

Project Review Instrument

As discussed previously, the project review should address both strategic and tactical factors. For reference, a summary of strategic and tactical factors to be considered is presented at Attachment 1.

When conducting a project review, the QA Reviewer will conduct a number of interviews, review project management data, and review work products during the

period. The purpose of these activities is to identify risks to the ECR Implementation Project, both strategic and tactical.

A "Project Review Instrument" has been developed and is included at Attachment 2. This form is intended to be used to focus interviews and help identify risks associated with the project.

Several points should be made regarding the review instrument. These are:

1. The form should be used as a guide for interviews undertaken as part of the project review (see "Interview Guidelines").
2. The draft form should be revised at the beginning of each review period to include any questions arising from the specific scope of the current phase of the project.
3. The draft form should be revised at the end of the project review to include specific questions related to risks identified, i.e., include "follow up" points for the subsequent project review.
4. Strategic and tactical risks identified should be documented in the final section of the form. Recommendations for managing these risks should be documented in this section.

Please note that the review instrument, while structured, is intended to be a "living document," i.e., one that changes to reflect the phase of the project and the results achieved.

Also, note that completion of the review instrument is a mechanism for documenting conclusions drawn from the review process. Business judgement is required to draw appropriate conclusions and prepare recommendation. That is, project evaluation is not a mechanical, "fill-in-the-blank" procedure.

Project Review Schedule Guidelines

Project reviews must be conducted regularly to minimize tactical and strategic risks. However, project evaluation should not interfere with the progress of the project. The following guidelines should be applied to determine when to schedule project evaluation reviews:

- Reviews of the ECR Implementation Project, to the extent practical, should be scheduled to coincide with major milestones in the work plan for the current phase.
- The ECR Implementation Project should be evaluated before decisions involving significant expenditures or contractual commitments.
- Reviews should be conducted before formally accepting major deliverables.
- Reviews should be conducted before any implementing any system and/or work flow changes with significant impacts on Court or DJA operations.

- Reviews should be conducted before any decision to materially change the scope of the current phase of the project.
- A formal evaluation should be carried before any decision to significantly change the overall scope of the ECR Implementation Project, the full ECR system, or the phasing of the project.
- A full evaluation of the project should be carried out at least every three months.
- Evaluations should be conducted if significant problems are identified in "on time, on budget" execution of the project.
- An assessment should be conducted if external events are identified which are of significant concern to the Project Sponsor, the Presiding Judge, or the Project Manager.

Initial Project Reviews

The major project objective for January - September 1998 is to implement a "core" ECR system. This scope of work includes two points were major decisions will clearly need to be made. The first will be the selection of a vendor to implement the core ECR system. DJA should evaluate the ECR Implementation Project after the procurement process has been completed and before entering any contracts.

The second major milestone when the ECR Implementation Project should be assessed is implementation of the core system later in the 1998. DJA should review the project before implementing the system.

Other project reviews during and after this period should be scheduled in keeping with the general guidelines.

Project Review Tasks

1. Preparation by ECR Project:
   1.1. Consolidate project documentation.
   1.2. Review and update internal assessment of project.

2. Preparation by QA Reviewer:
   2.1. Review tactical and strategic "baseline" documents.
   2.2. Review project management information for current assessment period (see "Inputs" section).
   2.3. Review preliminary work plan for subsequent period.
   2.4. Identify major work products scheduled to be completed:
      2.4.1. During current assessment period.
      2.4.2. During subsequent assessment period.
   2.5. Identify individuals whose input is required.

3. Preliminary Review:
   3.1. Interview project leadership (see "Interview Guidelines"):

3.1.1. Presiding Judge (or designated representative).
3.1.2. Project Sponsor.
3.1.3. Project Manager.
3.1.4. Superior Court Administrator.
3.1.5. Law, Safety, and Justice Business Area Committee representative.
3.1.6. ITS Liaison.
3.1.7. Selected Stakeholder Representatives.

3.2. Interview selected team members (see "Interview Guidelines"):
3.2.1. Team Leaders.
3.2.2. Technology Consultant.
3.2.3. Vendor Representative(s).

3.3. Conduct other interviews as determined in "Preparation" phase.
3.4. Review any work products not previously reviewed.

4. Issue Assessment / Additional Analyses:
4.1. Identify risks requiring further analysis:
4.1.1. Tactical risks.
4.1.2. Strategic risks.
4.2. Review risks with Project Manager.
4.3. Identify specific activities required to confirm and clarify nature and extent of risk.
4.4. Conduct additional analyses as required.

5. Reporting:
5.1. Draft project evaluation report.
5.2. Review with Project Manager and revise as appropriate.
5.3. Present project evaluation report to Project Sponsor.
5.4. Present project evaluation report to other stakeholders (e.g., ECR Steering Committee) as directed by the Project Sponsor.

6. Update "Review Instrument":
6.1. Findings of review.
6.2. Focus of subsequent phase of project.

Interview Guidelines

The Review Instrument includes a broad range of strategic and tactical issues to be considered when conducting interviews. Since these individuals have differing roles within the project, interviews should be focused as follows:

Person	Strategic	Tactical
Project Sponsor	✓	
Presiding Judge (or alternate)	✓	
Project Manager	✓	✓
Superior Court Administrator	✓	Project

		Coordination
Selected Stakeholders	✓	
Law, Safety, and Justice rep.	✓	Project Coordination
ITS Liaison	Technical Risk	✓
Team Leaders		✓
Technical Consultant	Technical Risk	✓
Vendor Leads		✓

The focus of interviews with other individuals interviewed should be defined based on their role in the ECR Implementation Project.

Project Evaluation Deliverables

The primary work product of project evaluation will be a report to the Project Sponsor presenting an analysis of the tactical and strategic risks to the ECR Implementation Project. This analysis should identify the specific risks to the project and provide recommendations for addressing each of them.

The QA Reviewer should also document any other observations, findings, or recommendations which, in their professional opinion, would be of value to DJA. The QA Reviewer should also express an opinion as to whether, based on the results of the project evaluation, the ECR Implementation Project should proceed.

In summary, the project evaluation report should include the following sections:

1. Tactical Assessment.
2. Strategic Assessment.
3. Other Findings and Recommendations.
4. Quality Assurance Opinion.

In addition, the QA Reviewer should provide ongoing feedback and advice to the Project Sponsor and Project Manager regarding the project.

Estimated Resource Requirements

The QA Reviewer's primary responsibility is to identify, not resolve, tactical and strategic risks to the ECR Implementation Project. Therefore, project reviews should not be time consuming or expensive undertakings. DJA should anticipate that each periodic review would require approximately 30 to 40 hours of effort by the QA Reviewer. The periodic review should be completed in about two elapsed weeks.

This estimate assumes that the QA Reviewer is monitoring the project on an ongoing basis. This monitoring activity includes regular discussions with the Project Manager, receiving progress reports, and reviewing work products. About 2 to 3 days effort per

month should be budgeted for this purpose.

ATTACHMENT 1

Project Review Topics

Project Review Topics

STRATEGIC PERSPECTIVE

1. Objectives
    - 1.1. DJA Objectives
        - 1.1.1. Operational
        - 1.1.2. Public Service
        - 1.1.3. Financial
    - 1.2. Superior Court Objectives
    - 1.3. Other Party Objectives

2. Project Justification
    - 2.1. Financial
    - 2.2. Public Service
    - 2.3. Business Operations
    - 2.4. Other

3. Risks to Achievement of Objectives
    - 3.1. Business Environment
    - 3.2. Organizational Constraints
    - 3.3. Legal / Policy Environment
    - 3.4. Strategic Priority v. Other Initiatives
        - 3.4.1. Superior Court
        - 3.4.2. DJA
        - 3.4.3. Law, Safety, and Justice Business Area Committee
        - 3.4.4. King County
    - 3.5. Technology
    - 3.6. Schedule
    - 3.7. Costs and Resources
    - 3.8. Vendor
    - 3.9. Operational Issues
    - 3.10. Other

Project Review Topics

4. Support of Stakeholders
    - 4.1. Judiciary
        - 4.1.1. King County Superior Court
        - 4.1.2. Washington State Court of Appeals
        - 4.1.3. Washington State Supreme Court
    - 4.2. DJA Management and Staff
    - 4.3. Superior Court Administration
    - 4.4. King County Justice System Agencies
    - 4.5. County Funding and Oversight Agencies
    - 4.6. Civil and Criminal Bar
    - 4.7. Other

5. Implementation Strategy
    - 5.1. Long-range Phasing of Implementation
    - 5.2. Plans for Current / Next Phases
    - 5.3. Funding Outlook
    - 5.4. Other

Project Review Topics

TACTICAL PERSPECTIVE

1. Work Program
    - 1.1. Definition of Scope of Phase
    - 1.2. Defined Goals/Outputs for Phase
    - 1.3. Defined Deliverables for Phase
    - 1.4. Work Plan
        - 1.4.1. Tasks
        - 1.4.2. Resource Assignments
    - 1.5. Phase Schedule

2. Project Management
    - 2.1. Plan Development
    - 2.2. Plan Implementation
        - 2.2.1. Progress Tracking
        - 2.2.2. Expenditure Control
        - 2.2.3. Quality Control
        - 2.2.4. Issue Tracking
        - 2.2.5. Acceptance Testing
        - 2.2.6. Contract Administration
        - 2.2.7. Other
    - 2.3. Quality Assurance

3. Oversight and Governance

4. Assessment of Major Deliverables
    - 4.1. Definition of Deliverable
        - 4.1.1. Specifications for Hardware or Software Product
        - 4.1.2. Description of Other Deliverables
    - 4.2. Acceptance Process
        - 4.2.1. Procedure

Project Review Topics

4.2.2. Test Results

4.3. Quality Control

5. Coordination with Related Projects / Initiatives

5.1. County

5.1.1. CMIS

5.1.2. LSJ Integration

5.1.3. Other

5.2. State

5.2.1. SCOMIS / JIS

5.2.2. Judgment and Statute Databases

5.2.3. Forms Development

5.2.4. State Policies on Electronic Records and Filings

5.2.5. Other

6. Risks to Execution of Work Plan

6.1. Legal / Policy Constraints

6.2. Scope Expansion

6.3. Technology Inadequacies

6.4. Schedule

6.5. Costs

6.6. Vendor

6.7. Operational

6.8. Human Resources

6.9. Other

7. Stakeholder Involvement in Phase Work Plan.

ATTACHMENT 2

Project Review Instrument

Review Topic	Findings
ECR Objectives *DJA has a variety of objectives for the ECR Implementation Project. These include operational, public service, and financial objectives. The Superior Court also has objectives for the project. Other stakeholders also have objectives for the ECR Implementation Project.*	
Are the objectives clearly defined and documented?	
Have the objectives changed during the previous period?	
Are the objectives realistic?	

Review Topic	Findings
Other questions (*document*): • • •	
Project Justification *The ECR system will provide a range of financial, service, operational and other benefits. These benefits have been used to justify the cost of acquiring, implementing, and operating the system.*	
Has an analysis been performed and documented which summarizes the costs and benefits of the ECR system?	
Has there been any material change in the estimates of costs and benefits during the preceding period?	
Does the ECR Implementation Project continue to be justified?	

Review Topic	Findings
Other questions (*document*): • • •	

Risk to Achievement of Objectives

There may be a number of risks to the realization of the objectives of the ECR Implementation Project. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

- *Organizational constraints.*
- *Legal or policy factors.*
- *Competing demands within the Superior Court, DJA, the Law, Safety and Justice community, King County government.*
- *Technological risks.*
- *Vendor-related risks.*
- *Operational pressures within DJA or the Court.*
- *Schedule constraints.*
- *"Market" acceptance.*

Review Topic	Findings
What are the main strategic risks?	
Have the strategic risks been documented?	
What risk management mechanisms have been implemented to: • Monitor risk. • Minimize risk. • Mitigate impact.	
Are project risks excessive?	

Review Topic	Findings
Other questions (*document*): • • •	

Support of Stakeholders

To be successful, the ECR Implementation Project must have the support of several important stakeholder groups, including the following:

- *King County Superior Court Judiciary.*
- *The Court of Appeals and Supreme Court.*
- *DJA management and staff.*
- *Superior Court Administration.*
- *Law, Safety, and Justice community.*
- *King County funding and oversight agencies.*
- *King County criminal and civil Bars.*
- *Other affected groups.*

Review Topic	Findings
Are stakeholders adequately informed about and involved in the project?	
Are there any additional stakeholder groups to consider?	
Do the stakeholders continue to support the ECR Implementation Project?	
What issues or concerns are stakeholders raising regarding the ECR Implementation Project?	
What changes in the scope, objectives, or work plans are required to address stakeholder concerns?	

Review Topic	Findings
Other (*document*): • • •	
Implementation Strategy *DJA intends to implement the ECR system in a series of phases over several years. This means that there must be an overall implementation strategy that defines the major phases of implementation. The implementation strategy should be reviewed to confirm:* · *The implementation strategy consistent with the objectives of the ECR Implementation Project.* · *The current and subsequent phases of the project are consistent with the long-range plans.* · *The ECR Implementation Project can continue to attract funding.*	
Has DJA documented a long-range strategy for phasing the development of the ECR system?	

Review Topic	Findings
Has the long-range plan changed materially since previous reviews?	
Are the detailed work plans for current and subsequent phases consistent with the long-range plan?	
Can the ECR Implementation Project continue to attract the funding required by the long-range plan?	
Does the implementation strategy need to be redefined because of funding limitations?	

Review Topic	Findings
Other (*document*): • • • •	

Review Topic	Findings

Work Program
 	
Each phase of the ECR Implementation must have a detailed work program. This work program provides the baseline for managing the phase and should include:
 	
• *Definition of Scope of Phase*
• *Defined Goals/Outputs for Phase*
• *Defined Deliverables for Phase*
• *Work Plan*
  ➢ *Tasks*
  ➢ *Resource Assignments*
• *Phase Schedule*
• *Expenditure Plan*	

Has a comprehensive work plan been prepared for each active phase of the project?	
Has DJA followed work plan during the period?	

Review Topic	**Findings**
Have there been significant variances from plan (scope, cost, schedule, other)?	
What remedial actions are required?	
Other (*document*): • • • •	

Review Topic	Findings
Project Management *Project management includes development (and modification) of detailed phase work programs and implementation of control procedures. Project management must be assessed in the following areas:* · *Project work plan development.* · *Progress tracking procedures.* · *Expenditure controls.* · *Quality controls.* · *Issue tracking and resolution.* · *Acceptance testing.* · *Contract administration.*	
Are project management techniques defined and operational?	

Review Topic	Findings
Is the project on time and on budget?	
What are the major "execution" risks at this point in time?	
Have there been any material changes in the phase work plan during the review period?	
Other (*document*): • • • • •	

Review Topic	Findings
Oversight and Governance *The project is overseen by several groups, including the ECR Steering Committee, the Executive Committee of the Court, DJA management, and the Law, Safety, and Justice Business Area Committee. The effectiveness of this oversight should be reviewed to determine if changes are required.*	
Have oversight groups effectively provided direction to the project team?	
Have oversight groups been effective in resolving issues and disputes?	
Other (*document*): • • •	

Review Topic	Findings
Assessment of Deliverables *The work program identifies the major deliverables for each phase of the project. The deliverables include both "tangible" deliverables (e.g., hardware and software) and "intangible" deliverables (e.g., revised procedure documents and work plans for subsequent phases). These deliverables should be reviewed by comparing the planned deliverable with the actual deliverable. The acceptance testing and quality control procedures used by the project team should also be reviewed.*	
Have all major deliverables expected during the review period been received?	
Were specifications or descriptions of planned deliverables documented?	
Were acceptance procedures defined for each deliverable?	
Were other quality control procedures developed for each deliverable?	

Review Topic	Findings
Were the results of acceptance tests and quality control checks documented?	
Were any deficiencies documented and resolved?	
Other (*document*): • • • • •	

Review Topic	Findings
Coordination with Related Projects / Initiatives *The ECR Implementation Project must be coordinated with other initiatives of the Superior Court, DJA, and other Law, Safety, and Justice Agencies within King County. The project must also be coordinated with State-wide projects affecting the operation of the Court.*	
What other projects within DJA, the Court, or the County affect the current phase?	
What actions have been taken to coordinate with these projects?	
What State-wide projects or initiatives affect the current phase of the project?	

Review Topic	Findings
What actions have been taken to coordinate with these projects or initiatives?	
Other (*document*): • • • •	

Review Topic	Findings
Risks to Execution of Work Plan *There may be a number of risks to the execution of the phase work plan. These include, but are not limited to, the following:* · *Legal / Policy Constraints.* · *Scope Expansion.* · *Technology Inadequacies.* · *Schedule.* · *Costs.* · *Vendor.* · *Operational.* · *Human Resources.* · *Other.*	
What are the major risks to executing the work plan for the current phase?	

Review Topic	Findings
Have these risks been documented?	
What risk management mechanisms have been implemented to: • Monitor risk. • Minimize risk. • Mitigate impact.	
Are phase risks excessive?	
Other (*document*): • • • •	

Review Topic	Findings
Stakeholder Involvement in Phase Work Plan *In addition to the ECR Implementation Project team, a variety of other stakeholders may be involved in a phase of the project. These included DJA management and staff, Judges, SCA staff, ITS staff, vendor personnel, and others.*	
Which stakeholder groups have a substantial involvement in the phase?	
Has the participation of these stakeholders been obtained?	
Are changes in this area required?	

Review Topic	Findings
Other (*document*): • • •	

Risk	Recommended Response

Risks	Recommended Response