Attachment 4

DRAFT

UCIS Replacement Project outline
July13, 2007

1) Operational Oversight

Setting up an appropriate operational oversight structure is one of the most important early tasks to be completed. Within the context of the current court system structure, I propose an operational oversight structure as follows:

Supreme Court has administrative authority over the courts in North Dakota.

Court Technology Committee was created by the Supreme Court by Administrative Order 9. Included in AO9 is the purpose of "Provide guidelines for the use and acquisition of new technologies". As such, this should be the policy level operational oversight committee. This committee reports to the Supreme Court.

Operations Committee
Daily operations of the project should have oversight by a broad-based committee with representation from the various user communities within the courts. Members of this committee must be willing and able to dedicate the time required.

This committee will have general oversight of the project and will be required to make decisions regarding tasks to be completed, the priority of tasks to be completed; assignment of tasks and portfolios and other operational issues.

Members of this committee will be appointed by the Supreme Court.

This committee will need to meet weekly, as needed.

The membership of this committee should include:
Clerk of court, large county
Clerk of court, large/medium/small county
Clerk of court, small/medium county
District judge, large county
District judge, small county
Supreme Court justice
State court administrator
Trial Court Administrator or Court Manager
IT Director
Project manager
This committee should be chaired by the state court administrator or a district judge.

Portfolios:
To manage the various aspects of the replacement project, I propose organizing the tasks in portfolios. Each portfolio would be managed by member of the state court administrator's office and would include various workgroups for the tasks to be completed. There will be multiple workgroups within a given portfolio. An individual may serve on multiple workgroups. These workgroups will be used to

facilitate the daily workload within the portfolio. The workgroups would be comprised of subject matter experts. The operations committee would be responsible for creating portfolios and assigning tasks and deliverables to each portfolio.

Within each portfolio, the portfolio manager would be responsible for ensuring that the tasks are assigned, completed and reported back to the operations committee.

The portfolios would include the following. There may be other portfolios assigned as needed.

> Case Flow: All case types. Intake, filing, tracking, calendaring. Document creation; word processing.
> Automation: Electronic Records Systems (Imaging); Electronic Filing (EFiling); Automation of other case processing tasks. Interface of software used by court personnel – CMS, FACSES, Jury, etc.
> External Interaction: Interfaces (Warehouse; Public Search); Integration (CJIS, DOCR; HP; DOT; City of Bismarck, City of Minot; City of Williston, Health Dept; Secretary of State voter system; state's attorneys; sheriff's; & jails; public defenders, etc.)
> Administrative: Fiscal; Infrastructure; Training; communications plan; statistical reporting; data conversion;

2) Project approach

Basic assumptions at the start of this project include that we are expecting to buy a Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) system; that the purchased solution will include methods of handling current processes that are different from the methods currently employed; that we are looking to minimize the amount of customization done to the system by customizing only when current business practice cannot be modified because of statute, rule or other significant impediment.

The system selected, and process used, to implement the system should include methods of identifying and eliminating redundancies and inefficiencies currently incorporated in our business practices. It is assumed the COTS solution has been developed to utilize the most efficient and effective practices. As such, we expect to modify the system as little as possible; modifying our business practices to accommodate the more efficient and effective practices.

Historically, software development projects have first undergone a significant analysis effort. This analysis effort typically details and documents every task that needs to be addressed by the software developers.

However, as we are looking to BUY a pre-programmed solution, a solution that will likely have addressed much of the minutia and details of case processing, the analysis for this project should focus on business process improvements, integration efforts, workflow improvements and on those significant business practices that will help differentiate one solution from another. I refer to this as a more "general" analysis. This analysis should result in a few hundred specific data elements to address, whereas a detailed analysis would likely result in several thousand.

A more detailed analysis, called a gap analysis, will need to occur after a vendor is selected. Such an analysis will serve the purpose of helping the vendor determine where customization and changes are required.

The specific scope of the analysis will fluctuate based on the vendor selected, current business processes and the anticipated changes required.

3) Project Management

The scope of this project will require a dedicated project manager. The court/court administrator's office should hire a full time project manager.

The project manager selected should be someone with court experience and experience deploying similar systems. I have been working with the National Center to identify such a person.

4) Schedule of Events and Estimated Timeline

a) July 2007 – September 2007 - Establish operational oversight – Set up operations committee; determine portfolios; Assign portfolio managers.
b) September 2007 – May, 2008 - Perform analysis of current practices, current interfaces and integration; current workflows and business processes, desired interfaces, and desired integration points.
c) June – 2008 – Develop and release an RFP based on the analysis.
d) July 2008 – August 2008 – Review responses to RFP; Review vendor's systems; select vendor; issue an intent to award and initial contract for gap analysis;
e) September 2008 – based on proposals received in response to RFP, develop budget request for 2009 legislature.
f) October 2008 – December 2008 – begin process of contract negotiation; begin gap analysis.
g) January 2009 – June 2009 – Continue gap analysis; continue contract negotiations; as funds allow, begin data conversion efforts.
h) July 2009 – June 2011 - Assuming legislative appropriation, continue deployment

4) Other points

Given the budget of this project, we will be required to report quarterly to ITD and SITAC. I will set up a meeting with ITD planning to begin discussions regarding reporting suggestions.

Current development efforts related to UCIS will need to be stopped at some point. That date has not yet been chosen, but to free up IT staff time that will be required for portfolio management, that date will need to be sooner (2007) rather than later (2009).

Attachment 4

DRAFT