



LJCMS Large Volume Court Risk Management Plan: Emphasis Phoenix Municipal Court



Prepared and Submitted By:

AmCad

220 Spring Street
Suite 150
Herndon, VA 20170



www.AmCad.com



DOCUMENT CHANGE CONTROL

| Version # | Date | Editor | Description of Change |
|-----------|----------|-----------|---|
| 1 | 06/22/09 | J. Gnecco | Document Submitted to PMC |
| 2 | 08/11/09 | J. Gnecco | Document edited per PMC feedback/response documents and re-submitted to PMC |
| 3 | 09/03/09 | J. Gnecco | Document edited per PMC BA feedback document of 8/17/09 |
| 4 | 09/10/09 | J. Gnecco | Document edited per PMC feedback document of 09/08/09; Re-submitted to PMC |
| | | | |
| | | | |



LJCMS LARGE VOLUME COURT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN ACCEPTANCE SIGNOFF

This LJCMS Large Volume Court Risk Management Plan represents a Project Deliverable defined in the terms of the LJCMS Large Volume Court Project Plan and Contract #125745, Appendix A-Work Order.

The undersigned are the authorized representatives of the party on whose behalf they are signing to accept this LJCMS Large Volume Court Risk Management Plan.

Accepted and Agreed To:

AMCAD

Phoenix Municipal Court

By: _____
(Authorized Signature)

By: _____
(Authorized Signature)

(Print or Type Name)

(Print or Type Name)

(Title)

(Title)

(Date of Signature)

(Date of Signature)





Table of Contents

DOCUMENT CHANGE CONTROLi

LJCMS LARGE VOLUME COURT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN ACCEPTANCE SIGNOFF ii

1 INTRODUCTION.....1

2 DEFINITION.....1

3 SCORING METHOD.....2

4 RISK ASSESSMENT FINDINGS3

5 RISK SCORE CARD11

6 RISK MITIGATION PLAN.....13

7 OPPORTUNITY ASSESSMENT31

8 OPPORTUNITY SCORE CARD.....34

9 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY35



1 INTRODUCTION

This document presents the Risk Management Plan for the LJCMS Large Volume Court Project. The document is presented in six parts:

- Definition
- Risk Assessment Findings
- Risk Score Card
- Risk Mitigation Plan
- Opportunity Assessment
- Opportunity Score Card

For purposes of this plan, “risk” is defined as a measure of the inability to achieve overall project objectives, and “exposure” the quantitative impact (i.e. lost dollars, time and/or productivity, etc.) of a risk event on the success of the LJCMS Large Volume Court Project.

2 DEFINITION

The following terms and abbreviations are used in the definition of the context of this document:

| Term | Definition |
|---------------------------|--|
| No. | Number assigned to the risk for tracking purposes |
| Risk Category | One of nine (9) categories of identified risk |
| Risk Item | Title of identified risk item |
| Risk Level | Level of risk defined as H = High, M = Medium, or L = Low |
| Prob | <i>Probability</i> a given risk will occur |
| Exp | <i>Exposure</i> (stated in quantitative terms) that a given risk presents |
| Sev | Severity of the impact of a risk event on the project (H = High, M = Medium, L = Low (exp * prob = sev)) |
| Mitigation Strategy | A strategy to mitigate the impact and/or severity of a risk event |
| Assignee | Entity responsible for executing mitigation strategy |
| Date assigned | Date mitigation action assigned |
| Requested completion date | Date mitigation action to be completed |
| Date completed | Date mitigation action actually complete |
| Opportunity Category | One of five (5) categories of identified opportunity |
| Opportunity Item | Title of identified opportunity item |
| Opportunity Level | Level of opportunity defined as H = High, M = Medium, or L = Low |
| AZiCMS | Arizona Integrated Case Management System |



| | |
|--------|---|
| AZ AOC | Arizona Administrative Office of the Courts |
| LJCMS | Limited Jurisdiction Case Management System |
| PMC | Phoenix Municipal Court |

3 SCORING METHOD

The following is an explanation of the scoring used for the Risk and Opportunity Scorecards and the Risk Mitigation Plan presented in this document:

Each Risk/Opportunity Assessment item has been assigned a level of L, M or H. AmCad has associated points for each level as follows:

- L = 2 points
- M = 5 points
- H = 10 points

Risk Score Card

The Risk Score Card quantifies the overall project risk by achieving individual totals for each category of risk and summing the total of these categorical values. Specifically, we calculated the total number of Low, Medium, and High Risks and multiplied these individual numbers by the appropriate point values defined above. So, the 22 Low risks were multiplied by 2 (the value associated with Low risks) for a total of 44. The 19 Medium risks were multiplied by 5 (the value associated with Medium risks) for a total of 95. The 14 High risks were multiplied by 10 (the value associated with High risks) for a total of 140. The combined total of these three values represents the Total Level of Risk of 279 points. The maximum possible number of points is tabulated by multiplying the total number of risks (55) by the High Point Value (10) for a grand total of 550. This value would be achieved if all risks were classified as High risks.

Opportunity Score Card

The Opportunity Score Card quantifies the overall project opportunity by achieving individual totals for each category of opportunity and summing the total of these categorical values. Specifically, we calculated the total number of Low, Medium, and High Opportunities and multiplied these individual numbers by the appropriate point values defined above. So, the 4 Low opportunities were multiplied by 2 (the value associated with Low opportunities) for a total of 8. The 2 Medium opportunities were multiplied by 5 (the value associated with Medium opportunities) for a total of 10. The 12 High opportunities were multiplied by 10 (the value associated with High opportunities) for a total of 120. The combined total of these three values represents the Total Level of Opportunity of 138 points. The maximum possible number of points is



tabulated by multiplying the total number of opportunities (18) by the High Point Value (10) for a grand total of 180. This value would be achieved if all opportunities were classified as High opportunities.

Risk Mitigation Plan

The Risk Management Plan is organized into a grid with an individual row associated with each identified Risk. Every risk row corresponds with numerical values for Probability (Pro), Exposure (Exp), and Severity (Sev). The Probability and Exposure values are scored utilizing a scale of 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest). The Severity totals simply represent the product of the Probability and Exposure figures (Pro x Exp) for a maximum Severity total of 100 (10 x 10). To ensure effective and comprehensive Risk Mitigation, all 55 identified risks have been assigned a Probability value of 10. The Exposure values represent the same point totals assigned to Low, Medium, and High Risks. So, Low risks have been assigned an Exposure level of 2, Medium risks have been assigned an Exposure level of 5, and High risks have been assigned an Exposure level of 10. Therefore, Low risks correspond to a Severity level of 20 (10 *Pro* x 2 *Exp*), Medium risks correspond to a Severity level of 50 (10 *Pro* x 5 *Exp*), and High risks correspond to a Severity level of 100 (10 *Pro* x 10 *Exp*).

4 RISK ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

The LJCMS Large Volume Court risk assessment resulted in the development of nine (9) categories of findings:

- Project Metrics
- Project Definition
- Sponsorship and Commitment
- Change Impact
- Staffing
- Project Management Structure
- Development Environment
- Complexity
- Compatibility



Table 1: Project Metrics Category

| No. | Risk Item | Risk Category: PROJECT METRICS | Risk Level | |
|-----|---|--|------------|--------|
| 1. | Person-hours: | Planned person-hours to complete project: | | |
| | | 1,000 or less | | Low |
| | | 1,001 - 5,000 | | Medium |
| | | Over 5,000 | X | High |
| 2. | Calendar Run-Time: | Planned calendar run-time for project completion: | | |
| | | 6 months or less | | Low |
| | | 7-12 months | | Medium |
| | | Over 12 months | X | High |
| 3. | Team Size: | Number team members (PMC & AmCad), at its peak: | | |
| | | 4 or fewer members | | Low |
| | | 5 - 15 members | | Medium |
| | | Over 15 members | X | High |
| 4. | Sites: | Number physical sites involved in roll-out of final work product(s): | | |
| | | 1 site | | Low |
| | | 1 to 3 | | Medium |
| | | Over 3 | X | High |
| 5. | Information Exchange/Sharing Interfaces: | Number information sharing/exchange interfaces: | | |
| | | 0 | | Low |
| | | 1 to 3 | | Medium |
| | | Over 3 | X | High |
| 6. | Number New Systems to Implement: | Number new systems implemented as part of the LJCMS project: | | |
| | | 0 | | Low |
| | | 1 | X | Medium |
| | | Over 1 | | High |
| 7. | Number Participating Organizations: | Number participating court jurisdictions and other organizations participating in project: | | |
| | | 1 | | Low |
| | | 2 To 4 | X | Medium |
| | | Over 4 | | High |

Table 2: Project Definition Category

| No. | Risk Item | Category: PROJECT DEFINITION | Risk | Level |
|-----|------------------------------|------------------------------|------|--------|
| 8. | Project Scope: | Project scope is: | | |
| | | Well-defined | | Low |
| | | Defined, but at a high-level | | Medium |
| | | Vague | X | High |
| 9. | Project Deliverables: | Project deliverables are: | | |
| | | Well-defined | X | Low |



| No. | Risk Item | Category: PROJECT DEFINITION | Risk | Level |
|-----|---|---|------|--------|
| | | Defined in name but not content | | Medium |
| | | Not defined | | High |
| 10. | New System Benefits: | New system benefits are: | | |
| | | Well-defined or quantified or of strategic importance | | Low |
| | | Defined in general, not quantified | X | Medium |
| | | Not defined or unclear | | High |
| 11. | Requirements Complexity: | Requirements for the project are: | | |
| | | Straightforward and understandable | | Low |
| | | Defined in general, not quantified | | Medium |
| | | Very vague and complex | X | High |
| 12. | User Knowledge: | Participating court personnel responsible for providing operational/technical knowledge are: | | |
| | | Knowledgeable in both user and IS areas | X | Low |
| | | Knowledgeable in user area only | | Medium |
| | | Lacking adequate knowledge of user area | | High |
| 13. | AmCad Project Team Business Knowledge: | Project team members who are highly knowledgeable about or experienced in the business area: | | |
| | | All | | Low |
| | | Half | X | Medium |
| | | None | | High |
| 14. | Legacy Documentation Availability: | Status of the documentation of existing systems in the user court is: | | |
| | | Complete and current | | Low |
| | | More than 75% complete and current | X | Medium |
| | | Nonexistent, less than 75% complete, or outdated | | High |
| 15. | Other Projects Dependencies: | Number of other projects, not under control of the AZICMS-LJ project, on which this project is dependent: | | |
| | | 0 | | Low |
| | | 1 | | Medium |
| | | 2 or more | X | High |
| 16. | Other System Dependencies: | Number of other systems, not under control of the AZICMS-LJ project, on which this project is dependent: | | |
| | | 0 | | Low |
| | | 1 | | Medium |
| | | 2 or more | X | High |

Table 3: Sponsor and Commitment Category

| No. | Risk Item | Category: SPONSORSHIP & COMMITMENT | Risk | Level |
|-----|-------------------------|---|------|--------|
| 17. | Project Sponsor: | Project sponsor is: | | |
| | | Identified, enthusiastic and influential | X | Low |
| | | Identified and influential, but passive | | Medium |
| | | Identified and enthusiastic, but not particularly influential | | Medium |
| | | Unknown | | High |





| No. | Risk Item | Category: SPONSORSHIP & COMMITMENT | Risk Level | |
|-----|--|---|------------|--------|
| 18. | Member Organizations Sponsorship and Commitment: | General attitude of member organizations' management: | | |
| | | All understand the value of and support the project | X | Low |
| | | One or more is somewhat reluctant | | Medium |
| | | One or more is very skeptical or resistant | | High |
| 19. | Commitment of Users in Member Organizations: | The general attitude of users in member organizations: | | |
| | | Understands value of and supports the project | | Low |
| | | Is somewhat reluctant | X | Medium |
| | | Is very skeptical or resistant | | High |
| 20. | Relationship to Member Organization Master/Strategic Plans: | The project and any new systems are: | | |
| | | Included in Master/Strategic Plan, or added with approval | X | Low |
| | | Added to Master Plan, not yet approved | | Medium |
| | | Not part of Master Plan | | High |

Table 4: Change Impact Category

| No. | Risk Item | Category: CHANGE IMPACT | Risk Level | |
|-----|---|--|------------|--------|
| 21. | Replacement Impact: | New system: | | |
| | | Replaces an existing, primarily automated system | X | Low |
| | | Replaces an existing, primarily manual system | | Medium |
| | | Is a totally new system | | High |
| 22. | Computer Operations Change Impact: | Impact of the new system on the existing computer operations of the participating organizations and court jurisdictions: | | |
| | | Little change | | Low |
| | | Moderate change | X | Medium |
| | | Severe change | | High |
| 23. | Organizational Change Impact: | Organizational change impact of new system: | | |
| | | None | | Low |
| | | Moderate change | X | Medium |
| | | Extensive change | | High |
| 24. | Policy Change Impact: | Policy change impact of new system: | | |
| | | None | | Low |
| | | Moderate change | X | Medium |
| | | Extensive change | | High |
| 25. | Procedure Change Impact: | Procedure /practice change impact of new system: | | |
| | | None | | Low |
| | | Moderate change | X | Medium |
| | | Extensive change | | High |
| 26. | Business Process Change Impact: | Business process (BP) change impact of new system: | | |
| | | None | | Low |
| | | Moderate change | X | Medium |
| | | Extensive change | | High |



| No. | Risk Item | Category: CHANGE IMPACT | Risk Level | |
|-----|---|---|------------|--------|
| 27. | Financial Controls Change Impact: | Financial controls change impact of new system: | | |
| | | None | | Low |
| | | Moderate change | X | Medium |
| | | Extensive change | | High |
| 28. | Audit Trail Change Impact: | Audit trail change impact of new system: | | |
| | | None | | Low |
| | | Moderate change | X | Medium |
| | | Extensive change | | High |
| 29. | Information Security Controls Change Impact: | Information security change impact of new system: | | |
| | | None | | Low |
| | | Moderate change | X | Medium |
| | | Extensive change | | High |

Table 5: Staffing Category

| No. | Risk Item | Category: STAFFING | Risk Level | |
|-----|--|--|------------|--------|
| 30. | Project Director Experience: | Project Director relevant experience: | | |
| | | 3 or more prior project of similar scope | X | Low |
| | | 1 or 2 prior projects of similar scope | | Medium |
| | | No prior projects of similar scope | | High |
| 31. | Project Manager Involvement: | Project Manager assigned: | | |
| | | On a full-time basis | X | Low |
| | | Full-time, plus minor responsibilities elsewhere | | Medium |
| | | Plus one or more projects | | High |
| 32. | AmCad Project Team: | Project team is: | | |
| | | Assigned to project full-time | | Low |
| | | At least half of the team is assigned full-time | X | Medium |
| | | Less than half of the team is assigned full-time | | High |
| 33. | AmCad Project Team Location: | Physical location of the project team: | | |
| | | Team is located together | | Low |
| | | Most of the team is located together | | Medium |
| | | Team is located at several sites | X | High |
| 34. | AmCad Project Team - Unit Integrity: | History of team members working as a team: | | |
| | | All have worked together before | X | Low |
| | | Some have worked together before | | Medium |
| | | Team members are strangers | | High |
| 35. | AmCad Project Team Experience with Core System: | Number of times team members have implemented the core system: | | |
| | | More than once | X | Low |
| | | Only once | | Medium |
| | | No knowledge or experience with the system | | High |
| 36. | Number Sub-contractors: | Number of subcontractors involved with the project: | | |
| | | None | X | Low |





| No. | Risk Item | Category: STAFFING | Risk Level | |
|-----|---------------------------|--|------------|--------|
| | | | 1 | Medium |
| | | | 2 or more | High |
| 37. | Key Court Staff Departure | Key court implementation staff departing before project implementation | | |
| | | | None | Low |
| | | | 1 | Medium |
| | | | 2 or more | X High |

Table 6: Project Management Structure Category

| No. | Risk Item | Category: PROJECT MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE | Risk Level | |
|-----|---------------------------|--|------------|--------|
| 38. | Methodology: | Methodology and other standards to be used on the project are: | | |
| | | Well-defined, recognized, documented, familiar to project leaders and team members | X | Low |
| | | Emerging, minimally documented, or unfamiliar to key team members | | Medium |
| | | No formal methodology | | High |
| 39. | Change and Issue Control: | Change and Issue Control processes for the project are: | | |
| | | Well-defined and accepted | X | Low |
| | | Documented, but vague and unclear | | Medium |
| | | Nonexistent | | High |
| 40. | Status Reporting: | Status Reporting processes and tools for the project are: | | |
| | | Well-defined and accepted | X | Low |
| | | Established, but unclear | | Medium |
| | | Nonexistent | | High |
| 41. | Quality Assurance: | Quality assurance procedures for the project are: | | |
| | | Well-defined and accepted | X | Low |
| | | Established, but unclear | | Medium |
| | | Nonexistent | | High |

Table 7: Development Environment Category

| No. | Risk Item | Category: DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT | Risk Level | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|---|------------|--------|
| 42. | New Hardware and/or System Software: | Project requirements for deployment of new hardware or system software: | | |
| | | None | | Low |
| | | Existing plus additional | X | Medium |
| | | All new | | High |
| 43. | Development and Testing | Availability of hardware/system software for development and testing: | | |
| | | Guaranteed availability | X | Low |
| | | Reasonable assurance of availability | | Medium |
| | | No assurance of availability | | High |



| Item | Risk Item | Subcategory: DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT | Risk Level | |
|------|---|---|------------|--------|
| 44. | PMC New Technical Architecture(s): | Technical architecture(s) are: | | |
| | | Standard and known/understood by the project team | | Low |
| | | New but proven in market but not known/understood by project team | X | Medium |
| | | Unknown and unproven in market | | High |
| 45. | PMC New Tools and Techniques: | Development tools and techniques used by the project team are: | | |
| | | Standard and known/understood by the project team | | Low |
| | | New but proven in market but not known/understood by project team | X | Medium |
| | | Unknown and unproven in market | | High |
| 46. | PMC New Language(s): | Project requires: | | |
| | | No new application software language(s) | | Low |
| | | New (trained but no wide-spread experience) application language(s) | | Medium |
| | | New (little or no training and no experience) application language(s) | X | High |
| 47. | New DBMS: | The project will use a DBMS that is: | | |
| | | Well-established in participating organizations | | Low |
| | | Established, but new for this application | | Medium |
| | | New DBMS for all or some participating organizations | X | High |

Table 8: System Complexity Category

| No. | Risk Item | Category: COMPLEXITY | Risk Level | |
|-----|--|--|------------|--------|
| 48. | System Availability Requirements: | System availability (unplanned down-time) must be: | | |
| | | 95% at application server | | Low |
| | | 98% at application server | X | Medium |
| | | Greater than 99% at application server | | High |
| 49. | Technology Mix: | Number of different technologies the system requires (e.g., DBMS, networking, minis): | | |
| | | 1 or 2 | | Low |
| | | 3 | X | Medium |
| | | 4 or more | | High |
| 50. | Data Complexity: | Level of complexity of data used by the system (measured by the number of entities and the relationship between them): | | |
| | | Not complex | | Low |
| | | Moderately complex | | Medium |
| | | Very complex | X | High |
| 51. | Data Quality: | Quality of data used in conversion process: | | |
| | | Simple to convert or of good quality | | Low |
| | | Average complexity or of fair quality | | Medium |
| | | Very complex or of poor quality | X | High |



Table 9: System Compatibility Category

| No. | Risk Item | Category: COMPATIBILITY | Risk Level | |
|-----|---|--|------------|--------|
| 52. | PMC Knowledge of Package: | Project team's knowledge of the package to be installed: | | |
| | | Previous experience | | Low |
| | | Conceptual understanding | X | Medium |
| | | No knowledge or experience | | High |
| 53. | Prior Work with AmCad: | PMC Implementation staff has worked with the vendor of the software package: | | |
| | | 3 or more times | | Low |
| | | 1 or 2 times | | Medium |
| | | Never | X | High |
| 54. | Functional Match With Business Requirements: | Software package matches the system requirements: | | |
| | | Well - minimal customization required | | Low |
| | | Fairly well - moderate customization required | | Medium |
| | | Not well - major customization required | X | High |



5 RISK SCORE CARD

| | | Summary Level | | |
|---|--|---------------|---|---|
| Risk Category | Risk Factor | Risk Level | | |
| | | L | M | H |
| PROJECT METRICS: | Person-hours | | | X |
| | Calendar Run Time | | | X |
| | Team Size | | | X |
| | Sites | | | X |
| | Information Exchange/Sharing Interfaces | | | X |
| | Number New Systems to Implement | | X | |
| | Number Participating Organizations | | X | |
| PROJECT DEFINITION: | Project Scope | | | X |
| | Project Deliverables | X | | |
| | New System Benefits | | X | |
| | Requirements Complexity | | | X |
| | User Knowledge | X | | |
| | Project Team Business Knowledge | | X | |
| | Documentation Availability | | X | |
| | Other Projects Dependencies | | | X |
| Other Systems Dependencies | | | X | |
| SPONSORSHIP/ COMMITMENT: | Project Sponsor | X | | |
| | Member Organizations' Sponsorship and Commitment | X | | |
| | Commitment of Users in Member Organizations | | X | |
| | Relation to Member Organization Master/Strategic Plans | X | | |
| CHANGE IMPACT: | Replacement Impact | X | | |
| | Computer Operations Impact | | X | |
| | Organizational Change Impact | | X | |
| | Policy Change Impact | | X | |
| | Procedure Change Impact | | X | |
| | Business Process Change Impact | | X | |
| | Financial Controls Change Impact | | X | |
| | Audit Trail Change Impact | | X | |
| Information Security Controls Change Impact | | X | | |
| STAFFING: | Project Director Experience | X | | |
| | Project Manager Involvement | X | | |
| | Project Team | | X | |
| | Project Team Location | | | X |
| | Contractor Team Unit Integrity | X | | |
| | Contractor Team Experience with Core System | X | | |
| | Number Subcontractors | X | | |





| Summary Level | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Risk Category | Risk Factor | Risk Level |
| | Key court implementation staff departing before project implementation | X |
| PM STRUCTURE: | Methodology | X |
| | Change and Issues Control | X |
| | Status Reporting | X |
| | Quality Assurance | X |
| DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT: | New Hardware and/or System Software | X |
| | Development and Testing Platform | X |
| | New Technical Architecture(s) | X |
| | New Tools and Techniques | X |
| | New Language(s) | X |
| | New DBMS | X |
| SYSTEM COMPLEXITY: | System Availability Requirements | X |
| | Technology Mix | X |
| | Data Complexity | X |
| | Data Quality | X |
| SYSTEM/ PROVIDER COMPATIBILITY | Knowledge of Package | X |
| | Prior Work With Vendor | X |
| | Functional Match With Business Requirements | X |
| SCORE CARD: | | |
| | Risk Totals: | 16 21 17 |
| | Weighted Totals | 32 105 170 |
| | Level of Risk: 307 of 540 possible points | |
| Reviewed by: | <i>A. McCall</i> | Prepared by: <i>J. Gnecco</i> |
| Date: | 05/28/09 | |
| | | |
| | | |



6 RISK MITIGATION PLAN

| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|--|--|-----|-----|-----|-----------|---|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 1 | Person-hours | Total estimated person-hours for the project | 10 | 10 | 100 | | Divide the project deliverables into phases with interim implementation targets. | | | | | Hours > 5000 |
| 2 | Calendar Run-time | Estimated calendar time for project completion | 10 | 10 | 100 | | Divide the project deliverables into phases with interim implementation targets. | | | | | Time >12 months |
| 3 | Team Size | Estimated team size, at its peak | 10 | 10 | 100 | | Divide the team into subunits responsible for different tasks, and have the unit leaders report back to the entire team on a regularly scheduled basis. | | | | | |
| 4 | Sites | Number of different physical locations that will use the final work product(s) | 10 | 10 | 100 | | Pilot the system in test environment prior to implementing in all locations | | | | | Sites > 1 offsite (jail court) and multiple outside agencies |
| 5 | Information Exchange Interfaces | Number of existing systems which must exchange information | 10 | 10 | 100 | | Through the gap, analysis and JAD sessions determine what changes will be necessary in interfacing to existing systems | | | | | Interfaces > 3 (includes local interfaces that PMC will develop) |



LJCMS Large Volume Court Risk Management Plan: Emphasis Phoenix Municipal Court

| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|--|--|-----|-----|-----|-----------|--|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | from the new system. Work with the "owners" of the systems to which the interfaces will be developed. Develop an Implementation Plan that details how and when new interfaces will be deployed. Keep abreast of status of local interfaces | | | | | |
| 6 | Number New Systems to Implement | Number of new systems that will be implemented as part of the LJCMS project | 10 | 5 | 50 | | Follow project methodology | | | | | 1 new system |
| 7 | Number of Participating Organizations | Number of user organizations involved with the project | 10 | 5 | 50 | | NA | | | | | 2 participating organization (AOC & PMC) |
| 8 | Project Scope | Planned work the project entails including interfaces, locations to be implemented, system modules, etc. | 10 | 10 | 100 | | Follow approved project scope document and contractual obligations. Follow Change Control Board (CCB) processes for | | | | | Definition complete |



| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|--------------------------------|---|-----|-----|-----|-----------|--|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | deviations. | | | | | |
| 9 | Project Deliverables | Systems, documents, training, etc. to be delivered and approved as part of the project and defined in project scope and work plan | 10 | 2 | 20 | | Follow approved project scope document, contractual obligations and work plan. Follow CCB processes for deviations. | | | | | Definition complete |
| 10 | New System Benefits | How the system will benefit both the Courts and the citizens of Arizona. | 10 | 5 | 50 | | PMC to determine ROI metrics where possible in order to quantify benefits. | | | | | |
| 11 | Requirements Complexity | How simple or complex project requirements are | 10 | 10 | 100 | | Utilize gap analysis, JAD sessions, existing documentation and project team member knowledge to ensure that system requirements are understood | | | | | Requirements are vague and complex |
| 12 | PMC User Knowledge | Participating personnel responsible for providing operational and technical knowledge to the project team | 10 | 2 | 20 | | Provide training to any new members of the client or team as applicable. Develop a knowledge management plan to ensure the retention of user | | | | | User personnel are knowledgeable in both user and IS areas |



| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|--|---|-----|-----|-----|-----------|---|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | knowledge within the organization. | | | | | |
| 13 | AmCad Project Team Business Knowledge | How knowledgeable about or experienced in the business of the courts | 10 | 5 | 50 | | Provide training to any new members of the team as applicable. Develop a knowledge management plan to ensure the retention of project team knowledge within the organization. | | | | | All are highly knowledgeable |
| 14 | Legacy Documentation Availability | The status of the documentation of existing systems | 10 | 5 | 50 | | Maintain current documentation and current update procedures throughout new system implementation cycles | | | | | Assumes existing documentation is 75% complete and current |
| 15 | Other Projects Dependencies | Number of other development efforts, not under control of the LJCMS project, on which this project is dependent | 10 | 5 | 20 | | Define a process to monitor other projects through structured communications with the respective project teams and/or controlling client whereby another project is dependent on the LJCMS project or the LJCMS project is dependent on | | | | | Computer room re-model project and local interfaces |



LJCMS Large Volume Court Risk Management Plan: Emphasis Phoenix Municipal Court

| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|--|---|-----|-----|-----|-----------|--|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | another project | | | | | |
| 16 | Other Systems Dependencies | Number of other development efforts, not under the control of the LJCMS project, that are dependent on this project | 10 | 10 | 100 | | Define a process to monitor other projects through structured communications with the respective project teams and/or controlling client whereby another project is dependent on the LJCMS project or the LJCMS project is dependent on another project. | | | | | Local interfaces |
| 17 | Project Sponsor | | 10 | 2 | 20 | | Assign a backup Project Sponsor that will assume the role only if the current Project Sponsor is unable. | | | | | Project Sponsor identified |
| 18 | Member Organizations Sponsorship and Commitment | General attitude of member organizations' management | 10 | 2 | 20 | | Follow standardized communications and status reporting to ensure continued commitment. | | | | | Understand the value of and support the project. |
| 19 | Commitment of Users in Member Organizations | General attitude of users in member organizations | 10 | 5 | 50 | | Follow standardized communications and status reporting to ensure continued | | | | | Understand the value of and support the project. |



| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|--|---|-----|-----|-----|-----------|--|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | commitment. | | | | | |
| 20 | Relations hip to Member Organizat ion's Master/St rategic Plan(s) | Whether the project and any new systems are included in Master/Strategic Plan(s) | 10 | 2 | 20 | | Verify that if project changes or master/strategic plan changes, that updates are made to the plan as related to the project | | | | | Complete |
| 21 | Replacem ent Impact | Whether the system is new or a replacement for an existing system and if a replacement how automated is the existing system | 10 | 2 | 20 | | Ensure that all functionality of the current system is defined through requirement specifications, JAD sessions and other documentation. Develop a conversion plan. | | | | | Replacing existing primarily automated system |
| 22 | Computer Operation s Impact | Effect of the new system on the computer operations of the organization | 10 | 5 | 50 | | Verify that all operations staff is trained on the new system, that enough staff exists to operate the new system, that any new hardware and software is ordered and installed prior to testing and training, and that computer operations staff are trained with the new hardware and | | | | | Assumes moderate change |



| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|-------------------------------------|--|-----|-----|-----|-----------|---|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | software as applicable. | | | | | |
| 23 | Organizational Change Impact | Organizational change required to support the new system | 10 | 5 | 50 | | PMC Management to keep staff apprised of what changes may be coming as a result of the new system and why organizational changes may be necessary | | | | | Assumes moderate change |
| 24 | Policy Change Impact | Policy changes required to support the new system | 10 | 5 | 50 | | PMC Management to keep staff apprised of what changes may be coming as a result of the new system and why organizational changes may be necessary. Confer with the AZ AOC regarding their recommendations on the subject. | | | | | Assumes moderate change |
| 25 | Procedure Change Impact | Procedure changes required to | 10 | 5 | 50 | | PMC Management to keep staff | | | | | Assumes moderate change |



| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|-----|-----|-----|-----------|--|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| | | support the new system | | | | | apprised of what changes may be coming as a result of the new system and why organizational changes may be necessary. Ensure procedural changes are documented and circulated prior to taking effect. Confer with the AZ AOC regarding their recommendations on the subject. | | | | | |
| 26 | Business Process Change Impact | Bus process changes required to support the new system | 10 | 5 | 50 | | PMC Management to keep staff apprised of what changes may be coming as a result of the new system and why organizational changes may be necessary. Ensure business | | | | | Assumes moderate change |



| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----------|---|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | process changes are documented and circulated prior to taking effect. Confer with the AZ AOC regarding their recommendations on the subject. | | | | | |
| 27 | Financial Controls Change Impact | Financial controls changes required to support the new system | 10 | 5 | 50 | | PMC Management to involve the City Auditor Dept and ITS dept in understanding the functionality of the new system and incorporating their suggestions into any new business processes that would need to be implemented. Confer with the AZ AOC regarding their recommendations on the subject. | | | | | Assumes moderate change |
| 28 | Audit | Audit trail | 10 | 5 | 50 | | PMC | | | | | Assumes |



| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|--|--|-----|-----|-----|-----------|---|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| | Trail Change Impact | changes required to support the new system | | | | | Management to involve the City Auditor Dept and ITS dept in understanding the functionality of the new system and incorporating their suggestions into any new business processes that would need to be implemented. Confer with the AZ AOC regarding their recommendations on the subject. | | | | | moderate change |
| 29 | Information Security Controls Change Impact | Information security controls changes required to support the new system | 10 | 5 | 50 | | PMC Management to involve the ITS dept in understanding the functionality of the new system and incorporating their suggestions into any new business | | | | | Assumes moderate change |



| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|------------------------------------|--|-----|-----|-----|-----------|---|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | processes that would need to be implemented. Confer with the AZ AOC regarding their recommendations on the subject. | | | | | |
| 30 | Project Director Experience | Project director's experience level | 10 | 2 | 20 | | Assign a backup Project Director with similar experience that will assume the role only if the current Project Director is unable | | | | | includes 3 or more projects of similar scope |
| 31 | Project Manager Involvement | Whether the project manager manages this project 100% of the time | 10 | 2 | 20 | | Monitor for changes in time assignment | | | | | Currently 100% |
| 32 | AmCad Project Team | Whether the project team is assigned to this project 100% of the time | 10 | 5 | 50 | | Monitor for changes in time assignment | | | | | Half the team is full-time |
| 33 | AmCad Project Team Location | The physical location of the project team is located at several sites. | 10 | 10 | 100 | | Encourage frequent status meetings, teleconference calls, and site visits | | | | | |
| 34 | AmCad Project Team – | The experience of the team members as a | 10 | 2 | 20 | | | | | | | All have worked together before |



LJCMS Large Volume Court Risk Management Plan: Emphasis Phoenix Municipal Court

| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|---|--|-----|-----|-----|-----------|--|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | Unit Integrity | team | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | AmCad Project Team Experience with Core System | The number of times that the team members have implemented the core system | 10 | 2 | 20 | | AmCad will provide training to any new members of the team as applicable, following internal AmCad knowledge transfer methodology. | | | | | Project team members have implemented the applications more than once |
| 36 | Number Subcontractors | The number of subcontractor involved with the project | 10 | 2 | 20 | | | | | | | No subcontractors |
| 37 | Key Court Staff Departure | Key court implementation staff departing before project implementation | 10 | 10 | 100 | | PMC to provide training to any new replacements and develop a knowledge management plan to ensure the retention of project team knowledge within the organization. | | | | | Three senior BA's nearing retirement |
| 38 | Methodology | PM Methodology and other standards to be used on the project | 10 | 2 | 20 | | Monitor. Include standards checking in test plans | | | | | Methodology and standards well defined, recognized, documented and familiar to project leaders and team members. |
| 39 | Change | Change and | 10 | 2 | 20 | | Follow CCB | | | | | Possible |



LJCMS Large Volume Court Risk Management Plan: Emphasis Phoenix Municipal Court

| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|--|--|-----|-----|-----|-----------|--|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | and Issue Control | Issue Control processes for the project | | | | | processes for deviations | | | | | modification to add PMC to the Change Control Board to be discussed with AOC |
| 40 | Status Reporting | Status reporting processes and tools for the project | 10 | 2 | 20 | | Follow defined team reporting and defined CCB reporting | | | | | Well-defined and accepted |
| 41 | Quality Assurance | Quality assurance procedures for the project | 10 | 2 | 20 | | Follow defined team reporting and defined CCB reporting | | | | | Well-defined |
| 42 | New Hardware or System Software | Project requirements for new hardware or system software | 10 | 5 | 50 | | Verify that any additional needed hardware and/or software is ordered and installed prior to testing | | | | | Existing plus additional |
| 43 | Development and Testing | Availability of hardware for development and testing | 10 | 2 | 20 | | Verify that any additional needed hardware is ordered and installed prior to testing | | | | | is guaranteed |



LJCMS Large Volume Court Risk Management Plan: Emphasis Phoenix Municipal Court

| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|--|---|-----|-----|-----|-----------|--|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 44 | PMC New Technical Architecture(s) | Implementation of application and data base environment | 10 | 5 | 50 | | Verify data integrity, availability, and security | | | | | New to PMC project team |
| 45 | PMC New Tools and Techniques | Development tools and techniques used by the PMC project team | 10 | 5 | 50 | | Provide training to any new members of the client team as applicable. Develop a knowledge management plan to ensure the retention of team knowledge within the project and organization. | | | | | Tools are not familiar to the PMC project team: |
| 46 | PMC New Language(s) | Application language(s) required by the project | 10 | 10 | 100 | | Provide training to any new members of the client or vendor team as applicable. Develop a knowledge management plan including a mentor program, to ensure the retention of user knowledge within the project and organization. | | | | | PMC project team has little or no training/experience |



| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|---|--|-----|-----|-----|-----------|--|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| 47 | New DBMS | Database Management System (DBMS) used by the project | 10 | 10 | 100 | | Verify that appropriate staff is knowledgeable. Develop a training plan that includes a process for training new staff/team members as applicable. | | | | | New DBMS for client organization |
| 48 | System Availability Requirements | System availability (unplanned down-time) | 10 | 5 | 50 | | The AmCad application has built-in redundancy. The PMC should review procedures surrounding down-time from an operations perspective | | | | | Must be 98% at host |
| 49 | Technology Mix | Number of different technologies the system requires (e.g., DBMS, networking, minis) | 10 | 5 | 50 | | Verify that appropriate staff is knowledgeable in the necessary technologies. Develop a training plan that includes a process for | | | | | Three technologies |



| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|-----------------------------------|---|-----|-----|-----|-----------|--|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | training new staff/team members as applicable. | | | | | |
| 50 | Data Complexity | The level of complexity of the data used by the system (measured by the number of entities and the relationship between them) | 10 | 10 | 100 | | Develop a data conversion plan. | | | | | Very complex |
| 51 | Data Quality | The quality of data for the conversion process | 10 | 10 | 100 | | Develop a conversion plan that includes a data "scrubbing" component. | | | | | Assumes very complex or poor quality |
| 52 | AmCad Knowledge of Package | The team's knowledge/previous experience of the package to be installed | 10 | 2 | 20 | | AmCad will provide training to any new members of the team as applicable, following internal | | | | | AmCad has previous knowledge and/or experience |



| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|--|--|-----|-----|-----|-----------|--|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | AmCad knowledge transfer methodology. Develop a training plan for PMC team members and users. | | | | | |
| 53 | Prior Work with Vendor | Whether the PMC implementation staff has ever worked with AmCad | 10 | 10 | 100 | | Provide opportunities for AmCad and PMC team /staff to mingle – such as lunches. Continue to utilize formal reporting structure and process methodologies such as the CCB, status reporting and work plan. | | | | | Never before |
| 54 | Functional Match With Business Requirements | How closely the software package matches the business requirements | 10 | 10 | 100 | | Develop supplemental gap analysis between existing business requirements and the functionality of the new system (including | | | | | PMC anticipates substantial customizations from Supplemental Gap Analysis in January 2010 |



LJCMS Large Volume Court Risk Management Plan: Emphasis Phoenix Municipal Court

| No. | Risk Item | Description | Pro | Exp | Sev | Avoidance | Acceptance/ Mitigation Strategy | Assignee | Date Assigned | Requested Compl Date | Date Completed | Comment |
|-----|-----------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|---|----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | | | | | new functionality from Jan. 2010 gap sessions) in order to ensure that all needed functionality is included in the new system | | | | | |



7 OPPORTUNITY ASSESSMENT

Table 1: Compatibility Category

| No. | Opportunity Item | Opportunity Category: Compatibility | Opp. Level | |
|-----|---|---|------------|--------|
| 1. | Relationship with the AOC: | Develop a more collaborative relationship with the AOC: | | |
| | | Somewhat Valuable | | Low |
| | | Valuable | | Medium |
| | | Extremely Valuable | X | High |
| 2. | Statewide CMS Solution: | Participate in a statewide project that will increase efficiencies in standardization and information sharing: | | |
| | | Somewhat Valuable | | Low |
| | | Valuable | | Medium |
| | | Extremely Valuable | X | High |
| 3. | Development of Bolt-On Features: | Be at the forefront of developmental opportunities for enhancement to the AZICMS Solution and provide valuable information and assistance to those responsible for implementing these features: | | |
| | | Somewhat Valuable | | Low |
| | | Valuable | X | Medium |
| | | Extremely Valuable | | High |

Table 2: Education Category

| No. | Opportunity Item | Opportunity Category: Education | Opp. Level | |
|-----|--|---|------------|--------|
| 4. | Knowledge of Microsoft SQL Server: | PMC Team Members will benefit from the requirement to learn the Microsoft SQL software: | | |
| | | Somewhat Valuable | | Low |
| | | Valuable | | Medium |
| | | Extremely Valuable | X | High |
| 5. | Comfort Developing within a Microsoft .NET framework: | PMC Technical Resources will benefit from working on software developed within Microsoft .NET framework | | |
| | | Somewhat Valuable | | Low |
| | | Valuable | | Medium |
| | | Extremely Valuable | X | High |
| 6. | Extensive Training on the AZICMS Application: | PMC Team Members will receive extensive, detailed training on the AZICMS Application in preparation for the transition from the legacy system to the AZICMS Solution: | | |
| | | Somewhat Valuable | | Low |
| | | Valuable | | Medium |
| | | Extremely Valuable | X | High |
| 7. | AmCad AiCMS Certification: | Select PMC BAs and Team Leaders will receive advanced-level training and, upon completion of the testing process, will become AmCad Certified AiCMS Users/Trainers | | |
| | | Somewhat Valuable | | Low |
| | | Valuable | X | Medium |
| | | Extremely Valuable | | High |



Table 3: Leadership Category

| No. | Opportunity Item | Opportunity Category: Leadership | Opp. Level | |
|-----|--|---|------------|--------|
| 8. | PMC will be a pioneer on the LJCMS Project: | On the Large Volume Addendum to the LJCMS Project, PMC has assumed a leadership role and will benefit from ownership and autonomy over the entire process. | | |
| | | Somewhat Valuable | | Low |
| | | Valuable | | Medium |
| | | Extremely Valuable | X | High |
| 9. | Voice in Standardization Effort: | As a critical member of the LJCMS Project and, essentially, the "Large Volume Pilot", PMC will be in a position to shape and influence the decisions made on standardization. | | |
| | | Somewhat Valuable | | Low |
| | | Valuable | | Medium |
| | | Extremely Valuable | X | High |

Table 4: Business Process Category

| No. | Opportunity Item | Opportunity Category: Business Process | Opp. Level | |
|-----|---|--|------------|--------|
| 10. | Retention of some current business processes: | As a critical member of the LJCMS Project the PMC will have the chance to retain functionality that is critical to the business system's operation by specifying exact development necessary to retain these approaches to workflow in the supplemental gap sessions. | | |
| | | Somewhat Valuable | | Low |
| | | Valuable | | Medium |
| | | Extremely Valuable | X | High |
| 11. | Knowledge and incorporation of other courts' valuable functionality: | Due to the participation of other Large Volume Courts like Mesa and Tucson, PMC will benefit from learning of the unique business processes of these courts. Additionally, certain valuable features from the CMS Solutions of these courts will, ultimately, be implemented into the AZICMS Application prior to the PMC go-live. | | |
| | | Somewhat Valuable | | Low |
| | | Valuable | | Medium |
| | | Extremely Valuable | X | High |

Table 5: Efficiency Category

| No. | Opportunity Item | Opportunity Category: Efficiency | Opp. Level | |
|-----|---|---|------------|--------|
| 12. | Allocation of Fewer Court Resources for Support: | AmCad offers excellent support to all of its customers. PMC would significantly benefit from this support as court resources can be assigned to other job responsibilities because of the level of support that AmCad will provide. | | |
| | | Somewhat Valuable | | Low |
| | | Valuable | | Medium |
| | | Extremely Valuable | X | High |
| 13. | New functionality delivered with | There is certain functionality included in the AZICMS product that will lead to an increased level of court effectiveness. The AZICMS application will streamline business processes | | |



| No. | Opportunity Item | Opportunity Category: Efficiency | Opp. Level | |
|-----|----------------------------|--|------------|--------|
| | the AZICMS product: | and offer great flexibility to its users. | | |
| | | Somewhat Valuable | | Low |
| | | Valuable | X | Medium |
| | | Extremely Valuable | | High |
| 14. | AZICMS System Reliability: | The AZICMS Application will be supported by both AmCad and the AOC. The same version of the application will be deployed to courts of both general and limited jurisdiction throughout the state of Arizona. The system functionality will be tested by both AmCad and the AOC. Therefore, issues will be reported by a number of different sources and addressed accordingly. This leads to an extremely reliable product because of the testing and use in a production environment that the application will undergo. | | |
| | | Somewhat Valuable | | Low |
| | | Valuable | | Medium |
| | | Extremely Valuable | X | High |



8 OPPORTUNITY SCORE CARD

| Summary Level | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Opportunity Category | Opportunity Factor | Opportunity Level | | |
| | | L | M | H |
| COMPATABILITY: | Relationship with AOC | | | X |
| | Statewide CMS Solution | | | X |
| | Development of Bolt-On Features | | X | |
| EDUCATION: | Knowledge of MS SQL Software | | | X |
| | Comfort Developing within a .NET Framework | | | X |
| | Extensive Training on the AZICMS Application | | | X |
| | AmCad AiCMS Certification | | X | |
| LEADERSHIP: | PMC will be a Pioneer on the LJCMS Project | | | X |
| | Voice in Standardization Effort | | | X |
| BUSINESS PROCESS: | Retention of some Current Business Processes | | | X |
| | Incorporation of Other Courts' Valuable Functionality | | | X |
| EFFICIENCY: | Allocation of Fewer Court Resources for Support | | | X |
| | New Functionality Delivered with AZICMS Application | | X | |
| | AZICMS System Reliability | | | X |
| | | | | |
| SCORECARD: | | | | |
| | Opportunity Totals | 0 | 3 | 11 |
| | Weighted Totals | 0 | 15 | 110 |
| | Level of Opportunity: 125 of 140 possible points | | | |
| | | | | |
| Reviewed by: A. McCall | | Prepared by: M. Pontius | | |
| Date: 06/18/09 | | | | |



9 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The project according to risk standards is virtually at the risk mid-point. In reviewing the Risk Management Plan a conclusion can be drawn that the overall project is of average and nominal risk based on the resulting score card totals.

- The number of high level risk factors is only 30% of the Risk Totals (17 / 54)
- The weighted total for high level risk factors is 57% of the Weighted Total (307 / 540)
- The average of all risk factors is 5.7 out of 10.0 (307 / 54)

The top three categories with the most significant risks are:

- Project Metrics – 71% of the risk factors in this category are labeled as high risk and rightfully so. In addition to the sheer size of the project (required resources and time, length of project, and number of sites) concern is given to the number of local interfaces that will be developed by PMC staff and the effort working with the agencies involved.
- Project Definition - significant in this category are the project and system dependencies (remodeling of the computer room and development of six agency interfaces) as well as not all requirements having been defined at this point.
- System Complexity – concerns in this category are with regard to legacy data and the conversion of that data to the new system. Historically, the quality and complexity of data have proven to be high risk factors.

Although the risk at this time is medium it is subject to change as there may be future modification factors over the course of the project that could cause the risk of the categories or individual factors to increase or decrease. With this in mind the documented risk responses/mitigation strategies will be applied to address the risks.

Included in the Risk Management Plan is an Opportunity Assessment which upon review indicates the opportunities are well above average:

- The number of high level opportunity factors is 79% of the Opportunity Totals (11 / 14)
- The weighted total for high level opportunity factors is 89% of the Weighted Total (125 / 140)
- The average of all opportunity factors is 8.9 out of 10 (125 / 14).



Opportunities for PMC include but are not limited to:

- developing a more collaborative relationship with the AZ AOC
- new software/application education for PMC staff
- maintaining a leadership position and influencing LJCMS standardization
- increased efficiency

As with the risk factors, the opportunities are subject to change over the course of the project.