



**Enterprise Architecture Standards
Exception Request Document**

based on the
Judicial Project Investment Justification (JPIJ)

***Specific Exception
Being Requested:***

***Title of Related
Project:***

Prepared by:

<i>Name</i>	
<i>Court</i>	
<i>Date</i>	

Goals of the Information Technology Enterprise Architecture Standards:

- Improve interoperability and integration
- Improve productivity
- Maximize reusability
- Reduce overall cost to the Branch as a whole
- Enable leveraging in procurement

Principles Underlying Requests for Exceptions to Statewide Standards:

- City/County investment has already been made (apart from the court) that reduces the cost to the court.
- Overall cost (total cost of ownership) is reduced from that of implementing the statewide standard. This savings must be balanced against the potential impacts to the broader Branch initiatives. Specific areas to be considered are: financial leverage, integration, support, and training.
- Overall risk is reduced from that of implementing the statewide standard,
- The local IT function is/will be providing support,
- The technology demonstrates long-term viability. This must include the consideration of the vendor's viability and future costs to evolve the technology solution.
- Substantially greater productivity is enabled through adoption of a local standard.

By submittal of this exception request, the court agrees to bear any later costs at the local level necessary to integrate the exception component or system with a statewide standard component or core system.

With the preceding statements in mind, please respond to the following questions regarding the exception component or system:

Q1. How will information from the system or component be exchanged with or integrated into core state systems, as applicable, in the event the exception is granted?

A1.

Q2. What is the long-term support strategy? Who will provide support for the excepted system or component? What service level agreements or intergovernmental agreements are in place to ensure acceptable support is maintained?

A2.

Q3. By how much is the five-year total cost to the Branch reduced by the exception?

Show a comparison of costs between the state standard and the requested exception below. Place the summary answer in A3G. For help with filling in tables, refer to instructions that appear in Section III of the JPIJ document (long version).

A3A. Development Costs for Current State Standard

<i>Fiscal Year</i>						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY_____</i>	<i>FY_____</i>	<i>FY_____</i>	<i>FY_____</i>	<i>FY_____</i>	<i>Total*</i>
<i>The number of FTE and third-party positions</i>						
1. IT FTE Positions						(Do not use)
2. User FTE Positions						
3. Professional and Outside Positions						
4. Total Positions *						
<i>The development costs in thousands (\$000)</i>						
5. IT FTE COST (Include ERE)						
6. User FTE COST (Include ERE)						
7. IT Services (Professional and Outside Cost)						
8. Hardware						
9. Software						
10. Communications						
11. Facilities						
12. Licensing and Maintenance Fees						
13. Other						
14. Total**						

* Items 1 through 3 must be described in *Appendix A. Roles and Responsibilities.*

** Items 7 through 13 must be substantiated in *Appendix B. Itemized List with Costs.*

EAS Exception Request Document, Version 1.0
Arizona Judicial Branch Automation Projects

A3B. Operating Costs for Current State Standard

Fiscal Year						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY</i> _____	<i>FY</i> _____	<i>FY</i> _____	<i>FY</i> _____	<i>FY</i> _____	<i>Total**</i>
<i>The number of FTE and third-party positions</i>						
1. IT FTE						(Do not use)
2. User FTE						
3. Professional & Outside Positions						
4. Total Positions *						
<i>The operating costs in thousands (\$000)</i>						
5. IT FTE COST (Include ERE)						
6. User FTE COST (Include ERE)						
7. IT Services (Professional and Outside Cost)						
8. Hardware						
9. Software						
10. Communications						
11. Facilities						
12. Licensing and Maintenance Fees						
13. Other						
14. Total**						

* Items 1 through 3 must be described in **Appendix A. Roles and Responsibilities.**

** Items 7 through 13 must be substantiated in **Appendix B. Itemized List with Costs.**

EAS Exception Request Document, Version 1.0
Arizona Judicial Branch Automation Projects

A3C. Total Project Cost for Implementing Current State Standard

<i>Fiscal Year (\$000)</i>						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY____</i>	<i>FY____</i>	<i>FY____</i>	<i>FY____</i>	<i>FY____</i>	<i>Total</i>
1. Development Costs						
2. Operating Costs						
3. Total Project Costs						

A3D. Development Costs for Proposed Exception

<i>Fiscal Year</i>						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY____</i>	<i>FY____</i>	<i>FY____</i>	<i>FY____</i>	<i>FY____</i>	<i>Total*</i>
<i>The number of FTE and third-party positions</i>						
1. IT FTE Positions						(Do not use)
2. User FTE Positions						
3. Professional and Outside Positions						
4. Total Positions *						
<i>The development costs in thousands (\$000)</i>						
5. IT FTE COST (Include ERE)						
6. User FTE COST (Include ERE)						
7. IT Services (Professional and Outside Cost)						
8. Hardware						
9. Software						
10. Communications						
11. Facilities						
12. Licensing and Maintenance Fees						
13. Other						

EAS Exception Request Document, Version 1.0
Arizona Judicial Branch Automation Projects

14. Total**						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

* Items 1 through 3 must be described in *Appendix A. Roles and Responsibilities.*
 ** Items 7 through 13 must be substantiated in *Appendix B. Itemized List with Costs.*

A3E. Operating Costs for Proposed Exception

<i>Fiscal Year</i>						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY ____</i>	<i>FY ____</i>	<i>FY ____</i>	<i>FY ____</i>	<i>FY ____</i>	<i>Total**</i>
<i>The number of FTE and third-party positions</i>						
1. IT FTE						(Do not use)
2. User FTE						
3. Professional & Outside Positions						
4. Total Positions *						
<i>The operating costs in thousands (\$000)</i>						
5. IT FTE COST (Include ERE)						
6. User FTE COST (Include ERE)						
7. IT Services (Professional and Outside Cost)						
8. Hardware						
9. Software						
10. Communications						
11. Facilities						
12. Licensing and Maintenance Fees						
13. Other						
14. Total**						

* Items 1 through 3 must be described in *Appendix A. Roles and Responsibilities.*
 ** Items 7 through 13 must be substantiated in *Appendix B. Itemized List with Costs.*

EAS Exception Request Document, Version 1.0
Arizona Judicial Branch Automation Projects

A3F. Total Project Cost for Implementing Proposed Exception

<i>Fiscal Year (\$000)</i>						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY_____</i>	<i>FY_____</i>	<i>FY_____</i>	<i>FY_____</i>	<i>FY_____</i>	<i>Total</i>
1. Development Costs						
2. Operating Costs						
3. Total Project Costs						

A3G. Total cost reduction is the difference of \$XXXXXXX between A3C 5-year total and A3F 5-year total.

Q4. Will the exception component or system stand alone?

If yes, will its functionality be what other courts would realistically desire today or in the near future?

A4.

Q5. How will the exception component or system enable productivity gains beyond those of the state standard?

A5.

Q6. How is overall project risk reduced through implementing the exception rather than the state standard?

A6. Score your project risk for both the standard and the exception solutions on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest risk. Comment as appropriate to explain your assessment or the difference in scores in each category. Refer to supplementary instructions that appear in Section IV.B. of the JPIJ (long version) to view detailed risk information.

EAS Exception Request Document, Version 1.0
 Arizona Judicial Branch Automation Projects

<i>Category</i>	<i>Standard score</i>	<i>Exception score</i>	<i>Description</i>
1. Strategic			Aligns with Court and Statewide Enterprise Architecture, goals, objectives, policies, standards and IT strategic plan.
Comment:			
2. Management			Senior and intermediate management is involved in, and supports, the project. A steering committee/project team is in place.
Comment:			
3. Operational			Adverse effects on current operations are unlikely or contingency plans are in place. Supports Agency Performance Measures.
Comment:			
4. Scope and Requirements			Scope and requirements are, or will be, clearly defined and approved. Effect on business processes has been assessed.
Comment:			
5. Technologies Competency			Agency has available, or will secure appropriate skills to implement the project. Organizational readiness has been assessed.
Comment:			
6. Infrastructure Dependencies			All key elements are included to fully implement the project. No additional costs are anticipated to deliver benefits.
Comment:			

Appendix A. Roles and Responsibilities

Provide the names, job titles and responsibilities of all the personnel involved in the project. These may include the Project Sponsor, Project Manager (Technical Project Manager, Business Project Manager), programmer, analyst, and consultant(s). If new FTEs or consultants will be hired, indicate “new.” You may also include a Change Management manager, and user personnel involved in acceptance testing. When a role pertains to ONLY the state standard or the proposed exception, please indicate that, as well.

Appendix B. Itemized List with Costs

Attach a detailed list of planned expenditures including unit costs and extensions. Ensure the total agrees with the TOTAL column on tables labeled “Development Costs for Current State Standard,” “Operating Costs for Current State Standard,” “Development Costs for Proposed Exception,” and “Operating Costs for Proposed Exception.” This list should contain all items associated with the total project investment, including hardware purchase costs, software purchase costs, software licensing costs, FTE and ERE costs, professional and outside services costs, consulting costs, communication costs, facilities costs such as cabling or wiring, training costs, travel costs, and all other costs.

Document Information

Title: Exception Request Document based on Judicial Project Investment Justification Version 1.0
Originator: Arizona Supreme Court, January 2005
Date: March 2010 (editorial changes)
Download: http://www.azcourts.gov/Portals/87/Documents/EAS/EAS_Exception.doc
Contact: Kat Nguyen, 602-452-3158, email: knguyen@courts.az.gov