



Enterprise Architecture Standards Exception Request Document

based on the
Judicial Project Investment Justification (JPIJ)

Specific Exception Being Requested: ***Themis Case Management System***

Title of Related Project: ***Mesa Municipal Court Case Management System Replacement Project***

Prepared by:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Paul Thomas</i>
<i>Court</i>	<i>Mesa Municipal Court</i>
<i>Date</i>	<i>September 23, 2014</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. Mesa Municipal Court (MMC) currently exchanges information with the core state systems; the implementation of Themis will not affect these communications.

MVD Reporting: MMC currently has an automated batch process that reads data from the case management system, formats the data into Motor Vehicle Division (MVD) specific file formats and sends the data to the AOC to pass on to the MVD. The only change to this process will be modifying the stored procedure so that it reads data from the Themis database.

AOC Reporting/Data Exchanges: All current information exchanges with the AOC are performed via either flat files which are batch processed or XML files managed through MQ Server technology. The only changes to these processes will be the substitution of data from Themis in lieu of the data that is coming from the current system.

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. Mesa's Information Technology Department (ITD) will be able to modify and extend the system to support MMC's needs for years with this platform. As MMC needs change, legislation is enacted or AOC establishes new rules or statewide initiatives, ITD will be able to immediately develop scope, project plan and start development efforts. Mesa will have total control over all aspects of the change process, including the ability to control budgets, scopes and timelines. ITD and MMC have a great working relationship and a long history of developing custom applications for MMC.

Documentation is very important to support any system. Tempe has provided Mesa with over 1,000 files documenting development and configuration of the application as well as processes and procedures developed for the users. Mesa will retain both the original copies from Tempe as well as "cleaned" versions which will subsequently be updated to reflect all changes made by Mesa. These updates may include data flow diagrams, process diagrams, database diagrams, data dictionaries, use cases and help files. The extensive documentation is essential reference for current IT staff and valuable training material for new IT staff.

Industry recognized standards and the AOC's Enterprise Architectural Standards are also important to supporting a system. The Themis platform is built using the Microsoft .NET framework and is hosted on Microsoft SQL servers and application servers. There are Microsoft support contracts in place for this infrastructure. ITD staff maintains certifications to consistently develop and support these technologies.

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 (AJACS)

Fiscal Year						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY14-15</i>	<i>FY15-16</i>	<i>FY16-17</i>	<i>FY17-18</i>	<i>FY18-19</i>	<i>Total*</i>
<i>The number of FTE and third-party positions</i>						
1. IT FTE Positions	5	5	2.75	2.75	2.75	(Do not use)
2. User FTE Positions	5	5	2.25	2.25	2.25	
3. Professional and Outside Positions						
4. Total Positions *	10	10	5	5	5	
<i>The development costs in thousands (\$000)</i>						
5. IT FTE COST (Include ERE)	\$631	\$631	\$347	\$347	\$347	\$2302
6. User FTE COST (Include ERE)	\$481	\$481	\$212	\$212	\$212	\$1598
7. IT Services (Professional and Outside Cost)						
8. Hardware						
9. Software						
10. Communications						
11. Facilities						
12. Licensing and Maintenance Fees						
13. Other						
14. Total**	\$1112	\$1112	\$559	\$559	\$559	\$3900

* 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>FY14-15</i>	<i>FY15-16</i>	<i>FY16-17</i>	<i>FY17-18</i>	<i>FY18-19</i>	<i>Total*</i>
The number of FTE and third-party positions						
1. IT FTE Positions	5	5	1.9	1.9	1.9	(Do not use)
2. User FTE Positions	5	5	2.35	2.35	2.35	
3. Professional and Outside Positions						
4. Total Positions *	10	10	4.25	4.25	4.25	
The development costs in thousands (\$000)						
5. IT FTE COST (Include ERE)	\$481	\$481	\$223	\$223	\$223	\$1632
6. User FTE COST (Include ERE)	\$1112	\$1112	\$463	\$463	\$463	\$3613
7. IT Services (Professional and Outside Cost)						\$
8. Hardware						\$
9. Software	\$800	\$800	\$	\$	\$	\$1600
10. Communications						\$
11. Facilities						\$
12. Licensing and Maintenance Fees						\$
13. Other						\$
14. Total**	\$1912	\$1912	\$463	\$463	\$463	\$5213

* 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.**

A3C. Total Project Cost for Implementing Current State Standard

Fiscal Year						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY14-15</i>	<i>FY15-16</i>	<i>FY16-17</i>	<i>FY17-18</i>	<i>FY18-19</i>	<i>Total</i>
1. Development Costs	\$1112	\$1112	\$559	\$559	\$559	\$3900
2. Operating Costs	\$1912	\$1912	\$463	\$463	\$463	\$5213
3. Total Project Costs	\$3024	\$3024	\$1021	\$1021	\$1021	\$9113

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

A3D. Development Costs for Proposed Exception

Fiscal Year						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY14-15</i>	<i>FY15-16</i>	<i>FY16-17</i>	<i>FY17-18</i>	<i>FY18-19</i>	<i>Total*</i>
<i>The number of FTE and third-party positions</i>						
1. IT FTE Positions	3.5	3.5	2	2	2	(Do not use)
2. User FTE Positions	5	2.75	2.25	2.25	2.25	
3. Professional and Outside Positions						
4. Total Positions *	8.5	6.25	4.25	4.25	4.25	
<i>The development costs in thousands (\$000)</i>						
5. IT FTE COST (Include ERE)	\$442	\$442	\$252	\$252	\$252	\$1640
6. User FTE COST (Include ERE)	\$481	\$270	\$212	\$212	\$212	\$1386
7. IT Services (Professional and Outside Cost)						
8. Hardware						
9. Software						
10. Communications						
11. Facilities						
12. Licensing and Maintenance Fees						
13. Other						
14. Total**	\$923	\$711	\$464	\$464	\$464	\$3026

* 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

A3E. Operating Costs for Proposed Exception

<i>Description</i>	<i>FY14-15</i>	<i>FY15-16</i>	<i>FY16-17</i>	<i>FY17-18</i>	<i>FY18-19</i>	<i>Total*</i>
<i>The number of FTE and third-party positions</i>						
1. IT FTE Positions	3.5	3.5	2.05	2.05	2.05	(Do not use)
2. User FTE Positions	2.75	2.75	1.45	1.45	1.45	
3. Professional and Outside Positions						
4. Total Positions *	6.25	6.25	3.5	3.5	3.5	
<i>The development costs in thousands (\$000)</i>						
5. IT FTE COST (Include ERE)	\$442	\$442	\$259	\$259	\$259	\$1659
6. User FTE COST (Include ERE)	\$270	\$270	\$148	\$148	\$148	\$985
7. IT Services (Professional and Outside Cost)						
8. Hardware						
9. Software	\$800					
10. Communications						
11. Facilities						
12. Licensing and Maintenance Fees						
13. Other						
14. Total**	\$1511	\$711	\$407	\$407	\$407	\$3444

* 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.***

A3F. Total Project Cost for Implementing Proposed Exception

TOTAL PROJECT COST - EXCEPTION

<i>Fiscal Year</i>						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY14-15</i>	<i>FY15-16</i>	<i>FY16-17</i>	<i>FY17-18</i>	<i>FY18-19</i>	<i>Total</i>
1. Development Costs	\$923	\$711	\$464	\$464	\$464	\$3026
2. Operating Costs	\$1511	\$711	\$407	\$407	\$407	\$3444
3. Total Project Costs	\$2434	\$1422	\$871	\$871	\$871	\$6469

A3G. Total cost reduction is the difference of \$2,643,000 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. Yes, Themis will be a standalone system. It will initially provide, at a minimum, the functionality MMC has today with the current system, which has been acknowledged as advanced in automation of processes and was used as the model for changes to AJACS. Continued improvements are planned for the future.

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

A5. The exception system will enable productivity gains beyond the state standard in three ways: ease of use, lower costs of ownership and extensibility.

MMC staff has spent substantial time with AJACS and Themis and has found Themis to be significantly easier to navigate and use. They report that the system is visually and functionally designed to aid the user with their tasks; having received no training, they have been able to enter, save and process cases through several scenarios with no assistance. Our finance staff determined that the functionality offered in Themis will save dozens of person-hours per month on common tasks such as financial adjustments on cases. Business practices and tasks will take less time to complete and increase the volume of transactions per day. Payment receipting clerks will have fewer windows or screens to look at when processing payments from customers, decreasing time per customer and increasing efficiency. With no training, they were able to navigate the system and find information where they expected it. Mesa users were not able to successfully enter and process a case in AJACS.

We feel there is considerable cost savings with the Themis system. We will realize annual mainframe support savings sooner by migrating to Themis as opposed to AJACS. Initial development and implementation costs will also be saved, as Themis provides the interfaces MMC needs to communicate with the state and third party vendors that are production-ready. We will further save on implementation costs since we can control time, scope and resources for projects and we will not depend on a vendor's availability and competing projects. The savings in reduced time and effort for staff to perform common functions will be significant.

As MMC intends to continue moving forward with innovations using technology to improve and automate court processes, it must be assumed that enhancements to the system would be requested on a regular basis. Neither the cost nor the development and implementation time of these enhancements can be estimated. In the case of AJACS requests these improvements would be outside of the control of MMC and prioritized with requests from other courts, while Themis enhancements could be developed and implemented more quickly, providing more productivity gains in a shorter period.

There are minimal costs associated with the Themis effort and those can be covered with local funding. We have an in-house staff of developers, analysts and subject matter experts that have a deep understanding of our business processes and our IT staff has in depth knowledge of the programming language and technology.

We will be able to modify and extend the system to support the needs of the court for years with this platform. As court needs change, we will be able to immediately develop scope, project plan and start

development efforts. We will have total control over all aspects of the change process, including tenability to control budgets, scopes and timelines. MMC and ITD have a great working relationship and a history of developing custom applications for MMC.

The Themis system employs current technology and is suitable as a replacement to our current CMS. It has an updated, user friendly interface that will help staff with their tasks. It uses modern database standards to address issues of reliability and dependability. The impact of implementing the Themis system will be immediate with tangible and intangible benefits to MMC.

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.

<i>Category</i>	<i>Standard score</i>	<i>Exception score</i>	<i>Description</i>
1. Strategic	1	1	Aligns with Court and Statewide Enterprise Architecture, goals, objectives, policies, standards and IT strategic plan.
Comment: The Themis system aligns with court and statewide EAS goals, objectives, policies, standards and IT strategic plan.			
2. Management	3	1	Senior and intermediate management is involved in, and supports, the project. A steering committee/project team is in place.
Comment: There is a well-defined management structure between Mesa Court and ITD. A steering committee is in place that includes senior managers from both MMC and ITD, Court Administrator and Presiding Judge. The vendor relationship has changed significantly which has impacted the management structure for support of AJACS.			
3. Operational	3	1	Adverse effects on current operations are unlikely or contingency plans are in place. Supports Agency Performance Measures.
Comment: As a self-hosted court, Mesa will control the high availability/redundancy requirements for the hardware environment of either option. There is a higher risk with the state standard in regards to the software because Mesa will not be the only court being supported by the AOC and as such, may not be able to obtain the assistance needed as quickly as it could be provided internally for the Themis system.			
4. Scope and Requirements	1	1	Scope and requirements are, or will be, clearly defined and approved. Effect on business processes has been assessed.
Comment: Both AJACS and Themis have clearly documented scope and requirements.			
5. Technologies Competency	1	1	Agency has available, or will secure appropriate skills to implement the project. Organizational readiness has been assessed.
Comment: Both MMC and ITD have personnel with the appropriate skills to implement and manage either system.			

6. Infrastructure Dependencies	2	1	All key elements are included to fully implement the project. No additional costs are anticipated to deliver benefits.
Comment: The AOC has not yet defined the structure and possible costs of support for self-hosted courts. Mesa has all the key elements to fully implement Themis and while no additional costs are anticipated, there are contingency funds available to cover unanticipated costs.			

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.

Executive/Steering Committee

- J. Matias Tafoya, Mesa Municipal Court Presiding Judge
- Paul Thomas, Court Administrator
- Diane Gardner, Chief Information Officer
- Lester Godsey, IT Manager

Subject Matter Experts

- Leonard Montanaro, Deputy Court Administrator
- Janie Moreno, Deputy Court Administrator
- Albert Lemke, Deputy Court Administrator
- Dyan Carney, Court Supervisor
- Edna Ramon, Court Supervisor
- Gina Sanchez, Court Supervisor
- Gloria Holland, Court Supervisor
- Karen Komada, Court Supervisor
- Nancy Bushaw, Court Supervisor
- Xiomara Tenreiro, Court Supervisor

IT Staff

- Lester Godsey, IT Manager
- Lauren Lupica, IT Project Mgr III
- Connie Williams, IT Engineer III
- Paul Poledna, IT Engineer III
- Lanny Wagner, IT Engineer II
- John Diamond, IT Engineer III
- Michael Kniskern, IT Engineer II
- Amy Davis, IT Engineer II
- Christine Chu, IT Engineer II
- Julie Darling, IT Engineer III
- Joe Hansen, IT System Architect
- Greg Stoner, IT Engineer III
- Ronald Williams, IT Engineer II
- Anthony Ross, IT Engineer I
- John Perry, IT Engineer III
- Hoan Vu, IT Engineer II
- Ihaab Dais, IT Engineer I
- Jeremy Montoya, IT Engineer II

- Technical Supervisor
- Project Management
- Technical Lead/Conversion
- FileNet Analyst
- FileNet Analyst
- Conversion, Interfaces
- Interface Analyst
- Web/IVR Analyst
- Reports/Export Interfaces Analyst
- Interface Analyst
- Middleware/DB Svcs
- Analyst
- DBA/Conversion
- Desktop Support
- Server
- Server
- Security
- Network Support

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.

[See Attachment B](#)

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.supreme.state.az.us/cot/Documents/Documents_default.htm
Contact: Alicia Moffatt, 602-452-3791, email: amoffatt@courts.az.gov