



Vermont Judiciary Next Generation Case Management System

Vermont Judiciary
Research and Information Services
Court Administrator's Office
 112 State Street, Suite 501
 Montpelier, VT 05609-0708
 [Phone] 802-828-4918
<https://www.vermontjudiciary.org/ng-cms/default.aspx>

STATEMENT OF WORK (SOW)

To Perform an INDEPENDENT REVIEW (IR)
of a Proposed

Vermont Judiciary Next Generation Case Management System (NG-CMS)

Expected SOW Schedule Summary:

DATE DISTRIBUTED	December 9, 2016
QUESTIONS DUE	December 14, 2016 by 2:00 p.m.
PROPOSALS DUE (via electronic submission)	December 16, 2016 by 2:00 p.m.
SELECTION NOTIFICATION	December 19, 2016
CONTRACT EXECUTED	December 20, 2016
PROJECT STARTS	December 21, 2016

LOCATION OF BID OPENING: 112 State Street, Suite 501, Montpelier

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT ALL NOTIFICATIONS, RELEASES, AND AMENDMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS RFP WILL BE POSTED AT:

<https://www.vermontjudiciary.org/ng-cms/default.aspx>

THE VERMONT JUDICIARY WILL MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO CONTACT BIDDERS WITH UPDATED INFORMATION. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF EACH BIDDER TO PERIODICALLY CHECK <https://www.vermontjudiciary.org/ng-cms/default.aspx> FOR ANY AND ALL NOTIFICATIONS, RELEASES AND AMENDMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE RFP.

PURCHASING AGENT: Jeffery Loewer
TELEPHONE: (802) 828-4918
E-MAIL: Jeffery.Loewer@vermont.gov



Vermont Judiciary Next Generation Case Management System

Table of Contents

1	OVERVIEW AND OBJECTIVES OF SOW	1
2	SCOPE STATEMENT	2
3	THE IR PROCESS AND SCHEDULE	4
4	ISSUING OFFICE	6
5	QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS SOW	6
6	QUOTE SUBMISSION	6
7	SUBMISSION FORMAT INSTRUCTIONS	6
8	EVALUATIONS OF SOW RESPONSES	8
9	SOW AGREEMENTS	8
10	ATTACHMENT SUMMARY	8
	ATTACHMENT A: IR REPORT TEMPLATE	9



Vermont Judiciary Next Generation Case Management System

1 Overview and Objectives of SOW

The Vermont Judiciary requests that a firm, fixed-price quote be submitted to perform an IR of an activity being proposed by the Judiciary. This SOW is being issued at time of vendor contract negotiation. Evaluation of the selected vendor's draft contract is a requirement of the review. The IR will include the following high-level activities:

- An acquisition cost assessment
- A technology architecture review
- An implementation plan assessment
- A cost analysis and model for benefit analysis
- An impact analysis on net operating costs for the Judiciary

A detailed outline of the required IR deliverable is in Attachment A to this document. The outline includes expected format and minimum requirements.

This IR is considered to be Standard for bidding cap purposes per your Retainer Contract.

Publicly available documents related to the Vermont Judiciary NG-CMS project can be found at:
<https://www.vermontjudiciary.org/ng-cms/default.aspx>.

2 Scope Statement

NG-CMS Project Background

The Vermont Judiciary continues to be under great pressure to become more efficient with fewer operational resources. Vermont Automated Docketing System (VTADS), described below, and the processes required to support its operation, including paper-based records, entry of data that resides elsewhere in electronic form, and multiple disparate data sources, hinder business process improvement efforts. The 2010 court restructuring, with its promise to increase management flexibility and operational efficiency, has been hindered and its benefits have not been fully realized, due to a lack of enabling technology. The transformation to an electronic-focused business model will give the Judiciary the flexibility to utilize available resources to accomplish needed work without the constraints of geography, place, and courthouse. Leveraging these technologies with automated case data intake, processing, and electronic records storage will free Judiciary resources from tedious clerical work by directing many filing and initiation tasks appropriately into the hands of the filers and automated workflows.

A NG-CMS will enable users to more easily accomplish the work of the Judiciary with an architecture that encompasses web and mobile-based user interfaces, flexible workflow, comprehensive definitions of business rules, and robust security features. The system will feature tight integration with electronic filing, and data and document management. The system will specifically target the Judiciary's strategic goals as follows:

- Increased access to judicial process for citizens by:
 - Standardizing practices and procedures
 - Ensuring that all files, documents, and other case materials are visible unless prohibited by policy or statute
 - Enabling the Judiciary to be open and accessible to justice partners, the media, and the public, in both policy and practice.
- Improved justice for citizens. Enabling electronic filing, electronic forms, and data and document management functionality will enhance interaction with the courts for all stakeholders and allow for:
 - Faster justice
 - Efficient justice
 - Effective and informed justice
 - Greater access to accurate and timely judicial information and improved interagency communication
- Automation and integration of Judiciary business processes will lead to:
 - Reduced clerical work performed by staff
 - Increased time for value-add work performed by staff
 - Diminished data entry by staff with no duplicative data entry
 - Maximization of data import
 - Improved functionality, accuracy, and reporting for financial systems
- Data transition from a paper-based system to an electronic system will mean:
 - Geography is irrelevant to court administration
 - The barriers of the case file and the courthouse will be removed
 - The system will be data-driven, not document-driven
 - Extensive reporting will be possible
 - Users will have the ability to better conduct impact analysis for decision-makers and other branches of government
- Enhanced technology:
 - Flexible/expandable to accommodate all future growth and business process reengineering without reliance on external resource (contractor) for reprogramming
 - Device independent

The Judiciary, the State of Vermont, and the federal government all share the goal of improving the timeliness and effectiveness of interagency communication through the increased use of standards. The NG-CMS will enhance the Judiciary's role as a hub of information for over 20 separate entities. As an information hub, the NG-CMS will have tightly integrated processes and data, inbound and outbound data interfaces, regular outputs to inform consumers, and ad hoc information portals. These capabilities will strengthen the entire justice system through better, faster, and more accurate communication and tighter data integration.

Judiciary Background and Philosophy

The Vermont Judiciary functions as a unified court system under the direction of the Vermont Supreme Court in accordance with the Vermont Constitution, Ch. II, Section 4. The Vermont court system consists of the Supreme Court, the Superior Court, the Judicial Bureau, and the Court Administrator's Office (CAO). The CAO is responsible for maintaining the budget, accounting and finance, security, network and infrastructure, and the buildings and physical assets of the Vermont Judiciary.

The Supreme Court is the court of final appeal in Vermont. The court hears appeals from the Vermont Superior Court and from certain administrative agency proceedings. The five justices of the Supreme Court render decisions in approximately 450 cases per year. There is no intermediate appellate court between the trial courts and the Supreme Court.

The Superior Court is the statewide trial court of general jurisdiction and there is a unit of the Superior Court in each county. The Superior Court has five divisions: criminal, family, civil, probate, and environmental. The environmental division operates statewide and is not organized into county units. Each unit of the Vermont Superior Court is managed by a Superior Court Clerk appointed by the Court Administrator and a Presiding Judge (chosen from among the Superior Judges) appointed by the Chief Superior Judge. Court Operations Managers in each unit, who report to the Superior Court Clerk, manage court staff. Approximately 45,000 cases are filed each year in the Superior Court.

The Judicial Bureau has statewide jurisdiction over civil violations. Police and other government officials have authority to charge civil violations, such as traffic violations, municipal ordinance violations, fish and wildlife violations, and various other civil violations set forth in Vermont statutes. The Judicial Bureau processes approximately 80,000 civil violation complaints per year.

Vermont has a centralized Court Administrator's office. This includes the Planning and Court Services division, Trial Court Operations division, Finance and Administration, and the Research and Information Services (RIS) division, which is responsible for the support of technology at the Judiciary.

The Judiciary acts as a crucial hub of information for over 20 separate governmental and non-governmental entities, including tightly defined integrations of process and data, inbound and outbound interfaces of data, regular outputs to information consumers, and ad hoc information portals.

3 The IR Process and Schedule

The IR bid must be received no later than the date and time provided on the cover page of this SOW. It is the bidder's responsibility to ensure that the submission email arrives on time; if requested, the Judiciary will respond to confirm receipt of submission and that it can be read and printed. Late submissions will be rejected.

Contingent on final vendor selection, the Judiciary expects this IR process to start on **December 21, 2016** and be completed by **February 3, 2017**.

If you think you will need to perform other tasks as part of this review process, or if you feel due diligence will require more time, please indicate so in your response. In this case, please propose a timeline.

The attached SOW provides a clear understanding of our expectations and will guide your assessment of the effort required to complete the IR. In general, we expect the IR process to include the following high-level tasks:

- The IR Vendor will conduct project planning and kickoff with the Judiciary.
- The Judiciary will develop an IR stakeholder contact list and provide the list to the IR Vendor within the first two days of the project. For example: Judiciary resources and NG-CMS Vendor resources, including name, role for project, role during IR, email, and telephone number.
- The IR Vendor's staff will conduct on-site meetings at Judiciary offices in Vermont, collecting information and interviewing stakeholders:
 - Initial interviews with Judiciary resources (follow-up interviews conducted via telephone).
 - Series of scheduled Judiciary meetings (facilitated by the IR Vendor) to develop the Judiciary's response to all risks and issues.
 - Final IR Report presentation/discussion with the CIO.
- The IR Vendor will identify risks and issues, and the strategies to address them:
 - IR Vendor's responsibility is to determine how the Judiciary would like to respond to each of the risks and issues identified by the IR Vendor.
 - A Judiciary representative will be responsible for documenting the Judiciary's response and providing it to the IR Vendor for inclusion in the Risks and Issues Management Plan.
- The reviewer writes the IR deliverable according to the statement of work, and delivers the draft document to the Judiciary prior to the meeting with the Judiciary CIO for initial review.
- The Judiciary will schedule a meeting with the IR Vendor to discuss the review, respond to risks and issues, and answer final questions; CIO may include additional project team members.
- The IR Vendor makes final adjustments to the deliverable report, works on any Risk Mitigations left, and submits the final IR document(s) to the Judiciary.
- The IR Vendor presents the IR Report findings to the Judiciary CIO and NG-CMS Project Sponsor; CIO may include additional project team members.
- Acceptance Form is completed and billing for IR deliverable is completed.

Example of Possible Project Schedule:

- Project Weeks 1 – 2:
 - IR Vendor requests all IR materials
 - IR Vendor reviews IR materials/develops interview questions
 - IR Vendor works with the Judiciary contact to schedule initial interviews with Judiciary resources
- Project Week 3:
 - IR Vendor conducts initial interviews with key Judiciary resources
 - IR Vendor develops Findings, Risks, and Issues
- Project Week 4:

- IR Vendor conducts follow-up interviews with Judiciary resources via phone, if needed
- IR Vendor refines and evolves Findings, Risks, and Issues
- IR Vendor develops Risk and Issue mitigation recommendations
- IR Vendor provides preliminary IR Report to Judiciary contact for initial review
- Project Week 5:
 - IR Vendor refines and submits the IR Report draft to the Judiciary for review
- Project Week 6:
 - The Judiciary provides IR Report feedback to IR Vendor
 - IR Vendor incorporates Judiciary feedback into the IR Report and resubmits the final version to the Judiciary
 - The Judiciary schedules the meeting with the Judiciary CIO and NG-CMS Project Sponsor
 - IR Vendor presents the IR Report findings to the Judiciary CIO and NG-CMS Project Sponsor.

4 Issuing Office

The Issuing Office is:

Vermont Judiciary
Research and Information Services (RIS)
Office of the Chief Information Officer (CIO)
112 State Street, Suite 501
Montpelier, VT 05609-0708

5 Questions about this SOW

All questions and correspondence about this SOW may be addressed via email to: jud.ngcms@vermont.gov. **Do not submit questions, correspondence, or the quote to the email address provided on the cover page of this SOW.**

NOTE: The question period for this SOW is between December 9, 2016 and December 14, 2016. All questions and concerns must be received during this period, in writing or by email.

6 Quote Submission

We ask that you submit a firm fixed-price quote to produce the IR Report deliverable. Your quote must address, at a minimum, the following activities:

- Conducting the IR tasks, to include but not be limited to:
 - An acquisition cost assessment
 - A technology architecture review
 - An implementation plan assessment
 - A cost analysis and model for benefit analysis
 - An impact analysis on net operating costs for the Judiciary
- Development of a Risk Management Plan
- Delivery of documents as outlined in the SOW

Include the following components in the quote:

- A brief outline of the tasks/steps you propose to take.
- A brief summary of similar work you have done in the past.
- A timetable for completing the review and the amount of interview time you will require of Vermont Judiciary employees.
- At least two references for similar work you have completed, with a short description and a current name/phone number for a reference contact.
- Resume(s) of the staff member(s) who will be doing the work. The staff you propose will be considered “Key” by the Judiciary.
- A total, firm, fixed-cost, all-inclusive quote that includes expenses. Costs may be broken down if you prefer; however, a final, single cost must be provided.

The Judiciary reserves the right to reject any or all responses to this SOW without cause. The Judiciary is in no way obligated to proceed beyond issuing this SOW document.

7 Submission Format Instructions

- The preferred method for submitting the quote is via email attachment to the Judiciary at the following email address: jud.ngcms@vermont.gov.

- The quote that you submit in response to this SOW must be in **one** MS Word for Windows (.doc) document or Adobe (.pdf) file. Optionally, a second file attachment in MS Project (.mpp) and/or a MS Excel (.xls) attachment is acceptable.
- The subject of the email must be: **“INDEPENDENT-REVIEW-Vermont Judiciary, NG-CMS Project, yourcompanyname”**
- The name of any attached documents must follow this naming standard: **“INDEPENDENT-REVIEW-Vermont_Judiciary_NG-CMS_Project_yourcompanyname.doc/.pdf/.xls”**
- Quote submissions will alternatively be accepted via mail or in person. If you do not submit your response via email attachment, you may submit it via CD with a hardcopy quote prior to the submission deadline. If sending a hard-copy, it must be an unbound master, suitable for copying.
- The quote must contain a signed Vermont Tax form (if not already on file) and a transmittal letter.
- While not mandatory, you are strongly encouraged to submit proposals of less than 25 pages.
- If possible, do not submit proprietary and confidential information in your quote. If you include such information, it must be clearly marked “Proprietary and Confidential.” After contract award, documents will be considered to be in the public domain.

The final IR deliverable resulting from the execution of this IR, including any attachments, must be submitted using MS Office for Windows tools (Version 2000 or above), using the outline provided in Attachment A. The final deliverable files can be zipped or in .pdf file format and should be emailed to the Vermont Judiciary (jud.ngcms@vermont.gov) as an email attachment. The subject of the email must be: **“FINAL-INDEPENDENT-REVIEW-Vermont Judiciary, NG-CMS Project”**. Also, at presentation time you will need to provide multiple bound copies within notebooks. The number of required copies will be discussed and agreed upon before the presentation date, but should not exceed 10.

8 Evaluations of SOW Responses

The responses will be evaluated based on the following:

- Duration of proposed work schedule
- Experience/knowledge with **court case management systems**
- Prior experience with this type of IR process
- Technical quote content
- Price quote content
- Approach to developing a risk management plan

9 SOW Agreements

If selected, the Contractor will sign an SOW Agreement with the Contracting Agency to provide the deliverables set forth in its response and at prices agreed by the Contracting Agency. Minimum support levels set forth in this SOW RFP and terms, and conditions from the Master Agreement, including Attachment C thereto, will become part of each SOW Agreement. Each SOW Agreement will be subject to review throughout its term. The Contracting Agency will consider cancellation of each SOW Agreement, as well as the Master Agreement upon discovery that the Contractor is in violation of any portion of the Master Agreement or an SOW Agreement, including an inability by the Contractor to provide the products, support, and/or service offered in its response. Each SOW Agreement shall specify the term of the Agreement.

In no event shall any SOW Agreement or any document proposed by the Contractor (a) require indemnification by the State of the Contractor; (b) waive the State's right to a jury trial; (c) establish jurisdiction in any venue other than the Superior Court of the State of Vermont, Washington County Division; (d) constitute an implied or deemed waiver of the immunities, defenses, rights or actions arising out of State's sovereign status or under the Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution; or (e) limit the time within which an action may be brought hereunder. Further, there shall be no limitation of liability, including a waiver of consequential, indirect, special or disclaimers of warranty without approval from the Office of the Attorney General.

10 Attachment Summary

Attachments to this SOW are:

ATTACHMENT A: IR Report template provides a template for the required deliverable format, describing the review requirements by section. The Judiciary requires you follow the format in Attachment A for your deliverable. However, if you propose changes to this format and/or content, you must specify your changes in detail in your quote for the Judiciary's consideration.

For presentation to the Judiciary CIO and NG-CMS Project Sponsor, the final version of the report should be delivered in multiple bound notebook binders. The number of these binders will be discussed with the independent reviewer before the presentation date.

Attachment A: IR Report Template

Independent Review (IR)

**Vermont Judiciary Next Generation Case Management System (NG-CMS)
Project**

for the

Vermont Judiciary

Submitted to the
Vermont Judiciary, Office of the CIO
By

XXXX

(Date)

Attachment A: Independent Review (IR) Report Template Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	11
1.1	Cost Summary.....	11
1.2	Disposition of IR Deliverables.....	11
1.3	Identified High Impact and/or High Likelihood of Occurrence Risks.....	11
1.4	Other Key Issues.....	11
1.5	Recommendation.....	11
1.6	Independent Reviewer Certification.....	12
1.7	Report Acceptance.....	12
2	Scope of this IR	13
2.1	In-Scope.....	13
2.2	Out-of-Scope.....	13
3	Sources of Information	13
3.1	IR Participants.....	13
3.2	IR Documentation.....	13
4	Project Information	15
4.1	Historical Background.....	15
4.2	Project Goal.....	15
4.3	Project Scope.....	15
4.4	Project Phases, Milestones and Schedule.....	15
5	Acquisition Cost Assessment	16
6	Technology Architecture Review	17
7	Assessment of Implementation Plan	18
8	Cost Benefit Analysis	19
9	Impact Analysis on Net Operating Costs	20
10	Risk Assessment & Risk Register	21
	Attachment 1 – Lifecycle Cost Benefit Analysis	22
	Attachment 2 – Risk Register	23

1 Executive Summary

Provide an introduction that includes a brief overview of the technology project and selected vendor(s) as well as any significant findings or conclusions. Ensure any significant findings or conclusions are supported by data in the report.

1.1 Cost Summary

Cost Activity	Cost
IT Activity Lifecycle:	<<#>> Years
Total Lifecycle Costs:	\$
Total Implementation Costs:	\$
New Annual Operating Costs:	\$
Current Annual Operating Costs:	\$
Difference Between Current and New Operating Costs:	\$
Funding Source(s) and Percentage Breakdown if Multiple Sources:	

1.2 Disposition of IR Deliverables

Deliverable	Highlights from the Review <i>Include explanations of any significant concerns</i>
Acquisition Cost Assessment	
Technology Architecture Review	
Implementation Plan Assessment	
Cost Analysis and Model for Benefit Analysis	
Impact Analysis on Net Operating Costs	

1.3 Identified High Impact and/or High Likelihood of Occurrence Risks

Risk Description	Judiciary's Planned Risk Response	Reviewer's Assessment of Planned Response

1.4 Other Key Issues

Recap any key issues or concerns identified in the body of the report.

1.5 Recommendation

Provide your IR recommendation on whether or not to proceed with this technology project and vendor(s).

1.6 Independent Reviewer Certification

I certify that this IR Report is an independent and unbiased assessment of the proposed solution's acquisition costs, technical architecture, implementation plan, cost-benefit analysis, and impact on net operating costs, based on the information made available to me by the Judiciary.

Independent Reviewer Signature

Date

1.7 Report Acceptance

The signatures below represent the acceptance of this document as the final completed IR Report.

Vermont Judiciary Chief Information Officer

Date

Vermont Judiciary NG-CMS Project Sponsor

Date

2 Scope of this IR

Add or change this section as applicable.

2.1 In-Scope

The IR report includes:

- An acquisition cost assessment
- A technology architecture review
- An implementation plan assessment
- A cost analysis and model for benefit analysis
- An impact analysis on net operating costs for the Judiciary
- An overall risk assessment of the proposed solution

2.2 Out-of-Scope

If applicable, describe any limits of this review and any area of the project or quote that you did not review.

3 Sources of Information

3.1 Independent Review Participants

List the individuals that participated in this IR.

Name	Title	Participation Topic(s)

3.2 IR Documentation

Complete the chart below to list the documentation utilized to compile this IR.

Document Name	Description	Source

Document Name	Description	Source

4 Project Information

4.1 Historical Background

Provide any relevant background that has resulted in this project.

4.2 Project Goal

Explain why the project is being undertaken.

4.3 Project Scope

Describe the project scope and list the major deliverables. Add or delete lines as needed.

4.4 Project Phases, Milestones and Schedule

Provide a list of the major project phases, milestones, and high-level schedule. You may elect to include it as an attachment to the report instead of within the body.

5 Acquisition Cost Assessment

List all acquisition costs in the table below (i.e. the comprehensive list of the one-time costs to acquire the proposed system/service). Do not include any costs that reoccur during the system/service lifecycle. Add or delete lines as appropriate. Based on your assessment of Acquisition Costs, please answer the questions listed below in this section.

Acquisition Costs	Cost	Comments
Hardware Costs	\$	
Software Costs	\$	
Implementation Services	\$	
System Integration Costs	\$	
Professional Services (e.g. Project Management, Technical, Training, etc.)	\$	
<<Other>>	\$	
<<Other>>	\$	
Total Acquisition Costs	\$	

- 1. Cost Validation:** Describe how you validated the Acquisition Costs.
- 2. Cost Comparison:** How do the Acquisition Costs of the proposed solution compare to what others have paid for similar solutions? Will the Judiciary be paying more, less, or about the same?
- 3. Cost Assessment:** Are the Acquisition Costs valid and appropriate, in your professional opinion? List any concerns or issues with the costs.

Additional Comments on Acquisition Costs:

6 Technology Architecture Review

After performing an independent technology architecture review of the proposed solution, please respond to the following.

1. **State's IT Strategic Plan:** Describe how the proposed solution aligns with each of the State's IT Strategic Principles:
 - a. Leverage successes of others, learning best practices from outside Vermont
 - b. Leverage shared services and cloud-based IT, taking advantage of IT economies of scale
 - c. Adapt the Vermont workforce to the evolving needs of state government
 - d. Apply enterprise architecture principles to drive digital transformation based on business needs
 - e. Couple IT with business process optimization, to improve overall productivity and customer service
 - f. Optimize IT investments via sound Project Management
 - g. Manage data commensurate with risk
 - h. Incorporate metrics to measure outcomes
2. **Sustainability:** Comment on the sustainability of the solution's technical architecture (i.e., is it sustainable?).
3. **Security:** Does the proposed solution have the appropriate level of security for the proposed activity it will perform (including any applicable State or Federal standards)? Please describe.
4. **Compliance with the Section 508 Amendment to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended in 1998:** Comment on the solution's compliance with accessibility standards as outlined in this amendment. Reference: <http://www.section508.gov/content/learn>
5. **Disaster Recovery:** What is your assessment of the proposed solution's disaster recovery plan; do you think it is adequate? How might it be improved? Are there specific actions that you would recommend to improve the plan?
6. **Data Retention:** Describe the relevant data retention needs and how they will be satisfied for or by the proposed solution.
7. **Service Level Agreement:** What are the post implementation services and service levels required by the Judiciary? Is the vendor proposed service level agreement adequate to meet these needs, in your judgement?
8. **System Integration:** Is the data export reporting capability of the proposed solution consumable by the Judiciary? What data is exchanged and what systems (State and non-State) will the solution integrate/interface with?

Additional Comments on Architecture:

7 Assessment of Implementation Plan

After assessing the Implementation Plan as proposed by the selected NG-CMS vendor, please comment on each of the following.

1. The feasibility of the implementation timetable.

2. Readiness of impacted divisions/departments to participate in this solution/project. Consider current culture, staff buy-in, organizational changes needed, and leadership readiness.

3. State and affirm how the milestones and deliverables proposed by the NG-CMS vendor provide sufficient detail to hold them accountable for meeting business needs in the following areas :
 - a. Project Management
 - b. Training
 - c. Testing
 - d. Design
 - e. Data Conversion
 - f. Implementation planning
 - g. Implementation

4. Does the Judiciary have a resource lined up to be the Project Manager on the project? If so, does this person possess the skills and experience to be successful in this role in your judgement? Please explain.

Additional Comments on Implementation Plan:

8 Cost Benefit Analysis

This section involves four tasks:

- 1) *Perform an independent Cost Benefit Analysis. Information provided by the Judiciary may be used, but the reviewer must validate it for accuracy and completeness.*
- 2) *Provide a Lifecycle Cost Benefit Analysis spreadsheet as an **Attachment 1** to this report. A sample format is provided at the end of this report template.*
 - a. *The cost component of the cost/benefit analysis will include all one-time acquisition costs, on-going operational costs (licensing, maintenance, refresh, etc.) plus internal costs of staffing and “other costs”. “Other costs” include the cost of personnel or contractors required for this solution, enhancements/upgrades planned for the lifecycle, consumables, costs associated with system interfaces, and any costs of upgrading the current environment to accept the proposed solution (new facilities, etc.).*
 - b. *The benefit side of the cost/benefit will include: (1) Intangible items for which an actual cost cannot be attributed; (2) Tangible savings/benefit such as actual savings in personnel, contractors, or operating expense associated with existing methods of accomplishing the work which will be performed by the proposed solution. Tangible benefits also include additional revenue which may result from the proposed solution.*
 - c. *The cost benefit analysis will be for the IT activity’s lifecycle.*
 - d. *The format will be a column spreadsheet with one column for each year in the lifecycle. The rows will contain the itemized costs with totals followed by the itemized benefits with totals.*
 - e. *Identify the source of funds (federal, state, one-time vs. ongoing). For example, implementation may be covered by federal dollars, but operations will be paid by Judiciary funds.*
- 3) *Perform an analysis of the IT ABC form (Business Case/Cost Analysis) completed by the Business, if available.*
- 4) *Respond to the questions/items listed below.*

1. **Analysis Description:** Provide a narrative summary of the cost benefit analysis conducted. Be sure to indicate how the costs were independently validated.
2. **Assumptions:** List any assumptions made in your analysis.
3. **Funding:** Provide the funding source(s). If multiple sources, indicate the percentage of each source for both Acquisition Costs and on-going Operational Costs over the duration of the system/service lifecycle.
4. **Tangible Costs & Benefits:** Provide a list and description of the tangible costs and benefits of this project. It is considered “tangible” if it has a direct impact on implementation or operating costs (an increase = a tangible cost and a decrease = a tangible benefit). The cost of software licenses is an example of a tangible cost. Projected annual operating cost savings is an example of a tangible benefit.
5. **Intangible Costs & Benefits:** Provide a list and descriptions of the intangible costs and benefits. Its “intangible” if it has a positive or negative impact but is not cost related. Examples: Customer Service is expected to improve (intangible benefit) or Employee Morale is expected to decline (intangible cost).
6. **Costs vs. Benefits:** Do the benefits of this project (consider both tangible and intangible) outweigh the costs in your opinion? Please elaborate on your response.
7. **IT ABC Form Review:** Review the IT ABC form (Business Case/Cost Analysis) created by the Business for this project. Is the information consistent with your IR and analysis? If not, please describe. Is the lifecycle that was used appropriate for the technology being proposed? If not, please explain.

Additional Comments on the Cost Benefit Analysis:

9 Impact Analysis on Net Operating Costs

- 1.) *Perform a lifecycle cost impact analysis on net operating costs for the Judiciary, minimally including the following:*
 - a. *Estimated future-state ongoing annual operating costs, and estimated lifecycle operating costs. Consider also if the project will yield additional revenue generation that may offset any increase in operating costs.*
 - b. *Current-state annual operating costs; assess total current costs over span of new IT activity lifecycle*
 - c. *Provide a breakdown of funding sources (federal, state, one-time vs. ongoing)*
- 2.) *Create a table to illustrate the net operating cost impact.*
- 3.) *Respond to the items below.*

1. Insert a table to illustrate the Net Operating Cost Impact.
2. Provide a narrative summary of the analysis conducted and include a list of any assumptions.
3. Explain any net operating increases that will be covered by federal funding. Will this funding cover the entire lifecycle? If not, please provide the breakouts by year.
4. What is the break-even point for this initiative (considering implementation and on-going operating costs)?

10 Risk Assessment & Risk Register

1. Perform an independent risk assessment and complete a Risk Register. The assessment process will include performing the following activities:

- a. Ask the IR participants to provide a list of the risks that they have identified and their strategies for addressing those risks.
- b. Independently validate the risk information provided by the Judiciary and/or vendor and assess their risk strategies.
- c. Identify any additional risks.
- d. Ask the Business to respond to your identified risks, as well as provide strategies to address them.
- e. Assess the risks strategies provided by the Business for the additional risks you identified.
- f. Document all this information in a Risk Register and label it "Attachment 2". The Risk Register should include the following:
 - **Source of Risk:** Project, Proposed Solution, Vendor, or Other
 - **Risk Description:** Provide a description of what the risk entails
 - **Risk ratings to indicate:** Likelihood and probability of risk occurrence; impact should risk occur; and overall risk rating (high, medium, or low priority).
 - **Judiciary's Planned Risk Strategy:** Avoid, Mitigate, Transfer, or Accept
 - **Judiciary's Planned Risk Response:** Describe what the Judiciary plans to do (if anything) to address the risk
 - **Timing of Risk Response:** Describe the planned timing for carrying out the risk response (e.g. prior to the start of the project, during the Planning Phase, prior to implementation, etc.)
 - **Reviewer's Assessment of Judiciary's Planned Response:** Indicate if the planned response is adequate/appropriate in your judgment and, if not, what you would recommend.

Additional Comments on Risks:

Attachment 1 – Lifecycle Cost Benefit Analysis

See sample format provided on page 29.

Attachment 2 – Risk Register

Sample Format Project Name:								
Description	Qty	Unit Price	Initial Implementation	Maintenance	Maintenance	Maintenance	Refresh & Maintenance	Total
Fiscal Year			FY 20XX	FY 20XX	FY 20XX	FY20XX	FY 20XX	
Hardware								
Server Hardware								\$ -
Network Upgrades								\$ -
Desktop Hardware								\$ -
Other								\$ -
Hardware Total			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Software								
Product License								\$ -
Product Per-User Charges								\$ -
Database								\$ -
Operating System Software								\$ -
Additional Server Software								\$ -
Additional Network Software								\$ -
Other								\$ -
Software Total			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Consulting								
Third-Party - Technical								\$ -
Third-Party - Business								\$ -
Deployment								\$ -
Upgrade								\$ -
Other								\$ -
Consulting Total			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Training								
Trainer								\$ -
Other								\$ -
Training Total			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other								
Other 1								\$ -
Other 2								\$ -
Other Total			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Personnel - Additional								
Technical Staff								0