



Court Case Management (CCM) Program Phase 1

Closeout Report

Program Specific Details	
Date Prepared:	September 30, 2010
Program Name:	Court Case Management (CCM) Program
Program Managers:	C. Armstrong and P. Lafleur
Program Description:	<p>CCM Program is a Provincial Court of Alberta initiative supported by the JIMS initiative. The aim of the CCM Program is to more effectively manage criminal cases in Edmonton and Calgary adult Provincial Court, and in turn, increase public confidence in the justice system and improve access to justice. The Program will address new and innovative methods by which matters are scheduled and disposed of in the Provincial Court.</p> <p>CCM also includes the Crown File Ownership component. File ownership uses a cradle-to-grave concept for managing files, assigning a single prosecutor to a matter throughout the life of the case. It allows more effective tracking of file assignments and workloads, and helps ensure work is distributed equitably and appropriately. Managing files efficiently also helps bring Crown prosecutors and the defence counsel or accused together at the earliest possible time, which leads to timely dispositions and shortens court proceedings.</p>
Need for Program:	<p>The CCM Program was initiated for several important reasons. Most notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Alberta's justice system has experienced a significant drop in confidence levels since 2003/04.• Provincial Court hears a growing number of increasingly complex cases each year. This places greater demands on Provincial Court Judges and judicial clerks.• Last minute adjournments and plea agreements often result in gaps in court time that could be reallocated to other cases.• Provincial Court Judges are appearing in court to address many administrative events, which takes the time away from meaningful events such as trials or preliminary hearings.• There is a lack of proper case management in Crown offices where file ownership does not exist.• Crown prosecutors' time is not being used as effectively as possible because of the effort invested by multiple prosecutors in reviewing the same files and the time spent in court attending to administrative tasks.• Many files are lost at any given time in Crown offices due to the current transfer process between Crown prosecutors and dockets.

**Overarching Principle:**

The Provincial Court and Alberta Justice recognize and accept the following overarching principle must apply to, and be respected in, any proposed initiative:

To recognize and protect judicial independence and the management of its judicial resources, the Provincial Court has jurisdiction over, and responsibility for, the scheduling and disposition of matters within the Provincial Court. Within this jurisdiction and responsibility, the Provincial Court seeks to:

- Ensure the solicitor-client relationship between a person accused of a crime and their counsel is assiduously fostered and supported.
- Recognize the public is entitled to proper and competent representation from the Crown by encouraging early and consistent contact between Crown and defence counsel or the accused, victims, witnesses, and police through a variety of measures including support for vertical file management within the Crown offices.
- Ensure a level playing field by treating the Crown and the accused equally with respect to any changes concerning how matters are scheduled and disposed in the Provincial Court.
- Achieve consistent approaches to case management processes in the Provincial Court (Calgary and Edmonton locations only).

**Program Approach:**

Several multi-day, process improvement analysis sessions were completed over a two month period. The sessions included mapping current work processes in Calgary and Edmonton Hearing Offices, docket courts, court scheduling and General Prosecution's Offices. Front-line representatives from the Provincial Court, defence bar, and Court Services, Criminal Justice and Corporate Services Divisions critically examined the data collected and identified 155 significant improvement recommendations. Of those, 131 were incorporated into the scope of the CCM Program; the remaining 24 were deemed post-project and considered out of scope.

In order to develop a comprehensive project plan, the project managers held several workshops with all stakeholder groups to develop a detailed work breakdown structure (WBS). The WBS was used to define program scope, resourcing, timelines, hardware, software, milestones and deliverables for the Program. At the same time, Organizational Change Management (OCM) teams were established in Court Services and Criminal Justice Divisions to help manage the people side of change in their respective areas.

The CCM Program was broken into several project components:

- Assignment Courts
- Low Complexity Courts
- Justice of the Peace (JP) Counter
- Required Appearance Court (RAC)
- Scheduled Disposition Courts
- Crown File Ownership
- Technology:
 - Implement a prosecutor information management system
 - Implement a web based courtroom scheduling system
 - Implement electronic court signage in the Edmonton Courthouse

The formalized governance team, known as the Provincial Implementation Committee (PIC), approved the CCM Program Project Statement on July 8th, 2009. The CCM Project Support Team, following the comprehensive project plan, defined budget and schedule, and executed the Program.



Program Governance\Organization	
Role	Name
Provincial Implementation Committee (PIC)	DCJ Allan Lefever (Chair), ACJ Wilkins, Barb Hookenson, Greg Lepp, Wes Smart, Mike Dinkel, Stephen Bull, Barry Chatwin
Court Services Sub Committees	Lorna Ross (Chair), Brenda Haynes, Basem Hage, Barb McCullough, Kerri McPhee, Randy Sloan, Rhonda McAndrews, John Porter, Sherri Stasiuk, Pat Kwasnycia, Lynne Blair-Kaye, Jessica Nedohin; Harprit Singh
Crown Sub Committee (Prov\Fed)	Greg Lepp (Co-Chair), Wes Smart (Co-Chair), Deborah Alford, Gordon Wong (former member), Bryan Laroque, Stephen Bilodeau, Martin Elton, Giselle Houle, Lloyd Robertson, Eric Tolppanen, Larry Stein, Carolyn Thompson
Judicial Sub Committee	ACJ Robert Wilkins (Chair), ACJ Jim Wheatley, Judge Catherine Skene, Judge Terry Matchett, Judge Shelagh Creagh, Judge David McNab
Defence Bar Sub Committee	Mike Dinkel (Chair), Allan Fay, Brian Hurley, Mitch Stephensen
JIMS Sub Committee	Stephen Bull (Chair), Gail Thomson, Debbie Tkachuk, Pat Lafleur, Mario Flecha, Murray McKay, Sandra Bachand, Roxanne Laderoute, Jason Quinton, Bruce McDonald, Greg Hartwick, Peter Scott
Project Lead	Tim Owens
Project Managers	Cheryl Armstrong, Pat Lafleur
Project Support Team	Tim Owens (Lead), Murray McKay, Jean Mah, Krista Belliveau, Jessica Nedohin, Jackie Starcevic, Sherri Stasiuk, Cheryl Armstrong, Pat Lafleur, Jill McKenzie, Alison Burns (former member)
Working Group	Tim Owens (Lead), Alain Coulombe, Brett Hammerlindl, Phil Robson, Ann Marie Barnhill, Basem Hage, Brenda Haynes, Cheryl Armstrong, Pat Lafleur, Brian Hurley, Jean Mah, Jessica Nedohin, Jill McKenzie, Karen Melnyk, Kerri McPhee, Krista Belliveau, Lloyd Robertson, Martin Elton, Murray McKay, Susan Pepper, Judge Terry Matchett, Alison Burns (former member), Gordon Wong (former member)
IT Working Group	Brett Hammerlindl (Chair), Bryan Laroque, John Porter, Paul Shredder, Brad Moore, Stuart Macleod (Microsoft) Charolette Liber, Phil Robson
Organizational Change Management Team – Court Services	Murray McKay (Lead), Corrina Berezanski, Harprit Singh, Rhonda McAndrews, Lynne Blair-Kaye, Shelia Geddes, Kim Febrowski, Lillian Ivankovic, Cheryl Lindberg
Organizational Change Management Team – Criminal Justice	Murray McKay (Lead), Gordon Wong, Susan Pepper, Lucia Calisi, Martin Elton, Faye Hogle, Michelle Bourgeois



Page intentionally left blank.



Program Resource Management

The CCM Program experienced procurement delays at the onset of the execution phase causing delayed start dates for external resources. This delay, along with scope reduction of application deliverables, reduced the external resources hours in comparison to the original plan. Internal resources either returned to their original divisional operational roles or continued in an ongoing support role capacity. External resources were released at the end of the project contract or were extended to continue providing ongoing support role capacity by the Corporate Services Information Technology.

Original Program Resources	Original Program Resource Work Effort	Actual Program Resource Work Effort
Internal Resources	3109	3115
External Resources	2939	1304
Total Work Effort	6048	7507

Stakeholder Management

The CCM Program was successful due to the extraordinary effort of stakeholder group who normally work in an adversarial system. This group was able to set aside the interests of their own area of responsibility and undertake a review of criminal justice processes from a holistic perspective. As a result, each stakeholder group gained a better appreciation for how their interests could be advanced while advancing the interests of the other stakeholders – a classic “win-win” scenario.

Stakeholders
Judiciary
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provincial Court of Alberta (Calgary and Edmonton)
Internal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deputy Minister, Alberta Justice and the Attorney General Assistant Deputy Minister, Court Services Division Court Services – Administration and IT (Edmonton and Calgary) Assistant Deputy Minister, Criminal Justice Division Crown prosecutors and support staff within the various sections/divisions/units within the Calgary and Edmonton General Prosecutions Offices Chief Information Officer, Corporate Services Division Corporate Services, IT Services JIMS Sheriffs (Edmonton and Calgary) Provincial Court, Youth (information only) Safe Communities Secretariat
External – Legal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defence Counsel, Legal Aid Alberta, Public Prosecution Service of Canada (PPSC)
External
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Witnesses, victims, self-represented litigants (including social workers), NGOs, Elizabeth Fry Society



Issue and Risk Management (for a full listing of the Issues and Risks see Appendix A and B)			
Total No. of Issues	Identified in Planning	Identified in Execution	Outstanding
26	14	12	0
Total No. of Risks	Identified in Planning	Identified in Execution	Outstanding
61	39	21	5

Objective, Benefits and Outcomes

Objective:
 Make more efficient and effective use of limited Court Services, Crown, Defence Counsel and Provincial Court (Calgary and Edmonton locations only) time and resources.

Benefits:
 Not only was the CCM Program completed on time and below budget, it also delivered planned and unplanned benefits. For example:

- Assignment Courts – By adopting the a ‘day-of’ approach to scheduling, the Provincial Court is able to more evenly distribute daily trial work among judicial resources and permit more cases to be scheduled and processed in a given day.
- Low Complexity Courts – Matters deemed low complexity by Crown can now proceed to trial more quickly.
- Case Management Office (CMO) Counter – CMO reduces Docket Court lists by dealing with administrative and non-contested matters outside of a courtroom. Defence counsel can also use this counter to make appearances and to book trials.
- Crown File Ownership – The implementation of Crown File Ownership assigns one Crown prosecutor to a case from start to finish which promotes proper case management within the Crown office. Crown assignment can be viewed online using RCS, which now brings Crown prosecutors and the defence counsel or accused together at the earliest possible time to facilitate timely dispositions and shortened court proceedings. File Ownership also reduces the number of Crown prosecutors investing time and effort in reviewing files and ensures one Crown is held accountable for a file’s progress from the beginning to the end of the court process.
- Technology:
 - Implemented **PR**osecutor **I**nformation **S**ystem **M**anager (PRISM) as the prosecutor information case management solution to support Crown File Ownership. PRISM interfaces with JOIN to access client information, trial dates and criminal records and sends information regarding Crown assignment, intended elections on files, eligibility for diversion program and categorization of file complexity
 - Implemented a web based **R**emote **C**ourt **S**cheduling (RCS) solution allowing counsel the option to remotely book cases; subject to the approval from Court Services CMOs
 - Implemented an electronic court signage solution in the Edmonton Courthouse assisting with movement of individuals to respective courtrooms similar to the existing system at the Calgary Courts Centre

The Safe Communities Task Force Report stated, “It’s time to...make sure the courts are dealing with offenders quickly and appropriately.” The innovative changes implemented as a result of the CCM Program responds to this priority.



Objective, Benefits and Outcomes

Expected outcomes:

- Maximize the use of available court time
- Streamline criminal justice processes
- Increase the public's confidence in the justice system
- Improve access to justice

The above outcomes will be achieved by:

- Maximizing the amount of time Provincial Court Judges spend on meaningful events
- Reducing the length of time required to dispose of cases from first appearance to disposition
- Reducing the number of appearances per case
- Increasing the number of cases processed to acceptable levels

Outcomes	Target Metrics	Baseline Metrics (Pre-Implementation) April 1 – Dec 31, 2009	Comparison Metrics (Post Implementation*) April 1 – Aug 31, 2010
Maximized amount of time Provincial Court Judges spend on meaningful events	Increase average time per sitting day for trial courts to 80% to a total of 4.5 hrs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase trials heard by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% in Edm • 10% in Calg 	Average court time hrs per day: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edm Urban: 2hrs 30min (2.50hrs) • Calg Urban: 2hrs 50min (2.83) 	Average court time hrs per day: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edm Urban: 2 hrs 59 min (2.98 hrs) 19.2% increase • Calg Urban: 2 hrs 53 min (2.88 hrs) 1.8% increase
Reduced length of time required to dispose cases from first appearance to disposition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trial • cases disposed of without trial 	Reduction in median elapsed time from first appearance to disposition in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calgary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trials by 10% • cases disposed of without trial by 10% • Edmonton: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trials by 10% • cases disposed of without trial by 10% 	Median elapse time first appearance date to final disposition in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calgary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trials 236.5 days • Without 174 days • Edmonton: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trials 157 days • Without 146 days 	Median elapse time first appearance date to final disposition in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calgary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trials 252.5 days; 6.8% increase • Without 142 days; 18.4% decrease • Edmonton: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trials 151 days; 3.8% decrease • Without 145 days; 0.7% decrease



Objective, Benefits and Outcomes			
Reduced number of appearances per case	Reduction in the number of appearances per case in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calgary and Edmonton to 5 appearances per case within 12 months from the date of program implementation 	Average appearances for cases concluded by: Trial Calgary Urban = 9.2 Edmonton Urban = 8.5 Non trial Calgary Urban = 6.3 Edmonton Urban = 6.5	Average appearances for cases concluded by: Trial Calgary Urban = 10.5; 14.1% increase Edmonton Urban = 10.1; 18.8% increase Non trial Calgary Urban = 6.7 6.3% increase Edmonton Urban = 6.4 1.5% decrease
Maintain number of cases processed at acceptable levels	Maintain the clearance rate in Calgary and Edmonton to 100%	Case Clearance Rate: Calgary Urban = 96.5% Edmonton Urban = 98.9%	Case Clearance Rate: Calgary Urban = 102.0% Edmonton Urban = 97.8%

*Please note: Some aspects of CCM were implemented as late as June 30, 2010.



Scope Management - Milestones/Deliverables				
#	Milestone/Deliverable Name	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Explanation of Variance
01	Program Statement Signoff Completed	July 10/09	July 17/09	CCM Program Statement was accepted by PIC July 8/09.
02	Program Kick Off Completed	July 22/09	July 22/09	
03	Docket Court Process Implementation Completed	Sept. 30/09	Nov. 13/09	Process implemented Feb.1/10.
04	Low Complexity Court Implementation Process Completed	Sept. 30/09	Nov. 13/09	Process implemented Feb.1/10.
05	Disposition Court Process Implementation Completed	Sept. 30/09	Nov. 13/09	Process implemented Feb.1/10.
06	Other Trials Process Implementation Completed	Sept. 30/09	Nov. 13/09	Process implemented Feb.1/10.
07	Procurement Processes Completed	Oct. 20/09	Oct. 28, 2009	
08	PRISM Pilot Expanded (Beta) Completed	Oct. 31/09	Removed from scope Nov. 13/09	CCM01 Change Request approved by PIC.
09	Intake Unit Implementation Completed	Oct. 31/09	Jan. 29/10	Process implemented Feb.1/10.
10	JP Counter/Courtroom Process Completed	Oct. 31/09	Feb. 8/10 (Calgary)	Process and assignments completed for implement Mar. 1/10 (Calgary only). Edmonton JP Counter will go live early June 2010.
11	File Ownership Support Team (FOST) Implementation Completed	Oct. 31/09	Feb. 22/10	Process and assignments completed. Implemented Feb 22/10.
12	Low Complexity Unit (Crown) Implementation Completed	Nov. 3/09	Jan. 29/10	Process implemented Feb.1/10.
13	Hearing Office Process Implementation Completed	Nov. 23/09	Dec. 15/09	



Scope Management - Milestones/Deliverables

#	Milestone/Deliverable Name	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Explanation of Variance
14	Baseline Metrics Captured	Dec. 10/09	May 28/10	BI metrics initial reports presented to PIC. Ongoing monthly reports have been requested, and PIC will continue to review and provide input.
15	Court Signage Live	Jan. 15/10	Feb 28/10	
16	Court Scheduling (JOIN modifications) UAT Live	Jan. 15/10	Jan. 17/10	
17	Court Remote Scheduling Software and Process Training Completed	Jan. 31/10	Feb. 22/10	Working Group decision to hold training close to new implementation date delayed delivery of training sessions.
18	PRISM UAT Environment Live	Jan. 31/10	Feb. 8/10	
19	PRISM PROD Environment Live	Jan. 31/10	Feb. 22/10	
20	Operations Manuals for Court Processes Completed	Jan. 31/10	May 28/10	Document within CCM program completed. Documentation will continue be updated through the CCM ongoing operational environment.
21	Bar Coding Implementation Completed	Jan. 31/10	Feb. 22/10	
22	File Ownership Process Implementation Completed	Jan. 31/10	Feb. 22/10	
23	Training Completed (Business units are doing internal process training; CCM trainer is doing application training only)	Feb. 12/10	Mar. 12/10	
24	Court Scheduling (JOIN Modifications) PROD Live	Feb. 12/10	Feb. 12/10	
25	Remote Scheduling UAT Live	Feb.12/10	Jan. 25/10	
26	Assignment Court Process Implementation Completed	Feb. 26/10	Feb. 1/10	



Scope Management - Milestones/Deliverables

#	Milestone/Deliverable Name	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Explanation of Variance
27	Remote Scheduling Implementation Completed	Feb. 26/10	Feb. 22/10	Remote Scheduling application live Feb. 22/10.
28	Remote Scheduling Pilot UAT Test completed	Feb. 26/10	See Milestone 27 above – Beta removed from scope Nov. 13/09	Full Remote Scheduling implemented Feb. 22/10 per CCM01 Change Request approved by PIC.
29	Remote Scheduling Rollout Begins	Feb. 26/10	See Milestone 27 above – Beta removed from scope Nov. 13/09	Full Remote Scheduling implemented Feb. 22/10 per CCM01 Change Request approved by PIC.
30	Provincial Court Electrical\Network modifications – Priority Criminal Courtrooms Completed	Mar. 31/10	Feb. 1/10	Priority courtrooms completed by Feb 1/10.
31	PRISM and RCS Release 2	Mar. 31/10	Mar. 22/10	RCS Release 1.2 completed. PRISM Release 2 completed.
32	Organizational Change Management Program Closure Completed	May 27/10	May 28/10	
33	Provincial Court Electrical\Network modifications – All Courtrooms Completed	May 31/10	Sep. 23/10	Issues relating to courtrooms 264 & 265 delayed implementation.
34	JP Counter Modifications - Edm Law Courts Building Completed	May 31/10	July 30/10	Installation of permanent light fixtures delayed completion until mid July.
35	CCM Program Completed	May 31/10	Sep. 30/10	Delay due to JP Counter Modifications Project and Courtroom Wiring Project.



Scope Management			
CR#	Scope Change Description	Date Raised	Program Impact
CCM01	Remove BC scheduling solution and related activities from plan, and incorporate the Court Scheduling JOIN modification and Remote Booking application activities.	July 23/09	Several new business and IT meetings by key SMEs will be required to finalize the go forward court scheduling and remote booking implementation plan. These meetings will be replacing originally planned work effort which is no longer required for the implementation of the BC SCSS & Judiciary Rota applications.
CCM02	Additional scope to incorporate additional electrical and network outlet to counsel tables within Edmonton Law Courts Building.	Oct. 27/09	PRISM use within Edmonton and Calgary courthouses has proven successful; however, Edmonton courtrooms will require the use of extension cords and network lines. A request from Court Services Sub Committee to modify courtrooms to maintain esthetics and prevent tripping hazards has been documented. This request will increase scope and budget capital requirements.
CCM03	Additional scope, schedule and budget changes.	Jan. 12/10	Some components and deliverables of the CCM Program have changed since CCM02. This change request is for modification of scope, schedule, budget, and resources in relation to the IT aspect of the CCM Program.
CCM04 V2	Transfer of capital budget to fiscal year 2010/11 for delayed components of the CCM Program.	Feb. 1/10	Some components of the CCM Program are delayed and will not be completed until next fiscal year. There is a requirement to move capital budget from 2009/10 to 2010/11.
CCM05 V2	Move of additional capital budget to fiscal year 2010/11 for delayed JP Counter component of CCM.	Mar. 10/10	Some new components of the CCM Program are delayed. There is a requirement to move capital budget from 2009/10 to 2010/11.
CCM06	Labor and material required to complete the courtroom wiring project in 2010/11 will be higher than originally estimated.	Mar. 26/10	
CCM07 V2	This change request is for modification of schedule, budget and resources in	May 19/10	The implementation of JP Counter at the Edmonton Law Courts building will now occur on June 7 th , 2010. A small change request



Scope Management

CR#	Scope Change Description	Date Raised	Program Impact
	<p>relation to the JP Counter and Provincial Courtroom Wiring modification aspects of the CCM Program.</p>		<p>from Tri-tech Project Management Inc. increasing the Capital budget for Fund 02 by less than \$450.00 was received. The completion of the Provincial Courtroom Wiring modifications has taken longer than anticipated and has now been re-estimated to complete by June 30, 2010. Due to the schedule impacts per above; the CCM Program activities will be changed to July 15, 2010.</p>
CCM08	<p>Labor and material required to complete the JP Counter Project in Edmonton.</p> <p>Labor and material required to complete the Courtroom Wiring Project (courtrooms 264&265). Estimated project end date is September 30, 2010.</p>	Aug. 11/10	<p><u>JP Counter Project:</u></p> <p>Three Change Orders were received from Tri-Tec Project Management Inc. and approved by Alberta Infrastructure in June and July 2010.</p> <p><u>Provincial Courtroom Wiring Project:</u></p> <p>The installation team is unable to install cabling in courtrooms 264 and 265 as both are located above the parkade and require special measures. These measures were not anticipated and cannot be accommodated within the existing budget and timelines.</p>



Quality Management
CCM utilized a variety of Quality Assurance processes to ensure the quality of deliverables throughout the program as follows:
Quality Tasks Undertaken
Completed peer review on deliverables.
Used quality checklists and “to do” lists for project support team members.
Utilized an application known as TASC for requirements, design, development and bug fix tracking (by Information Technology).
Maintained and analyzed the project schedule using a formalized progress reporting process.
Conducted audits on project and project management deliverables with confirmed acceptance.
Managed and reported on project budget monthly.
Confirmed client satisfaction and program success utilizing metrics captured from the Business Intelligence (BI) Phase 2 project.
Monitored and controlled all risks and issues utilizing issue and risk logs, mitigation strategies and escalation where necessary.
Managed change control through the use of a formalized cope change control process which created 6 change requests.
Managed communications through the use of a formalized communication plan ensuring external stakeholders used the CCM webpage for controlled, accurate and consistent messaging.
Managed and reported project status bi-weekly.
Managed Organizational Change Management including people, process and culture.
Managed project team ensuring team alignment, accountability and performance.
Measured, evaluated, reported success upon completion through a closure report.

Records Management
The CCM Program arranged for the storage and security of both hard copy and soft copy (electronic) records and project documents following the completion of the Program. Jason Quinton, JIMS Program Director, has taken ownership of the records.

Communication Management
Communicating the purpose, importance and details of the CCM Program to garner support for the initiative and, ultimately, increase its success in streamlining, and increasing public confidence in, Alberta’s criminal justice system was completed utilizing the following approach:
Supported messaging from the top (DCJ Lefever & PIC) down (to all impacted stakeholders).
Ongoing, clear communication by PIC to affected staff and stakeholders.
Distribution of monthly newsletters and handouts to communicate the importance of the CCM Program and how each participating group was essential to its overall success.
Clearly defined roles and priorities.
Expected benefits were highlighted at every opportunity.
Town Hall Meetings were held to update criminal justice system stakeholders, answer questions and take suggestions. (This medium ultimately increased buy-in and helped determine direction and final strategies for implementation.)



Communication Management

Follow-up messages from Deputy Chief Judge Lefever were distributed regarding the progress and successes of the project, and to recognize the contributions of those involved.

Internet presence was established early in the Program.

The Court Case Management webpage was housed within the Provincial Court web site.
<http://www.albertacourts.ab.ca/ProvincialCourt/CourtCaseManagement/tabid/331/Default.aspx>
 Quantity of website hits was monitored.

Internal SharePoint was utilized for internal/confidential project related information accessible only by project team members and approved stakeholders.

Stakeholders were able to provide feedback through website online submission, established committees, and project support groups.

Asset Management

The CCM Program acquired a variety of assets. Unless utilized for CCM Phase Two, these assets were transferred to the following divisions to fund ongoing maintenance and support:

Asset	Division Responsible
Electronic Court Signage Displays and kiosks utilizing Infax software (Edmonton Law Courts building)	Court Services
Case Management Office (CMO) Counter (also known as JP Counter) built within the Edmonton Law Courts building	Court Services
Courtroom wiring modifications within the Edmonton Law Courts building	Court Services
Prosecutor Information System Manager (PRISM) application utilizing PowerBuilder software on servers located within Service Alberta infrastructure environment	Criminal Justice
Remote Courtroom Scheduling (RCS) application utilizing Microsoft Dynamics CRM software on servers located within Service Alberta infrastructure environment	Court Services
Crown Prosecutor Citrix IDs and Security ID FOBs secured through Service Alberta	Criminal Justice
External Active Directory Services (ADS) IDs for Defence Counsel connectivity to RCS secured through Service Alberta	Court Services
Bar Code Readers	Criminal Justice
Bowker Building 6 th Floor renovations including the development of 10 office spaces for project team members	Criminal Justice
Training Room equipment – network switches, workstations, printers and projectors	Divided equally between Court Services and Criminal Justice Divisions



Lessons Learned – Summary (for a full listing of the Lessons Learned see Appendix C)

The Project Support Team: The CCM Program Project Support Team was presented with the unique challenge of delivering an improvement opportunity, including technology, to a diverse stakeholder group. Additionally, significant changes occurred during implementation that further challenged the Project Support Team, including: the Government of Alberta hiring freeze, a lengthy procurement process, a cumbersome financial approval process, “fluid” policies and practices regarding IMT capitalization, and PMO and IMAGIS reporting.

Stakeholders: The justice ‘system’ is in reality not really a ‘system’, but rather a loosely connected group of stakeholders with a range of interests and responsibilities for specific steps in the process. Each area fiercely defends its independence, yet for the system to be effective in every respect, the stakeholders must exist in an interdependent environment, one in which the distinctness of the roles and responsibilities is understood, accepted and respected.

Approach: Overall structure of the CCM Program, including PIC, Project Management, Organizational Change Management, Business Analysis processes and practices (business process redesign), the Working Group, and subcommittees empowered stakeholder groups to work collaboratively and share expertise to develop effective technical solutions and work processes.

Performance Area	What Worked Well	What Can be Improved
Project Management (PM) Processes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning • resource management • issue & risk management • scope definition & management • schedule development & control • procurement planning & management • cost estimating & budget control • quality planning & control • deliverables • reporting 	<p>The CCM Program received several positive comments regarding the PM processes utilized. PM dedication, strength and excellent team management skills were critical to the success of the Program.</p> <p>Positive comments relating to how project planning incorporated all stakeholders in its development, how the team was well organized and how everyone felt fully engaged and informed enabled everyone to stay on track.</p> <p>Many felt the reporting and communications used by project management was excellent.</p>	<p>Many commented about the tight timelines associated with the CCM program saying there was not enough time to properly prepare the IT aspects for delivery.</p> <p>Some felt meetings were planned on too short of notice, especially as the implementation timelines were getting closer.</p> <p>Projects must include longer procurement timelines and increased financial management process time to help mitigate impact on resources. Financial estimates must include operational and capital contingency funding.</p> <p>Projects end date should never be the same as fiscal year end date.</p>
Organizational Change Management (OCM) Processes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • education • tools • planning • establishing teams • communications • coaching 	<p>Positive feedback was received regarding Organizational Change Management and its processes. More specifically, OCM followed a structured best practice process that provided many tools, strategies and tactics to assist in preparing, managing and reinforcing staff</p>	<p>Many felt the ADKAR training was completed too late in the program schedule to be useful on CCM. As well, many felt that when it came to the people side of change and the sensitivities that come with this, video conference meetings can actually at times impede the needed discussions. Face-to-face meetings</p>



Lessons Learned – Summary (for a full listing of the Lessons Learned see Appendix C)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sponsorship • support 	<p>on the CCM Program changes affecting their areas.</p> <p>The assignment of a full time OCM Lead on the program and the implementation of the OCM Teams at the inception of the program were excellent. Moreover, the teams worked very well with one another with high levels of trust/confidentiality that is paramount for effective OCM planning and deployment. The membership of these teams matched well with having the in-depth knowledge of their operations in their respective business areas. Feedback also suggested that being part of the OCM teams empowered team members and the processes that they followed and the tools, strategies and tactics they shared with all levels of positions in their areas increased staff engagement and ownership when it came to CCM Program changes.</p> <p>Many felt consistent messaging and communications from an appropriate source aided in buy-in and acceptance of the overall process. Also, for the most part, feedback suggested that OCM provided supervisors and management with value-add tools, strategies and tactics when preparing, managing and reinforcing change with their staff. Overall management at all levels were active and visible sponsors of the CCM program changes which was the number one factor for successful people change in large diverse projects.</p>	<p>done strategically, consistently and appropriately can get more at the root causes of what staff may be struggling with when it comes to change. A balance between different types of how we meet must be looked at strategically depending on what issue is being dealt with.</p> <p>OCM teams were challenged when it came to recommending communication messages for supervisors and managers around the changes as, at times, specifics were not known on change impacts that caused frustration and angst among some front line staff because they wanted to know how their jobs were going to be impacted.</p> <p>Some felt CCM Program needed more consistent, dedicated and earmarked OCM resources to ensure team members and staff assigned to do OCM tasks were not doing it off the 'sides of their desk'.</p> <p>A resounding lessons learned based on feedback was investing more time up-front in the program to increase the awareness and train team members around OCM practices and processes.</p> <p>Feedback and observation suggested that OCM team membership required a certain level of authority when it came to recommending OCM tasks to a variety of positions in their areas. Furthermore, having management involved earlier and more intimately in the OCM team going on's was needed to better connect management with the OCM teams in relation to what the OCM team's roles and responsibilities are.</p> <p>OCM must have more than one approach for difference types of people including those ministry controls and those it doesn't (judiciary, PPSC, defence).</p>
--	---	---



Lessons Learned – Summary (for a full listing of the Lessons Learned see Appendix C)

<p>Governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• leadership• sponsorship• communications• management support• stakeholder management• visible and active	<p>Having strong leadership and governance engaged and committed to the Program was very positively and an integral part of the overall success.</p> <p>The guidance and strong support from the governance group to challenge people and keep everything moving forward removing unforeseen obstacles and road blocks which could not be dealt with by the teams was appreciated by all stakeholders.</p>	<p>More face to face information updates sessions by PIC members in both Edmonton and Calgary were recommended.</p>
---	--	---



Performance Area	What Worked Well	What Can be Improved
<p>Technical Management Processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requirements gathering • design specifications • test plan • construction • testing • training • release management • documentation • transition to operations • tools • system to system interfaces • security 	<p>There were several technical components critical to CCM Program success including the selection, implementation and management of two new applications for the Ministry. Business understanding of first generation production releases and functionality to meet timelines really helped with pressures on IT resources.</p> <p>Business members truly appreciated the professionalism and the varying skill set of each of the IT team members on the CCM Program which enabled the successful implementation of the applications as deemed necessary by the stakeholders.</p> <p>Electronic signage in Edmonton was instrumental in the movement of individuals to appropriate courtrooms and helped give the older courthouse a fresh, new look.</p> <p>Integration Strategy and daily meetings of all stakeholder groups, enabled business to interact directly with developers without formal CRs resulted in immediate action.</p>	<p>Regional areas within the province did not feel their ongoing concerns were addressed by IT resources, due to the high demands place on them by CCM.</p> <p>Due to procurement delays, application development started too late limiting the amount of time available for data migration testing and User Acceptance Testing (UAT) to ensure a seamless 'go live'.</p> <p>Change Request (CR) process is too formal and too labor intensive and need to be more agile.</p> <p>Business requirements needed to be finalized earlier to enable appropriate design and development.</p> <p>Digital signage procurement and installation delays eliminated time in the schedule for testing prior to 'go live' which caused issues for IT and business at the onset.</p> <p>Ensure resource backups are in place for key IT roles in case of illness to ensure timelines are achieved.</p> <p>Gain active participation by Enterprise Architecture group to review proposed solutions.</p>



Performance Area	What Worked Well	What Can be Improved
<p>Human Factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • resource availability • team experience • vendor management • communications • interaction with sponsors • business & management • quality of meetings • vendor interaction • team skills • training 	<p>Appreciation was expressed by several people for the opportunity to participate and become part of the CCM Program as either a member of the Working Group, OCM Team or project support groups. Bringing together various stakeholder groups, from various geographic locations within Alberta, enabled members to establish trusting relationships, increase their knowledge of Alberta Justice, and understand how change impacts an entire ministry.</p> <p>Holding regularly scheduled meetings with all stakeholders together enabled prompt decision making and ensured timelines and success for CCM Program was achieved.</p> <p>Having key business people involved gave greater ability to help complete the tasks and implement the new processes.</p> <p>Relationships built during the CCM Program will be beneficial for all future projects.</p>	<p>Sheriff's felt they were brought to the table to late in the program.</p> <p>PPSC felt they were brought to the table to late in the program.</p> <p>Compensation or an honorarium from CDLA, Legal Aid or other sources needs to be investigated to facilitate external stakeholders' involvement on projects especially of defence.</p> <p>Possibly including a Legal Aid resource at governance or working group level may assist in bringing defence counsel onboard.</p>



Performance Area	What Worked Well	What Can be Improved
<p>Communication Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning • dissemination • buy-in • support 	<p>The general feedback received about communications was very positive. People appreciated a monthly newsletter was distributed and a central internet site was created to go for information about the Program and provide feedback.</p> <p>Additionally, there was a central point where communications were issued. Messages received were always consistent, regular and frequent.</p>	<p>A better communication strategy needs to be developed, including a variety of different practices of communication, to ensure internal and external stakeholders get the information they need in a reasonable timeframe.</p>
<p>Product Specific</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRISM • RCS • JOIN 	<p>Overall, software solutions received very positive feedback from everyone, including how quickly the applications were implemented given the ever-changing business requirements.</p> <p>The ability of the applications to seamlessly exchange information (mainly to the users) helped reduce re-keying and redundancy. Products are also easy to use.</p> <p>The interaction and communications among the diverse IT teams appeared to be a very positive experience.</p>	<p>Failure to confirm all data requirements to be transferred between JOIN and PRISM (victims' data) caused some interim processes to be established at the onset.</p>



Performance Area	What Worked Well	What Can be Improved
<p>Process Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • business process redesign • business analysis • recommendations 	<p>The opportunity to bring people together from the various geographic locations to work together to discuss and create harmonized business processes was viewed as a great benefit to the Program success.</p> <p>The business process redesign environment was created early in the planning phase and allowed members to gain a sense of trust and openness, and the confidence to work toward a common goal. Business analysts (BAs) were given the appropriate authority to contact resources directly, speeding up the decision making process.</p> <p>The Ben Graham methodology and training completed by the business analysts provided the tools necessary to ensure business received the processes and technology required for successful implementation of the CCM Program. Utilizing a bottom-up approach (involving the people actually doing the work early in the process) added to the dedication and commitment of the divisions.</p> <p>Crown is very happy with the assignment court process because of the reduction of continuations. Provincial Court is pleased with Crowns efforts to be prompt and very positive in Assignment Courts.</p>	<p>Calgary and Edmonton criminal justice areas not doing the same at the start caused some problems for the CCM Project Support Team and some of the judiciary.</p> <p>Defence had a hard time seeing the big picture, why processes were changing and what changes were impacting them.</p>



Post Project Responsibilities

At the completion of the CCM Program there were tasks outstanding which required actions to address them. These outstanding activities were transferred to responsible operational resources.

Outstanding Activity/Actions required to address them	Operational Resource Responsible
Network Supernet enhancement for Court Services yet to be delivered by Service Alberta	Alain Coulombe
Network Supernet enhancement for Criminal Justice yet to be delivered by Service Alberta	Alain Coulombe
Victims database yet to be included in JOIN to PRISM interface	Alain Coulombe
Updated and Published Court Services Operational Manuals	Brenda Haynes, Basem Hage
Updated and Published Criminal Justice Operational Manuals	Martin Elton, Susan Pepper, Lloyd Robertson
Review of disposition courts and adjust as necessary	Judicial SubCommittee
Review of assignment court slots and adjust as necessary	Judicial SubCommittee
Review of quarterly success metric reports	Provincial Implementation Committee

Future Consideration Items/Suggestions

The Program received approval to proceed with the Planning/Design of CCM2. The following is suggested for future consideration.

Suggestion for Future Consideration

For Edmonton:

- Increase technology for Child Friendly Courtrooms.
- Increase capacity of videoconference solution.



Deliverable Acceptance Sign-off

This closure document constitutes the final CCM Program deliverable, and has been approved by the authorized representatives of the Provincial Implementation Committee (PIC) as noted below.

PIC Members	
Deputy Chief Judge A.H. Lefever Chair, PIC	Approved by email
Assistant Chief Judge R. Wilkins PIC Member & Lead of Judicial Subcommittee	Approved by email
Vicki Brandt, ADM, Court Services Division For Barb Hookenson (retired) PIC Member & Lead of Court Scheduling Subcommittee	Signature on original
Greg Lepp, QC, ADM, Criminal Justice Division PIC Member & Co-Chair, File Ownership Subcommittee	Signature on original
Stephen Bull PIC Member & Lead, JIMS Subcommittee	Approved by email
Barry Chatwin, CIO, Corporate Services Division PIC Member	Approved by email
Mike Dinkel, QC PIC Member & Defence Bar Representative	Approved by email
Wes Smart, PPSC PIC Member & Co-Chair, File Ownership Subcommittee	Approved by email



Appendix A - Issues

Program Issue Register			
Issue ID #	Issue Title	Issue Details	Status
QW 001	QW02 - CCM – Program owner approval and review process too lengthy causing delays	Program owners increasing reviewing requirements of material before distribution to attendees for workshops is impacting program timelines.	Closed
CM001	Unclear Program Scope	Scope of CCM Program is unclear resulting in futile WBS development workshops. Misunderstanding of how components fit together in one program i.e. CCM, CFO, and Electronic Board. Sequencing and Dependencies are undefined.	Closed
CM002	PM's Absence	Project Manager in charge of quick wins will be unavailable for an undetermined time due to a tragic event.	Closed
CM003	Group/Team Relationships Unclear	In theory the PIC has been implemented but collaboration is not visible if practiced. Stakeholder/SME involvement is unclear (responsibilities and level of strategic importance).	Closed
CM004	No "High-Level Picture"	A high-level visual representation from a business and architecture perspective is not up to date or does not exist.	Closed
CM005	Resource Availability	Workshop booking becoming extremely complex and time consuming. Delays in booking workshops delaying Program progress.	Closed
CM006	BPR Lead	BPR Lead Bev Elliott no longer available in new year for CCM Program. This will impact planning workshops.	Closed
CM007	BPR Process mapping resource availability	Resource availability to complete business process mapping, particularly in Court Services and the Provincial Court.	Closed
CM008	Bail Project delivery disconnect	Gordon Wong is under the impression that the bail project has been enveloped by CCM. He is concerned because the bail project has an April 1st implementation.	Closed
CM009	JIMS\CCM Disconnect	Stephen Bull raised issue at CCM PIC Feb. 4, 2009 through Business Agent Team presentation	Closed
CM010	Business Requirements Delay	Business Requirements have not yet been finalized. PRISM Pilot requires Business Requirements be finalized prior to User Acceptance Testing. Delays due to various vacation schedules within Criminal Justice may impact Pilot schedule.	Closed
CM011	Lack of Corporate Services IT resource availability	Current CIO office involvement on the Foundations business cases for JIMS is causing resource availability issues within the PRISM Pilot project. This may cause additional impacts for CCM design of production environment for any file ownership solution thus impacting the February 2010 target deployment of finalized solution. CIO awareness needs to be increased.	Closed
CM012	PRISM Pilot test database delays	Manitoba is to provide a test database for installation within Alberta for the PRISM Pilot. Preparation of data taking longer than anticipated. Transfer of database taking longer than plan schedule. Delays will impact pilot schedule.	Closed
CM013	Delay finalizing the scheduling technical solution	Project planning phase was completed using a BC scheduling technical solution as its go forward approach. Several members from AB Justice travelled to Vancouver to further review the BC scheduling solution. Concerns have been raised that may change scheduling technical solution direction.	Closed
CM014	GoA hiring freeze	A GoA hiring freeze was instituted on July 23, 2009. Hiring of two business analysts and the OCM Lead may be impacted. Project tasks deadlines may be difficult to complete due to staff shortages.	Closed
CM015	Delay in procuring Microsoft Dynamics Professional Services	Microsoft provided one Statement of Work which did not meet the approval of the Project Support Team. Microsoft revised and resubmitted Statement of Work which is being reviewed by Procurement and Legal Services. Additional delays may impact Remote Booking capabilities for February 2010.	Closed
CM016	Witness Marshalling	Crown has raised a concern about witness marshalling areas not being available for Feb. 1. This may cause additional resource impacts for Criminal Justice.	Closed
CM017	Microsoft Expenses	Microsoft expenses are higher than anticipated and are may not follow GoA policies. Approval may impact future resource availability to be onsite.	Closed



Program Issue Register

Issue ID #	Issue Title	Issue Details	Status
CM018	Courtroom Wiring modifications timelines unknown	Courtroom wiring modification timelines have not been finalized by Court Services IT Representative. This will impact Crown access to PRISM use within some courtrooms.	Closed
CM019	Microsoft contract end date prior to revised implementation schedule	CCM Working Group has finalized Implementation date for Remote Scheduling of Feb. 22nd. Microsoft current contract ends Feb. 19 prior to the revised implementation date. Resource availability and contract funding is now an issue.	Closed
CM020	Victims database fields not included in JOIN to PRISM interface	PRISM Pilot established listing of required fields necessary between JOIN and PRISM. Interface development missed Victims field causing work around interim solution being utilized.	Open
CM021	PRISM UAT delays	PRISM import of JOIN data to the UAT environment had some data issues to be resolved causing delay in the start of UAT. UAT has found many bugs requiring fixing and retesting which has resulted in longer than planned UAT activities.	Closed
CM022	RCS application requires Crown assignments to be displayed	Remote Courtroom Scheduling application only flags if a file is Low Complexity or File Ownership. Defence Counsel information sessions have identified a new requirement to have Crown assignments displayed to eliminate the tracking down or file assignments.	Closed
CM023	JAG financial year end processes impacting Project Management workload	With the CCM Program in high gear, Project Managers must focus on managing scope, schedule, quality and deliverables. The additional workload per JAG financial year end processes is causing additional Project Managers workload and is causing impact on their other project management activities necessary on the CCM Program. CCM has a huge volume of purchases resulting in increased monthly financial management requirement since the onset of the Program, to which Criminal Justice has provided some part time assistance from a Criminal Justice admin support since December to assist with procurement activities.	Closed
CM024	Assistance is required to help PM's track the many outstanding purchases and backordered items which require review and analysis for financial year end	CCM has several outstanding purchase orders and back order items which need to be processed. Project Management has completed these tasks on behalf of all divisions to date, however, with year end and CCM coming to an end, we are seeking assistance from divisions who are accepting delivery of all work products.	Closed
CM025	Sherri Stasiuk secondment ending March 31, 2010	Sherri Stasiuk was seconded from Court Services for a Business Analyst position on the CCM Program. Her secondment is up on March 31, 2010. There is a strong ongoing demand for modifications and enhancements to Remote Courtroom Scheduling application which will require input and analysis by Court Services to ensure ongoing success. Operational support will work around Sherri's operational commitments however, delays on the analysis will impact release timelines going forward.	Closed



Appendix B - Risks

Program Risk Register			
Risk ID #	Risk Title	Risk Details	Status
001	PM capacity exceeding 100%	Quick Wins PM capacity exceeds 100%. If this continues, PM will not be able to ensure stakeholder satisfaction and ensure quality deliverables are developed.	Closed
002	QW02 - CCM introduction of new system	CCM will introduce a new application and processes which may possibly constrain JIMS Readiness going forward.	Closed
003	QW02 - CCM - Communications resource availability	Communications resource identified is not available for required amount of time. Quantity or quality of communications may suffer.	Closed
004	QW02 - CCM - Governance perception different than SafeCom communications	SafeCOM is communicating JIMS Quick Win progress differently than JIMS Governance - perception needs to be confirmed or may lead into failure to achieve DM understanding.	Closed
005	QW02 - CCM - Paramount for the CCM Program to be seen as Judiciary led and not under the ownership of the JIMS office	First Organizational Change Management meeting (September 9 th , 2008). Is vital CCM Program seen under leadership of the Provincial Court to ensure buy-in and commitment towards the goal, objectives and tasks	Closed
006	QW02 - CCM - File Ownership software selection may require analysis and formal business requirements gathering	PRISM may not be endorsed by PIC as application solution for File Ownership. Additional work may be required to determine business requirements and perform solution analysis	Closed
007	QW02 - CCM - Ben Graham Target Process Methodology and Toolset will not match JIMS Target Process Methodology and toolset	CCM approach for target process methodology and toolset will not match JIMS process methodology and toolset. There is a concern rework of models which will be required at the conclusion of the CCM Program to meet JIMS requirements. Resourcing, budget and schedule impacts to JIMS may occur.	Closed
008	QW02 - CCM - PRISM Pilot may narrow the focus of Crown thus not producing target state business requirements or processes (Links to Risk 006 above)	Best practice - develop business requirements and target state processes then determine technology to best suit. Concern with piloting PRISM before the above is completed may narrow the focus of users to the capabilities within PRISM vs. thinking outside the box for what future needs may be	Closed
009	QW02 - CCM - PRISM Pilot solution built in legacy Power Builder version and may cause support issues for Corporate Services	PRISM application was developed in house in Manitoba in a legacy PowerBuilder version, over multiple years containing multiple modules. With PRISM pilot proceeding, implications regarding how much of the PRISM application is truly required for File Ownership, its architectural and support is causing concerns to CIO.	Closed
010	QW02 - CCM - IMT Program Proposal for prioritization estimates may be a concern for PIC members.	CCM Project Support Team was requested to complete proposal documents for IMT prioritization purposes within CJ and CS for CIO review and prioritization. The estimates have not been fully vetted by team members and will not be finalized till June 30, 2009. This may cause some concerns for PIC members and may impact future program financial acceptance.	Closed



Program Risk Register			
Risk ID #	Risk Title	Risk Details	Status
011	QW02 - CCM - Business Requirements finalization delays may cause impacts to solution evaluation and selection in time for final program plan inclusion.	Business Requirements finalization delays may cause impacts to solution evaluation and selection in time for final program plan inclusion.	Closed
012	QW02 - CCM - Organizational Change Management Lead Transition	JIMS has submitted a request to transition Murray McKay off of the CCM Program OCM Lead role to enable the development of a JIMS JAG OCM Strategy by end of September. This transition may cause negative impacts to the CCM Program with front line staff trust.	Closed
013	QW02 - CCM - Remote Scheduling next phase	Project Planning has determined Remote Scheduling by Crown and Defence should be in future phase, allowing court resources (mainly trial coordinators) enough time to gain familiarity with software tool and process before added additional complexity of remote scheduling. PIC may not accept scope change which would then affect acceptance and buy-in from business resources developing plan.	Closed
014	Inefficient use of technical/business time	Indirect recommendations creating additional work for Project Support Team. Inefficient use of limited technical and business time.	Closed
015	Program priority of SMEs	Lack of priority of appropriate SMEs to perform tasks outlined in Work Plan, including OCM, will compromise process success.	Closed
016	Increased Involvement of PPSC in CCM	If PPSC requires the Project Support Team or IT resources to assist with the PPSC project, CCM Program tasks may not be completed on schedule.	Open
017	Delay in decision making	If Provincial Court cannot come together to make decisions expeditiously, Program schedule will be impacted.	Closed
018	Lack of OCM buy-in and competencies	Lack of OCM buy-in and competencies may result in limited benefits realization for the CCM Program.	Closed
019	JOIN technical changes	If JOIN cannot complete the technical changes within the timelines set out in the Work Plan, scope may be impacted.	Closed
020	BPR SME resources	If Project Support Team cannot acquire sufficient SME resources to conduct detailed BPR, Program delay or failure may occur.	Closed
021	Reinforcing Change	If no emphasis is placed on reinforcing change within technology/business processes and OCM, sustainability may be compromised.	Closed
022	Disapproval of key conceptual models	If Provincial Court disapproves of any of the key conceptual models developed, the Program will be dislocated.	Closed
023	Arranging Program meetings	If those involved in the CCM Program do not provide availability to Project Coordinator on a timely basis, schedule delay occurs.	Closed
024	Availability for Program meetings	If those involved in the CCM Program cannot be made available for meetings, limited acceptance and buy-in on decisions made may occur.	Closed
025	JOIN buy-in	If JOIN does not buy-in to new applications, schedule may be delayed.	Closed



Program Risk Register

Risk ID #	Risk Title	Risk Details	Status
026	Indirect JOIN change requests	JOIN change requests indirectly relating to court scheduling or file ownership are impeding on business analysts' time.	Closed
027	Multiple demands on CCM SMEs	Multiple demands of some SMEs may create schedule delays.	Closed
028	Negative outcomes from recommendations	Unanticipated negative outcomes may arise from the recommendations meant to increase efficiency.	Closed
029	BI Phase 2 and or Enhanced BI	BI Phase 2 or Enhanced BI is not in place in time to provide metrics when required.	Closed
030	Enterprise Architecture Models not completed as per schedule	The Enterprise Architecture models (Technology, Data, Application, Privacy, Security, and Interoperability) do not get completed; it will have an impact on the implementation for the CCM Program.	Closed
031	Unknown unintended consequences	Implementing applications may have an unknown impact on stakeholders.	Closed
032	British Columbia Supreme Court Scheduling System unknowns	Confirmation of the complexities within the technical solution of SCSS	Closed
033	Acceptance of workload reports.	If workload reports do not gain acceptance by Crown prosecutors as a good measure, buy-in may be compromised.	Closed
034	Insufficient time to properly meet implementation date.	If CCM Program is not properly implemented in February 2010, momentum going forward may be a challenge.	Closed
035	JIMS acceptance of CCM's mapping process.	If the JIMS initiative does not accept or understand the mapping process used by CCM, some of the Project Support Team may have to assist in interpretation, or JIMS may have to complete the process again accordingly to their methodology.	Closed
036	Vacations	If SMEs are unavailable due to summer vacation, unplanned delays may occur.	Closed
037	Inputting into PRISM	If unable to input tombstone date, assign files, and/or note-up files in PRISM, Crown File Ownership could fail.	Closed
038	If PRISM is not the solution	If PRISM is not the solution after piloting, the Crown File Ownership program may be viewed as a failure.	Closed
039	Failure of CCM	If CCM fails, Crown File Ownership may fail.	Closed
040	IT resources	If IT resources with sufficient skills or experience aren't obtained, CCM will be delayed.	Closed
041	IT – money and time	If sufficient money or time is not provided to the IT aspects of the CCM Program, the Program may fail.	Closed
042	Front-end interface	If the CCM Program cannot get a front-end interface, success of the Program may suffer.	Closed
043	Remote scheduling	If remote scheduling, in some form or fashion, is not available at implementation, CCM may be viewed as a failure.	Closed



Program Risk Register			
Risk ID #	Risk Title	Risk Details	Status
044	Fujitsu resources	If Fujitsu contract resources currently assigned to the CCM Program are terminated earlier than expected, CCM Program success may be compromised.	Closed
045	Scope processes	If Business does not agree on a scope for processes by plan implementation, target date will not be made.	Closed
046	Schedulers in Edmonton	If additional Schedulers do not become available in Edmonton, new scheduling system and court process will be at risk.	Closed
047	Closure of courtrooms for training	Courtroom closures are required in order to maximize training of staff on the new application. Escalate issue to DCJ Lefever as required. Otherwise consider: training outside normal work hours; or smaller group training over an extended period of time which may impact schedule; or utilize a train the trainer approach. (to be finalized via Training Strategy sessions).	Closed
048	Lack of Criminal Justice Crown metrics	There is a concern that no metrics to demonstrate success on behalf of Crown has been included in the Project Statement. This may impact CCM Program success on a divisional basis.	Closed
049	Judiciary closing 3 Edm courtrooms in January	Judiciary has indicated they will be closing 3 Edm courtrooms in January due to judicial staff shortages. This external system change may cause target metrics may be skewed. Program demonstration of success may not be accurate.	Closed
050	Remote Booking PIA requested by IT.	Remote Booking being implemented on the internet, Corporate IT has indicated a PIA must be completed. This may cause CCM Program schedule implications.	Closed
051	Service Alberta Hosting failover service not available for 24\7 up time	Service Alberta failover service not available for PRISM or Dynamics environments and may make availability of solution in future unstable	Open
052	Requirements identification	New requirements continue to be identified. There is no time to assess these change requests much less include them.	Closed
053	Service Alberta to provide a hosting environment for the Court Scheduling website	There is a dependency on Service Alberta to provide an environment for the Court Scheduling website in time for user acceptance testing. The matter is complicated further by Service Alberta instituting a "freeze period" over the holidays.	Closed
054	Availability of SMEs and BAs for IT	The IT plans assume CCM SMEs and BAs are available when needed in order to provide prompt response to the IT Team.	Closed
055	Tight IT Readiness Timeline	There is no slack in the IT Teams' schedules. Most are already working overtime. A delay could easily occur if tasks take longer than estimated or if a key person is not available.	Closed
056	CCM Impact on Sherriff's Operations	The Sherriff's commented they will require more staff to transfer the in-custody accused to the trial courtrooms.	Open
057	Court Signage implementation delays	Court Signage delivery delays may impact implementation for Feb. 1st.	Closed



Program Risk Register

Risk ID #	Risk Title	Risk Details	Status
058	Planned Defence Counsel training is acceptable	Counsel training established with little input by representatives and may not be acceptable to all.	Closed
059	GoA External ID creation in a timely fashion	GoA needs to create external ID's for each defense counsel to connect to Remote Scheduling. Delays in obtaining counsel permission and data may impact implementation success.	Closed
060	Law Society membership being the only criteria for registration for RCS	Currently the only requirement to obtain access to Remote Courtroom Scheduling is a valid Law Society ID which may be a risk in the future as additional ID's are requested by firms, self represented, etc.	Open
061	Sherri Stasiuk secondment ending March 31, 2010	Sherri Stasiuk was seconded from Court Services for a Business Analyst position on the CCM Program. Her secondment ends March 31, 2010. There is a strong ongoing demand for modifications and enhancements to Remote Courtroom Scheduling application which will require input and analysis by Court Services to ensure ongoing success. Operational support will work around Sherri's operational commitments however, delays on the analysis may impact release timelines going forward.	Open



Appendix C – Lessons Learned Session Details

Lessons Learned - Business – Edmonton		
What Worked Well?	What went wrong or could be Improved?	Future Projects? What to start doing, keep doing, do more of?
Having the right people in the right places at the right time	Working in silos until PIC was formed (when project was still “file ownership”)	Personal preferences should not be affected standardization to be enforced and mandated
Having the right people for the team for all phases of the CCM Program.	External representation (have 1 voice effectively represent a group). Not enough open sessions & limited attendance at them.	Communication between all stakeholders is essential for success
Having the ability to bring in experts (ie: Chris Boyle, Microsoft)	Limited & voluntary involvement of PPSC (limited Judicial leverage).	Phase 2 should be clearly defined and funding allocated at the beginning of the project.
Involving front line staff throughout all phases of the Program	Limited involvement of Sheriffs; they were brought in too late.	Track timelines and action items
Following, and sticking to, a formalized project management format	ADKAR held a little late in the process.	Setting meetings (sub-committees, working groups) well in advance
Creating sub-committees for better management of tasks & discussions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having key people attend those meetings who can make the decisions. • Having sub-committees in place took away silos, and provided the ability for Court Services, Crown, Corporate Services, Provincial Court and defence to work in a team atmosphere, with everyone working toward a common goal. (all stakeholders were involved on every level) 	Develop better training, timelines & resources when involving two cities. Full time Crown - difficult to work their schedules into training.	Ability to have immediate decisions made (hearing people that can make decisions at the table).
OCM – ADKAR Training was excellent. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications went well (Barb’s Blog, regular emails, status reports, information sessions, newsletters) 	Resentment from other areas in AB when changes meant delays in dealing with their concerns (ie: JOIN); decisions made without them; issues on hold (there were steps to assess risk of impact to business for other locations).	Project team, resources available.
Enthusiasm & dedication of those involved, finding true champions.	Mapping only included front lines. Questions were unanswered because of it. Line drawn too low.	Create “transition team” to deal with CCM issues coming up.
Information sessions were not too frequent and gave all stakeholders a forum to discuss and receive instant feedback from those on the ground	Application development started too late	Business needs to take control of what has priority when it comes to CRs (IT).
Having Sherri & Jackie (key people from the business) involved, gave greater ability to help carry out the new processes.	Phase 2 issues should have funding, and resources clearly defined, set something in place so it doesn’t get lost if funding not available.	More champions from defence
Established timelines & follow through, well tracked and kept everyone who had tasks on target. Goals and achievements were well planned, as were the people tasked with getting the job done.	Meetings planned on too short of notice.	Procurement needs to be done early
Having the ability to interact with developers (IT) on-site without formal CRs resulted in immediate action.	Change request process cumbersome resulting in delays in necessary and immediate action.	Keep communication open and maintain consistent
Having PIC for governance, again ability to make immediate decisions	Scope creep (timelines)	Reduce cases when implementing new project associated with the courts



Lessons Learned - Business – Edmonton

What Worked Well?	What went wrong or could be Improved?	Future Projects? What to start doing, keep doing, do more of?
Having <u>set</u> meetings well in advance, allowed for better management of time.	Lack of resources (hiring freeze resulting in inability to backfill).	Compensations for people on the outside that are involved (defence)
Consistent follow-up on action items.	Implementation date was too specific	Help defence bar by educating them so they can be more involved
Relationship building which will affect future programs	Need more informational sessions with Barb H., Judge Lefever for morale building	Follow-up & stay in touch with all parties
The implementation together was a positive	Need to involve all areas of staff & get them more involved	
Not just for Crown.	Need more recognition of staff (Court Services)	
Including Judiciary in the initial process.	Develop different programs especially when dealing with offices that may have different levels of staff (or amount)	
Many meaningful discussions	Timelines need to be readdressed (need to look at IT & the applications first).	
Training	IT needs to be at the table from onset	
Change management taken into consideration for different areas, especially the Judiciary.	Need to better define who should be part of project	
Having everyone on board.	Poor communications around what are the differences going to be & how it is going to affect all staff and how changes are going to impact jobs (more OCM) to help minimize angst in divisions.	
Everyone was helping each other and was willing to take risks.	Ensure everything is up and running before releasing production	
Provincial Court led the project, had great leadership.	Better understanding of the whole process	
Great leadership (Mike Dinkel)	Engaging defence	
Total commitment from all areas.	More engagement of the defence (RCS)	
All leaders in project were prepared to work with one another	Identifying people who will actually be doing the job.	
Engaging OCM with senior management	More information sessions, lunch included.	
Line staff charted process (Ben Graham mapping process)	Striking balances in workloads difficult	
Discovery of different talents in regards to staff helped project progress	Implementation date was too specific	
Everyone talking together is a positive	Finding time for staff to buy-in when planning	
	More consistency with OCM	
	Under estimated scope	
	Lack of understanding of the big picture for many	
	Need better staging of testing & implementation.	



Lessons Learned – Business - Calgary

What Worked Well?	What went wrong or could be Improved?	Future Projects? What to start doing, keep doing, do more of?
Insight into others' roles in the system. A new appreciation of impacts of changes	Judiciary not engaged enough in new process	Additional smaller analysis sessions
Having 1 dc start to end really helped.	Move away from assembly line at time of hiring freeze - At a time when resources are getting worse	Everything done at the same time, applications & business
Flexibility to not make changes if no longer necessary (recommendations). Or alter to cover changing needs (not enforce the change)	Not fully understand IT when they are asking us for decisions. - More clarity on how this works. - Need to see more examples, (go see Winnipeg, B.C. & remote booking)	Quick response from IT when change required.
Debriefings after business operations changes, as things are implemented	Formality of creating CRs – things are missed & getting heavy on paperwork. Need agile development.	Catalogue of ideas not implemented. Try to implement what has not been done
Shifting from one dedicated Crown in project to someone in Operations (current experience & insight)	Timeline problem (wait for IT). - Having vague start date	Decide early in the process what will be required for support/maintenance
Ability for BA's to contact people directly	Hiring freeze: - We now have 2-1 Crown assistants per Crown, afraid will be come 3-1 or 4-1 - Court services short staffed - Not able to have BA/CS rep from Calgary	Real-time solutions – having right people in support team and access to people who can make decisions
Defence included in the process	Not having 1 dedicated Crown - stretched	Have town hall meetings to give people forum to express their opinions
Cities and stakeholders work together to define best practices	Prototype of IT first (or refine & iron out issues)	Bring people in early on, particularly key ones, to gather support & feedback
Nice to not start all business processes at once	Defence not represented enough from both cities	Clear, predefined rollout date.
Management structure with PIC, but built with bottom up experts at work level. (Knew what they were doing and made decisions). PIC not drill down to specifics	Unclear, changing processes	Changes to new process (improvements) should be done after analyzing impact, not immediately.
Calgary office, bringing on management earlier in the process = acceptance gained	Not enough testing	More testing
Analysis sessions and ability to combine resources as necessary to brainstorm and find real-time solutions	Not enough time to brainstorm a beginning: - Go back & think further	Projects affect whole system; need to have active engagement of all stakeholders
Structure, top-down	Town hall style meetings series: - Clear message of post-change meeting to review process. - Consider changing if necessary. - No place to vent concerns/issues. - Perception no power – feedback is useless. - Reps were only participants, not single decision makers. - Inadequate resources	Expanded use of change management for defence/court.
Communication	IT delay – not everything released at same time. Not enough testing for RCS.	Share the burden of efforts to assist with project
Provided process to share knowledge and provided ways to express concerns	Manage change/keep it going by handling negative opinions	Expand cloning to people
Identifying issues, all participants "step-up" to resolve them as a team, mutually benefit	OCM wasn't viable for defence counsel/judiciary	Video conferencing beneficial – use more so everyone comfortable



Lessons Learned – Business - Calgary

What Worked Well?	What went wrong or could be Improved?	Future Projects? What to start doing, keep doing, do more of?
IT part – found solutions for all identifying problems	Not achieve endorsements from the busy defence lawyers from the start.	Get everyone together at the start (stakeholders)
Support team, right team members. Risks tracked and managed	“What project”? Need to find more creative ways to disseminate information.	Make sure next time that Fed/Crown involved at the beginning so they are aware of what is going on
Key court services, Calgary & Edmonton; working together	Edmonton & Calgary not doing everything same way at first caused problems	Find someone with the ability to sell big picture to defence counsel
PIC made things happen.	Need some stats that can measure with subsystem. Trial & Preliminary continuations. (Judiciary)	In order to have defence at the table provide some type of compensation (ie: free lunch) so that they can be a part of all decisions and changes
Total commitment to the project.	Hard to get defence to come up with 1 model. They want to be able to do what they want.	Empower staff at all levels
People carried on even with hiring freeze.	Defence had a hard time seeing the big picture	Have resisters at the table
Group communication & discussions so everyone knows what is going on was terrific	Not enough defence involved	
Great, valuable	Judges had trouble finding out who to get involved (Feds) did not know who to engage	
With Crown being there on time has made defence more accountable	Meetings held in the cities were too late	
Crown really happy with Assignment Courts, less continuations	Planning needed to include Feds, Prov-Alberta Justice Program, but that was everything focused did not realize whole change would affect the Feds & Feds still trying to get up to speed	
Crown totally involved Assignment Courtrooms, real positive, punctual	Does not challenge judiciary	
JP Counter working. Appeasing defence more, come a long way since March	Traveling is the killer, more technology, in person for first meetings, then video conferencing	
Debriefings worked well everyday following implementation dates	Testing and training done too late	
Bringing OCM Lead on board went well, being involved & give input. Should have started earlier, ran out of time at the end	Drain on staff – lucky we had dedicated staff	
Having Alain Coulombe at the table	Not enough details, process & IT	
Having confidence in the Program	Spell out more details, business requirements	
Lead times have been cut, get early trial continuation date	Crown, Feds not involved early enough	
Things were getting done quickly	Business involved at looking at BC system, wasted time	
Rhonda excellent	Counter – crown not doing the same things	
Plan supported by other stakeholders, and unrepresented stakeholders (accused) making sure their two needs were addressed.	Get expert advice on how to get defence counsel on board. (Find a way/communication)	
With knowledge that we had at the time, probably would not have done things differently		
Project that came in on budget and all across Canada people watching.		
Team always there (ie: Tim & Team).		



Lessons Learned – Business - Calgary

What Worked Well?	What went wrong or could be Improved?	Future Projects? What to start doing, keep doing, do more of?
Commitment.		
Use of website & focusing for updating was a huge success in getting messages out there		
Organization of structure for whole Program – excellent		
OCM tried to communicate with defence & get them around the table		
Team worked well together		
Open mindedness		
Commitment of senior people from Day 1, defence bar, judges, managers, feds, crowns		
M. Dinkel did an excellent job (defence, professional/ consultant)		
Ground rules were set by the judiciary early on & this is a good thing		
Judiciary lead – success		
Strong leaders, positive		
Hard work of court services staff		

Lessons Learned - IT

What Worked Well?	What went wrong or could be Improved?	Future Projects? What to start doing, keep doing, do more of?
Lessons Learned session was appreciated	UAT testing not long enough	Set reasonable milestone dates on requirement and stick to those dates or enforce change control processes if cannot be met
Jean Mah's support invaluable	Developers did not have enough access to Manitoba developers	IT (all teams) to be involved in workshops during planning phase if possible
CCM project PM's fantastic – supportive, responsive, decisive	Not enough staff – 1 person to do 1 job (DBA) – was seriously underestimated – unreasonable expectations if sick	Requirements to be done prior to selecting a product or software solution
Developers and BA's in close proximity beneficial	Went to IT with final date – not question – forces tough decisions, have conversation first, not able to deliver same as required, deployed based on Manitoba estimates	Complete a full gap analysis when buying off the shelf product or any other solution
In person resolution of challenges and issues by RCS, JOIN and PRISM developers and Project Support Team members	Allow more time for telecom/domain inter-operability changes – not adequate consultation with all players (1 item missed for CSIT) – audit part	Ensure Enterprise Architecture adequately reviews proposed solutions to make sure it fits into bigger picture
Room 600 – close to PRISM and RCS developers	Infrastructure should have been started earlier (displays, concrete for wiring)	Ensure project team has a Solution Architecture in place to help with interface development to legacy or multiple systems
UAT proximity to developers handy	Needed to engage Enterprise Architecture sooner – flaw in processing requirement prior to involvement, need review	If possible draw lines for requirements to be completed
UAT morning check-in meetings were great	Players not in place early enough – JOIN not included (B.S.) in discussions should have been	Continue to have Lessons Learned sessions and use what is learned on future projects
RCS UAT went well – fully engaged	Purchasing process changing on the fly – unexpected delays, compressed	Project must continue to have formal mechanism for approvals in place for the entire



Lessons Learned - IT		
What Worked Well?	What went wrong or could be Improved?	Future Projects? What to start doing, keep doing, do more of?
	installation time	project life cycle
Team dynamics was positive	TASC access delayed until in UAT for BA's	Separate IT Group weekly meetings to deal with maintenance and project issues works well
Using Softgrid instead of deploying large deskside technical installation excellent	Missed design steps	Business to have ownership of requirements and UAT
Business understanding of 1 st generation production releases and functionality to meet timelines helped with pressures on IT	Timelines – training started before development finished and UAT started after training – everyone using different version of PRISM causing some confusion – hard to fix problems – different version or different issues, caused little to no QA testing by programmers (no time)	Ensure infrastructure is in place before deployment finalized
Business accommodating work around while doing technical fixes was great	Not consult enough prior to build – deadlines prevent proper bottom up analysis, was all about could be done on time	Formalized communication plan in place
Strong executive support crucial to the project success	Not enough technical documentation	Timely procurement
JOIN did a lot of leg work at the start which helped RCS	Timelines - no UAT for digital signage – problems on day 2 & 3 – duplicate data or no data displayed, if testing occurred prior to go live, digital signage firewalls issues would have been identified sooner	Focus on quality not just deadlines (delivery dates)
Calgary facilities (courtrooms) worked well	Cannot clone trainer – too high expectations for trainer, was needed by other positions – DBA and Alain and John and BA resources	Entire team to help identify issues early and provide mitigation strategies to be built into plan
Collaborative effort by all team members to go live	PRISM UAT was held back because did not review files from JOIN – lost days of testing	Single point of contact between IT and business established early
Purchasing process made easier within Service Alberta	Deskside analysts/developers have to go through third party (Service Alberta) to complete work (offsite) and have control over work – rely on others (delay frustrating) – deployment issues, issue resolution (including accesses, etc.)	Well rounded project teams with roles and responsibilities well defined
Deskside analyst was able to help trainer by booking training sessions, etc.	Administrative reporting was overwhelming	Project Management discipline great
Having a deskside analyst on site	Softgrid issues were a challenge during deployment	Ensure adequate time in place for proper communication of deliverables
Pd a resource in Service Alberta to get work done helped escalate processes	IT agendas were not always prepared or if prepared not struck to causing many meetings to be extremely lengthy or with little outcomes	Ensure all stakeholders are actively involved throughout entire project life cycle
Team made it work – all very positive and hard working	Multiple people following up on same IT problem/issues	Project has a formal mechanism for approvals and project life cycle
Access to decisions makers	Proof of concept should be done with technical teams that will develop it – closer to final product	Need multiple DBA roles
Equipment and requirements met	Different locations for JOIN BS's, UAT testers and JOIN technical team	Have formal methodology in place like RCS did
Blair and his relationship with Service Alberta helped with trouble shooting, follow up and timeline deliverables vs. posted schedules	Fixing data after loaded as well as prevent future issues – complication because of timelines – preventative fix first, affected user support of application on go live	Ensure adequate time and resources are in place before proceeding and setting go live dates



Lessons Learned - IT

What Worked Well?	What went wrong or could be Improved?	Future Projects? What to start doing, keep doing, do more of?
Decisions and responsiveness timely	Testing located to development (noisy) – proximity for issue resolutions was more important	Technical analysis must be involved when requirements are gathered
Got all software, hardware and remote access for project team members that was needed	Functionality had to be dropped because of imposed timelines – time spent to turn pieces off (even through would take longer to build)	Ensure BA's and technical team need to sit down and discuss changes fore an IT Change Request is prepared
Clear sense of urgency known from the onset	Not have JOIN printer in UAT boardroom from start – not having time to plan in advance (incl. landscape view)	Technical analysis should be part of the planning process (or completed directly after business requirements submitted)
Consultant from Manitoba leading the project was good	Decisions reflected timelines ... no because they were well thought out	Have a clear process defined at start for requirements process
RCS has no day to day maintenance tasks	Requirements were always changing – not nailed down early enough, required more analysis, priority of requirements changed	Put guidelines and/or etiquette in place to help streamline email communications – to ensure not overwhelming staff
New skills developed by team BA's	Scope or Quality – something gives (or both if timelines too short)	Ensure agendas are set ahead of time – ensure meetings stick to the agendas
Decisions made quickly and for the most part stayed the same	JOIN moving away half way through project caused dislocation between BA's and BS's	Need to have solution identified before a Go Live date set
JOIN and RCS worked well together proactive engagement with each other	On no. of changes/scope requirements must expectations too high given timelines – have to prove/argue why not get what expect – takes away from development	Ensure someone on project has the necessary experience in the area and with connections – helps keeps things moving along
BA's were able to reduce scope to bare bones for delivery on RCS	Evaluation time wasted on requirements that dropped in priority – distraction from other work	Send developers to go see product if purchased from another province – allows for questions and better understanding
JOIN responses were prompt and timely	Timeframes was pre-determined by business and not changeable due to procurement delays	Consult with IT prior to deriving Go Live dates to ensure realistic of scope (more collaborative decision)
IT and JOIN good communications	Business Analysts from technical team needs to be involved from the beginning	Document more prior to going live – gap analysis for PRISM not done early enough which caused some issues for development
RCS has architecture	No technical architect for PRISM	Motivational dates
Sr. Mgmt endorsement and engagement was excellent	Scope creep (PRISM) Manitoba	Earlier involvement with Enterprise Architecture required
Graphical interfaces were useful used to communicate to BA's and technical teams (RCS)	Get requirements first and then choose software solution – Off Shelf may be good or not	Ensure lines of communication established and delivered
Good participation from business	Communications lacking need to have face to face meetings. Point of contact with someone who can make the final decisions	Physical Infrastructure (building modifications) should start earlier – should identified earlier
Project has a formal mechanism for approvals and project life cycle	Any superficial/gap analysis done	Timelines must consider resources availability to meet scope and follow proper processes (eliminates pressure for a set go live date)
RCS has middle tier architecture defined up front	When buying premade product do not assume that it will work when business practices may be different	Business must continue to be flexible after initial requirements completed
Ability to tweak interfaces successfully	Deadline problems with no option to get more resources	Have team building near beginning of project – connect players sooner – builds respect
RCS has architecture in place at the beginning and did not compromise	Scope and timeline was an issue for IT	Need to include a design step (and time effort) in life cycle estimates
Quality of people on project – dedicated staff	Changes in requirements documentation made with not enough knowledge of how it affected	Proof of Concept (technical) done close to the final version for solution deployed



Lessons Learned - IT		
What Worked Well?	What went wrong or could be Improved?	Future Projects? What to start doing, keep doing, do more of?
	stakeholders	
Finding Dynamics as a remote scheduling solution in September	Not enough time to test interface	Firm deadlines from UIT of business – cut off approach
Microsoft played a huge role in bringing project discipline (solution architect) to the project	Took too long to use the enterprise assessment report	Retain knowledge acquired during previous phases – not bring in new set of people if possible
Functioning model of what went well in Manitoba – inter jurisdictional process and interaction was good	Changes in sequence of tasks were often made unilaterally without the input of other affected IT stakeholders	Double procurement estimates to be more realistic
	Business requirements not given a firm milestone end date which caused the time remaining for subsequent tasks to shrink to an inadequate level	Morning UAT check-ins good
	Timing and resourcing not enough IT staff	Deskside analysts must be on hand during deployment and must have access to do all functions as necessary – or bring in Service Alberta for launch
	Project stakeholders and team need to define a project process for the requirements gathering phase	Book JOIN BS to be on sight with BA's to resolve issues quickly during requirements and testing phases
	Too many decisions over ruled with RCS (JOIN)	JOIN testing area setup
	Too much email communication – at times overwhelming	
	Formal written documentation for requirements would eliminate many discrepancies and deficiencies reported as a result of hearsay or recollection (not in documentation in the first place)	
	Not all scenarios covered in UAT testing – not enough time (PRISM)	
	Softgrid deployment during production was an issue	
	JOIN disconnected between IT and CCM Team	
	JOIN felt they were not being communicated with. Needs to be included in the workshops and ongoing meetings	
	Poor quality assurance done on date – need for dedicated role	
	Procurement needs to change – takes too long	
	Never end a project in March – bad time (fiscal year end)	
	Quality is sacrificed for timelines (PRISM and JOIN) – business and technical have to live with what happens	

Lessons Learned – Project Support Team		
What Worked Well?	What went wrong or could be Improved?	Future Projects? What to start doing, keep doing, do more of?
Equal collaboration by all divisions on CCM from the start aided in Program success.	No detailed review of current crown processes was completed caused quick forced process changes following	Ensure adequate representation from all stakeholders at the onset of the Program is critical to success and builds relationships at



Lessons Learned – Project Support Team

What Worked Well?	What went wrong or could be Improved?	Future Projects? What to start doing, keep doing, do more of?
	implementation.	the start and ensures collaboration.
Having a firm (un moving) delivery date ensured CCM was delivered on time with success. If date not firm, could still be waiting for perfect solution to deploy.	Provide more information to meeting coordinator to ensure appropriate time and resources are booked.	Develop a meeting booking template for population and submission to meeting coordinator to ensure adequate information is provided.
Have structured meetings in place kept things on track and organized.	Several components of the CCM Program have never been completed before therefore no past history was available to draw from when planning tasks, work effort and schedule. Therefore many tasks were under estimated or under resourced.	Having management or a team member with appropriate authority on the Organizational Change Management teams at the onset helps with success.
Centrally coordinating meetings to one individual team member was extremely positive.	Difficult to get the people committed to the tasks at the onset. Some key divisions and stakeholder groups did not have resources assigned to CCM at the start	Project support team, management and OCM teams should meet together early in the Program.
Splitting IT from working group aided them to get tasks completed sooner.	Meetings key you away from getting things done.	More formal OCM with judiciary will help provide more methodology, structure etc. to membership
Daily meetings during implementation were terrific.	IT was disconnected from business and vice versa.	Clearly identified and dedicated resources by business for mapping of their processes is necessary at program onset to ensure no delays on tasks occur, especially during planning.
With CCM being a high priority within the ministry, aided in people moving schedules around to fit in key CCM meetings, etc.	Working Group meetings need to balance updates with critical issues for resolution.	Continue to have structured and frequent meetings to keep program on track.
Business aiding in the development of solutions helped with them owning the product following delivery.	Project Support Team was often faced with session difficulties due to poor technology. Criminal Justice must ensure adequate installation, guidelines and training is available for project support teams around teleconferences, videoconferences and Live Meeting.	Daily meetings for implementations are critical to success.
Leadership, especially DCJ Lefever was excellent and ensured CCM success.	Training on booking meetings using outlook and the use of SharePoint is necessary for all project support team members at the onset of a program.	Working Group meetings should focus on issues at the onset then move into program progress and updates.
Project Support Team feels the governance structure established for CCM was a perfect mix with all the necessary participants required.	Some key divisions/stakeholders did not have resources assigned to CCM at the start of the Program making communication to all areas affected less effective at the start of project planning.	Utilizing of Live Meeting and other teleconference/video conference technology works well
It was critical that the Alberta team travelled to BC to view the Scheduling System; although not chosen; the team was able to gain insight into what was possible.	High level cost estimates submitted for IMT Proposal Submission were used as go forward budget approval which did not appropriately reflect the approved Project Statement budget breakdown (Operational and Capital).	Continue to book meetings using a centralized resource
	A time delay between first interview and arranging a second interview, or position offer, may lead to a candidate pursuing other opportunities, in which case we may lose the candidate we were hoping to hire.	Give contractors access to GoA email and possible blackberry access.
	The implementation of new Program Management processes during execution of the Program caused a	Having the entire team all on site at the onset builds working relationships early and aids in project task completion.



Lessons Learned – Project Support Team		
What Worked Well?	What went wrong or could be Improved?	Future Projects? What to start doing, keep doing, do more of?
	great deal of rework.	
	Resources doing more than one role on a program caused deadlines to be at risk and the overall quality of deliverable to be questioned.	GoA\JAG financial processes are very labor intensive and require additional time and resources incorporated into any future project plan
	A request for an environmental scan for CCM was dropped as the enterprise architect team restructured.	
	Environmental Scans were completed based on Business Requirements gathered by Quick Win business case development team members. Often the environment scan was completed by one individual's knowledge.	
	The Court Case Management Quick Win was approved by the Deputy minister. This Program was included on the Quick Win log however is deemed a Judiciary Led initiative causing some disconnects between JIMS BAT and CCM Program.	
	A significant number of JAG resources are not able to accomplish their assignments within the desired timeframes due to them being over allocated.	
	There was not a great deal of project management understanding, process or tools.	
	Some CCM Program components started with a designated delivery schedule causing high expectations on the project support team and IT resources.	
	Organization Change Management is not fully accepted within the organization.	
	GoA\JAG financial processes are very labor intensive and require additional time and resources incorporated into any future program\project plan.	
	On key implementation dates of new software it is critical to have a desk side analyst on hand to assist with any installation issues.	

Lessons Learned - PIC		
What Worked Well?	What went wrong or could be Improved?	Future Projects? What to start doing, keep doing, do more of?
Open collaborative approach everyone took to get CCM going and then expanded to address the needs of everyone	Federal Crown did not see changes in provincial system affecting them until late in the project. Now playing catch up. Federal Crown was invited to meetings; however, scope of involvement was not highlighted. Would have helped if a model was	Projects need both capital and operating contingency



Lessons Learned - PIC		
What Worked Well?	What went wrong or could be Improved?	Future Projects? What to start doing, keep doing, do more of?
	developed setting out objectives and anticipated procedure changes well ahead of time – to aid in Federal Crown understanding impacts sooner.	
Most felt the layers of governance were appropriate to ensure PIC members were well informed and knew what was happening on the project	The governance model was a little too complex to explain - there should really have been a sponsor committee of 3 or 4 and a steering committee that included PPSC etc (PIC was really both models together)	There needs to be clearer role definition when infrastructure work is involved, especially around financials (infrastructure staff, JAG liaison and project team)
Having one go to person for all areas (sub-committees) really helped the initiative be successful	Attempts were made to define technology tasks too early (before the business requirements were known), until we pulled the plug on early technology WBS creation activities we had technology driving the project	There needs to be a better way to obtain individual hours spent on tasks and remaining effort to complete (without the PM having to collect and enter everything)
Organizational change Management working close with teams at the beginning of the project really helped	OCM training should have been performed earlier (training covering what is OCM, why is it important etc.)	A full data migration test cycle should be performed, this helps to identify all issues and also provides a good estimate for the time that will be needed
Having the right people on governance at the start (adding stakeholder representation along the way as necessary) worked well. Never had too many at governance	A better detailed breakdown of operating vs. capital budget should be developed during project planning	Consider adding legal aid to the steering committee, this may help engage defense counsel as well
Project Lead was great to deal with, a real go to person	Analysis of other jurisdictions should have been performed early in the project to help the business see "what the future could be"	There needs to be a better financial process - large initiatives need a dedicated financial resource to manage the budget, forecast, payments process and better IMAGIS reports should be developed
Project Management dedication and strength provided governance members a sense of comfort, providing good documentation on issues and risks along with mitigations and proposed solutions for decision guidance, enabling governance to be policy driven and pro-active	Defence requires difference practices of communication in future	Keep having open, collaborative approach by all governance members, maintain high level of mutual respect and trust
High level of mutual trust and respect by everyone listening and hearing each other	Business requirements took too long to finalize - if it was a learning process use of iterative design/build could have been used	Continue PIC type forum to share ideas, form policies
Project Support Team empowered to do daily tasks and decisions	The Governance Diagram (CATS PAW) was too complicated to understand and explain to people until well into the project	Project Management documentation and proactive information helped governance to make decisions and mitigate issues quickly
Lots of ebbs and flows on CCM, started by Crown, then socialized it and expanded it to include Court Services and Judiciary and ultimately became bigger with Judiciary leading the initiative. Joint process – governance established quickly which moved CCM ahead.	Earlier, detailed analysis of the BC scheduling solution should have been performed	Ensure the right resourcing is in place and empowered, and ensure strong Project Management is in place
	Needs to be more focus on Federal Crown, Judiciary and Defence for change management	Ensure the right people in governance positions established quickly.
	Getting more people on board in Edmonton and Calgary for defence would have enabled more participation at the start	An earlier plan for on-going support is needed so more time is available to agree funding and perform procurement, etc.



Lessons Learned - PIC

What Worked Well?	What went wrong or could be Improved?	Future Projects? What to start doing, keep doing, do more of?
	There were too many people at the initial project kick-off	Check into possibility of providing defence counsel who participate on projects an honorarium from CDLA, Legal Air or other source
		Governance Model needs to be less complicated at the start of the project eliminated a complex CATS PAW diagram. Start with a less complicated model at the beginning and expand as the project expands would make it easier to communicate.
		Consider change management early and for all aspects (judiciary, PPSC, Defence). Need ongoing resource with project team
		Ensure right people are participating on project, especially Edmonton and Calgary defence bar
		Must have more than one approach for change management. Different for people you control vs judiciary and external stakeholder groups like defence counsel
		Must have an independent person provide information and communications to defence counsel (not a lawyer)
		Set up a model at the onset to test with stakeholders, then identify business requirements to ensure you meet their needs
		Ensure purpose of meetings and analysis seminar clearly known at the onset, will ensure attendance and participation
		Information Technology people need to be at the table from day one – especially enterprise architecture
		One 'go to' person for UIT and one for each of the different stakeholder groups work well.
		Establishing governance group like PIC, and Working Groups and Sub Committees early ensures the right people are engaged and committed to the overall project success throughout the project
		Governance level was appropriate, many of the members do not feel a steering committee level is necessary
		Utilizing best practices on projects or application development doesn't always generate progress, try something new to stimulate progress for early delivery