



Post-Project Report

FOR

CA DISPOSITION REPORTING
IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (CA-
DRIP) - PHASE 2

REVISION 1.0

JULY 24, 2014

DOCUMENT REVISIONS

Version	Date	Name	Change Description	Sections
0.1 – 0.3	6/4 – 6/26/14	Neil Payne, Peggy Petras-Ames	Initial draft version	All
0.4	7/3/14	Neil Payne	Mo West: add GRA and partner challenges	3.4.1, 3.9.1
0.5	7/8/14	Neil Payne	Renea Stewart input	2.1.1, 2.2, 3.1.1, 3.3.1, 3.5.1, 3.9.1
0.6	7/17/14	Neil Payne	Chelle Uecker input	2.2, 2.3, 3.1.1, 3.1.4, 3.2.1, 3.3.1, 3.4.1, 3.5.1, 3.7, 3.9.1, 4, 6
0.7	7/23/14	Neil Payne	Added appendix with approval e-mails, updated approvals section	Approvals section, appendix B
1.0	7/24/14	Neil Payne	Finalize document	Title Page, TOC

APPROVALS

Project Approver	Title	Signature/Link to Electronic Approval	Date
Amber Dow (DOJ)	DP Manager	Via E-mail (see Appendix B)	7/2/14
Chelle Uecker (AOC)	IS Manager	Approval page scan (see Appendix B)	7/17/14
Madelyn Thiessen (SCC)	Division Manager	Via E-mail (see Appendix B)	7/2/14
Robert Oyung (SCSC)	Chief Technology Officer	Via E-mail (see Appendix B)	7/7/14

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	6
1.1	PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES	6
1.2	TEMPLATE SOURCE	6
2	PROJECT INFORMATION	7
2.1	BACKGROUND.....	7
2.1.1	Participants	7
2.1.2	Statement Of Need	7
2.2	OBJECTIVES	7
2.3	STAKEHOLDERS	8
2.4	PROJECT IDENTIFIERS	9
3	PROJECT SUMMARY	10
3.1	OVERVIEW	10
3.1.1	End State Summarization	10
3.1.2	Focus	10
3.1.3	Process And History	11
3.1.4	Accomplishments	11
3.1.5	Future Opportunities And Improvements	11
3.2	SCOPE.....	12
3.2.1	Scope Details.....	13
3.3	OBJECTIVES	14
3.3.1	Objectives Details	14
3.4	EXPECTATIONS AND OUTCOMES	14
3.4.1	Expectations And Outcomes Details.....	14
3.5	BENEFITS.....	17
3.5.1	Benefits Anticipated And Unanticipated	17
3.6	SCHEDULE	18
3.7	BUDGET	19
3.7.1	Budget Details.....	19

3.8 PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20
3.8.1 Process	20
3.9 LESSONS LEARNED AND OPPORTUNITIES	20
3.9.1 Lessons Learned And Recommendations	20
3.9.2 Future Opportunities And Requirements.....	22
4 DOCUMENTATION LIST.....	24
5 GLOSSARY	26
APPENDIX A	28
PERFORMANCE METRICS.....	28
SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT	28
APPENDIX B	29
STEERING COMMITTEE APPROVALS	29

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the post-project report is to provide, in summary format, the results of the CA-DRIP Phase 2 Project. It entails the purpose, challenges, benefits, lessons learned, future possibilities, and other relevant information. The objective of this report is to provide information that can be used by interested parties, including project participants, management, granting organizations, other project staff, and those who have a vested interest in a potential future phase for this project.

1.2 TEMPLATE SOURCE

The template utilized as a general basis for this post-project summary document is the Post Project Review, sourced from the CA AOC SDLC (Solution Delivery Life Cycle) methodology (2014).

2 PROJECT INFORMATION

2.1 BACKGROUND

2.1.1 PARTICIPANTS

The CA-DRIP Phase 2 Project was a technical project undertaken by various governmental entities, The Judicial Council of California / Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), the California Department of Justice (DOJ), and Santa Clara County (SCC), along with sponsor and business aspect support by the Superior Court of California, Santa Clara County (SCSC). It was the next logical progression from Phase 1, where needs and solutions were analyzed and defined in preparation for the technical deployment aspect of a Phase 2.

2.1.2 STATEMENT OF NEED

The California Department of Justice (DOJ) reported that for the 2008 calendar year approximately 45% of the statewide arrests involving felony offenses reported to the DOJ had felony dispositions on the state criminal history file. For the period of 2000 to 2009, approximately 55% of the statewide arrest events reported to the DOJ had dispositions on file. In conversations with DOJ, they believe approximately 20% of the statewide dispositions were missing arrest data. Dispositions may not get applied to the criminal history because there is no arrest record to link to, or the linking data is incorrect. This is not just “data,” it is critical information used to make charging decisions, pretrial release decisions, sentencing decisions, and probation and correctional programming decisions, in California and nationwide through the FBI’s national criminal history files. Moreover, this critical information is used in non-criminal background checks for employment, especially employment where an offender should be prevented from having contact with children or other vulnerable populations. Quality improvements in data sent to the DOJ improves public safety in California and nationwide. The data for Santa Clara County is better than the statewide averages, however a substantial problem remains.

(source: Project Charter)

2.2 OBJECTIVES

Project Charter Objectives

1. Improve disposition linkage and reduce arrests without matching dispositions;
2. Utilize CA-AOC's standards, based upon the current GRA (Global Reference Architecture) and NIEM technologies, as well as the CA-AOC integration infrastructure, so the technology is repeatable with other local trial courts/counties. This will provide a consistent deployment approach for additional superior courts to adopt in future phases.
3. Develop and document model business processes that resolve mismatched cases and identify/correct remaining open arrests and open dispositions.
4. Define performance measurements and implement a monitoring process to evaluate level of improvement following a period of usage between SCC and DOJ.

Opportunity Provided Objectives

1. Develop protocol and identify challenges and approaches in implementing national standards in a local environment.

2.3 STAKEHOLDERS

Entity Acronyms:

Entity	Acronym
Administrative Office of the Courts (CA)	AOC
Department of Justice (CA)	DOJ
Santa Clara County	SCC
Santa Clara County Superior Court	SCSC

Lead stakeholders:

Role	Entity	Name
Project Sponsors	AOC	Mark Dusman
	DOJ	Cuong Nguyen
	SCC	Joyce Wing
	SCSC	David Yamasaki
Steering Committee	AOC	Chelle Uecker
	DOJ	Amber Dow
	SCC	Lyn Thiessen
	SCSC	Rob Oyung

Role	Entity	Name
Project Management	AOC	Neil Payne
	DOJ	Mary Lenigar
	SCC	Kathy Sanchez
Business and Exchange Support Leads	AOC	Daniel Wu
	AOC	Mark Yuan
	AOC	Raul Ortega
	DOJ	Chris Bodine
	SCC	John Hursey
	SCSC	Dawn Saindon
Standards and Schemas	SEARCH	Mo West
Funding and Direction	NCSC	Jim Harris
	NCSC	Tom Clarke

2.4 PROJECT IDENTIFIERS

Entity	Project ID
AOC	ITSO.0035
DOJ	CA DRIP Phase 2
NCSC	01520.0000
SCC	
SCSC	

3 PROJECT SUMMARY

3.1 OVERVIEW

3.1.1 END STATE SUMMARIZATION

The CA-DRIP Phase 2 project was completed with a significant level of accomplishment, but without full implementation or Production utilization. The AOC Data Integration Team completed Integration Services Backbone (ISB) implementation and testing, with the same occurring for the CA DOJ components and services. Santa Clara County fully participated and was able to create data exchange and testing capabilities for all three environments, Test, Staging, and Production. The benefit that justified the full implementation of the solution by the county, that required many system enhancements in order to complete the Go-Live deliverable. This was weighed against the potential new case management system deployment by the superior court, and thus those final aspects were not realized at the end of the project.

In order to fully realize the benefit of a full implementation of the solution by the county (SCC), many system enhancements were identified as required for the completion of the Go-Live deliverable. This was weighed against the pending new case management system to be deployed by the superior court (SCSC), which was considered and determined by the court late in the project. The county and court are in the midst of discussions to determine continued use of the county information services environment.

As a result, the exchange was not put into production, although Production Testing was completed by all parties (AOC, DOJ, SCC, SCSC). The AOC and DOJ implemented a fully supported solution for exchanging disposition data, using national standards-based specifications. Santa Clara County was fully involved until it became clear the full set of enhancements and deployments on their side was not justified due to the possible replacement of the court's case management system and pending court-county decisions regarding the future reporting of case dispositions. The DOJ and AOC are in preliminary discussions with court leadership and CMS vendors as to possible future implementations.

3.1.2 FOCUS

- Positively impact the accuracy, efficiency, and completeness of the state criminal history database
- Improve technical and business designs and processes

- Pilot and prove secure connectivity standards and implementations
- Implement and test exchange and data management solutions
- Utilize in a Production environment and measure success and improvements
- Gather lessons learned to enable improvements and future partner deployments

3.1.3 PROCESS AND HISTORY

- Utilized standard and as-needed project management techniques
- Worked well as a team during both expected and unexpected tasks and issues
- Technical standards were refreshed and implemented
- Implemented connectivity and security between the three technical project partners
- Decisions relating to security requirements, scheduling, and schedule extension were handled by the Steering Committee
- Weekly status and technical meetings were regularly held, well attended, and very fruitful and positive, keeping the project moving while resolving questions and issues

3.1.4 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Secure connectivity implementation and discovery of related challenges
- Specifications upgraded to national NIEM level
- Centralized Integration Services Backbone enhanced for improved processing, error capture, and acknowledgement transactions
- Solution successfully tested in Test, Staging, and Production environments
- Significant volume of transactions were tested
- Defined metrics data sources and future processes (see appendix)
- Defined basic SLA attributes (see appendix)

3.1.5 FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES AND IMPROVEMENTS

- Expand to include more organizations and case management systems who will submit dispositions using the centralized CA-DRIP services
- Upgrade security and NIEM standards for local and statewide environments
- Enhance assessment, planning, and project management processes

- Provide an expansive solution to reduce the effort and time to complete connectivity tasks
- Acquire and utilize grant funding for expansion and improvement of the data exchanges

3.2 SCOPE

The scope of CA-DRIP Phase 2 was focused on implementing new business processes and related technologies between the SCC, SCSC, local agencies and the State. Phase 2 also included, where applicable, planning for Phase 3. The project was designed to achieve the specific deliverables defined for the project within the funding and timeline constraints of the NCSC grant.

Business process improvement opportunities were planned as a part of this Phase 2 project. Additional strategies to increase information sharing across agencies and technical platforms were to be identified, in addition to costs and resources necessary to improve these areas. These would then be documented and implemented in future phases.

Scope Summary:

Scope	Description
Original	Implement and prove a technology solution and applicable processes that were based upon the Phase 1 work products, to be then utilized by the Phase 2 participants and others in the future.
Final	Scope expanded to include a refresh of the service specifications. Other aspects were completed, along with additional lessons learned, more compliant specifications, and some maturation of the ISB services at the CCTC.

3.2.1 SCOPE DETAILS

Summarized Details:

Scope Item	Result / Status	Variance Reason	Cause
Develop new business processes	Not Applicable	New processes already developed and in use	The primary focus for new business processes was Santa Clara County, which had already developed and implemented such processes by the startup of Phase 2 (identified in Phase 1)
Develop new technologies	Completed and Exceeded	Additional realizations	Security risks and needed technology considerations were realized, discussed, and developed as much as feasible during the project
Implement and deploy technical solutions	Mostly Completed	SCC enhancements not fully implemented	Due to possible implementation by the court of a new case management system and changes to the submission of dispositions by the court
Develop strategies for additional funding and approaches	Completed and Exceeded	Significant opportunity	A significant funding opportunity via an NCHIP grant was realized and acted upon, as well as security, technology, and error reporting improvements identified that will need future funding

3.3 OBJECTIVES

3.3.1 OBJECTIVES DETAILS

Objective	Status	Variance Business or Technical Reason
Improve disposition linkage and reduce arrests without matching dispositions	Met / Not Met	The technical solution object was met, but the objective was not met due to the exchange not utilized in a Production mode upon completion of the project
Utilize CA-AOC's standards-based (GRA and NIEM) technologies as well as the CA-AOC integration infrastructure so that the technology is repeatable with other local trial courts/counties. This will provide a consistent protocol, methodology, and deployment approach for courts throughout the country to adopt in the future	Met / Exceeded	This objective was met through utilization of the GRA and NIEM standards. However, the objective was exceeded when the specifications were revised to be compliant with current NIEM standards and the Package re-published and utilized for the exchange
Develop and document model business processes that resolve mismatched cases and identify/correct remaining open arrests and open dispositions	Not Met	SCC had already completed their work to vastly improve disposition submissions and virtually eliminate errors.
Define performance measurements and implement a monitoring process to evaluate level of improvement following a period of usage between SCC and DOJ	Met / Not Met	Performance measurement processes were defined and documented, but not utilized in Production

3.4 EXPECTATIONS AND OUTCOMES

3.4.1 EXPECTATIONS AND OUTCOMES DETAILS

The following table describes the deliverables / requirements at a summary level, along with expectations, outcomes, and comments regarding variances from expectations.

Deliverable / Requirement	Expectation / Benefit	Outcome	Variance Comments
Project Charter	Set project direction and deliverables	Set good direction, commitment, and a set of deliverables	Understanding of a “pilot” project was not consistently understood by all participants
National Standards and Guidelines Assessment	Compliance with XML and security standards to bring clarity and efficiency	XML payload and formatting methodology in line with NIEM standards	Payload XML for Disposition Recording a different NIEM version from the Error Reporting XML (very minor impact)
		Overcame challenge for web services addressing solution in order to be in line with GRA standards	Modifications to the ISB relating to WS addressing were required to implement the GRA objectives
		GRA-based Security solution acceptable but not optimal	Security header utilized UNT instead of the preferred PKI standards, due to schedule and resource constraints
Performance Metrics process (see Appendix)	Ability to measure success and benefit quantitatively by the end of this and future projects	DOJ specific and project (AOC, DOJ) process defined	Not fully tested nor implemented due to only two partners ending at a “Live” status
Business Process Models and Use Cases	Further refining of BP and UC components from Phase 1	BP models not updated, Use Cases developed and used	Business process improvements already implemented by SC County, AOC created ISB use cases
Service Specification Packages	Provide the basis for the technical security and payload solution, based on standards	New packages were developed, based upon prior packages and NIEM standards	Full revision of the specifications was completed, with a couple minor changes during the project

Deliverable / Requirement	Expectation / Benefit	Outcome	Variance Comments
Requirements for the technical solution	Requirements are defined that will drive the technical design and implementation	Requirements were developed by each partner. GRA PKI security requirement was tabled for this phase.	Lack of time, resources, and funding to implement a PKI / Digital Signature solution was replaced with the UNT solution, per Steering Committee decision and after conferring with NCSC
Development of Disposition receipt and Error Report	DOJ to develop the technical solution and test per the requirements	Development and testing completed	NA
Development of Disposition submit and Error Report receipt	SCC to develop the technical solution and test per the requirements	Submit/receive data element solution developed and tested via one connection and application point	Project and testing fully supported, with continuation to modify all system components not completed. Error management on the receiver side was not enhanced.
Integration Test Plan	Develop a plan, distribute, and utilize to ensure testing success	Plan developed and distributed, along with more detailed and as needed documents	Not fully utilized, but simplicity and support by the partners of the testing enabled full and sufficient testing
Cutover Plan and Production Go-Live	Create and use plan for final steps success, Go Live in Production	Basic plan developed and AOC and DOJ fully implemented in Production (testing completed and signed off), exchange did not go into full Production usage	Implementation of a large quantity of enhancements and modifications to the County system in order to Go Live was not completed due to potential CMS replacement by the court

Deliverable / Requirement	Expectation / Benefit	Outcome	Variance Comments
Service Level Agreement (see Appendix)	Was not expected, but is the type of document needed when entities share data and need to ensure compliance and performance	A draft three-way SLA document was created and archived	Wasn't specifically defined within the Charter, but is a necessary binding component
Funding for a future phase	Investigate potential funding and apply if appropriate	NCHIP grant for a Phase 3 requested through the CA DOJ	NA

List Source: Project Charter, project results

3.5 BENEFITS

3.5.1 BENEFITS ANTICIPATED AND UNANTICIPATED

Aspect / Benefit	Origin	Status	Comments
Standardized, reusable technology (efficient, controllable)	Project Charter	Met	Developed reusable specifications that are able to be updated to national standards as they change
Standardized security technology (secure, nationally supported)	Project Charter	Not Met	UNT (user name token) security method was approved for this phase, but PKI was preferred and needs to be considered for a Phase 3 implementation
More robust ISB functionality (better control and reporting)	Project tasks	Exceeded	Exceeded expectations as a result of issues mitigation replay/retry needs, and increased error handling enhancements

Aspect / Benefit	Origin	Status	Comments
Project initiation and management enhancements (tested and further defined for an improved Phase 3)	Project tasks	Met / Exceeded	Expectations were realized of improvements discovered during the project. Expectations were exceeded regarding connectivity and assessment needs, which revealed important security aspects and were surprisingly large in effort
Teamwork importance (for efficiency and a solution-driven project)	Project tasks	Met / Exceeded	While the importance of teamwork and communication between the partners was understood, it was demonstrated beyond a normally expected level, with good results produced by the teams and the project as a whole
Application interfacing with the data exchange (efficiency and accuracy of processing)	Project Charter, Project tasks	Met	AOC and DOJ met the goals of providing new necessary components and interfaces into Production, with the county providing similar aspects through the testing phases
Management of scope and resources in a feasible manner	Project Charter, Project tasks	Met	Considerable time was expended during the project to evaluate scope, efforts, and directing resources at the proper priority level needed to complete the project

3.6 SCHEDULE

Original Schedule

The original target Go Live / end date for the project was 3/31/14.

Final Schedule

The adjusted and final end date for the project was 6/30/14, with the Production Go Live target as the end of May 2014.

Schedule Variance

The end date was moved due to delays in the schedule for the connectivity and development tasks. Staff availability and a normal quantity of issues and specifications changes also had more minor impact to the schedule.

3.7 BUDGET

Source: Grant (NCSC)

Original Budget: \$250,000

Final Budget: \$110,000

Variance Explanation

The reduction from the original budget amount to the final budget amount was due to the AOC and SCC declining funding due to either:

- On-staff personnel were available (AOC, SCC); or
- There was a lack of time in the schedule to orientate and train a consultant to work with the technical aspects of the organization's systems (SCC).

3.7.1 BUDGET DETAILS

Budget Line Item	Status	Description	Variance Cause
DOJ Deliverables	On Budget	Grant funding pass-through to CA-DOJ for their requirements, development, metrics, testing, and Production cutover work.	NA

3.8 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

3.8.1 PROCESS

3.8.1.1 PROJECT CHANGE MANAGEMENT

Change management for this project primarily revolved around changes to security methodology or technical specifications.

Summary of changes:

Type / Who	Submitted	Approved	Implemented	Deferred	Denied	Impact (\$)
Specifications (Tech) Project team	6	5	5	1		None
Security Steering Committee	1	1	1			None
Schedule Extension Steering Committee	1	1	1			None

3.9 LESSONS LEARNED AND OPPORTUNITIES

3.9.1 LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Lesson Learned	Type	Recommendation
Connectivity is one of the most time consuming and problematic aspects.	Project	Utilize a full pre-startup assessment and evaluation process. Plan partner-specific activities and sufficient time frame to implement, based upon the results of the assessment.
Structured testing can be challenging, dependent upon each partner's technical environment, resource availability, and organizational testing methods or requirements.	Technical	

Lesson Learned	Type	Recommendation
<p>CCTC technical security policies required more than anticipated court and county resources in order to implement network routing to the CCTC.</p>	<p>Security</p>	
<p>Deliverables and end state of the project may have varying interpretations by various partners.</p>	<p>Project</p>	<p>Prepare a generic high-level project plan linked to each deliverable at a low level and utilize during charter preparation to ensure and enable a complete understanding that leads to a knowledge based commitment to the project deliverables..</p>
<p>Differences in development tools and web services application between the partners lead to the need for some flexibility and potential changes to the specifications and/or data.</p>	<p>Technical</p>	<p>Identify differences during a pre-startup assessment.</p>
<p>Multiple partners with multiple cultures and priorities present unique challenges for ventures of this type.</p>	<p>Project</p>	<p>Ensure at charter and project preparation points that the challenges related to management of an exchange / integration project are presented and discussed relating to roles, responsibilities, and commitment. This will help to meet the challenges in an environment of ownership, leadership, and accountability .</p>
<p>Understanding of the definition of a “pilot” project was not consistently understood by all participants</p>	<p>Project</p>	<p>More clearly define in the project charter the exact expectations, scope definition, and deliverables without ambiguity.</p>

Lesson Learned	Type	Recommendation
Overall capability of each project partner to commit to successfully complete the deliverables was impacted by perspectives, challenges, and/or business decisions discovered during the project	Technical Project	Via a reasonably comprehensive pre-startup assessment by each partner, ascertain as many of the technical needs and challenges before full commitment and project schedule items are ensured and finalized. Potential future business changes or needs are to also be better identified and considered during the planning and commitment phase.

3.9.2 FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES AND REQUIREMENTS

- Leverage Phase 2 successes and consider / initiate a follow-on phase (Phase 3) to add disposition submitting partners and continue enhancement of the exchange and processes. Dependencies / tasks prior to full commitment:
 - Obtain grant funding.
 - Obtain engagement commitment from potential CMS software vendors and interested courts and a centralized solution.
 - Ensure both AOC and DOJ have executive sponsorship, as well as availability and commitment of necessary resources.
 - Obtain Judicial Branch and DOJ appropriate levels of approval, confirmation of support, and grant allocation agreement.
- Case Management Systems Standardization
 - Partner with one or more case management vendors for inclusion as a standard data exchange for California customers
- Data Exchange Security
 - Evaluate feasibility, effort, and cost of an upgrade to PKI (digital signature) level. Implement solution if possible.
- Pre-Charter Assessment
 - Utilize more extensive assessment methods, local business process analysis, partner pre-commitment detailed evaluation, and appropriate planning adjustments prior to project charter completion and tasks startup with each partner
- Standardized Deployment Package
 - Package and utilize appropriate project and deliverable documents that can be used to engage and onboard partners who submit dispositions

- Resolve Connectivity Challenges
 - Expand focus, effort, method, resources, and scheduling for connectivity tasks
- Improve meeting and change management processes to better support static (standard) and dynamic (new) discoveries and other aspects of the project

4 DOCUMENTATION LIST

Types: Project, Specifications, SDLC, Deliverable

Status: Artifact, Project Mgmt, Project Tasks

Document	Version	Type	Status
Project Charter	1.0	Deliverable	Artifact
Performance Improvement) (DOJ)	1	Deliverable - DOJ	Artifact
Performance Metrics	1	Deliverable	Artifact
Service Level Agreement	0.3	Deliverable – New	Artifact
Specifications Package (NIEM, GRA)	2.0.4	Deliverable, Specifications	Artifact
Error Codes (ISB)	1	Specifications	Artifact
Project Request (AOC)	10/18/13	SDLC	Artifact
Project Assessment (AOC)	10/21/13	SDLC	Artifact
Requirements (AOC)	2	SDLC	Artifact
Issues and Action Items	9	Project	Project Mgmt
Summary Status	6/3/14	Project	Project Mgmt
Technical Q&A Log	3	Project	Project Tasks
Change Request 001 (4 items)	3/5/14	Project	Project Tasks
Change Request 002 (1 item)	1	Project	Project Tasks
Change Request 003 (1 item)	2	Project	Project Tasks
High Level Connectivity Diagram	2/5/14	Project	Artifact
Certificate Deployment Guide	1	Project	Artifact
ISB Connectivity Testing Guide (draft)	0.2	Project	Artifact
Test Cases and Tracking (AOC)	2	Project	Artifact
Quality Assurance Plan (AOC)	2	Project	Artifact
QA Report Summary	Various	Project	Project Tasks
DOJ Prod Data Test Usage Agreement	4/9/14	Project	Project Mgmt

Post-Project Report

Document	Version	Type	Status
Test Results	(various)	Project	Project Tasks
Use Case Document	3	Project	Artifact
Testing Process	3	Project	Project Tasks
Production Validation Plan and Log	7	Project	Project Mgmt
Production Testing Log (testing, signoff)	3	Project	Project Mgmt
Defect Report (AOC)	(various)	Project	Project Tasks
Agendas and Meeting Notes	(various)	Project	Project Mgmt
Applic. and Arch. Security Review (AOC)	4.6	Project	Artifact (AOC)

5 GLOSSARY

Term / Acronym	Description
AOC	Administrative Office of the Courts (CA)
Artifact	Permanent archived work product and/or reference documentation as a record or for future usage
CA	California
CA-DRIP	CA Disposition Reporting Improvement Project
CMS	Case Management System
Disposition	The final or updated status and relevant information relating to a criminal court case, arrest, or filing
DOJ	Department of Justice (CA)
GRA	Global Reference Architecture
NCSC	National Center for State Courts
NIEM	National Information Exchange Model (niem.gov)
Partner	An organization that participates in a data exchange. Most commonly for CA-DRIP referred to for the organization that submits dispositions to the CA DOJ.
PKI	Public Key Infrastructure, aka Digital Signature, involving components used for security purposes
Project Mgmt	Project Management
SCC	Santa Clara County
Schema	Data definition specification
SCSC	Superior Court, Santa Clara County
SDLC	Solution Delivery Life Cycle (CA AOC) – project management and documentation methodology
SEARCH	Justice information sharing resource (analysis, best practices, etc.)
Specifications	Technical definition and NIEM compliant XML model

Term / Acronym	Description
UNT	User Name Token – a type of security used with web services for identification / authentication

APPENDIX A

PERFORMANCE METRICS



CA-DRIP
Performance Metrics v

SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT



CA-DRIP Svc Lvl
Agrmt v0-3.pdf



Performance Metrics

FOR
CA-DRIP PHASE 2

REVISION 1.0

JULY 2, 2014

DOCUMENT REVISIONS

Version	Date	Name	Change Description	Sections
0.1 – 0.2	6/26/14	Neil Payne	Initial document	All
1.0	7/2/14	Neil Payne	Per Mary Lenigar, eliminate Data Mart report	4.1

RELEVANT DOCUMENTS

Title / Description	Location
DOJ Performance v1.0 (DOJ deliverable – Cloverleaf Solutions)	Project folder

APPROVALS

Name	Title	Signature/Link to Electronic Approval	Date

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	6
1.1	PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES	6
1.2	OVERVIEW	6
2	PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT DEFINITION	7
2.1	PRIMARY PERFORMANCE GOALS	7
2.2	SERVICE LEVEL GOALS	7
2.3	DURATION MEASUREMENT	8
2.3.1	DOJ Perspective	8
2.3.2	ISB / CCTC (AOC) Perspective	8
2.3.3	Submitting Entity Perspective	8
3	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT	10
4	APPROACH TO PERFORMANCE MONITORING	11
4.1	CA DOJ	11
4.1.1	Sample Reports	11
4.2	ISB / CCTC (CA AOC).....	13
5	PERFORMANCE REVIEW	14
5.1	METRICS COLLECTION STARTUP	14
5.2	CONCURRENT DISPOSITIONS TO DOJ	14
5.3	REVIEWS.....	14
6	GLOSSARY	16

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

This document outlines the performance measurements that will be recorded and monitored and how the monitoring process will be defined and implemented. It is specifically focused upon the dispositions submitted to the CA DOJ via CDR (Charge Disposition Reporting Service) and the CDER (Charge Disposition Error Report) responses to the submitting entity.

1.2 OVERVIEW

The California Disposition Reporting Improvement Project (CA DRIP) Phase 2 is a continued collaboration of SCC, the SCSC, the CA-DOJ and the CA-AOC to improve criminal disposition reporting and develop a model that can be used by other jurisdictions within the State. Phase 2 includes:

- Enhancement and implementation of the Data Exchanges between CA-AOC, CA-DOJ, SCC-ISD and SCSC
- Improvement in the business processes in order to expedite correction of errors from the automated reporting of final dispositions to the State
- Creation of documentation required to support Phase 3, which is envisioned to deploy the disposition reporting improvements to other courts/counties within California
- Definition of performance measurements and implementation of a monitoring process to evaluate level of improvement following a period of usage between ACC and DOJ

2 PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT DEFINITION

The project charter describes the primary performance improvements for the CA-DRIP project as follows:

“California Department of Justice (CA-DOJ) has reported that for the 2008 calendar year approximately 45% of the statewide arrests involving felony offenses reported to the CA-DOJ had felony dispositions on the state criminal history file. For the period of 2000 to 2009, approximately 55% of the statewide arrest events reported to the CA-DOJ had dispositions on file. In conversations with CA-DOJ, they believe approximately 20% of the statewide dispositions were missing arrest data. Dispositions may not get applied to the criminal history because there is no arrest record to link to, or the linking data is incorrect. This is not just “data,” it is critical information used to make charging decisions, pretrial release decisions, sentencing decisions, and probation and correctional programming decisions, in California and nationwide through the FBI’s national criminal history files. Moreover, this critical information is used in non-criminal background checks for employment, especially employment where an offender should be prevented from having contact with children or other vulnerable populations. Quality improvements in data sent to the CA-DOJ improves public safety in California and nationwide. The data for Santa Clara is better than the statewide averages, however a substantial problem remains.”

2.1 PRIMARY PERFORMANCE GOALS

The primary performance improvement goals, as described above, are:

1. Improve the percent of arrests with dispositions in the criminal history file.
2. Reduce the percent of dispositions with missing arrest data.

2.2 SERVICE LEVEL GOALS

The Service Level Agreement (SLA) contains the following list of performance goals:

1. Performance standards are to conform to the legal requirement that the provision of case dispositions from the superior court to the CA-DOJ is required within a maximum of 30 days following the case being disposed.
2. Partners receiving exchange transactions shall have the capability to complete initial processing within 5 minutes of receipt.

3. The CA-DOJ will return errors (business errors) discovered by the business application within 1 hour.
4. The submitting entity will ensure data, schema, or other errors are corrected and the transactions re-submitted with sufficient lead time to comply with the 30-day reporting requirement.

2.3 DURATION MEASUREMENT

2.3.1 DOJ PERSPECTIVE

2.3.1.1 REPORTING FREQUENCY

From the perspective of the CA-DOJ, the information can be reported on a periodic basis.

Exceptions:

- The CA-DOJ would not have timings between the submitting entity and the ISB.
- The initial disposition processing will meet the initial processing goals see #2 above). However, the full processing of a disposition through to the Criminal History Database may normally take several hours. This is due to processing multiple tapes or files from various counties that may contain hundreds of dispositions each. Thus, this post-exchange processing is not included within the metrics tracking and performance improvement reviews.

2.3.2 ISB / CCTC (AOC) PERSPECTIVE

2.3.2.1 REPORTING FREQUENCY

From the perspective of the CA-AOC, the information can be reported on a periodic basis.

Exceptions:

- The CA-AOC would not have timings between the submitting entity and the ISB.

2.3.3 SUBMITTING ENTITY PERSPECTIVE

2.3.3.1 REPORTING FREQUENCY

From the perspective of the entity submitting the dispositions, it is assumed the information can be reported on a periodic basis.

Exceptions:

- The submitting entity would not have timings between the ISB / CCTC and the CA-DOJ.

3 PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

The above section defining the performance improvement focus shows primary and service level performance improvement goals. Performance measurement is required to demonstrate performance improvements with disposition processing.

Base Lining

The primary improvements detailed in the previous section and the project charter will need to be base lined with actual numbers for SCC, as well as in the future for additional submitting entities. This baseline should include information for at least one or two years where dispositions were provided through legacy methods. They should ideally show periodic values for comparison with current measurements.

The AOC would not be able to provide any base line values, unless it was determine it was possible to gather the information from a specific court CMS system.

The SLA performance goals will not need a baseline, since those performance goals refer to the performance of the new system.

Collection and Reporting

The metrics can be collected on a periodic basis (monthly or quarterly). General areas of measurement should include:

1. Dispositions, by type
2. Error reports generation metrics
3. Internal processing of data received
4. Base line statistics for improvement assessment
5. Evaluation data for court certify/suspend date to the DOJ receipt date
6. Other internal or external elapsed processing times, as deemed appropriate

4 APPROACH TO PERFORMANCE MONITORING

4.1 CA DOJ

The CA-DOJ recommends leveraging their existing reports for performance monitoring as much as possible to both make use of proven and tested technology as well as reducing costs.

- The Disposition Processor has existing statistics reporting capabilities that can be run on a by county basis. This reporting contains information to monitor volume of dispositions, errors, dispositions with no arrest cycle (a primary measure), etc.
- Timing / duration statistics for initial processing and sending error reports will need to be created as a custom report.

4.1.1 SAMPLE REPORTS

Disposition Statistics Report

The sample report that follows is the standard disposition statistics report run for Santa Clara County for the month of March 2014. Some of the data in this report is understood internally at CA-DOJ and may need to be removed, ignored or explained to others to prevent confusion.

Statistics from 03/01/2014 to 03/31/2014

```
=====
Total DCNs.....6557
ATDR Errors.....4
DCNs Processed (Good Subjects).....6553
  Thumb Search.....0
  Record Sealing.....0
  Ignored Transactions.....69
DCNs Updated.....5225 (79.7% of DCNs Processed)
  New CIIs Created.....0 ( 0% of DCNs Updated)
  New DSPs Created.....282 ( 5.4% of DCNs Updated)
  NAOLs Created.....1093 (20.9% of DCNs Updated)
  Current CIIs.....3828 (73.3% of DCNs Updated)
  Current DSPs.....22 ( .4% of DCNs Updated)
Transaction Conditions (MANUAL).....-2678 (15.9% of DCNs Processed)
Edit Failures (MANUAL).....3718 (56.7% of DCNs Processed)
Update Failures (BATCH).....4 ( .1% of DCNs Processed)
=====
```


Custom Statistics

The DOJ custom statistics and periodic reporting should contain the information below:

1. Report Dates by date range
2. Number of disposition recordings received, by report type (total, initial, subsequent and corrected)
3. Average time to complete the initial ATDR processing
4. Average time to send error reports (from receipt of recording to error report send time)
5. Number of failed recordings
6. Number of error reports that failed to send
7. Number and percent of dispositions that completed all disposition processing and were sent to the Batch Processor
8. Average number of days from the last certification or court disposition/suspended date (this would provide feedback on compliance with the 30 day goal)

4.2 ISB / CCTC (CA AOC)

The CA AOC, via the ISB, expects to be able to provide (to be developed) the following statistical aspects for performance measurement:

1. Report Date ranges (from and to)
2. Number of disposition recordings or error reports received
3. Number of recordings and error reports rejected due to errors
4. Number of recordings and reports successfully validated
5. Number of recordings and reports successfully transported / delivered to the target partners
6. Number of recordings and reports not successfully transported / delivered to the target partners, by error type (implementation of an enhancement would also enable reporting by type of error)
7. Average time to process and deliver after receipt (requires implementation of an enhancement)

5 PERFORMANCE REVIEW

5.1 METRICS COLLECTION STARTUP

Performance baseline metrics should start to be collected:

- Collection of metrics should begin the month following the collection of baseline metrics; and
- When CA-DRIP begins full Production operations; or
- At the end of the month when Production operations begin if they begin in the middle of a month.

5.2 CONCURRENT DISPOSITIONS TO DOJ

County agencies may continue to send dispositions via tape or FTP (previous legacy method) for a substantial period of time after beginning CA-DRIP operations. This needs to be considered when analyzing any collected metrics and can only be reported by the DOJ.

5.3 REVIEWS

Ongoing Reviews

Ongoing review by the exchange partners of the performance metrics should assist them in the disposition improvement effort and provide the information necessary to “steer” the project for maximum performance achievement. Additionally, a review of user experiences and any difficulties in use or operation of the system should help guide any needed software specification changes as well as recommendations for improvement in the overall system.

Formal Reviews

At some point, a formal review and production / distribution of a performance report may be desirable, as this can be an excellent format to communicate current achievements and the potential for future gains with stakeholders and counties considering moving to the new system.

Information Collaboration

For both ongoing and formal reviews, it may be prudent for the various data exchange partners to combine raw data and/or statistical analysis information into a single method of reporting for project level analysis and decision-making.

6 GLOSSARY

Term / Acronym	Description
CA-AOC	California Administrative Office of the Courts
CA-DOJ	California Department of Justice
CA-DRIP	California Disposition Reporting Improvement Project
CDR	Charge Disposition Recording Service. This service provides the ability for CA DOJ to receive an initial, subsequent action, or corrected disposition sent by a justice partner. Previously: DOJ901.
CDER	Charge Disposition Error Report. This services provides the CA DOJ with the ability to send a disposition error report notification to a justice partner. Previously: DOJ802.
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
ISB	Integration Services Backbone
SCC	Santa Clara County
SCC-ISD	Santa Clara County Information Services Department
SCSC	Superior Court fo California, County of Santa Clara



SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT
CALIFORNIA DISPOSITION REPORTING
CA-DRIP PROJECT PHASE 2

BETWEEN: CA AOC, CA DOJ, SANTA
CLARA COUNTY

MAY 12, 2014

VERSION 0.3 (DRAFT)



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS

JUDICIAL AND COURT ADMINISTRATIVE
SERVICES DIVISION

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES OFFICE

Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Information Services Division
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688

Copyright © 2012 by Judicial Council of California – Administrative Office of the Courts.
All rights reserved.

Except as permitted under the Copyright Act of 1976 and as otherwise expressly provided herein, no part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including the use of information storage and retrieval systems, without permission in writing from the copyright holder. Permission is hereby granted to nonprofit institutions to reproduce and distribute this publication for educational purposes if the copies credit the copyright holder.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables.....	iv
List of Figures.....	iv
Revision History.....	v
Abbreviations and Acronyms.....	v
1.0 Document Overview	1
2.0 Exclusions	2
3.0 Exchange Participants	3
3.1 Exchange Partners and Providers	3
3.1.1 Partners.....	3
3.1.2 Middleware Provider.....	3
3.1.3 Network Path Provider.....	3
3.2 Participant Services and Actions.....	4
Organization	4
4.0 Availability	4
4.1 Availability	4
4.2 Downtime Criteria and Notification.....	5
5.0 Performance	7
5.1 Performance Standards	7
5.2 Replay	7
5.2.1 DOJ Replay	7
5.2.2 ISB Replay	8
5.2.3 SCC Replay.....	9
5.3 Re-Submission	9
5.3.1 Re-submission to DOJ Due to Error Report	9
6.0 Support and Incident Management	9
6.1 Support Schedule.....	9
6.2 Incident Reporting – Automated.....	10
6.3 Incident Reporting – Exchange Participants	10

6.4 Incident Categorization 11

6.5 Incident Resolution..... 12

6.6 Incident Escalation 13

7.0 Data Quality 14

 7.1 Data Accuracy, Standards, and Issues 14

8.0 Authentication and Renewals 15

 8.1 Authentication Renewal Policies 15

 8.2 Authentication Renewal Notification..... 15

List of Tables

Table 1. Participant Services and Actions 4

Table 2. Availability Exceptions 5

Table 3. Downtime Notification Contacts 6

Table 4. Support Schedule By Participant 10

Table 5. Incident Reporting Contacts – ISB Automated Notification 10

Table 6. Incident Reporting Contacts - Participants 11

Table 7. Incident Resolution Parameters 12

Table 8. Notification Contacts – Credentials and Certificates..... 16

List of Figures

No table of figures entries found.

Revision History

Change #	Date	Who	Description of Changes
0.1thru 0.3 (draft)	3/21/14 – 5/12/14	Neil Payne, Mary Lenigar, Daniel Wu	Initial version of the document through draft 3

Abbreviations and Acronyms

Abbreviation	Description
AOC	California Administrative Office of the Courts
CA-DRIP	California Disposition Reporting Improvement Project
CCTC	California Courts Technology Center
DOJ	California Department of Justice
ISB	Integration Services Backbone (at CCTC / managed by AOC)
SC	Santa Clara
SCC	Santa Clara County
SCSC	Santa Clara Superior Court

1.0 Document Overview

This document describes the specific expectations around the provision and utilization of the California Disposition Reporting data exchange, which includes four exchanges relating to Disposition Reporting (Recording) and Error Reporting (Reporting). The document identifies measureable and agreed-to responsibilities, components, performance factors pertaining to the data exchange, and procedures and contacts for notifications and reporting.

DRAFT

2.0 Exclusions

The following topics are not within the scope of this document.

- Fees, costs, or cost policies.
- Data custody, system of record, confidentiality, auditing, data retention, or archival policies.
- Contact information outside of the applicable, respective operational and application teams of the participants specifically addressed within this document.
- Application business logic or functionality outside of that which affects the exchange.

DRAFT

3.0 Exchange Participants

This section identifies each participant and describes their corresponding technical services and actions.

3.1 Exchange Partners and Providers

3.1.1 Partners

- California Department of Justice (CA DOJ).
 - Receive disposition submission
 - Respond with error report
- Santa Clara County (SC County).
 - Submit disposition
 - Receive error report

3.1.2 Middleware Provider

- California Administrative Office of the Courts (CA AOC).
 - Standards, schemas, security, central connectivity

3.1.3 Network Path Provider

- California Superior Court, County of Santa Clara [County-to-ISB via the court] (SC Sup Court).
 - Connectivity with CCTC WAN

3.2 Participant Services and Actions

Table 1. Participant Services and Actions

Organization	Provide Data	Consume Data	Network Services	Provide Web Services	Consume Web Services	Security Authentication	Schema Validation	Enumeration Validation	Transformation	Standards	Business Application	Application Interface
CA AOC (ISB)			X	X	X	X	X			X		
CA DOJ	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X
SC County	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X
SC Sup Court			X									

4.0 Availability

This section defines the policy for the exchange availability, support schedule, and performance standards.

4.1 Availability

- The data exchange components and connectivity managed by each partner shall be normally and minimally available and actively support during business hours, defined as:

Monday through Friday, 8:00 am to 5:00 pm Pacific Time.

- Availability is also provided outside of the normal available time periods by the exchange participants.
- Availability exceptions:

Table 2. Availability Exceptions

Organization	Maintenance Windows & Other Scheduled Activities	Unscheduled Outages
CA AOC (ISB)	Sundays, 9 am to 6 pm Wednesdays, 6 pm to 9 pm Note: Does not impact the normal availability for this exchange. Planned outages may occur during these times. They are usually of short duration, with exchange partners notified of planned long outages with sufficient lead time.	If during the business day, notification to exchange partners will occur as soon as possible.
CA DOJ	Monday through Thursday, 12 am to 5 am	If during the business day, notification to exchange partners will occur as soon as possible.
SC County	???	???

4.2 Downtime Criteria and Notification

- Criteria:
 - Scheduled downtime will occur outside of normal maintenance windows, or
 - Scheduled downtime is required outside of normal maintenance windows on an emergency basis, or
 - Downtime has suddenly occurred without warning outside of normal maintenance windows or scheduled downtime periods.
- Scheduled Downtime Notification
 - Notification for scheduled downtime shall be via e-mail
 - Notifications will be sent to the exchange partners a minimum of one calendar week prior to the downtime event start.
- Unscheduled Downtime Notification:
 - Notification for an unscheduled downtime event shall be by phone call to the other exchange participants within 1 hour of the event start, with a follow-up notification sent via e-mail immediately thereafter.

Table 3. Downtime Notification Contacts

Organization	Type	Contact Name	Contact Phone / E-mail
CA AOC (ISB)	Primary	???	???
	Alternate	???	???
CA DOJ	Primary	DOJ Computer Operations	916-227-3000 hdcsas@doj.ca.gov and hdc.computeroperations@doj.ca.gov
	Alternate	none	none
SC County	Primary	???	???
	Alternate	???	???

DRAFT

5.0 Performance

This section defines the policy for the exchange availability, support schedule, and performance standards.

5.1 Performance Standards

- Performance standards are to conform to the legal requirement that the the provision of case dispositions from the superior court to the CA DOJ are required within a maximum of 30 days following the case being disposed.
- Partners receiving exchange transactions shall have the capability to complete initial processing within 5 minutes of receipt, per the following:
 - The ISB (middleware exchange application) shall complete validations and (1) report issues back to the submitting entity or (2) attempt to transport to the intended target, depending upon the type and severity of error.
 - The receiving entity will complete initial validations and report pre-business (exchange) application issues back to the submitting entity.
 - These standards shall not be in effect if delays are caused by public carrier or are due to other causes out of the control of the participant managing the services.
- The CA DOJ will return errors (business errors) discovered by the business application within 1 hour.
- The submitting entity will ensure data, schema, or other errors are corrected and the transactions re-submitted with sufficient lead time to comply with the 30-day reporting requirement.

5.2 Replay

Replay, if appropriate for each partner or provider, is defined and described below.

5.2.1 DOJ Replay

Definition of Replay: To retain and repeat the attempt to deliver a transaction one or more times after an unsuccessful initial delivery attempt. The Charge Disposition Error Document is the only transaction currently defined for the DOJ to send. This should not be confused with synchronous responses by the web service which will not be replayed.

If the DOJ is unable to successfully send the Charge Disposition Error Document to the target entity, it shall re-attempt to do so using the following procedure:

- Retain the Charge Disposition Error Document.
- Replay (re-execute) the attempt to deliver the payload transaction for up to 24 hours following the initial delivery attempt failure.
- The wait time before each Replay attempt will be executed shall be 4 hours.
- Maximum Replays: 6.
- After 6 Replay attempts that fail, send a notification message to the same exchange partners that are listed below for the initial delivery failure notification. The payload shall be archived for 60 days. At this point, it may be required to complete a manual intervention within DOJ.

5.2.2 ISB Replay

Definition of Replay: To retain the payload and repeat the attempt to deliver the transaction one or more times after an unsuccessful initial delivery attempt.

If the ISB is unable to successfully submit the exchange transaction to the target entity, it shall re-attempt to do so using the following procedure:

- Send a notification to the ISB application team.
- Retain the transaction.
- Replay (re-execute) the attempt to deliver the payload transaction for up to 24 hours following the initial delivery attempt failure.
- The wait time before each Replay attempt will be executed shall be 4 hours.
- Maximum Replays: 6.
- For each Replay attempt that fails, send a notification message to the ISB application team .
- If the maximum Replay repetition quantity has been reached without a successful delivery, the payload shall be archived for 60 days. At this point, dependent upon analysis, it may be required to complete a manual intervention within the ISB to re-submit or the transaction may need to be re-submitted by the original submitting entity per ISB application team instructions.

5.2.3 SCC Replay

If the SCC services are unable to successfully submit the exchange transaction to the target entity (the ISB), it shall re-attempt to do so using the following procedure:

- ???.

5.3 Re-Submission

Re-submission processing, if applicable, is defined and described below.

5.3.1 Re-submission to DOJ Due to Error Report

Condition 1: DOJ Is Unable to Process a Disposition

If a Charge Disposition Document was received without error by the web service but in later processing generates a Charge Disposition Error Document that indicates DOJ was unable to parse and save the data in the staging tables, then the Charge Disposition Document transaction may need to be re-submitted by the original submitting entity.

- In this case, the original Charge Disposition Document (Recording) may be corrected and re-submitted without conferring with DOJ.

Condition 2: Special Instructions

- In no other case other than for Condition 1 should the original Charge Disposition Document (Recording) be re-submitted without specific instructions from DOJ.

6.0 Support and Incident Management

This section defines standard support, incident categories, resolution, and escalation.

6.1 Support Schedule

- Support by the exchange partners shall be provided during the available days and hours defined within the Availability section of this document.
- Support outside of the defined business hours shall be per the capability and the discretion of the partner providing the service that requires support activity, with no guarantee of support availability provided.

- Special priority designation and a variance to the operational schedule may be temporarily implemented through mutual agreement by the impacted partners.

Table 4. Support Schedule By Participant

Organization	Primary Support Hours	Secondary Support Hours
CA AOC (ISB)	Monday through Friday 8:00 am to 5:00 pm	Guaranteed support: ??? Monday through Friday, Midnight to 8:00 am, 5:00 pm to Midnight Weekends
CA DOJ	Monday through Friday 8:00 am to 5:00 pm	None
SC County	???	???

6.2 Incident Reporting – Automated

- Certain error conditions, such as an inability for the ISB to deliver payload transactions, will trigger notifications that are automatically delivered to specified e-mail addresses.

Table 5. Incident Reporting Contacts – ISB Automated Notification

Incident	Payload Submitter	Payload Consumer	Send Notification To
Failure after maximum Replay attempts	SC County	CA DOJ	ISB Application Team
	CA DOJ	SC County	ISB Application Team
ISB internal processing errors	Any	Any	ISB Application Team CCTC Team(s)

6.3 Incident Reporting – Exchange Participants

- Incidents are to be reported to the appropriate participant team or support desk.
- It is expected that the organization impacted by and reporting the incident will have first made a best attempt to resolve the issue by contacting their local support desk or application support team.
- Specific incident reporting contacts are as follows:

Table 6. Incident Reporting Contacts - Participants

Report To	Contact Information
CA AOC (ISB)	ISB Application / CA-DRIP Team ???- ???-???, ???@jud.ca.gov
CA DOJ	DOJ Computer Operations 916-227-3000 hdc.computeroperations@doj.ca.gov and hdcsas@doj.ca.gov Specify: "Dispo Processor"
SC County	SCC I.T. Support Desk Support Desk: ???, ???@sccounty.org

6.4 Incident Categorization

Problems/Incidents specific to this Data Exchange are categorized as Priority 1 to 4, defined as follows:

- **Priority 1 (P1) Incident (critical, no workaround)**

Defined as a disruption of service where one or more integration partners no longer has access to the service or as follows:

For 5 business days or more:

- A critical component of an application or the entire application has stopped or is so severely impacted that the application or component cannot reasonably continue to operate and there is no workaround available;
- or
- A critical business process has stopped or is so severely impacted that the business process cannot reasonably continue to occur and there is no workaround;
- or
- Data is corrupted or data integrity issues related to security/confidentiality pose a risk to the data protection, confidentiality, accuracy, or completeness (no minimum quantity of days);
- or

Data cannot be delivered within the legally required time frame due to the issue, regardless of how many hours or days the issue has existed.

- **Priority 2 (P2) Incident (critical, workaround)**

Defined as a critical issue that does have a workaround that can be utilized, per the following:

For 5 business days or more:

- A critical component of the application is unavailable or will not work or the entire application has stopped or is so severely impacted that the application or component cannot reasonably continue to operate, but a workaround is available;
 - A critical business process is unavailable or is so severely impacted that the business process cannot reasonably continue to occur, but a workaround is available;
 - A non-critical component of the application is unavailable, will not work or is not operating as expected, and there is no workaround available; or,
 - A non-critical business process is unavailable or is not occurring as expected and there is no workaround available.
- **Priority 3 (P3) Incident** is defined as follows:
 - For a period of less than 5 business days a critical component of the application is unavailable or will not work or the entire application has stopped or is so severely impacted that the application or component cannot reasonably continue to operate
 - A non-critical component of the application is unavailable, will not work, or is not operating as expected and there is a workaround available; or,
 - A non-critical business process is unavailable or is not occurring as expected and a workaround is available.
 - **Priority 4 (P4) Incident** is defined as follows:
 - An incident does not qualify as a Priority Level 1, Priority Level 2, or Priority Level 3 Incident.

6.5 Incident Resolution

If a reported problem is not responded to and/or is not resolved within the time limits for P1 and P2 Priority Incidents, or otherwise resolved within a reasonable period of time, the partner or exchange provider working to resolve the issue shall escalate the incident appropriately and provide the escalation status to the reporting partner/provider.

Table 7. Incident Resolution Parameters

Priority Level	Logged and Acknowledged	Time To Resolve
1	2 hours	24 hours
2	4 hours	72 hours
3	4 hours	5 business days
4	4 hours	Per mutual agreement

6.6 Incident Escalation

If a reported problem is not responded to and/or is not resolved within the time limits for P1 and P2 Priority Incidents, or otherwise acknowledged (notification of incident ID and initial status) within a reasonable period of time, the partner or exchange provider working to resolve the issue shall escalate the incident appropriately and provide the escalation status to the reporting partner/provider.

Additionally, the reporting organization may request an escalation of the incident resolution time and/or priority, due to a change in criticality, exceeding of the time to resolve, or other significant impacting activity.

7.0 Data Quality

7.1 Data Accuracy, Standards, and Issues

- Each exchange partner will make a best effort to submit accurate disposition or error reports.
- Each partner will adhere to standards pertaining to data types and the provision of required data.
- Each partner will make a best effort to expeditiously complete corrective action to the respective service and exchange components to resolve identified data quality issues and to improve future accurate and efficient data provision through resolution of data related issues.

DRAFT

8.0 Authentication and Renewals

This section describes the policies for authentication component expiration and renewals.

8.1 Authentication Renewal Policies

- General Policies
 - Password or certificate overlapping is at the discretion of the exchange participants. Note: Overlapping is where a new password or certificate can be established and effective prior to the expiration of the previously existing password or certificate.
- Renewal Period Policies Per Partner
 - CA AOC:
 - Passwords for data exchanges must be changed every 12 months.
 - Certificates for data exchanges must be replaced every 12 months.
 - CA DOJ:
 - Passwords for data exchanges are not changed.
 - Certificates for data exchanges must be replaced every 3 years.
 - SC County:
 - Passwords for data exchanges must be changed every ?? months.
 - Certificates for data exchanges must be replaced every ?? months.

8.2 Authentication Renewal Notification

- Credentials, Certificates Notification
 - Notification of upcoming renewals for passwords, certificates, or other security related items shall be provided to the other affected participants at least 4??? weeks prior to expiration.
 - Notification of upcoming renewals for passwords shall include written instructions for implementation of the changes.
 - Notification of upcoming expiration of certificates will contain instructions for the procedure to obtain the new certificates.

Table 8. Notification Contacts – Credentials and Certificates

Organization	Type	Expiration	Notification To
AOC (ISB)	Certificate	Yearly	DOJ: When ISB certificate is renewed, the DOJ CA-DRIP application will automatically accept the updated certificate. SCC: ???
	Password	- same as above -	DOJ: hdcsas.doj.ca.gov
DOJ	Certificate	Not applicable. Clients automatically receive the updated certificate when they connect	Not applicable.
	Password	Does not expire	Not applicable
SC County	Certificate	???	???
	Password	- same as above -	- same as above -

APPENDIX B

STEERING COMMITTEE APPROVALS



CA-DRIP Ph 2 Proj
Completn Aprvls.pdf

**CA-DRIP Phase 2 Project - Project Completion Approvals
Steering Committee Members**

Request

From: Payne, Neil [<mailto:Neil.Payne@jud.ca.gov>]

Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 10:04 AM

To: Oyung, Robert; 'Lyn Thiessen (Madelyn.Thiessen@isd.sccgov.org)'; Uecker, Chelle; Amber Dow

Subject: RE: CA-DRIP Final Report Draft - review request - deliverables signoff
Steering Committee Members,

Per my note below, the NCSC agreement with the AOC requires we have an approval from each of you regarding the project's deliverables. Unless you are aware of a reason to not do so, please send me an e-mail this week generally approving the project completion and indicating the charter deliverables as completed, so I can close this item out with NCSC.

Thanks for your help,

~ Neil

R. Neil Payne

Amber Dow

From: Amber Dow [Amber.Dow@doj.ca.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 10:33 AM

To: Payne, Neil

Cc: Mary Lenigar; Joe Dominic

Subject: FW: CA-DRIP Final Report Draft - review request - deliverables signoff


Neil,

DOJ approves the project completion. Thank you.

Chelle Uecker

POST-PROJECT REPORT

APPROVALS

Name	Title	Signature/Link to Electronic Approval	Date
Amber Dow (DOJ)			
Chelle Uecker (AOC)	IT Manager		7-17-2014
Madelyn Thiessen (SCC)			
Robert Oyung (SCSC)			

*W/Chelle
Final
Approval*

Madelyn Thiessen

From: Thiessen, Madelyn [Madelyn.Thiessen@isd.sccgov.org]

Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 3:22 PM

To: Payne, Neil; Oyung, Robert; Uecker, Chelle; Amber Dow (Amber.Dow@doj.ca.gov)

Subject: RE: CA-DRIP Final Report Draft - review request - deliverables signoff

Hi Neil:

Sorry I have not had a time to review the final report, I've glanced through it and it looks very good. I approve the project completion and agree that the deliverables have been completed.

Please let me know if you need anything else.

Thank you, and happy July 4th.

L.

*Madelyn (Lyn) Thiessen
Application Services Division Manager
SCC Information Services Department
Phone: 408-918-7125*

Robert Oyung

From: Robert Oyung [ROyung@scscourt.org]

Sent: Monday, July 07, 2014 11:25 PM

To: Thiessen, Madelyn

Cc: Payne, Neil; Uecker, Chelle; Amber Dow (Amber.Dow@doj.ca.gov)

Subject: Re: CA-DRIP Final Report Draft - review request - deliverables signoff

Neil,

Sorry for the delayed response. I wanted to make sure other people at Santa Clara had a chance to comment.

We support the findings of the report and thank you for the thorough project summary.

-rob