

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 1 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 5 |
| 1.1 Justice On-Line | 7 |
| 1.2 Audit Objectives and Scope | 8 |
| 1.3 Audit Approach and Methodology | 8 |
| 2. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—GOVERNANCE RISK..... | 11 |
| 2.1 Management Control Framework | 11 |
| 2.2 Scope Management | 15 |
| 2.3 Investment Management | 17 |
| 3. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—PROJECT RISK..... | 19 |
| 3.1 Organization and Staffing | 19 |
| 3.2 Control Process | 22 |
| 3.3 Development Process | 24 |
| 4. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—BUSINESS RISK | 27 |
| 4.1 Requirements Management..... | 27 |
| 4.2 Solution Design | 30 |
| 4.3 Management of Change | 32 |
| 5. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—TECHNOLOGY RISK..... | 34 |
| 5.1 Informatics Readiness | 34 |
| 5.2 Infrastructure Readiness..... | 36 |
| 6. RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSE..... | 39 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the Department of Justice the Justice On-Line (JOL) project was created to deliver electronic solutions in response to the Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) requirements for the Government On-Line (GOL) initiative. The project is very important to the Department of Justice and could have a major impact on the organization, its clients, and other stakeholders. JOL could be a multi-year project with a significant scope in a new, complex, and quickly evolving field—on-line government programs and services.

A strong, clearly identified governance structure is a critical success factor for project scope management, keeping the project in sync with the strategic directions of the organization and ensuring participation and support by all stakeholders over the full duration of the project. A management framework for JOL has been put in place. Although the governance structure has been identified, it was evident that there were various interpretations concerning the accountabilities, roles, and responsibilities of the various elements.

The audit team used a risk assessment approach, determining governance, project, business, and technology risks that may prevent the Department from delivering JOL solutions on time, within budget, and according to user requirements. With respect to the Department's implementation of the JOL initiative, the audit team identified several areas of concern that need to be addressed.

- Roles and responsibilities need to be clarified and communicated to the entire organization.
- The accountability of the JOL Director needs clarification.
- Stronger linkages among the various projects are needed and formal communications and management roles need to be clarified.
- On-going funding has not been resolved.
- There should be partnerships with other agencies. This part of the governance structure is not formally identified, nor is it clear.
- The scope of JOL is not consistently understood.
- There is no clarity of overall objectives and direction—each project is managed independently.

- The JOL Project Management Office's relationship with the various projects is unclear.

The JOL Steering Committee (known as BIT.COM) has not approved the scope of the project and this is a key sign-off. There are inherent risks to a project's scope until it is specifically defined and approved. Explicit scope definition is necessary for user expectations management. At this point in time user expectations are varied and, in many cases, high. There is a possibility that user expectations will exceed what is feasible and this will have a long-term negative impact on users' acceptance of the solutions that are implemented.

Management support and leadership is critical to project success and is difficult to maintain for multi-year projects. At this point in time there is minimal evidence that senior management supports the JOL project or that it considers the project to be a main priority of the Department.

At this time it is not possible to ascertain if the anticipated benefits will be achieved. The broad definition of GOL benefits and objectives makes it difficult to measure whether they are being achieved or are achievable at the Department of Justice. Using such high level descriptions of objectives and benefits makes managing user expectations difficult because they are open to broad interpretation.

The level of TBS funding for GOL is not as high as was expected a year ago. There is a high probability that the Justice Portfolio will receive less funding than anticipated or possibly no funding at all. It is not evident that JOL is a priority of management and, as a result, the support for internal funding is not certain. It is possible that the internal funding required to deliver JOL projects will not be available.

Implementing JOL objectives will mean significant change to the Department's culture, organization, competency, processes, and technology. The project has not addressed management of change, a critical area for project success. Change management is the area most often overlooked during the project life cycle. With several JOL projects underway, it is important that change is coordinated so staff are not overwhelmed by all the changes. Otherwise, they can be unwilling to endorse changes. Implementing JOL programs and services will also drastically change the way the public does business with the government. Such external change requires that there is a common front to change to ensure that the integrity and image of the organization is not negatively impacted.

There have been successes in that the JOL project office has been established, staffed, and various projects have been initiated. However, the roles, responsibilities, and accountability of the JOL Director and the JOL project office are not clearly accepted or understood by those

involved in JOL projects. Long-term project success will only be achieved if accountabilities are understood by all players.

Within all four areas of risk (governance, project, business, technology), the audit team observed that JOL projects are operating independently and with little integration of effort. With each project heading in its own direction there is a possibility of lost opportunities to effect economies, duplication of effort, and solutions not meeting the Department's GOL vision.

As well, JOL's role with other departments is not clear. The TBS expects GOL initiatives to be not only integrated within departments but also across departments. This is clearly not the case at the Department of Justice.

In general, there is a risk that the JOL project will be affected by or will have an impact on a number of internal and external GOL initiatives. While the projects are interrelated with respect to subject matter, resources, clients and timing, there is the risk of duplication of scope/effort, of initiatives heading in opposing directions, or of having an impact on each other's schedules. There should be information sharing and coordination of effort at multiple levels (strategic and project management).

This audit offers several recommendations to address these areas of concern.

The management response to the recommendations contained in Chapter 6 of this report was provided by the Chief Information Officer, Information Management Branch in August 2002 and an updated response was provided by the Senior Director, JOL in January 2003.

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1997, the Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) was designated as the Government of Canada's Management Board. In an effort to improve the quality of life for all Canadians, a blueprint for change was initiated. The report "Results for Canadians: A Management Framework for the Government of Canada" introduced a framework and a guide to implement change in the way that government programs and services are managed and delivered. All departments, agencies, and councils are expected to participate in identified initiatives for change.

As part of this effort, the Services Improvement Initiative requires government organizations to become dynamic, flexible, and forward looking to prepare for the next new economy. Government On-Line (GOL) is another key initiative. The GOL goal is for Canada "to be the most electronically connected government in the world to its citizens. So that Canadians can access all government information and services on-line at the time and place of their choosing."¹ This initiative is one of the Government's core agenda items for management change and improving access to convenient and seamless service. Departments and agencies are to establish projects to:

- improve service to the client, from a client perspective (more convenient or a measurable cost or time savings);
- ensure or enhance the health, security, and economic well-being of Canadians;
- provide additional benefits, such as opportunities for potential integration with other services and partners and for re-use of applied technologies or business practices;
- contribute to more cost effective delivery of information and services.

By achieving these goals, Canadians would be able to skilfully create and use knowledge to improve all aspects of their life and work, eventually making Canada the world's best place to live and work.

¹ Prime Minister Jean Chrétien, *Response to the Speech from the Throne*, October 13, 1999.

GOL will be a major transformation of government and its relationship with citizens and business. It requires rethinking the delivery of services within and across departments and agencies, by approaching service delivery from the client's perspective. Federal departments and agencies, while retaining responsibility for their individual programs and services are to collaborate with each other to provide secure electronic citizen-centric services. GOL is to combine electronic technologies with a citizen-centred delivery model to deliver integrated services, giving clients seamless entry to the full range of government institutions. GOL is expected to ensure various organizations find new working relationships in order to achieve the goal of making Canada the country most connected to its citizens by 2005. Departments and agencies are expected to work together toward the common goal, in an integrated and co-operative manner, as one corporate entity.

GOL is based on a number of guiding principles:

- Client-driven service:
 - information and services will be grouped according to citizen and business needs;
 - information and services will be intuitive, easy-to-use, relevant, current, and reliable.
- Convenient and accessible:
 - information and services will be accessible from home, work, or a public access site, in ways that accommodate the needs of all Canadians in both official languages;
 - access to information and services will be available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, with live support available during designated business hours.
- Consistent:
 - information about programs and services will be consistent for all service delivery channels (i.e. telephone, mail, in-person, and electronic).
- Responsive:
 - services will have predictable turnaround times based on pre-determined and published program service standards.
- Private and secure
 - privacy will be respected and protected;
 - security safeguards will be in place and commensurate with client requirements.

A three tier approach is being taken by the Government of Canada to address GOL requirements. This was endorsed by Treasury Board Secretariat Information Management Sub-Committee (TIMS) and seen as a means for each tier to build toward full and secure electronic service delivery. Tier One, to be accomplished by December 31, 2000, required federal government organizations to establish an on-line presence that meets the basic GOL criteria as laid out by the

TBS (conforming to a common look and feel). Tier Two requires government organizations to deliver end-to-end, secure, interactive electronic delivery of programs and services. Tier Three will extend Tier Two objectives to service delivery arrangements with external partners. All tiers are to be completed by December 31, 2005.

1.1 Justice On-Line

The Justice On-Line (JOL) Project Charter (also known as a business case) reads:

Justice On-Line is the Department of Justice's response to the nation-wide GOL initiative. It will coordinate efforts toward rendering [the] Department a recognized world leader in the provision of direct access to justice system information and services, made possible through integration and collaboration among resources across the Department and the Justice Portfolio, and through partnerships with other members of the Canadian justice community.

As stated here, JOL is meant to be a collaborative approach to the GOL initiative by organizations that fall under the Justice Portfolio,² other jurisdictions (provincial/ municipal), and federal departments, especially the RCMP, Solicitor General Canada, National Parole Board, and Correctional Service Canada.

Justice On-Line comprises 17 projects including three TBS-funded projects: Justice and the Law Cluster, Legislation Information Management System (LIMS), and Digital Court. The Justice On-Line Project Management Office (hereafter referred to as the JOL Office) was established in 2001 and is a contact point for the TBS in terms of funding and reporting on TBS-funded projects. The Digital Court project is considered an "external" project as it is managed outside of the Department, but received its funding through the JOL Office. The other JOL "internal" projects are being funded by the Department and although these projects fit within the JOL concept, they are not coordinated by the JOL Office.

² The Justice Portfolio includes the Supreme Court of Canada, the Federal Court of Canada, the Tax Court of Canada, the Canadian Human Rights Commission, the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal, the Law Commission of Canada, the Office of the Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs, the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioners of Canada, and the Department of Justice.

1.2 Audit Objectives and Scope

The objectives of this audit were to review and assess:

- the state of readiness of the Department of Justice with respect to this initiative, including plans, activities and projects underway;
- the state of readiness in terms of workforce capacity to implement Justice on-line projects, including training and awareness of specialised staff and departmental staff at large;
- the appropriateness of leadership, coordination, and consultation provided to departmental sectors and regional offices with respect to this initiative;
- the appropriateness of communications with partners and stakeholders;
- the adequacy of resources assigned to this project; and,
- the sustainability of resources to operate the Justice and the Law Cluster and projects once launched.

The scope included the operations and activities of the Department's Information Management Branch (IMB) and Communications Branch, which have responsibility for implementing GOL. The scope also included electronic service delivery initiatives and efforts underway in other departmental sectors and regional offices. The audit team focused on the three TBS-funded projects and conducted a limited review of other JOL projects.

The review of GOL at the Department of Justice took place from October 18, 2001 to January 14, 2002.

1.3 Audit Approach and Methodology

Information was collected by reviewing and assessing project documentation such as the JOL project charter, business requirements, minutes of meetings, records of decisions, training material, and problem reports. Interviews were conducted with project team members, management, and users of the JOL systems.

For this assignment the audit team used a risk-based methodology based on a number of Canadian and international sources, including:

- the TBS guidelines as expressed in the Internal Audit Handbook and Policies,
- the Institute of Internal Auditors Systems Auditability and Control Guide for procedures and practices of systems under development,

- the Control Objectives published by the Information Systems Audit and Control Association,
- the Computer Audit Guidelines from the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants,
- other more specific risk assessment guides such as the Systems Engineering Institute Taxonomy Based Risk Identification guide.

The assessment methodology considered the risk posed by factors that could have an impact on the success of the project. Four categories of risk were identified: governance risk, project risk, business risk, and technology risk. Information collected during the audit is focussed on the elements of risk and analysed within these categories. Each category has its own framework of sub-categories or elements. For example, under governance risk, the Department's management control framework, scope management, and investment management are all assessed.

The results of the risk assessment are presented in the format of risk matrixes. The matrix identifies factors that could affect the Department's successful delivery of GOL on time, within budget, and having met user requirements. These factors comprise the baseline against which risk is assessed. Each category of risk has an introductory section, followed by a risk matrix, which is organized into three columns describing observations of the related project activity, the auditor's conclusions and assessment of risk, and recommendations for those areas where improvement would reduce the risk to an acceptable level.

The risk assessment describes the nature of the threat, the likelihood of it occurring, and the consequences of that threat. A statistically derived assessment methodology was not used due to the varying, unique factors of JOL, which include:

- different projects being fostered by unique business problems for which solutions are being sought,
- different business and project organizational approaches,
- personal project management styles,
- different project control and system development methodologies.

These factors all work against the applicability of a statistically derived assessment methodology. In this review, the following describes the types of risk referred to in this audit:

Low Risk Inherent risk is present, but adequate precautions to manage the risk are also present. No unusual environmental influences are present.

Medium Risk Inherent risk is present but can be mitigated either through a combination of significant project management measures or environmental influences. For example, marking project areas as being in the medium risk range means that the identified risks can be reduced through the combined application of a recognized methodology, a quality assurance regime, and an experienced team familiar with the business and technology areas at risk.

High Risk Inherent risk is compounded by either the absence of adequate precautions or the presence of unusual environmental influences. For example, business risk would be high due to the absence of a documented comprehensive control framework, such as a mission critical financial system. Technical risk would be assessed as high if an organization was attempting to use an unfamiliar technology, or depending on unreleased versions of vendor software for a promised infrastructure.

Within each risk category and sub-category there are numerous individual measures that are recorded in the risk matrixes. As some measures are not unique to an individual category, some apparent duplication is intentionally included for readability.

The audit team has relied on lessons learned literature and other audits/reviews that have consistently reported that structured project management practices and techniques are a key elements of successful projects. Best practices indicate that projects that follow rigorous development and accountability processes and that have senior management support are more likely to be successful.

2. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—GOVERNANCE RISK

The audit team assessed governance risk through the examination of:

- Management control framework—the structure that manages and controls the relationship between GOL activities and the overall departmental strategy, assignment of responsibility, management structure, and communications;
- Scope management—managing to ensure that projects are developed and implemented within the originally identified parameters, but are also able to adapt to changing internal and external conditions;
- Investment management—conducting ongoing cost-benefit analysis by managing and monitoring projects to ensure that the right resources are in place to realize the identified benefits.

2.1 Management Control Framework

The Department of Justice has established a control framework that includes a multi-level structure of management groups involved in the JOL initiative. These management groups are BIT.COM, BYTE.COM, the project sponsor (Assistant Deputy Minister, Business and Regulatory Law Sector), the JOL Project Management Office, and various individual GOL projects related to the Department.

BIT.COM

Within the Department, BIT.COM is the senior management level that acts as the JOL Steering Committee. The committee's membership is representative of all areas of the Department. Two assistant deputy ministers chair the committee and other committee members include director generals and directors. BIT.COM is responsible for ensuring all cross-organizational issues are resolved. The committee meets once a month and minutes are produced.

BYTE.COM

At the time of this audit, BYTE.COM was a relatively new committee, having only been in place for a few months. The committee is co-chaired by directors from business/program areas of the Department and is made up of members at the director level.

The committee's mandate is to provide strategic advice and to support and advise BIT.COM on the use of technology. As well, the committee has a mandated challenge function for all departmental IT projects/proposals and provides advice and leadership to ensure communication, consistency, sound decision making, and efficiency.

BYTE.COM has five sub-committees: connectivity, litigation support, information knowledge management, better use of technology (training), and JOL. The audit team was told that committee meeting minutes would be made available on the departmental Intranet Web site.

Project Sponsor/Champion—ADM, Business and Regulatory Law

The Assistant Deputy Minister (ADM) of the Business and Regulatory Law Sector is the JOL project champion. This ADM and Sector provide strategic leadership, promote and communicate initiatives and objectives, and dedicate the resources needed to meet JOL business and project objectives.

JOL Project Management Office (JOL Office)

The JOL project management team was established in 2001. The team is headed up by a Director who reports to the Department's ADM of Integration. The JOL Director is accountable for establishing and developing e-justice products and services in accordance with Government of Canada GOL objectives and encompassing programs/services delivered by the entire Justice Portfolio. The office acts as a catalyst/facilitator in the integration of business, people, and technology pertaining to the JOL project. (See the section on Project Risk, Organization and Staffing for more information on the JOL Project Management Office.)

Individual GOL Projects

Within the Department of Justice there are numerous ongoing GOL initiatives. Individual GOL projects include those internal to the Department of Justice, those only in external organizations, but which have gone through the JOL Office to secure GOL funding (e.g. Digital Court, Supreme Court), and those that cross federal jurisdictions (e.g. Justice and the Law Cluster). Not all GOL projects are necessarily coordinated through the JOL Office.

2. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—GOVERNANCE RISK

| OBSERVATIONS | CONCLUSION | RISK | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|--|--|-------------------------|--|
| 2.1 Management Control Framework | | | |
| <p>BIT.COM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee members interviewed indicated that the committee mandate is not always respected or clear. • Tactical instead of strategic points are often discussed. <p>BYTE.COM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JOL topics discussed in committee meetings are mostly limited to JOL vision, funding requests. • The audit team found minimal evidence of the committee providing the integration across the Department with respect to JOL. • Committee members had varied interpretations of the committee’s mandate. <p>Project sponsor/champion—ADM, Business and Regulatory Law</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many departmental staff interviewed had different understandings of the project sponsor’s role with respect to JOL. <p>JOL Project Management Office</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The audit team found that there existed different interpretations of the role and accountability of the JOL Office and the director. Some projects see no linkage at all, others see a direct reporting relationship. <p>Individual GOL Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The audit team found varying levels of integration between individual GOL projects and the JOL Office. None of the internal GOL projects have a direct reporting relationship to JOL Office. • Departmental interfaces with other partners in the Justice Portfolio are not clear. • While the TBS expects cooperation and sharing among GOL projects—it is one criteria for TBS funding—the audit team found no evidence of such relationships. • The audit team found no evidence of senior level communication across departments. • The audit team found no departmental strategy for integrating GOL efforts across federal jurisdictions. | <p>At this point in time it is not evident that all senior management supports the project and sees it as one of the priorities of the organization. The audit team is of the opinion that there are several areas of concern that need to be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • senior management support for JOL initiatives is not evident; • roles and responsibilities with respect to JOL need to be clarified and communicated to the entire Department; • the accountability of the JOL Director needs clarification; • there are strong linkages with some projects, but formal communications and management of the projects are not clear; • on-going funding of JOL projects has not been resolved; • the Department should be forming partnerships with other departments/agencies on GOL initiatives. This part of the governance structure is not formally identified, nor is it clear who should be initiating such partnerships. <p>A strong, clearly identified governance structure is a critical success factor for scope management, keeping the project in sync with the strategic directions of the organization and ensuring participation and support by all stakeholders over the full duration of the project. (See the next section for detailed findings on scope management.)</p> | <p align="center">H</p> | <p>1. It is recommended that the ADM Integration ensure that the JOL governance structure be reviewed with the aim of strengthening the management control framework, including review of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • project organization—key roles, responsibilities, resources; • monitoring—change management, scope management (both scope and change management are addressed in greater detail in later sections of this report); • communications—linkages among initiatives. |

2.2 Scope Management

All projects are faced with factors that can affect their ability to deliver on time, within budget, and according to business requirements. Scope management refers to the processes used to ensure any significant changes to these three elements are identified and approved.

JOL is following the Enhanced Management Framework (a TBS requirement for GOL funding) in which project charters are a tool to identify and manage project scope. The JOL Project Charter (or business case), dated February 1, 2001, provides some early description of the JOL project scope and its general objectives. As well, the audit team found that some individual JOL projects have developed their own project charters, which may or may not show a relationship to the JOL Project Charter.

2. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—GOVERNANCE RISK

| OBSERVATIONS | CONCLUSION | RISK | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|--|------------|---|
| <p>2.2 Scope Management</p> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The JOL Project Charter, dated February 1, 2001, does not reflect the project structure in place and has not been approved. The project scope and objectives are very general. • Charters for individual projects vary in content and level of detail, and have not been approved. • Interviewees expressed concern about what exactly is in the project scope. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Some were not sure if projects not funded by the TBS are included in JOL’s scope. – Some were not sure if other GOL projects that are in the Justice Portfolio are managed by other departments or are part of the JOL scope. – Some were not sure if GOL projects with outside partners are part of the JOL scope. – Some were not sure of what the JOL scope is and how it is being managed. – Some were not sure what the scope priorities are and, in some cases, felt JOL was not a departmental priority. • With respect to other key projects/initiatives both internal and external, the audit team observed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – JOL initiatives are at varying stages in their development, – initiatives have not all defined their own scope and management framework, – accountability has been assigned to several individuals in various parts of organization, – various levels of integration with the JOL project are required, – projects could have an impact on each other and the directions being taken. | <p>The management framework is in place to manage project scope, but the scope of JOL was not consistently understood by those who were interviewed.</p> <p>The Steering Committee has not approved the scope of the project and the Project Charter has not been signed off. There is an inherent risk that the project scope will continue to change (grow or shrink) until it is specifically defined and approved.</p> <p>Disciplined scope management ensures that a project has the ability to adapt to internal and external changes that always occur for multi-year projects. The JOL project needs to be more disciplined in its scope management process.</p> | <p>M/H</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. It is recommended that the ADM Integration ensure that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the JOL Project Charter is updated and kept current; • the revised Project Charter is approved by the Steering Committee; • each individual JOL project develop a project charter, keep it current and have it approved. 3. It is recommended that the Project Sponsor ensure that project scope management is in place, and includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • scope definition and approval; • that any significant changes in JOL project functionality, cost, and schedule are approved; • the scope is communicated to all staff. |

2.3 Investment Management

Investment management is a process of resourcing that ensures anticipated benefits are delivered. Benefits and costs are usually defined in a project business case or project charter.

The following JOL objectives/benefits (as per the JOL Project Charter dated Feb. 1, 2001) for each tier of the government-wide GOL initiative provide a high level description of anticipated benefits:

- the objective/benefit of Tier One (by December 31, 2000) was to establish an on-line presence while encouraging a client-centric approach to presenting information;
- the objectives/benefits of Tier Two (by December 31, 2005) are to
 - deliver key federal programs and services securely on-line;
 - encourage end-to-end, electronic service delivery of key federal programs and services;
 - promote client-centric clustering and integration of information and services.
- the objectives/benefits of Tier Three (by December 31, 2005) are to
 - promote inter-jurisdictional electronic service delivery;
 - build on Tier Two objectives and apply the same objectives with the provinces, territories, municipalities, businesses, volunteer organizations, or international partners.

As part of the GOL government-wide initiative the TBS has provided funding for specific projects—LIMS, Digital Court, and Justice and the Law Cluster. Other JOL projects are funded internally.

2. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—GOVERNANCE RISK

| OBSERVATIONS | CONCLUSION | RISK | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|--|------------|--|
| 2.3 Investment Management | | | |
| <p>Objectives and Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each JOL project has its own objectives and benefits. For example, Justice and the Law Cluster sites three main benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Convenience: the cluster complements existing in-person services by offering clients a viable alternative to waiting in line, travelling to government offices, or being placed on hold on the phone; – Autonomy: the cluster fosters a self-service environment, offering clients the opportunity to seek out answers to their questions and needs on-line; – Accessibility: clients can access information and services on-line at the time and place of their choosing. <p>Funding for JOL Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBS funding for fiscal year 2001–2002 must be used by the end of the fiscal year or be refunded to the TBS. • Auditors were told that there is no guarantee of TBS funding for the next fiscal years. • JOL project managers told the auditors that it was not clear if internal funding would be available for the on-going years. • Management priority and support for on-going funding was not evident. | <p>At this time it is not possible to ascertain if the anticipated benefits will be achieved. The broad definitions of GOL benefits and objectives makes it difficult to measure whether they have been achieved or are achievable.</p> <p>In recent months funding allocations in government have been redirected. The level of TBS funding for GOL is not as high as was expected a year ago. There is a high probability that the Justice Portfolio will receive less GOL funding than anticipated, or possibly no funding at all.</p> <p>It is not evident that JOL is a priority of management. As a result, the support for internal funding is not certain. There is the possibility that the funding required to deliver the JOL projects will not be available.</p> | <p>M/H</p> | <p>4. It is recommended that the ADM Integration ensure that when the JOL Project Charter is updated (see Recommendation 2), its objectives and benefits are achievable and realistic based on the level of funding.</p> |

3. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—PROJECT RISK

The audit team examined project risk through the examination of:

- Organization and staffing—the adequacy of roles, responsibilities, and resourcing attributed to the effort.
- Control process—evidence that planning and scheduling methodology was used for addressing critical path management, risk mitigation, and critical issues identification and resolution.
- Development process—the existence of a formal definition process, and the degree to which that process is being followed by all participants on GOL related activities.

3.1 Organization and Staffing

The JOL Office was established in 2001 and is headed by a Director and supported by one project administrator, one communications advisor, one business analyst and one assistant. The Director reports to the ADM, Integration and the JOL Office is delegated accountability, responsibilities, and roles through a job description for services related to the development and management of GOL at the Department of Justice.

The key activities of the JOL Office include:

- leading the Department in establishing and developing innovative e-justice products and services in accordance with GOL objectives and plans;
- acting as a catalyst and a facilitator in supporting the integration of business, people, and technology concerns and activities—JOL encompasses programs and services delivered by the entire Justice Portfolio;
- supporting senior management in defining a GOL vision and direction for the Department;
- working with business lines to define and develop on-line information sources and services;
- developing a strategic plan that encompasses business processes, people and technology working to meet GOL targets;

- developing annual action plans, communications plans, and reporting to management on progress.

Each JOL project has implemented its own project structure. The following are examples of the organization and staffing of three TBS-funded projects followed by one other JOL project.

Justice and the Law Cluster

This project has a project manager (external contractor), who works with and reports to the JOL Director, and is supported by a dedicated team of five. The project's development team is at Government Telecommunications and Informatics Services (GTIS), Public Works and Government Services Canada and includes two developers and one system architect.

LIMS

A project manager (external contractor) has been appointed and until recently the project did not recognize any linkage to the JOL Office other than as a mechanism for funding. Approximately 15 people are currently working on the project, the majority of whom are contractors.

Digital Court Services

The TBS has a Memorandum of Understanding with the Supreme Court of Canada and Department of Justice concerning the Digital Court GOL project. It describes in general terms the role of each party. Funding was provided by the TBS through the Justice Portfolio. The project is expected to follow the TBS Enhanced Management Framework guidelines and other GOL requirements. The Supreme Court has its own project team and there is no linkage to the JOL Office other than the recognition of the office as a mechanism for funding.

Family Law Systems

A project manager has been given responsibility for the three key services under this area: Family Orders and Agreements Enforcement Assistance; Central Registry of Divorce Proceedings; and Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Registry Act. The project has its own structure and has no linkage to the JOL Office.

3. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—PROJECT RISK

| OBSERVATIONS | CONCLUSION | RISK | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|--|-------------------------|--|
| 3.1 Organization and Staffing | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are various interpretations about the role and responsibilities of the JOL Director and the project management office. • Each JOL project has implemented its own project structure. • Some of the people interviewed see no role for the JOL Office. • Others view the JOL Director as the focal point in the Department and accountable for all JOL activities. • Projects are concerned about their ability to find qualified resources and to maintain them, especially since future project funding is not guaranteed. | <p>There has been success in that the JOL Office has been established, staffed, and various projects have been initiated.</p> <p>The roles, responsibilities, and accountability of the JOL Director and the JOL Office are not clearly accepted and understood by the organization. The role of the JOL Office with other departments is also not clearly understood. The TBS has expectations that GOL initiatives are not only integrated across departments but also within departments. This is clearly not the case at the Department of Justice. Projects that exhibit cooperation and sharing are more likely to receive TBS funding.</p> <p>With each project heading in its own direction there is a possibility of lost opportunities to effect economies, duplication of effort, and solutions not meeting the Department’s GOL vision.</p> <p>Because of the lack of clarity and obvious differences in interpretation in the accountability framework, it is not currently possible for the JOL Director to fulfil key activities such as the development of a strategic plan that encompasses business processes, people, and technology in order to meet GOL requirements and targets. There is no means to measure if JOL will meet GOL requirements and targeted goals.</p> <p>The audit team is of the opinion that long-term project success will only be achieved if accountabilities are understood by all players. An appropriate accountability framework that outlines the key players in the JOL initiative could work toward resolving concerns around integration, sharing, and linkages among JOL projects.</p> | <p align="center">H</p> | <p>5. It is recommended that the Project Sponsor ensure that a comprehensive accountability framework for JOL is developed, approved by senior management, implemented and clearly understood by all JOL projects.</p> |

3.2 Control Process

The TBS guidelines (Enhanced Management Framework) recommend that projects have a structured framework for project control. This is based on lessons learned in systems development in both the public and private sector. Formal project control processes include, for example, planning, budgeting, configuration management, risk management, project management tools and techniques, and problem management.

3. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—PROJECT RISK

| OBSERVATIONS | CONCLUSION | RISK | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|--|------------|---|
| 3.2 Control Process | | | |
| <p>JOL projects lack generally accepted control processes in following areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – there is no strategic plan for JOL. Such a plan would show the interface of projects; – the yearly deliverables are unclear; – it is unclear how/if the project will achieve the GOL requirements by the 2005 TBS deadline; – there was no integrated detailed plan for the fiscal year 2001–2002; – internal and external participation in the development process is unclear; – critical path management techniques are not being used, therefore the impact of delays or non-delivery cannot be measured; – JOL priorities are unclear and there appear to be shifting priorities. JOL is not seen as a departmental priority. • Project charter (business case format): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – there is no up-to-date JOL project charter, – not all individual projects have project charters. • Risk management—identification and monitoring of risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – JOL lacks generally accepted control processes in this area. • Quality assurance process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – JOL lacks generally accepted control processes in this area. • Sign-off requirements and processes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – JOL lacks generally accepted control processes in this area. • Budget: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – limits were set for the fiscal year 2001–2002; – three projects have TBS funding, – others projects are funded from existing operational budgets, – the level of funding has changed in recent months. | <p>Basic project control processes are weak, especially in the planning. When these processes are weak projects have a higher probability of failure. This is especially true for multi-year, multi-disciplined initiatives with many areas of the organization having roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>Since it is unclear what deliverables will be achieved and how the JOL project objectives fit with GOL requirements, it is unclear if JOL will meet the GOL requirements. It is not clear if JOL will meet the expectations of internal and external staff. This could have an impact on the credibility and image of the Department of Justice.</p> | <p>M/H</p> | <p>6. It is recommended that the Director of the JOL Project Management Office ensure a JOL strategy is developed and that an integrated plan for each fiscal year is also developed.</p> <p>7. It is recommended that the Director of the JOL Project Office ensure more formal project control processes are implemented.</p> |

3.3 Development Process

The TBS guidelines (Enhanced Management Framework) recommend that projects have a structured development process. Although the TBS provides general guidelines, a clear methodology is needed to take projects through each step of development. A sound methodology is an essential element that ensures key steps are taken and processes are not missed that might jeopardize the achievement of a project's objectives.

3. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—PROJECT RISK

| OBSERVATIONS | CONCLUSION | RISK | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|---|------|---|
| 3.3 Development Process | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At present, the JOL approach to the development process is informal. An overall development methodology is not documented or understood by all participants. The audit team found that there was a significant difference of opinion as to the efficiency and effectiveness of the development processes that are being used. The level of understanding of the effort and work involved in developing e-solutions is varied. | <p>There is a lack of understanding about all the steps and activities that are necessary to complete a project. In addition, the level of effort required is not understood. There is an overall simplistic view of the complexity of the process, the potential impacts and resources required.</p> <p>Projects have a higher probability of success if they use a structured development methodology. It is very difficult to manage a multi-year project with sub-projects and to maintain consistent quality without using a structured development process that is understood and followed by all participants.</p> | M/H | <p>8. It is recommended that the GOL Project Sponsor ensure an overall development methodology is documented, approved and applied by all project participants.</p> |

4. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—BUSINESS RISK

The audit team assessed business risk through the examination of:

- Business requirements management—the specification and management of business requirements related to GOL processes under consideration.
- Solution design—the process of translating the business requirements into service delivery solutions.
- Management of change—the impact of the GOL activities on major business processes, and the organization’s ability to deal with change.

4.1 Requirements Management

Both the Canadian public and government staff will be users of JOL programs and services. Determining users’ needs is an important preliminary step in the design and development of JOL systems. As the Department of Justice moves toward delivering on-line access to its programs and services, understanding and managing user requirements is crucial to the success of the eventual systems.

The audit team focused its examination of user requirements on the three TBS-funded projects.

Justice and the Law Cluster

This project used focus groups to define user requirements. The focus groups had good participation from all members and the requirements definition process was completed in November 2001.

- Four to six focus groups were held with members of the public (including Aboriginal representatives) in Montreal, Halifax, Alberta, and north of Ontario.
- One focus group was held with Department of Justice staff.

- A report has been generated from the study of these focus groups (the report has not been approved and signed off).
- Requirements identified in the first round of focus groups will be validated through future focus groups:
 - three or four focus groups will be held with sufficient representation,
 - a system prototype (used to help define user requirements and business processes) will be evaluated during the sessions,
 - an evaluation report of the focus groups' responses to the prototype will be produced,
 - the prototype will be modified according to the findings of the report.

LIMS

This project has not used a formal requirements definition process. It is not clear what requirements management process will be used.

Digital Court

This project is using a requirements management approach based on a consultation process with a group of agencies, courts, and tribunal representatives. Meetings with portfolio representatives were held in July and August 2001, with the intent of establishing synergy between related groups for information sharing and establishing partnerships for standards development. The meetings provided opportunities for sharing standards or lessons learned on e-filing initiatives.

4. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—BUSINESS RISK

| OBSERVATIONS | CONCLUSION | RISK | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|--|------|--|
| 4.1 Requirements Management | | | |
| <p>Defining User Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no standard business requirements process being used by the various JOL projects. The projects all have their own requirements definition and validation processes. • The audit team noted various interpretations by users/managers as to what the requirements management process involves: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – it is not clear what activities should be included; – there are varied interpretations of when and how different players should participate; – there are varied interpretations of the roles and responsibilities; – it is not clear who should sign off the requirements, nor is sign off understood as a function of user accountability. • The audit team found that two of the TBS-funded projects, the Justice and the Law Cluster and Digital Court, have developed requirements processes that are adequate for their needs. However, the LIMS project had not developed a formal requirements definition process. | <p>Requirements management is a difficult task for any project but it is critical for success. It is essential that knowledgeable users at each appropriate level articulate the requirements. Unless there is a structured and rigorous process that records requirements, it is easy to miss requirements, misinterpret, or oversimplify complex business rules and processes.</p> <p>The JOL project has not yet established a standardized process for requirements management. The possible impact of this gap is that requirements will not be identified and therefore will not be reflected in the business solutions designed for delivering on-line services and programs. There are extenuating factors to complicate the process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • users are both internal and external to the Department of Justice, • partnerships with other organizations are needed to define requirements, • the overall complexity of varied internal users poses a significant challenge. | M/H | <p>9. It is recommended that the JOL Director ensure a formal requirements management process is implemented as part of the development methodology.</p> |

4.2 Solution Design

Solution design is the process of translating all business requirements (user and technical) into a working solution.

Security and privacy requirements are essential when doing business across the Internet and must be taken into account in the development of JOL projects. New privacy legislation has been passed and government organizations are required to do privacy impact assessments. The TBS encourages that risk assessments are done on all GOL projects.

4. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—BUSINESS RISK

| OBSERVATIONS | CONCLUSION | RISK | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|
| 4.2 Solution Design | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each project is responsible for its own solution design. • The complexity of the solutions are not clearly understood by the various JOL projects at this time. • The audit team found few linkages between the different applications. • The audit team found little planning for the integration of different components of projects. • The audit team found that there has been minimal consideration of security and privacy requirements. | <p>With each project using different processes for defining requirements and designing the solution it is not possible at this time to determine if the solutions will meet the requirements.</p> <p>It is possible that the various projects will duplicate effort, design solutions that are not technically compatible, or use different technologies thus increasing the cost of support and maintenance.</p> <p>It is important to address security and privacy requirements early in the development process.</p> | <p align="center">M/H</p> | <p>10. It is recommended that the JOL Director ensure a process is implemented to integrate the various JOL projects.</p> <p>11. It is recommended that the JOL Director ensure privacy and security requirements are addressed for all JOL projects.</p> |

4.3 Management of Change

The GOL solutions will involve change across government and at the Department of Justice. The changes brought on by GOL will affect the Department in the following areas:

- Culture—departmental behaviours, norms and values:
 - the move from paper to electronic business transactions will require staff to use new technologies that are both integrated into internal processes and integrated into dealings with clients.
- Organization—departmental business portfolios, organizational structures, and roles and responsibilities:
 - new activities and redefined roles and responsibilities will evolve that reflect integration with external parties.
- Competency—of staff skills, aptitudes, and knowledge to drive business:
 - the focus will be on managing versus collecting information. There will be an increase in the need for integration skills and managing relationships among partners.
- Processes—staff activities, tasks, workflows, business transactions, and operating and managing processes:
 - knowledge and content management processes will be required to ensure consistency and integrity of data.
- Technology—departmental applications and development of staffs' technical skills:
 - the focus will be on integrating components in both external and internal environments. Staff skills must be developed to maintain all the e-services that are to be delivered.

The management of change refers to the Department's ability to deal with the impact of GOL activities on its major business processes.

Expectations Management

As part of assessing the potential changes that GOL will bring to the Department, other important management areas must not be overlooked. Expectation management refers to managing users' expectations of the solutions' functionalities. The appropriate approach to expectations management involves determining and managing organizational limitations against user delivery expectations. An organization facing change must learn to manage the disconnect between intent/expectations and the reality of resources and capability to deliver results.

4. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—BUSINESS RISK

| OBSERVATIONS | CONCLUSION | RISK | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|--|-------------------------|--|
| <p>4.3 Management of Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area of management of change has not been addressed by the Department. There is no change management plan developed and no identification of the areas where change will occur and how to make it happen. Expectations Management—current expectations are high. The JOL project has not put in place processes to manage the expectations of both internal and external users. | <p>The implementation of JOL objectives will mean significant departmental changes in its culture, organization, competency, processes, and technology. The JOL Office and individual projects have not addressed the management of change, yet it is a critical area for project success. It is the area that is most often overlooked during the project life cycle. Lessons learned and best practices literature indicates that this is one of the weakest areas of project implementation and is one of the most important for overall project success.</p> <p>The impact of weak management of change processes is that users will not be ready for the new processes and will not endorse the new solution. Data integrity issues can result. Additionally, without user buy-in, business processes will not be efficient and effective and will not integrate well with technical solutions.</p> <p>With several JOL projects underway, it is important that change is coordinated so staff are not overwhelmed by all the changes. If such efforts are not undertaken, staff can be unwilling to endorse the changes. Also, JOL will result in changes in how the public does business with the Department. Such changes require coordination to ensure a common front to change is presented. Otherwise, the integrity and image of the organization could be negatively affected.</p> <p>Explicit scope definition is necessary for managing users’ expectation (see the section on Scope Management for detailed discussions). At this point in time user expectations are varied and, in many cases, high. There is a possibility that user expectations will exceed what is feasible and this will have a long-term negative impact on user acceptance of the solutions that are implemented.</p> <p>Managing user expectations is made difficult by applying high level descriptions of objectives and benefits, which are open to broad interpretation (as discussed in the section on Investment Management).</p> <p>Because the JOL project has not put in place processes to manage the expectations of both internal and external users, the impact could be a negative image for the organization and a lack of endorsement of the solutions implemented. Currently, user expectations are high and the feasibility of their implementation is not clear.</p> | <p align="center">H</p> | <p>12. It is recommended that the JOL Director ensure that the management of change becomes a project priority by securing a resource with extensive expertise and experience in this field who will be charged developing a change management strategy and plan.</p> <p>13. It is recommended that the JOL Director ensure each JOL project puts in place processes for managing user expectations.</p> |

5. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—TECHNOLOGY RISK

The audit team assessed technology risk through examination of:

- Informatics readiness—the readiness of the organization to deal with information technology (IT) changes coming about from the implementation of GOL system solutions.
- Infrastructure readiness—the degree of project conformity to the organization’s technical standards/methods and technology environment, and the impact the project will have on this infrastructure.

5.1 Informatics Readiness

Informatics readiness refers to the ability of the Department’s information technology (IT) area to be ready to implement and maintain JOL solutions.

The Department’s Information Management Branch (IMB) has an important role to play in ensuring that the Department is ready to implement and maintain GOL solutions.

5. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—TECHNOLOGY RISK

| OBSERVATIONS | CONCLUSION | RISK | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|
| 5.1 Informatics Readiness | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The audit team found no baseline for IT maintenance and support costs. • The level of user traffic has not yet been estimated and is an unknown factor. • The audit team observed minimal planning for IT readiness. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Some thinking has been done regarding knowledge transfer, but there is no formal plan in place. – Each project is responsible for doing its own planning for IT readiness. • Among departmental users there is a lack of understanding of the need for processes like configuration management and release management. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – IMB is gradually implementing these types of sound IT business processes. – Each JOL project is developing in isolation of each other and in some cases the link to IMB is not clear. • JOL has not yet addressed the need for more complex support of JOL solutions in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – application and technology support, – telecommunications support, – skilled technical resource support for application development, – ongoing maintenance and operations. | <p>Informatics readiness is always an issue as projects move toward implementation.</p> <p>The type and level of IT operations and maintenance activities for JOL need to be considered. IMB should be involved in this planning so necessary activities such as training can be effectively managed. The type of IT skills required to support JOL operations need to be identified. Currently, IT plans do not exist for such areas as implementation, training, and maintenance.</p> <p>Informatics readiness is not just a technical issue. Users must follow processes, such as release management, and understand the impact and costs of operations and maintenance support. Implementing IT business processes reduces risk, but users must endorse and follow the processes. Such acknowledgement means a cultural change for both IT staff and clients.</p> | <p align="center">M/H</p> | <p>14. It is recommended that the JOL Director develop a plan, to be completed in conjunction with IMB, for ongoing IT maintenance and support.</p> |

5.2 Infrastructure Readiness

Technical solutions implemented by JOL will probably require changes to the current technical architecture and management framework. An e-infrastructure diagnostic tool can identify technical, policy, methodology, and procedural gaps. Such diagnostic tools are available in the marketplace and can be used to examine, for example, application architecture, hardware and software, and development and operations architecture.

5. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS—TECHNOLOGY RISK

| OBSERVATIONS | CONCLUSION | RISK | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|---|------|---|
| 5.2 Infrastructure Readiness | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The JOL project has not assessed the potential impact on the Department’s technical architecture. Areas that should be covered include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – application architecture, – hardware and software, – networks, – Web services, – middleware, – information management, – security, – development architecture, – operations architecture. • There have been some discussions between the JOL Office and IMB concerning infrastructure readiness and potential impacts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Adherence to technical standards and methods are not clear. – The LIMS project is being assessed against the infrastructure. – It was not clear to the auditors if other projects are being assessed. | <p>It is important for an organization to develop an excellent working knowledge of electronic infrastructure. Newer and less widely proven platforms have substantially higher risk than mature and widely used platforms. Introducing e-business solutions will introduce new technologies that will need to be supported and maintained and must operate within the common architecture.</p> <p>The various JOL projects could potentially select, for example, different technical solutions, hardware, software, and middleware. The webmasters and developers for each project could also use different tools. The greater the differences in tools, the higher the maintenance costs. In such a scenario, the achievement of economies of scale will be impossible. The result will be negative impacts or lost opportunities.</p> | M | 15. It is recommended that the JOL Director, in conjunction with IMB, ensure that a comprehensive assessment is completed that identifies the potential impacts of the various GOL projects on the Department’s technical architecture. |

6. RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

1. It is recommended that the ADM Integration ensure that the JOL governance structure be reviewed with the aim of strengthening the management control framework, including review of:

- **project organization—key roles, responsibilities, resources;**
- **monitoring—change management, scope management (both scope and change management are addressed in greater detail in later sections of this report);**
- **communications—linkages among initiatives.**

Agree. Since this report was presented, the Justice On-Line office now reports to the ADM, Corporate Services through the Chief Information Officer.

The ADM, Corporate Services will present a Justice On-Line Office Project Charter, covering Roles and Responsibilities as well as Monitoring and Communications activities to the BIT.COM committee for discussion and acceptance in 2003-2004. In addition, the ADM, Corporate Services will ensure that the Justice On-Line Office is represented on all committees and working groups related to Justice On-Line, for example the LIMS Steering committee (done). The Project charter will account for all listed above, that is, Project organization –key roles, responsibilities, resources; monitoring – change management, scope management (both scope and change management are addressed in greater detail in other sections of this report); and communications – linkages among initiatives. Each Justice On-Line initiative is considered to be a separate project, and is also called a Departmental Key Service using the Government On-Line definition of a key service.

2. It is recommended that the ADM Integration ensure that:

- **the JOL Project Charter is updated and kept current;**
- **the revised Project Charter is approved by the Steering Committee;**

- **each individual JOL project develop a project charter, keep it current and have it approved.**

Agree. The Justice On-Line Office will prepare an updated Project Charter for presentation to the BIT.COM committee in 2003-2004. One of the tenets of the Justice On-Line Office Project Charter is expected to be the requirement that each of the Justice On-Line initiative keep current their Project Charters and that the Justice On-Line Office be mandated to request regular updates and project status and to report on the status of these projects to the BIT.COM committee, once per year at a minimum. Each JOL initiative will be managed using a project management methodology based on the Enhanced Management Framework for IM/IT projects.

3. **It is recommended that the Project Sponsor ensure that project scope management is in place, and includes:**

- **scope definition and approval;**
- **that any significant changes in JOL project functionality, cost, and schedule are approved;**
- **the scope is communicated to all staff.**

Agree. The former Project Sponsor was briefed every two weeks on the status of the Justice On-Line initiative and the status of all key services within the scope of Justice On-Line. The value and need of a new sponsor will be assessed in the Spring of 2003-2004.

The Justice On-Line Office will communicate status to all staff using a variety of means, including a JOL Intranet site, the JustInfo news bulletin, articles in the InterPares journal and regular informational notes to all staff.

4. **It is recommended that the ADM Integration ensure that when the JOL Project Charter is updated (see Recommendation 2), its objectives and benefits are achievable and realistic based on the level of funding.**

Agree. The ADM Corporate Services, who is the authority for Justice On-Line will carry out a review of Key Services associated with Justice On-Line. Only Key Services for which a funding source has been identified will be included. This phase will be completed no later than March 31st, 2003.

- 5. It is recommended that the Project Sponsor ensure that a comprehensive accountability framework for JOL is developed, approved by senior management, implemented and clearly understood by all JOL projects.**

Agree. The Project Sponsor, if the position is maintained, will be fully involved in the development of the new Project Charter. In order to promote understanding of the Justice On-Line initiative within the Department of Justice, he will present the Charter and findings to the Executive Council of the Department, once approved by BIT.COM. The charter will include an accountability matrix. If a new project sponsor is not appointed, the Director JOL will assume responsibility for the recommendation.

- 6. It is recommended that the Director of the JOL Project Management Office ensure a JOL strategy is developed and that an integrated plan for each fiscal year is also developed.**

Agree. The Director of the Justice On-Line Office will develop a strategy and plan for each fiscal year once funding levels of all projects related to JOL are known.

- 7. It is recommended that the Director of the JOL Project Office ensure more formal project control processes are implemented.**

Agree. Based on the Project Charter, the Director of the JOL Office will convene all JOL project leaders in order to confirm expectations with respect to departmental reporting, TBS reporting, financial control, liaison with TBS/CIOB office and any other related responsibilities of JOL projects as well as to put in place mechanisms for regular follow-up and control.

- 8. It is recommended that the GOL Project Sponsor ensure an overall development methodology is documented, approved and applied by all project participants.**

Agree. The Director, JOL will formulate, communicate and ensure acceptance of a development methodology. The development methodology will be based on the Enhanced Management Framework and in line with the development methodology developed by the IMB sector of the Department of Justice in order to track JOL projects.

- 9. It is recommended that the JOL Director ensure a formal requirements management process is implemented as part of the development methodology.**

Agree, as above.

- 10. It is recommended that the JOL Director ensure a process is implemented to integrate the various JOL projects.**

Agree. An Integrated JOL Plan for all projects under the Justice On-Line umbrella will be developed as per item (6) above and regular meetings and reporting schedules put in place for the optimal integration of Justice On-Line projects.

- 11. It is recommended that the JOL Director ensure privacy and security requirements are addressed for all JOL projects.**

Agree. The Justice On-Line Director will be mandated through the Charter and accountability matrix to ensure that all relevant Treasury Board policies and guidelines are currently being and will be followed in the development of Key Services as part of the their project plan. This includes Privacy Impact Assessment for those projects that propose to manage personal information and a Threat/Risk Assessment for all new projects. In addition, the Director will verify that policies and guidelines relating to data matching, Common Look and Feel, etc. are adhered to by Justice On-Line projects.

- 12. It is recommended that the JOL Director ensure that the management of change becomes a project priority by securing a resource with extensive expertise and experience in this field who will be charged developing a change management strategy and plan.**

Agree in principle. Resources for Justice On-Line Key Service projects are minimal at this time, however, as projects come on stream, an approach and plan for the management of change within the Department will be drawn up for presentation to the Executive Committee of the Department at an appropriate time.

- 13. It is recommended that the JOL Director ensure each JOL project puts in place processes for managing user expectations.**

Agree in principle. The Director, Justice On-Line will prepare a Communications plan, based on the Integrated JOL Project Plan and schedule in order to communicate the progress

and expected results of Justice On-Line projects within the Department. Timeframes will depend of available resources.

- 14. It is recommended that the JOL Director develop a plan, to be compiled in conjunction with IMB, for ongoing IT maintenance and support.**

Agree. The Director, JOL Office will prepare a plan for on-going IT support and maintenance of the Justice On-Line projects in 2003-2004 and the plan will be presented to BIT.COM for approval.

- 15. It is recommended that the JOL Director, in conjunction with IMB, ensure that a comprehensive assessment is completed that identifies the potential impacts of the various GOL projects on the Department's technical architecture.**

Agree. The Director, JOL Office will prepare a plan for impacts of Justice On-Line project on IMB infrastructure based on the Integrated JOL Project Plan in 2003-2004.