Information Technology Capital Investment Program
Project Close Out Report

To: Information Technology Strategy and Investment Committee
John Vittner, Office of Policy and Management

From: W. Michael Regan, Department of Correction

Email: Michael.Regan@ct.gov

Agency: Department of Correction
Project: Offender Management Information System (OMIS)

Project Start Date: 7/10/2013

Project End Date: 7/3/2019

Project Manager: Tomasz Kazmierczak

Total Funds Requested: $4,375,000

Total Funds Allotted to Agency: $4,375,000

Accumulative Total Capital Fund Expenditures to Date: $1,355,345

Brief Project Description/Summary:
The DOC OMIS project will replace the existing set of complex, fragmented, duplicative and outdated systems with a comprehensive, modern and fully integrated system to support all CTDOC institutions, (Jails and Prisons), Board of Parole and Pardons, and the Division of Community Supervision, and to provide DOC offender data for consumption by other law enforcement entities (municipal, state and federal) and constituents. This project entails the purchase and implementation of a market leading, modified off the shelf (MOTS) system for managing all offender related functions within Department of Correction and the Board of Parole and Pardons. Offender related functions include (but are not limited to) intake, classification, sentence and time calculation, programs and treatment, movement, banking and commissary, parole, community supervision and reporting.

List Project Goals and Deliverables Completed:
(Please provide a brief summary of the goals and deliverables that were implemented. Please reference the IT Capital Investment Brief for the initial goals of the projects.)
The IT Capital OMIS project was not completed.

On April 18, 2019 the Department of Administration (DAS) sent Global Tel Link Corporation (GTL) a letter informing the company that DAS "has determined that it would be in the best interests of the State to terminate the Contract". As such, pursuant to Section 29 of the Contract and the authority granted to the state's Chief Information Officer under the Connecticut General Statutes, the Contract was terminated effective immediately and GTL and DSI-ITI were directed to discontinue all Performance under the Contract.

DAS has been working with the company on the close out of the agreement. This work is currently in process.

The Department of Correction is still in need of replacement functionality for its aging offender management systems. The department is in the preliminary stages of identifying the type of solution it will pursue to replace and/or augment its inefficient and/or limited IT systems/solutions in light of the above.

The agency will shortly be convening a work group to review the status of the agency's needs and to develop system replacement options and recommendations.

The agency has briefed the state's Chief Information Officer, Mark Raymond, on the current situation and plan and he will be participating in the development of the system replacement strategy and plan.

A lot of work was completed under the former framework in terms of understanding our systems needs and business practices/workflows and the procurements made to date will support the replacement solutions we ultimately acquire. With the exception of the project management expenditures and a $50k payment to the software vendor, IT Capital Funds for this project were used for the acquisition of critical IT infrastructure that will support whatever software solution(s) the agency ultimately acquires.

The agency views this current turn of events as a project setback rather than the end of the project. The dissolution of the state's relationship with this vendor does not end the agency's need for a replacement for its aging offender management systems nor does it end the agency's efforts to identify and secure replacement functionality that will assist it in achieving the project's IT Capital goals and objectives. It does however, require that the agency take a step back and evaluate its needs, its remaining project resources and its options going forward. That being said, the current legal process being undertaken by DAS must play out before any final decisions can be made, however DOC has begun this process and will update Mr. Vittner and Mr. Hadfield its progress.

Project Replication Opportunities:
(Are there opportunities to repeat or leverage the project solution by other state agencies? Please provide a brief explanation.)

No

Key Lessons Learned:
(Provide any lessons learned or experienced during this project that may be helpful to other agencies starting a similar project.)

DOC OMIS After Action Report

Evaluation upon termination of contracted software vendor

The OMIS Project Manager and numerous DOC staff involved in the project prepared the following After Action Repo[rt] (AAR) following the termination of the development agreement between the state of Connecticut and the vendor.

This evaluation looked at what happened, why it happened, what worked, what did not work and what could have be[en] improved,

A large number of project BC owners and SMEs engaged in collectively developing and documenting this AAR.

Issues and Recommendations are categorized as follows:

- Scope/Approach
- DOC Project Preparation
- DOC Resources
- Contractor Selection
- Contractor Resources
- Gap Analysis Documentation

After Action Evaluation

Scope/Approach

Issues:

- Extremely large and complicated project with too many moving components
- Level of required customization was too large to fit product to DOC needs

Recommendations:
- See what other States (similar to CT – size + combined Jails & Prisons) have in terms of systems, contractors, approach etc.
- Internal assessment of DOC legacy systems – what functionality and screens to keep as is vs. what to modify or start from scratch
- Internally get buy in on the COTS (Commercial Off the Shelf) concept which will require substantial adjustment [on] part of DOC to accommodate any contractor system
- Prioritize & Focus – take targeted approach
- Consider agile approach – Build and test component by component instead of all at once.
- Start with documenting the most complicated and largest components and data conversion
- For complex/large BCs undertake gap analysis in smaller units within BC for easier understanding by contractor.
- Have greater involvement from BC Directors in the requirements process with early decisions on process chang[es] Administrative Directive modifications etc.

DOC Project Preparation Prior to Gap Analysis

Issues:
- DOC did not have thorough/complete documentation on all current processes, scenarios, legacy data etc.
- DOC legacy data needs fixing and cleaning prior to conversion

Recommendations:
- Consolidate and standardize similar processes/functions across multiple departments and BCs to work in a unifi[ed] consistent manner in the system
- Collect/Create documentation, forms, videos and other materials particularly for complex and unique requirements
- Anticipate what would trip up a contractor/watch outs
- Create definitions of CT DOC terminology to give to contractor
- Keep the current level of detailed granularity of RFP and contract
- Create detailed business and technical scenarios, use cases, requirements to represent, all permutations and combinations of functionality that the new system must handle

DOC Resources

Issues:
- Fit gap documents did not reflect complete and accurate software specifications within BCs and across BCs
- Lack of cross BC integration/specifications
- Churn in DOC resources – Retirements, promotions, transfers, other priorities
- Some DOC departments/units have extremely limited resources and are unable to provide the required numbe[r of] resources to the project

Recommendations:
- DOC to hire full time professional Business Analysts (BA) – impact analysis, system design, technical requiremen[ts] ahead of start of the project
- Provide training to SMEs on System requirements, design, data migration, process etc.
- Have full time staff including BAs and SMEs dedicated to the project
- Have SMEs from across the agency/facilities at gap analysis and specifications workshops
- Look for resources who can stay on the project at least 5 years
- Have one set of DOC team members provide requirements and another set review documents to ensure completeness

- DOC resources have a series of meetings ahead of time and come prepared with scenarios to discuss in fit gap sessions and keep notes for all items shared to ensure everything is included in contractor system specifications
- DOC resources "own/drive" fit gap agenda, order, use cases, to be covered in gap analysis

Contractor Selection

Issues:
- Contractor was not prepared to take on this project
- Contractor dramatically underestimated the project
- Contractor's core product required extreme modifications to meet DOC requirements

Recommendations:
- Institute longer vetting process to ensure contractor is signing the contract "eyes wide open"
- Demonstrate and document select DOC requirements/functionality with contractor prior to contract signing
- Visit other States (contractor's customers) to see contractor's system in production, project approach, timeline, experience etc.
- Ask for critical/foundational components of the contractor product that the contractor is not willing to change- Example navigation, security etc.
- Evaluate historical employee turnover at contractor – ask for project commitment
- Contractors succession planning and knowledge transfer when employees leave

Contractor Resources

Issues:
- Took excessive time
- Delivered sub-par product(s)
- Lacked capability
- Had high turnover causing learning curve and repeated sharing of DOC knowledge
- Limited understanding of DOC understanding – no one person understood the requirements end to end
- Lack of cohesiveness – one hand did not know what the other was doing
- Lack of leadership/project ownership – no one person with authority was overseeing all contractor teams
- Not dealing with decision makers – multiple layers

Recommendations:
- Insist that contractor resources substantially learn current DOC business processes and existing systems before starting Gap Analysis (DOC show and tell)
- Ensure contractor resources have thoroughly reviewed DOC documentation including contract requirements, Administrative Directives etc. prior to beginning Gap Analysis
- Contractor resources should have in depth knowledge of their own system
- Demand contractor librarian to ensure sharing DOC knowledge across all concerned contractor team members (in a hub and spoke model)
- Record Gap Analysis sessions to avoid repeating same information again and again
- Review and approve critical contractor resources assigned to DOC based on background and experience
- Conduct all Gap Analysis sessions face to face locally in CT

Gap Analysis Documentation

Issues:
- Gap Analysis documentation did not show CT specific product but rather general screens. It also did not include phase by phase specifications but rather end state specifications
- Some requirements presented by DOC during Gap Analysis were ignored unless they were directly tied to the BC
- Some requirements were misunderstood by contractor
- There was large time lapse between Gap Analysis sessions and delivery of documents resulting in delayed correction of many errors

Recommendations:
- Undertake documentation in a phased approach
- Demand quicker turn around even with fewer components documented (instead of receiving full BC documentation at once) – quicker back and forth with the contractor
- Insist on exact screens that represent CT 'to be' product
- Clear list of phase deliverables and overall end state deliverables
- Insist on all Gap Analysis topics be included even if contractor believes some topics are not relevant