Project Closure Report

Project Name: Modify the e-Warrants System (NCSC Grant)
Project Manager: Tony Salerno
Project Sponsor (s): Dustin Rhoads (JNET), Ralph Hunsicker (AOPC), Mike Shevlin (PSP)
Prepared by: Tony Salerno
Date: January 16, 2014

Reason for closing the Project *(Check one or all that apply)*

_X__ Project objectives achieved
_X__ Project deliverables completed and approved
___ Project cancelled

Review of objectives, deliverables and schedule as outlined in the grant agreement:

	Met	Missed	Partially Met	Excluded or Removed	Comments
Purposes:					
(1) Migrate the data manipulation functionality of the Commonwealth of Pa.'s automated warrants data transfer system (e-Warrants) from the Pa. State Police (PSP) system components to the Pa. Justice Network (JNET) system components.			X		Some significant data scrubbing functionality was transferred to JNET. For policy reasons, the data mapping and data conversion functionality remained at PSP.
(2) Improve the success rates of the system's initial warrant entry and warrant cancellations and improve the ability to report warrant record rejections by ORI.	X				Primarily because of the improved data scrubbing functionality implemented at JNET, the success rates of initial warrant entries improved from 67% to 74%. Success rates of warrant cancellations improved from 38% to 43%. New reports have been developed that allow warrant/wanted person record rejections (and rejection reasons) by ORI. *Samples will accompany this Report.*

	Met	Missed	Partially Met	Excluded or Removed	Comments
(3) Enable warrant modifications and transmission of an NCIC File Number (NIC) to the Administrative Office of Pa. Courts (AOPC) when a servicing ORI manually enters a warrant record in the PSP System.	X				A new JNET application was implemented that enables much easier correction of warrant data errors and resubmission to PSP and NCIC. System modifications were made to ensure that AOPC receives NICs for successful manually-entered warrants.
(4) Share technical artifacts and "lessons-learned" with the Warrant and Disposition Management (WDM) project team for dissemination to the justice community.	X				System requirements specs, architectural and detailed design specs were previously submitted. Additional deliverables as defined n the grant agreement will be shared along with this Report.
Deliverables:					
Functional and Technical Requirements Specification	X				Delivered on 11/20/2012; update delivered on 9/18/2013
System Architectural Design	X				Delivered on 11/20/2012
System Performance Metrics	X				Delivered on 6/5/2012
Detailed System Design Specs	X				Delivered on 9/18/2013
Screenshots of new JNET Warrant Error Correction Application	X				Delivered on 9/18/2013
ORI-Level Reports Samples	X				Delivered on 1/16/2014
Test Cases Documentation	X				Delivered on 1/16/2014
End-User Release Documentation	X				Delivered on 1/16/2014
Post-Implementation "Success" rates	X				Delivered on 1/16/2014
Project Closure Report, including "Lessons-Learned"	X				Delivered on 1/16/2014
Schedule Schedule amended by agreement during the project called for *Phase 1* to be completed on *11/10/2012, Phase 2* on *9/30/2013* and *Phase 3* by *12/31/2013*			X		Phases One and Two completed on schedule. Phase Three completion was late by two weeks.

Lessons Learned

1. *Secure Universal Buy-In Prior to Start of Project*: It became clear in the early stages of this project that we did not have universal buy-in from all the key stakeholders. There were stakeholders within the State Police, in particular, who were not involved in planning meetings and discussions, and hence were surprised to learn of the project and their required participation.
2. *Identify all Customers or Stakeholders who Must Participate in Requirements Gathering:* We mistakenly depended on one specific, small group within PSP to provide us with functional requirements, only to learn throughout much of the project that a broader group needed to be involved. This led to delays in completing the requirements spec for handoff to the Architect and Developers, as well as numerous changes to the Spec after it had been handed off.
3. *Improve Means of Sharing Key Project Information:* Because the project included individuals from three separate organizations, there was too much dependence on email and collective and individual participant recollections of discussions. Consequently, much information was easily forgotten. A good online project collaboration site would have been a boon to project communications.
4. *Adopt a Deliverables-Based Model:* The project benefitted greatly from the change made to the Grant Agreement, approximately a third of the way through the project, from a time-based to a deliverables-based model. The former was difficult to manage during the first third of the project because of lack of real control over the time that both the Courts Staff and State Police Staffs could devote to the project.
5. *Ensure that All Participants Agree to a Schedule to Perform and Complete Joint Undertakings:* When it was imperative that individuals from all three organizations participate in a joint project activity such as end-to-end testing, it is a good idea to have a detailed schedule that is agreed upon by all participants prior to the start of the activity. Our end-to-end testing consumed a lot more time than expected, not because of unanticipated technical issues, but because all participants were not working from the same schedule.
6. *A High Level of Tolerance and Flexibility are Essential:* The Project Manager or Project Leadership Group must be able to “roll with the punches,” because there will be many of them in a project that requires commitment and cooperation from three disparate organizations with view the process of integrating warrant information with law enforcement very differently. Project scope and requirements changes are inevitable; it is best that they not be resisted; focus instead on effectively mitigating the impact on the project schedule and cost.
7. *Include the Warrants Data Error Correction Functionality in the Law Enforcement System:* One of the major outcomes or products of this project is a Warrant Error Correction Application that was developed by JNET staff and made available to JNET system users. This was done at JNET simply because the State Police did not at this time have the funds or times to develop this functionality in their law enforcement system that contains up-to-date wanted persons records. Ideally, however, the functionality belongs in the latter system (In Pa., the system is called *Portal XL*). Although the new JNET Warrant Error Correction Application is proving to be very popular, users complain of having to jump from back and forth from the JNET App to the wanted persons processing screens in *Portal XL*.