Change Request for Certification and Release of Funds Form

**PROJECT GOVERNANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PROJECT NAME</strong></th>
<th>Office of the State Engineer (OSE) Litigation &amp; Adjudication Program (LAP) Business Application Modernization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT PHASE</strong></td>
<td>Project completion: final state and roadmap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATE</strong></td>
<td>April 11, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEAD AGENCY</strong></td>
<td>Office of the State Engineer / Interstate Stream Commission (OSE/ISC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER AGENCIES</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXECUTIVE SPONSORS</strong></td>
<td>Greg Ridgley, General Counsel and LAP Program Director; Charles Kinney, CIO and Information Technology Services Bureau (ITSB) Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGENCY HEAD</strong></td>
<td>Tom Blaine, PE, State Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGENCY CIO/IT LEAD</strong></td>
<td>Charles Kinney, MS, MBA, JD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT MANAGER</strong></td>
<td>Charles Kinney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT ABSTRACT**

From original project charter, March 2014:

OSE is responsible for managing the waters of New Mexico. Current applications that support the Litigation and Adjudication Program (LAP) are at the end of their useful life. The Agency seeks to plan to modernize these applications. The plan will be based on an assessment of legacy systems and business processes, articulation of future needs, and evaluation of modernization approaches and platforms.

Key changes from original charter document:

1. **Executive Sponsors:**
   - Greg Ridgley, General Counsel & LAP Director;
   - Charles Kinney, CIO
2. **Schedule:**
   - Consultant start date: Scheduled, April 2014; actual, Feb. 2015
   - Project completion: Scheduled, July 2014; anticipated, June 2016
3. **Cost, current state assessment.** Original est.: $16,400; actual: $24,070 (per Scope of Work)
4. **Governance.** Oversight is now directly by OSE senior management
5. **Project manager:** Charles Kinney, CIO
6. **Assumptions:** Software platform(s) for any modernization projects will be selected based on suitability for purpose and fit with long-term systems integration plans

| **Start Date (Actual):** | Feb. 2015 | **Planned End Date (Current Est.):** | June 2016 |
**JUSTIFICATION FOR CHANGE IN CERTIFICATION**

This change request requests no additional funds.

Changes that motivate this change request fall into several categories: (1) organizational changes; (2) project schedule changes and consultant performance; (3) lessons learned from recently closed BPMS project; (4) new approach to IT planning; (5) business value; (6) better understanding of LAP IT needs; and, (7) more direct contribution to program performance.

1. **Organizational changes.** The LAP Modernization project was conceived in FY13 and initiated in March 2014. Since then, new leadership and staff bring better focus to IT planning to ensure alignment with LAP and agency needs. Changes since March 2014 include the following:
   a. Tom Blaine became State Engineer in December 2014.
   b. Deborah Dixon became ISC Director and Deputy State Engineer in February 2015.
   c. Greg Ridgley became OSE General Counsel and LAP Director in June 2014.
   d. Mr. Ridgley appointed two new deputies, Arianne Singer and Christopher Lindeen. Ms. Singer, in turn, now serves as LAP's liaison with the IT Services Bureau.
   e. Several LAP adjudication bureaus have new bureau chiefs.
   f. John Romero, Water Rights Division Director, and John Longworth, Technical Services director, became joint heads of the Water Rights Allocation Program (WRAP) upon the retirement of the former WRAP director in May 2015.
   g. Charles Kinney became permanent CIO and IT Services Bureau chief in August 2015. Former CIO and Executive Sponsor Renee Martinez, left OSE in September 2014.
   h. Charles Kinney became project manager in June 2015 upon retirement of former project manager and applications software manager Mercedes Ortega.
   i. The ITSB business analyst assigned to the project left OSE in June 2015.
   j. ITSB has reorganized since August 2015. ITSB has a new business analyst, a new IT architect position, and expanded its GIS team from 2 to 4. ITSB now directly supports LAP’s key software application, WRATS; previously WRATS was supported by a LAP staff member and ITSB had little role in its design, development, or operational support.

2. **Project schedule changes and consultant performance.**
   a. Because of the above leadership changes, the Info-Tech consulting team, originally scheduled to begin work in April 2104, did not begin work until February 2015.
   b. Info-Tech’s “current state assessment” report was initially rejected and subsequently accepted only after substantial input from OSE staff and major re-work by Info-Tech.
   c. OSE exercised its contractual option to terminate the Info-Tech contract in May 2015 due to poor contractor performance during on-site “final state” definition work.
3. Lessons learned from recently closed BPMS project
The changes proposed here are informed directly by lessons learned from the OSE/ISC Water Rights Business Process Management System (BPMS) project, which was closed out on November 6, 2015. Lessons include the following:

a. **Senior leadership and governance.** Communication between ITSB and LAP program management will be more frequent and at a higher level compared to the BPMS project. LAP modernization will be based on on-going consultation between agency, LAP, and IT leadership: (i) the CIO is now part of the agency senior leadership team; (ii) LAP’s Deputy General Counsel serves as liaison to ITSB; (iii) the CIO now attends LAP managers’ meetings.

b. **Project scope and methodology.** This project was conceived of as a “big bang” project (as was the recently closed BPMS project) to replace a legacy system: consultants would assess requirements, define future state, and implement via classic waterfall methodology. Such an approach carries high risk of failure. The changes proposed here represent, instead, an incremental approach to planning and execution that is more likely to accurately assess, design for, and meet LAP business requirements.

c. **Schedule and technology.** The project schedule includes use of modern but proven web-based technology that reduces project risk by reducing complexity, dependencies, and uncertainty. Deployment of communication, collaboration, and information sharing tools will enable the agency to craft modernization plans that meet LAP needs timely and successfully.

d. **Organizational change and change management.** The BPMS project attempted too much change, too quickly: to document, assess, change, and automate business processes as a single project with tight deadlines, executed by consultants unfamiliar with agency subject matter and processes. The LAP Modernization project was to have been carried out in similar fashion and thus faced similar risks.

The changes proposed here take a different approach. They address modernization as a long-term effort that will last beyond the completion of this project, and that will be executed by agency staff with existing resources. These changes will result in a system modernization plan that will be realized as a series of methodical, incremental, but continuous improvements.

(This is the approach that the IT Services Bureau and the agency successfully adopted for its new web-based water rights application tracking system, which was designed and deployed in less than ten months in 2015.)
JUSTIFICATION FOR CHANGE IN CERTIFICATION

4. New approach to IT planning
   The lessons learned from the BPMS project, combined with a review of previous agency and IT planning processes, contributed to the following changes in agency IT planning:
   a. The OSE/ISC IT Strategic Plan for FY17, published 9/1/2015, adopted a more realistic, streamlined approach to planning that (a) expressly aligned with priorities set by State Engineer Tom Blaine in January 2015 and (b) adopted the best-practice Baldrige National Quality Award framework of organizational performance excellence.¹
   b. We recognize that planning is a process that must be on-going to ensure continuous alignment of IT plans and projects with changing agency priorities and programs.²
   c. ITSB adopted a “strategy tree” planning methodology in December 2014 as an agile approach to IT planning. The current plan was assembled with input from 40 senior agency directors and managers; it is revised on an on-going basis as new needs are identified and existing issues are addressed. Please see Appendices 1 and 2. Appendix 1 outlines the “strategy tree” approach to strategic planning that ITSB is now using. Appendix 2 shows the current version of ITSB’s strategy tree; it shows the LAP Modernization project in context of overall agency IT planning and projects.
   d. The LAP Modernization project is one of many integrated projects that serve the single aim of delivering integrated systems to support water rights administration and adjudications for OSE/ISC.
   e. CIO Charles Kinney and Deputy General Counsel Arianne Singer now have lead responsibility for project execution. They, LAP staff, and ITSB staff will use the tools, processes, and training proposed here to create a modernization plan in the context of the overall IT strategy tree.
   f. As called for in the original project charter, Kinney’s and Singer’s efforts now focus on more detailed articulation of current and future needs, and methodical, evidence-based evaluation of modernization approaches and platforms.

5. Business value
   a. Notwithstanding inadequate contractor performance (2(b) & 2(c) above), Info-Tech’s assessment provided value in its confirmation of organizational issues that have been present since at least 2008.
   b. In particular, the Info-Tech 2015 assessment, as well as a previous assessment by POD, Inc., in 2008, and a 2015 LAP organizational assessment identified common, persistent issues (please see item (6), below, “Key LAP IT planning needs”). Those issues represent opportunities for improvements that can be addressed, in part, through use of modern, web-based systems and tools.

¹ See http://www.nist.gov/baldrige/publications/criteria.cfm
² To paraphrase former President Eisenhower, “planning is everything; plans are worthless.” See http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=10951 Plans must be adapted to changing conditions. A robust, agile planning process enables such adaptability. As agency objectives and priorities change in response to rapidly changing conditions (e.g., due to drought or key litigation such as Texas v. New Mexico), IT plans must change as well.
Justification for Change in Certification

6. Better understanding of LAP IT needs
   As noted above, three independent assessments (POD, 2008; Info-Tech, 2015; forward feedback, 2015) identified the same underlying organizational issues, which must be addressed to ensure proper identification, design, and deployment of new IT systems, and which LAP and IT management are now committed to addressing via LAP modernization:
   a. Communication and collaboration. Communication and collaboration among staff with LAP and between LAP and other agency groups can be improved.
      Completing the project as proposed here will create a plan of steps required to modernize LAP systems. Deployment, use, and training in the communication and collaboration tools identified here will enable CIO Kinney and Deputy General Counsel Singer to collaborate with LAP and IT staff to do so.
   b. Workflow and project management. Software tools and techniques will help improve task tracking, workflow management, and overall project management among the seventy staff in ITSB and LAP.
      Completing the project as proposed here will identify and implement new project and workflow management processes that (i) serve as plans (prototypes) for future projects and (ii) will be part of ongoing, agile planning.
   c. Document search, retrieval, and management. Current document search and retrieval processes are inefficient and ineffective: staff use personal and shared file systems, which are not well organized, create duplication, and rely on idiosyncratic personal knowledge to identify needed documents. Work product, policies, and procedures are not easily located or shared.
      Completing the project as proposed here through utilization of “lightweight” document search and retrieval tools will enable documentation and refinement of existing document management processes. As we do so, we will identify best practices for legal document and case management and thereby create requirements for full-fledged document and case management systems.
   d. Training. LAP staff receive little systematic training on use of current software, including basic productivity tools (e.g., MS Office) and specialized systems as such WRATS (Water Rights Adjudication Tracking System), and major platforms such as Esri’s GIS tools.
      Completing the project as proposed here will include systematic training in the newly deployed software tools and processes, which in turn will enable LAP and IT staff to better understand and document requirements for long-term modernization.
   e. Demand for web applications for access to agency data. Particularly due to the Texas v. New Mexico law suit in the U.S. Supreme Court, and the NM Supreme Court’s upholding of the agency’s approach to Active Water Resource Management, the agency plans to deploy new public-facing web sites to give water rights claimants the ability to review data on-line. Therefore, LAP modernization plans must ensure that agency systems and data are not vulnerable to outside attack.
### JUSTIFICATION FOR CHANGE IN CERTIFICATION

7. More direct contribution to program performance  
   a. LAP Modernization plan. The changes proposed here will enable successful, timely completion of the LAP Modernization project and provide the foundations for on-going planning and improvement of LAP information systems within the context of overall agency IT plans and planning. Please see Appendices 1 and 2. The LAP Modernization project is now one of many projects that are part of ITSB’s strategic plan to modernize all OSE/ISC systems.
   
   b. Communication and collaboration, and workflow and project management among LAP staff and between LAP and ITSB will improve. This, in turn, will result in a modernization plan that is methodical, incremental, and integrated with overall agency IT plans.
   
   c. Document search, retrieval, and management. These processes will improve. Deployment of the software proposed here will improve legal work product and annually save about one FTE of attorney and paralegal time, valued at more than $86,000.
   
   d. Training associated with deployment of the communication/collaboration and document search and retrieval tools will provide feedback about user requirements, which will directly inform subsequent planning and modernization work.
   
   e. Consultant’s plans for securing public-facing web sites will be a key part of design and deployment of new, interactive, web-based applications.
   
   f. The combination of results (a)-(e) above will help meet LAP performance measures. Increased staff productivity will contribute directly toward meeting LAP performance measures in several areas, including but not limited to the following: targets for numbers of offers to defendants and percentages of water rights with judicial determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Requested this Certification:</th>
<th>Expenditure of remaining funds: $75,930</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount Previously Certified:</td>
<td>$100,000 (includes expenditure requested here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Appropriation:</td>
<td>Expended to date: $24,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining: $75,930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Appropriated Amount (include any new funds):</td>
<td>$100,000 (no new funds)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CERTIFICATION HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Laws of 2014, Chapter 63, Section 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPROPRIATION HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Laws of 2014, Chapter 63, Section 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR DELIVERABLE SCHEDULE AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Deliverable &amp; Performance Measure</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual: $24,070</td>
<td>Actual: 4/20/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Date: -0-</td>
<td>Est: 6/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed: 75,930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare funding request for implementation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>Plan: $16,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Date: -0-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed: -0-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### This Change Request

| Project completion: (1) written assessment report; (2) LAP Modernization strategy tree | Original: $100,000 | 6/30/16 | All |
| | Proposed: *same* | | |

### BUDGET

*No additional budget is requested.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSE staff</td>
<td>N/A: will use available staff resources</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>Info-Tech: current state assessment report</td>
<td>$24,070</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RiskSense: public-facing web site security plan</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Upgrade existing videoconferencing capabilities</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$24,210</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Trello: web-based, light-weight project management, collaboration, document sharing</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$10,120</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X1 Desktop: document indexing, search, retrieval</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skype for Business: videoconferencing, communication, collaboration</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$24,070</strong></td>
<td><strong>$75,930</strong></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change Request for Certification and Release of Funds Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION &amp; VALIDATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A – IV&amp;V was not required for the original project proposal and is not required for this revision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>IMPACT OF CHANGE</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risks &amp; Mitigation Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Please see Justification sections 3 &amp; 4, above, “lessons learned from recently closed BPMS project” and “new approach to IT planning.” Risks are substantially mitigated by avoiding another “big bang” approach to replacing legacy systems, by using new planning methodology, by focusing on incremental, continuous improvement, and by relying upon and investing in existing staff expertise (rather than on outside consultants who do not understand OSE processes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td>Expert consultants, RiskSense, who have worked with OSE and other state agencies, will address security concerns associated with deploying new public-facing, interactive web sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consolidation &amp; Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>Operations, maintenance, and enhancement of software, hardware, and associated processes will be documented and supervised as part of ongoing ITSB operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Records Retention</strong></td>
<td>Project records will be maintained electronically, as in all previous OSE/ISC IT projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Performance Measures</strong></td>
<td>Please see Justification section 7 above, “anticipated program results.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tree Diagram

Simple strategy "road map" for organization or program

**Metaphor:** roots - branches - leaves: aims - strategies - projects each linked to one well-defined measure

"Line logic" connects boxes

**Builds & reflects shared understanding:**
*Plans are nothing; planning is everything.* — D.D. Eisenhower

---

© Kinney Associates Tree Diagram
Step 1

*Root: Define Aim and Outcome Measure*

**Aim:**
- Clear, mutually agreed upon end point (not the means)
- A "stake in the ground"
- Long-term perspective (3-5 years)

**Outcome measure:**
- Quantitative statement of aim -- *How do we know if we are making progress?*
- Meaningful, objective: relates directly, clearly to *organizational* mission & priorities
- *Not* a "target" number
Step 2

**Branches**: Define & Select a Few, Key (3-5) Strategies

- Use long-term (3-5) year perspective
- Select *priority* issues for improvement
- Identify major *themes*, not specific projects or activities
- Create shared context for entire agency

**Strategies**:

- Assess current system: assets & challenges
- Identify lessons learned, best practices, key leverage points
- Identify gaps between current and desired future states:
  - Prioritize gaps for attention
  - Define strategies to address priority gaps

**Example**:

**Strategy**: Standardize *data-related business processes & data definitions*
Step 3
**Branches: Define Measure for Each Strategy**

What measure will tell us if we are making progress?
*One* measure serves as compass for each strategy
Objective, quantifiable
Define measures *before* choosing projects
Measures are *strategy* not *project* measures or milestones

**Example:**
*Strategy:* Standardize data-related business processes &
data definitions
*Measure:* % of data elements & data-related business
processes that have been standardized and implemented
Step 4  
*Leaves: Define & Select Projects*

**Current projects:**
- Map current projects to a strategy
- Assess need to *improve* current projects

**New projects:**
- Select to *support* strategies & *move* strategy measures

**Priorities:**
- "Prune" leaves: focus on key projects that help achieve aim
- Consider best practices to move strategy measures

**Reporting:** color code leaves (projects) to indicate status
Appendix 2 to LAP Modernization Change Request

MUSKRAATS* INITIATIVE

Aim
1. Maintain existing applications to improve data quality & functionality [S1]
2. Standardize data-related business processes and data definitions [S2]
3. Deploy & integrate system modules that are "single source of truth" [S3]
4. Maintain & enhance end-user services (EUS) & infrastructure (IS) to support existing & new operations and software applications

Strategy

1. Strategy Measure
   1. % of changes that improve data quality & functionality [S1]
   2. % of data elements & data-related business processes that have been standardized & implemented [S2]
   3. % of modules deployed and integrated
   4. No. of unplanned service outages of any kind that affect more than one person for more than 15 minutes

2. Strategy Measure
   1. 1. Maintain & enhance WATERS [P1.1]
   2. 1.2. Maintain & enhance WRATS and LRG Hydrographic Survey D8 [P1.2]
   3. 1.3. Maintain & enhance Reynolds Report
   4. 1.4. Maintain & enhance RTMS
   5. 1.5. Maintain & enhance GIS data warehouse
   6. 2.1. Executive team serves as information mgmt oversight body
   7. 2.2. Identify major data-related processes & their relationships
   8. 2.3. Set priorities for processes to standardize
   9. 2.4. For each process: map existing process & define desired future process & req'd data
   10. 2.5. Agree on agency-wide definition of a "water right" data elements & their relationships
   11. 2.6. Create & validate "as-is" data dictionary for existing systems
   12. 2.7. Identify communication, facilitation, & performance improvement skills
   13. 2.8. Complete LAP Modernization Project
   14. 3.1. Build & deploy system modules [P3.1]
   15. 3.2. Create & use agency-wide, "future-state" data dictionary
   16. 3.3. Streamline & strengthen IT SW dev, tools & skills
   17. 4.1 EUS: POC/IT work orders timely, using well-defined priorities & escalation process
   18. 4.2 EUS: create & deploy training modules on basic topics (e.g., file system, Trello, X)!
   19. 4.3 EUS: telephone services
   20. 4.4 EUS Networks wired & wireless, Inc. switches, firewalls, RMM, web deployments
   21. 4.5 EUS: Servers (application, storage & print), Inc. VMs
   22. 4.6 EUS: Security, Inc. (cloud) backup, business continuity, disaster recovery, audits, AD authentication & authorization
   23. 4.7 EUS & IS: User productivity software, Inc. Windows OS & MS Office support, upgrades

Project [1.0]

PROJECT MEASURE

1. % changes that improve data quality & functionality
2. % changes that improve data quality & functionality
3. % changes that improve data quality & functionality
4. % changes that improve data quality & functionality
5. % changes that improve data quality & functionality
6. % of processes identified & related to one another
7. % of processes identified for which task force convenes & meets
8. % of processes in 2.2 for which future process is defined
9. % of well-defined data elements in core systems
10. % of managers who have facilitated cross-agency team within the past year
11. % of modules deployed agency-wide
12. % of data elements from 2.6 that in future-state dictionary
13. % of tools that are standardized, deployed & on which staff are trained
14. Median times to complete requests, by priority
15. No. of modules deployed
16. No. of bureaus for which service reviewed & optimized, including mix of mobile & land lines
17. No. & duration of unplanned network outages
18. No. & duration of unplanned server outages
19. No. & severity of security incidents
20. No. of upgrades deployed

OSE/ISC Final State

One, agency-wide information management system to support Active Water Resource Management (AWRM), water rights permitting, and water rights adjudications [A1 see notes]

OSE/ISC Road Map

Outcome Measure

% of business for which current, accurate data & reports are immediately & easily available to support AWRM requirements [A2]

Key:
Rose colored boxes show the LAP Modernization project and how it relates to the overall agency aim.

Although the tree shows only linear, hierarchical relationships, strategies and projects contribute to reinforce one another. Projects to which the LAP Modernization plan will contribute are highlighted in light yellow.

* MUSKRAATS: Multi-User System & Knowledgebase for Water Rights Administration & Adjudication - Working Draft - Tree 14a, 4/11/16 for DoIT Change Request