

1

**To:** Cyran, Mark[Mark.Cyran@atosorigin.com]; King, Vanessa[Vanessa.King@atosorigin.com]  
**Cc:** Hicks, Mark[mark.hicks@atosorigin.com]  
**From:** Powell, Randy  
**Sent:** Thur 4/7/2005 1:07:22 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Atos Origin Crisis Communications Plan - Dallas County Situation  
AIS Concerns and issues.doc

Mark,

Here is the document that was (unofficially) given to Commissioner Price last year. This document was delivered in paper form to Commissioner Price in response to his repeated request to put our concerns in writing. He took the questions in this document and re-wrote those into a new document that he delivered to Dallas County Commissioner's Court, InfoIntegration, and Dallas County staff. This has led to a significant number of meetings, communications, and heated debates between Commissioner Cantrell, InfoIntegration, and Commissioner Price.

To our knowledge, no one other than Commissioner Price knows that these concerns were raised by us. He has publicly told everyone they were raised by Ron Williams (of ClearView Technologies) and OC3.

If you have any more questions, give me a call.

Randy

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Cyran, Mark [mailto:Mark.Cyran@atosorigin.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 07, 2005 7:15 AM  
**To:** Powell, Randy; King, Vanessa  
**Subject:** FW: Atos Origin Crisis Communications Plan - Dallas County Situation  
**Importance:** High

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Sparks, Rose  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 07, 2005 5:53 AM  
**To:** Cyran, Mark  
**Subject:** FW: Atos Origin Crisis Communications Plan - Dallas County Situation  
**Importance:** High

Hi Mark,  
Please see the attachment. I will be in around 7 to review with you.

Thanks,  
Rose

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Jessica\_Schwend@coltrin.com [mailto:Jessica\_Schwend@coltrin.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 06, 2005 11:16 PM  
**To:** rose.sparks@atosorigin.com  
**Cc:** Brad\_Thatcher@coltrin.com; troy\_mccombs@coltrin.com  
**Subject:** Atos Origin Crisis Communications Plan - Dallas County

GOVERNMENT  
EXHIBIT NO.

168

3:14-CR-293-M

ATOS ORIGIN 00265

SBP-1A-236-0081-02\_00000066

Situation  
Importance: High

Rose,

As discussed, please find attached below a Crisis Communications Plan for the Dallas County situation.

It includes a communications flow, action plan, positioning statement, key messages and potential Q&A.

There are some areas short on facts, namely the statement, key messages and Q&A, that we can update after your sourcing session tomorrow morning with Paul Stewart and Mark.

Please let me know when you need help with anything. I'll be on call!

Regards,

Jessica  
212-221-1616 Ext. 121

(See attached file: Dallas County Situation - April 6.doc)

## AIS Concerns and/or Issues

### Issue #1:

Dallas County currently has little management and leadership guiding AIS.

### Description:

There is little or no management oversight on the overall requirements to develop and lead a system the scope of AIS to completion.

### Indicators:

- 1) There is no single point of contact for AIS status or issues.
- 2) There are continual "last minute" missed requirements needed to "go-live".
- 3) InfoIntegration repeatedly raises new tasks that "must be" completed prior to go-live".
- 4) During LIMS discussion, forensic sciences asked who they should talk to for workflow and InfoIntegration was the response. The software vendor should never be the most knowledgeable person of the Dallas County workflows.
- 5) The project has continual unexpected issues that delay completion because the owner of the system is unknown.
- 6) No department knows what will be on AIS and what will remain on the mainframe.
- 7) Sections of key departments are just now getting involved. This may cost Dallas County more money, while adding confusion.
- 8) No one is looking strategically at how AIS/JIS fit into the IT architecture. Need to build comprehensive integration interface definition and business model

### Questions should be asked:

- 1) When will all "issues" be resolved in order to "go-live"?
- 2) What happens at the end of the development cycle? Who owns the business process?
- 3) Who signs off on the success of AIS?

**Issue #2:**

InfoIntegration appears to be developing AIS without quality system engineering principles

**Description:**

In the software development community, there are software development standards. Commonly used standards are the Software Engineering Institute's (SEI) Capability Maturity Model (CMM). This is a ranking of the quality of work process for an organization. Although small companies often do not get formally assessed, certain software development processes should be in place to guarantee a quality product. These processes include major tasks (requirements definitions, design, development, testing). It appears InfoIntegration is developing Dallas County's AIS without following any such standards.

**Indicators:**

- 1) In discussions with InfoIntegration developers we hear common indicative statements such as:
  - a. Requirements are defined at each user meeting
  - b. Requirements are redefined at each user meeting
  - c. There are no formal system requirements
- 2) While working on the AIS/Criminal Courts integration, Atos Origin was questioned about why we wanted to follow such a formal process.
- 3) There have been no formal County checkpoints for any development tasks that we are aware of.

**Questions should be asked:**

- 1) What software development processes are being followed?
- 2) Where are the AIS requirements specifications?
- 3) Where are the AIS design documentation?
- 4) Where are the AIS testing specifications?
- 5) Where are the AIS/County sign-off documents?

**Issue #3:**

Deliverables for contracted tasks appear to be missing

**Description:**

There are deliverables in every task court ordered by Dallas County Commissioner's court. These deliverables include user documentation and technical documentation. User documentation typically consists of users manuals. This could be achieved via on-line help. Technical documentation typically consists of requirements specifications, design documentations, data dictionary, test scripts, test results. Currently none of this documentation has been delivered, although many tasks have been completed and paid in full.

**Indicators:**

- 1) In working on AIS/Criminal Courts design documents that were requested were never delivered.
- 2) In working on AIS/Criminal Courts InfoIntegration accessed actual database to identify data elements (instead of data dictionaries).
- 3) Rodney Christian stated that he requested technical documentation and was delivered nothing.

**Questions should be asked:**

- 1) Where is the contracted User Documentation?
- 2) Where is the contracted technical Documentation?
- 3) Without user documents or technical documents, how will Dallas County validate what it is getting?
- 4) Without user documents or technical documents, how does Dallas County validate cost estimates for new modules?
- 5) If InfoIntegration does not produce these documents, why is Dallas County obligated to pay?

**Issue #4:**

Work effort appears to be delayed and charged to subsequent tasks

**Description:**

There appears to be tasks that are billed as complete that are not complete. It is possible that work for tasks is being completed under the efforts of other subsequent tasks. This would lead to one of two potential issues: 1) Dallas County is being billed for tasks that are not real, 2) Eventually, this practice will lead to AIS being incomplete and funding being dried up. At this point AIS will have no means of being completed.

**Indicators:**

- 1) InfoIntegration indicated that multiple user interfaces were undeveloped. (These tasks were previously completed according to contract)
- 2) Discussions with InfoIntegration about system readiness have indicated that subcomponents of the system were not defined or developed, however, tasks for their completion were completed.

**Questions should be asked:**

- 1) Do we have a Dallas County validation sign-off for each task?
- 2) Who is authorized to validate successful completion of a task?

**Issue #5:**

AIS does not have integration plan or standard defined interfaces

**Description:**

AIS is being called the Dallas County Integrated Justice System by the vendor. Although the AIS system is a major portion of the Dallas County Integrated Justice System (as defined within the Strategic IT Plan), it is responsible for the law enforcement responsibilities only. There are several other major components of integrated justice including Courts (Civil, Criminal, JP), community supervision, forensic sciences, jail management, and data sharing and integration support. AIS should not be responsible for major components outside of law enforcement.

Without using the Dallas County integration infrastructure and standardizing interfaces to/from AIS, Dallas County will limit its effectiveness in achieving AIS' major benefits. It will drive up integration charges by requiring multiple development efforts that do the same thing. It will increase maintenance cost long term. It will require development efforts to transition to other agencies through Techshare.

**Indicators:**

- 1) Through discussion about the AIS/Criminal Courts integration it was apparent that system integration (sharing data real-time between systems) was a new concept for AIS business planning.
  - a. There are no standard defined interfaces (into or out of) their system.
  - b. There are no standard data definitions available for data mapping.
  - c. There is not any predefined integration points for data sharing
- 2) When talking to the Sheriff representative about Enterprise System Integration, they asked Atos Origin had talked to InfoIntegration. He stated that this was the precise issue that had been discussed with several police departments and InfoIntegration did not have a proper answer for the representatives to feel comfortable.
- 3) InfoIntegration has begun integration implementation discussions with several entities (UTMB, DANSA, multiple police departments) without discussing the Dallas County system integration architecture. This type of point-to-point integration will cost Dallas County high maintenance cost long term.
- 4) In a meeting with Forensic Sciences, InfoIntegration had no high level plan for integrating AIS and LIMS. There suggestion was focused on bringing all LIMS data into AIS. Only after IT Services took over the discussion, did any progress toward a standard business analysis and integration plan take place.

**Questions should be asked:**

- 1) What are the standard interfaces provided by AIS?
- 2) Are these interfaces enabled for Dallas County's Integration Architecture (BizTalk)?
- 3) Where are the AIS data definition specifications?
- 4) Where are the AIS interface definitions for Dallas County's other Integrated Justice Components? (Forensics, Public Defender Investigation, Civil/JP Courts, Probation, UTMB, DANSA, DPS, police department RMS)