

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF ASSURANCE	i
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
GENERAL MANAGEMENT RESPONSES	11
1. INTRODUCTION	13
1.1 Background	13
1.2 Organizational Structure	14
1.3 Audit Objectives and Scope	14
1.4 Audit Methodology	15
2. iCASE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK	17
2.1 Planning.....	17
2.2 Responsibilities and Organization.....	19
2.3 Resources	22
2.4 Management Reporting.....	24
2.5 Communicating	26
2.6 Human Resources Management.....	27
2.7 Training.....	28
3. iCASE USE	31
3.1 Use of iCase Functions and Data	31
3.2 User Satisfaction	35
3.3 Data Integrity.....	43
3.4 User Support.....	46
3.5 Benefits.....	48
4. TECHNICAL, CHANGE, AND INTEGRATION ASPECTS	49
4.1 iCase Architecture, Design, and Infrastructure	49
4.2 iCase Integration and Interfaces With Other Systems	51
4.3 Documentation and Help.....	52
4.4 Connectivity	54
4.5 System Availability	55
4.6 Information Technology Security and Privacy	56
4.7 System Upgrades and Change Management Process.....	58
5. LEGAL SERVICES UNITS	61
6. RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES	65

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BCP	Business Continuity Plan
IFMS	Integrated Finance and Materiel System
IMB	Information Management Branch
iRIMS	Integrated Records Information Management System
IT	Information Technology
LIMD	Legal Information Management Directorate
LPM	Law Practice Management
LRM	Litigation Risk Management
LSUs	Legal Service Units
PIA	Privacy Impact Assessment
PPSC	Public Prosecution Service of Canada
RDIMS	Records, Documents, Information Management System
RO	Regional Office
SPPM	Strategic Planning and Performance Management
SMS	Salary Management System

STATEMENT OF ASSURANCE

We have completed the internal audit of the iCase application system. The overall objectives of the audit were:

- a) to review and assess the adequacy of the framework in place for iCase user support, operations, maintenance, and enhancements; and to recommend improvements;
- b) to review and assess the extent to which iCase meets user requirements, supports national and local reporting requirements, is integrated with other applications, supports LSUs, contains accurate data and information; and to recommend improvements.

The internal audit was conducted in accordance with the Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) Policy on Internal Audit and the Institute of Internal Auditors Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing.

The audit team assessed:

- a) the management control framework against criteria documented in TBS and departmental policies and against criteria derived from the Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) 2003 Management Accountability Framework as well as TBS audit guides;
- b) the extent to which iCase-related operations, procedures, and enhancements are managed with due regard to economy, efficiency, and effectiveness;
- c) the level of client satisfaction with the iCase system.

In our professional judgment, sufficient and appropriate audit procedures have been conducted and evidence gathered to support the accuracy of the conclusions reached and contained in this report. The conclusions were based on a comparison of the situations as they existed at the time of the audit and against the audit criteria. It should be noted that the conclusions are only applicable for the areas examined.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

iCase is a web-based legal information management system that provides timekeeping, billing, case management, document management, and case reporting functions. It is used by approximately 5,000 departmental¹ staff at headquarters, regional offices, and legal services units (LSUs). iCase is also used by approximately 280 legal agents who conduct criminal prosecutions for timekeeping and bill preparation. iCase is used as an integral part of daily activities in support of legal services delivery to clients. iCase has become the primary departmental source of national, portfolio, regional, and unit reporting on legal cases.

Generally, departmental units that do not manage legal case files or record time do not use iCase for their files but some units such as Strategic Planning and Performance Management (SPPM) for example) use iCase for analysis and departmental reporting purposes. Different functions of iCase are used by the various portfolios, regional offices, and LSUs. iCase is used by counsel, paralegals, assistants, iCase administrators, records management staff, legal agents, and managers at various levels. Each HQ portfolio has a contact person at the national level for iCase matters. Each office that uses iCase has one or more iCase administrators. The Agents Affairs Unit (AAU) uses iCase to review, approve, and analyze legal agents' invoices.

At the time of the audit, the Legal Information Management Directorate (LIMD) managed the business aspects of iCase. LIMD is located in the Review of Legal Services Section, which forms part of the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management (SPPM). iCase national business application analysts in LIMD are assigned to work with designated portfolios, headquarters units, and LSUs. Furthermore, LIMD staff prepare reports from data contained in iCase and from systems that contain older data such as Caseview, Timekeeping (TKS), and Carpe Diem. LIMD provides functional direction to the iCase Information Technology (IT) Team, which is assigned on a full-time basis to the continued support of iCase. The iCase IT Team is part of the Information Management Branch (IMB).

¹ During the audit the Federal Prosecution Services portfolio became the Public Prosecution Service of Canada (PPSC), which is a separate department. About 800 PPSC staff use iCase. In this report we refer to the departmental organization prior to the formation of PPSC. The separation of PPSC had little impact for the purposes of this audit.

The audit covered the activities relating to the management and use of iCase at headquarters, four regional offices (Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, and Montreal), and 10 LSUs. Audit planning and fieldwork was conducted between August 2006 and January 2007.

iCase Management Framework

LIMD has been operating for several years without a formally defined mandate or an appropriate place in the organization of the Department. In April 2006, LIMD was assigned to the Review of Legal Services Section, SPPM. In December 2006 the Review of Legal Services Section prepared an iCase Program Proposal strategy in the form of a presentation that defines the mandate, governance structure, and responsibilities of LIMD as well as the iCase organizational and reporting structure, and establishes iCase priorities. The iCase Program Proposal notes the requirement for LIMD to transition to a permanent departmental organizational unit with clearly defined reporting, relationships and funding. The iCase Program Proposal provides an action plan for iCase. We were told that this strategy was approved by BIT.COM. In our view the iCase Program Proposal addresses required improvements for the iCase program.

For fiscal year 2006-07 LIMD had prepared a yearly plan that contained 14 objectives. As of January 2007, we found that progress had been made toward meeting most of the objectives. It should be noted that LIMD was required to complete substantial work that arose as a priority during the year and that was not set out in the yearly plan.

We found that planning was in place for the activities of the iCase IT Team. In addition to providing ongoing support, the iCase IT Team has two projects under way. One is to develop and implement upgrades to iCase. The second project deals with longer term improvements and has two phases. At the time of the audit, Phase 1 was in progress. This includes technical improvements to hardware and software used by iCase with a completion target date of October 2007. Phase 2 involves either developing or obtaining a new version of iCase and was yet to be scheduled.

Resources for iCase are drawn from LIMD and the Review of Legal Services Section, IMB, and user units. LIMD has 10.5 staff. The new mandate being developed for LIMD and the implementation of the iCase Program Proposal require that the level of resources be reviewed.

Since its creation, LIMD has been funded by partial budget allocations during the year and has no permanent budget. The level of human and financial resources assigned to develop, support, and administer iCase will determine how well iCase functions. A balance must be struck between the potential additional costs for staff in both LIMD and IMB, and the savings and

benefits that will result from the use of iCase. Permanent A-base funding is requested in the iCase Program Proposal.

We found that the iCase IT Team monitors iCase performance on an ad hoc basis. On the business side, there are many reports for case management and time keeping. However, we found there is no regular reporting to sufficiently analyze the use, performance, and administration of iCase.

We found that while various documents mention some responsibilities, one single document that defines the current responsibilities for the use and management of iCase as a whole is required. In practice, LIMD is currently responsible for administering, and coordinating the user aspects of iCase. Also, several sections in IMB are involved in supporting iCase or aspects of the departmental IT infrastructure used by iCase. However, there is no manager in IMB who monitors all IT aspects of iCase and no document consolidates the IMB responsibilities for iCase. A definition of IMB responsibilities for iCase is required.

LIMD provides training to iCase administrators and users at the time of iCase implementation and has provided refresher training to one region contacted by the audit. A train the trainers approach is followed with local iCase administrators who are expected to provide ongoing training. Generally, iCase administrators provide training to new users as well as one-on-one training on request. However most do not offer formal refresher training. iCase administrators vary in their training capabilities, as many do not have the skills to deliver training and may not sufficiently know iCase. Also, iCase training that is targeted to managers on the use of iCase as a management tool has also not been sufficiently provided and is required. During the audit, LIMD prepared a draft document outlining a one-year national plan for training. The document indicates that LIMD will pursue alternate forms of training such as online tutorials. Training of some 5,000 users and managers is a complex undertaking, and various parties (i.e. LIMD, local iCase administrators, portfolio staff, and special stakeholders such as Litigation Risk Management) are providing training. A long-term training strategy is essential to ensure proper coordination of training.

iCase Use

iCase is implemented in all regional offices (ROs), most LSUs, and all Headquarters units conducting legal work. The system was to be implemented in the remainder of LSUs before the end of March 2007.

Staff use most iCase functions. The various HQ portfolios and ROs use different functions of iCase depending on their specific requirements. The case management functionality of iCase was

originally designed to support litigators. A limited number of legal services units use this case management functionality.

The timekeeping functionality of iCase is used by all users required to do so as per departmental directives. Recording time is mandatory for designated counsel, paralegals, and support staff.

ROs enter each litigation, prosecution, and advisory case in iCase mostly as a separate case file. However, smaller prosecution cases or ad hoc litigation/advisory activities are entered under a single file. LSUs we contacted are using iCase for timekeeping. Legal agents who conduct criminal prosecutions (but not those involved in civil litigation) were also using iCase. Those legal agents who use iCase use it for recording time and preparing their invoices.

iCase requires managers and staff to complete a number of data fields (elements) for each case. There are national data elements and portfolio data elements (with some differences by portfolio). While a significant amount of this iCase data is used to conduct or manage the cases, there is no certainty that data entered that is not directly used for case management is used in the Department for reporting and analysis. Each data element maintained in iCase has a cost associated with it because it takes time to enter, update, and monitor it. A review of data use is required to identify data elements that may not be cost beneficial to capture and maintain. We were informed that this has been identified as a requirement for the project which will address the next generation of iCase.

User Satisfaction

Users recognize the benefits of iCase and many told us it meets their needs. Yet many others mentioned improvements are required and some indicated that they are very dissatisfied. Generally, iCase meets user requirements for case management, document creation and access, and recording time. We found that there are strategies and plans to deal with most of the issues we encountered. These issues include:

- As the use of iCase features increases, some users find that there are issues with the features and changes are required to the functionality.
- As the business environment evolves, new requirements are identified that were not addressed in the initial iCase design. As a result, the system has had some difficulties in meeting these requirements. Although there is a procedure for considering and implementing new requests received from users this procedure does not always identify issues or provide sufficient feedback on the extent and significance of required changes. We were informed

that once the implementation of iCase is completed the iCase Team will conduct a more comprehensive review of requirements.

- While some users find iCase easy to use, many staff told us that they find it cumbersome and inefficient. It is essential that a widely used system such as iCase be extremely easy to use. iCase has had slow response time and periods of downtime that are a concern to users. Note that a system upgrade was implemented in January 2007. The upgrade was intended to address some of the issues related to response time and downtime. We were informed that more improvements would be made in 2007/08.
- iCase functions appropriately for the needs of the Agents Affairs Unit, except for frequent system interruptions (time outs) for individual legal agents when invoices are being created.
- Over the last few years, the number of reports has increased. LIMD was to simplify, combine, and make the reports more user-friendly. iCase produces approximately 196 predefined reports. Moreover, LIMD provides iCase data in raw form to meet specific requirements. Nonetheless more flexible reporting software is required. This is identified as a priority in the iCase Program Proposal.
- A working group was being formed to address the issue of alignment of iCase organizational units with the departmental cost centre structure. Some cases apply to multiple clients and Justice staff from different cost centres are involved. To facilitate the management and reporting on resources, LIMD is planning to implement changes in iCase to align organizational units to cost centres.

Data Integrity

Data integrity applies to both case data and documents. The increase in demand for iCase management reports has resulted in an increased emphasis on ensuring that information is accurate and complete. There are reports provided that help to ensure that all mandatory data is entered and reviewed. However, there are insufficient processes to ensure the accuracy of the data. A few sections review data accuracy on a sampling basis each week. This is a good approach for improving data accuracy.

With respect to documents, we found that a strategy to identify documents to be captured on legal files should be developed, implemented and communicated. For example, we found that some documents are prepared outside of iCase and that there is no monitoring of whether the recording of documents related to a case is complete. We were informed that iCase is not a document management system. IMB is selecting a new system to manage electronic documents for the Department and has committed to working with the iCase team.

User Support

Users are supported by local iCase administrators, many of which were assigned on a part-time basis to sections or directorates at the time of the audit. These administrators in turn may contact LIMD national business application analysts who are assigned to each portfolio, all LSUs, and other HQ units. In our view the support provided to users is generally appropriate. During the audit, the Toronto RO had assigned a full-time RO iCase Administrator as a pilot project, which should improve the use of iCase in that region. This is an approach that should be considered by other regions.

Technical issues are usually referred to the IMB Help Desk, the iCase Help Desk, or directly to an iCase IT Team member. The iCase IT Team located in Ottawa is not available to support all time zones. While there is an informal agreement with the British Columbia RO for a CS in Vancouver to support iCase after 5:00 pm EST, this approach has not been effective. An improved process should be implemented to support all time zones in Canada.

Benefits

Generally those we interviewed indicated that iCase has produced benefits and that more should be derived as iCase improves. For example:

- iCase is a single national system capable of providing a consistent approach to working with cases and case documents as well as for time recording;
- Senior management is using reports for measuring departmental work, budgeting, resource allocation, planning, strategies, and for input to the Departmental Performance Reporting process;
- RO directors and other managers use the iCase information to monitor various aspects of legal work;
- iCase allows for the sharing of information pertaining to cases and related documents.

iCase Architecture, Design, and Infrastructure

iCase is used by departmental and external users as well as LSUs and legal agents. The iCase architecture is complex requiring links with other departmental systems, other software as well as with the networks of client departments where LSUs are located. In our opinion, the iCase IT Team is following a reasonable approach to address existing issues and improvements should occur.

Documentation and Help

There are various manuals available to iCase administrators and users. Also, iCase has a useful online Help function. In our view these manuals contain useful information. Most staff we interviewed who had used them indicated that they are useful references.

Responsibilities for the use and management of iCase as a whole are partly defined in various documents but not sufficiently in the existing manuals. Greater clarity could be achieved by updating existing manuals.

Because iCase has many features and is flexible to use, for certain tasks some staff have developed brief reference documents of local procedures that are easier to use than the large iCase manuals. The sharing of local manuals and guides among iCase user units should be promoted and facilitated.

System Availability

We were told that iCase has had periods of downtime that are a concern to users and IMB given its widespread use and the impact of its unavailability.

There are no regular and complete reports on all downtime periods. There are some reports on downtime but they are incomplete. For example, they do not include problems caused by software other than iCase or hardware not fully dedicated to iCase; they do not track the many temporary errors that occur where a corrective action is not required; and they do not track problems in ROs or LSUs related to the local office IT environment. Steps continue to decrease iCase downtime.

Information Technology Security and Privacy

A Threat and Risk Assessment (TRA) was prepared in 2004 and concluded that the existing level of risk was higher than acceptable. A Certification and Accreditation document was prepared in 2006 which mentioned that progress had been made. iCase was accredited with conditions due to a few recommendations pending implementation (stated in the TRA, Certification and Accreditation documents).

A Business Continuity Plan (BCP) was available in draft form. The BCP needs to be completed as soon as possible.

An iCase Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) was prepared in January 2005. The PIA states that compliance with privacy requirements depends on improved security as recommended by the TRA.

System Upgrades and Change Management Process

The change management process with respect to definition of requirements, development, testing, and user acceptance for iCase and related documentation needs improvement. We were told that LIMD management and the iCase IT Team intended to improve:

- technical and user testing
- the management of the application programming code
- the system development process

We were told that the iCase IT Team intended to acquire new testing tools and set up a testing environment that more closely resembles the real operational environment including the implementation of regression testing.

iCase system upgrades are implemented periodically. The last one was implemented in January 2007.

Legal Services Units

There are 42 LSUs with approximately 1,200 iCase users. Support staff who assist with the administration of iCase are client department employees. All LSUs we visited had recently implemented iCase and therefore they lacked experience in using the system. Most LSUs were using iCase only for timekeeping but we were informed that three were also using it for case management. So far the implementation of iCase in LSUs has had mixed results. The larger LSUs reported that they are generally satisfied with iCase. Staff in the small LSUs told the audit team that they are dissatisfied with the system. They do not have sufficient staff to have an iCase Administrator who would have adequate knowledge and sufficient time to provide the required support. Mid-size LSUs reported satisfaction levels that are somewhere in the middle of these two extremes. The need for additional support to small and some medium-sized LSUs should be reviewed. It is to be noted that the case management functionality of iCase was originally designed to support the needs of litigators.

The management responses to the recommendations contained in this report were provided by the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services and the Chief Information Officer, Information Management.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT RESPONSES

Law Practice Management Directorate

We thank the Internal Audit Branch for their audit of the iCase application. The Law Practice Management Directorate (LPMD) created in August 2007 has been given the mandate to ensure that national policies, processes and tools are in place to support the efficient and effective delivery of legal services to government. LPMD defines and supports and coordinates the development of common legal and business practices across various law practice areas by providing:

- leadership on a variety of law practice issues such as legal risk management, knowledge management, quality management, and legal and policy advice on dispute prevention and resolution; and
- direction and support on business practices related to the practice of law in areas such as legal information and systems (e.g., iCase), standard legal service agreements and reporting on the provision of legal services to government.

The departmental decision to create the LPMD is founded on the need for greater consistency and coordination in legal and business practices; considerations raised in several of the audit recommendations presented in this report. The implementation of measures required in response to the audit recommendations will be managed under the leadership of the LPMD.

Information Management Branch

It has been recognized in several independent external and internal assessments that the IM/IT investment portfolio at the Department of Justice is funded at approximately 50% of what is needed when compared with other departments of a similar size. The associated risks have been identified at the departmental level and some internal measures taken; however, the greater portion of the gap remains.

IT engineering functions such as Change Management, Project Management, Quality Assurance, Performance Monitoring and reporting require investment. IMB has not been able to enter into proper Service Level Agreements (SLA) with its iCASE business client due to insufficient funding of the IT function leading to an impossibility to guarantee performance such as the application's availability figures and recovery time.

IMB's organizational structure is under review by the CIO including options to use common services, but funding to move organizational change forward is required. For example, the level of risk managed salary in the branch at the outset of 2008 – 2009 was \$2 million. In addition, the Justice IM/IT resources, nation-wide, are not under the authority of the CIO, a model which is not endorsed by the Treasury Board standards concerning the CIO function and which creates risk of uncoordinated regional applications development with the associated costs and inefficiencies. The CIO is examining SLA based approaches to national IM/IT services that have been implemented in other government departments with the endorsement of their senior regional executive.

Despite these challenges, the IM/IT function has made significant strides over the past several years. These include the creation of a Technology Renewal Program, the introduction of rudimentary change management, the procurement of some basic system development and life-cycle management tools and associated training of staff, significant progress in the area of the departmental Information Management Project (RDIMS) , initial organizational improvements, IT security posture improvements and the initial start of an Applications Engineering Services section. At the technology and application level, considerable investment has been made to stabilize and optimize iCASE and improvements have increased the level of client satisfaction (informal assessment).

The CIO therefore is in agreement with the IM/IT recommendations of this audit and highlights that the next generation of the engineering process, the infrastructure and the application platform that support the Next Generation iCASE will be the subject of coordinated investment proposals for both one-time and ongoing systemic funding corrections of the IM/IT function.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

iCase is a web-based legal information management system that provides timekeeping, billing, case management, document management, and case reporting functions. It is used by approximately 5,000² departmental staff at headquarters, regional offices, HQ units involved in legal services delivery, and legal services units (LSUs). Different functions of iCase are used by the various portfolios, regional offices, and LSUs. The case management function in iCase allows for the recording of case data such as names of participants, important dates, risks, related files, charges, and litigation outcomes. iCase contains national data standards (i.e. timekeeping, risk level, contingent liability, client department names) and portfolio-specific data standards. iCase is used by LSUs and three other headquarter units for timekeeping. iCase is also used by approximately 280 legal agents for timekeeping and bill preparation (but not for document creation). iCase is used as an integral part of daily activities in support of legal services delivery to clients. iCase has become the primary departmental source of national, portfolio, and regional reporting on legal cases.

The Department of Justice began development of iCase in 2002 to replace the Caseview system that had been used by the Department since 1995. iCase combines in a web-based environment the functions of the previous Caseview system, other timekeeping systems, and the Justice Electronic Forms (JEF) system used to process legal agent invoices. iCase contains the records of more than 400,000 cases and stores more than 3.2 million documents.

Generally, departmental units that do not manage legal case files or record time do not use iCase for their files. However, some HQ units such as SPPM use iCase information for analysis and departmental reporting purposes.

² During the audit the Federal Prosecution Services portfolio became the Public Prosecution Service of Canada (PPSC), which is a separate department. About 800 PPSC staff use iCase. In this report we refer to the departmental organization prior to the formation of PPSC. The separation of PPSC had little impact for the purposes of this audit.

1.2 Organizational Structure

The Legal Information Management Directorate (LIMD) manages the business aspects of iCase. LIMD operates as a project and, as of April 2006, is located in the Review of Legal Services Section, which forms part of the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management (SPPM).

iCase national business application analysts in LIMD are assigned to work with portfolios (including the sections in the ROs related to each portfolio), other headquarters units, and LSUs. LIMD also coordinates Department-wide business activities related to iCase and provides training nationally on the system. Furthermore, the Business Data Systems and Services section in LIMD prepares reports from data contained in iCase and from systems that contain older data such as Caseview, Timekeeping System (TKS), and Carpe Diem. Both TKS and Carpe Diem were used to record time prior to the deployment of iCase. LIMD defines business requirements and priorities that guide the work of the iCase Information Technology (IT) Team, which is assigned on a full-time basis to the continued support of iCase (system upgrades, system changes, and technical problems resolution). The iCase IT Team is part of the Application Development Support Section of the Information Management Branch (IMB). IMB is responsible for the technical IT aspects of iCase.

iCase is used by counsel, paralegals, assistants, iCase administrators, records management staff, legal agents, and managers at various levels. Each HQ portfolio has a contact person at the national level for iCase matters. Each office that uses iCase has one or more iCase administrators. The Agents Affairs Unit (AAU) uses iCase to review, approve, and analyze legal agents' invoices.

1.3 Audit Objectives and Scope

The audit reviewed and assessed the extent to which iCase:

- meets user requirements;
- supports national and local reporting requirements;
- is integrated with other applications;
- supports LSUs;
- contains accurate data and information;
- is subject to appropriate budgetary and financial control.

The audit also reviewed and assessed:

- the appropriateness of the resources assigned to the system;
- the suitability of training and support for users;
- the adequacy of both privacy and security measures;
- the appropriateness of policies and procedures related to the use of iCase and the extent of compliance with these.

The audit included activities pertaining to iCase at headquarters, four regional offices (Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, and Montreal) and 10 LSUs. The planning and on-site examination for this audit were carried out between August 2006 and January 2007.

1.4 Audit Methodology

The methodology for the audit consisted of a review of pertinent documentation and systems, interviews with relevant staff, and appropriate audit testing.

Interviews were held with:

- the Chief Information Officer;
- the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section;
- the Director, Legal Information Management Directorate and staff;
- staff from a sample of 10 LSUs and four regional offices;
- various other departmental personnel using or supporting iCase.

2. iCASE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

2.1 Planning

We were informed that prior to December 2006, because of other priorities and a lack of resources, a strategy or long-term-plan for iCase had not been prepared. However, in December 2006 the Review of Legal Services developed the iCase Program Proposal in presentation form; a strategy that defines the mandate, governance structure, and responsibilities of LIMD with respect to iCase; defines the iCase organizational and reporting structure; and also establishes iCase priorities. We were told that this strategy was approved by BIT.COM³. The iCase Program Proposal provides an action plan that includes the following priorities:

- undertaking various activities in support of the Department's data integrity program;
- completing iCase deployment in all LSUs;
- rationalizing the reports and data services delivery approach;
- providing testing services in support of the system's technical optimization project;
- assisting the iCase IT Team in implementing a separate instance of iCase in support of the transition of the Federal Prosecution Service (FPS) to the Public Prosecution Service of Canada (PPSC);
- evaluating the feasibility of using case management functionality in LSUs;
- launching the business requirements definition phase of the next generation of iCase;
- ensuring efficient and effective operations.

The iCase Program Proposal identifies the following next steps:

- regularize/formalize positions within LIMD (the iCase Business Team);
- obtain approval of the iCase Program Proposal (as indicated above, approval was obtained) including permanent funding and integration with the Law Practice Management Directorate (LPM).

³ IM/IT management committee reporting to the Senior Management Board.

The iCase Program Proposal indicates that once LIMD becomes a permanent organizational unit, iCase priorities will be revised, as required, in light of LIMD's mandate. Changes will also be made, as required, to respond to departmental priorities. Some of the listed activities are contingent on obtaining sufficient funding.

At the time of the audit, the Review of Legal Services Section was developing a workplan to address the priorities. We were informed that converting LIMD from project mode into a permanent organizational unit will take place as part of a more general departmental reorganization.

In our view the iCase Program Proposal addresses required improvements for the iCase program. We were informed that the proposal is a high level document that was not intended to discuss operational considerations such as detailed improvements to the iCase system.

For fiscal year 2006-07 LIMD had prepared a yearly plan that contained 14 objectives. As of January 2007, we found that the following progress had been made toward meeting the objectives: eight were completely achieved, five were partially achieved, and little progress had been made in achieving one objective. However, at the time of our review, two months remained in the fiscal year to meet the objectives. It should be noted that LIMD was required to complete substantial work that arose as a priority during the year, work that was not set out in the yearly plan. For example, separation of iCase access controls for the Public Prosecution Service of Canada (PPSC) was implemented. Further, separation of iCase functions and data for PPSC remain to be defined. Another unplanned activity was the harmonization of the iCase organizational units with the departmental cost centres (further discussed in "Satisfaction of User Requirements"). Both activities have required a significant level of effort.

We found that planning was in place for the activities of the iCase IT Team. In addition to providing ongoing support, the iCase IT Team has two projects under way. One is to develop and implement the next upgrade to iCase. The last upgrade (Build 1.1.6) dealt primarily with iCase performance issues and was implemented in January 2007. At the time of the audit, work was already under way for Build 1.1.7 with user requirements being defined by LIMD.

The second technical project (optimization activities) deals with longer term improvements. There are two phases to the project. At the time of the audit, Phase 1 was in progress, which includes upgrading the database server, clustering databases, implementing an automatic balancing of the load of the web servers, and providing complex reports. The completion target date for this phase is October 2007. Phase 2 involves either developing or obtaining a new version of iCase (if a ready application is chosen) and was yet to be scheduled; it will follow the definition of the business requirements.

Recommendation and Management Responses

- 1. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that the iCase Program Proposal is fully implemented.**

We agree. All components of the iCase Program Proposal are being addressed in short and medium-term strategies developed by the Business Practices Service of the Law Practice Management Directorate.

2.2 Responsibilities and Organization

LIMD has been operating without a formally defined mandate or an appropriate place in the organization of the Department for several years. Until the end of March 2006 LIMD reported to the Senior Regional Director, Quebec Regional Office and operated without a permanent budget, approved job descriptions for staff, or the necessary linkages to senior management that would be reflected in a formal organizational unit. We were told that senior management recognized that this was a problem, and in April 2006, LIMD was assigned to the Review of Legal Services, SPPM. At the time of the audit we found that LIMD continues to operate as a project rather than as a formal organization and therefore LIMD management does not have clearly defined authorities. This has negatively impacted the ability of iCase to meet requirements such as the need for improved compliance to defined legal and iCase business practices. As the organization responsible for the business activities of iCase, LIMD requires a strong mandate and the support and commitment of senior management. Also, senior management endorsement of iCase is required with respect to HQ portfolios, ROs, and LSUs to ensure that the required priority is given to iCase activities.

The iCase Program Proposal notes this organizational issue and LIMD is trying to obtain a formal mandate, which will transform it into a permanent departmental organizational unit with clearly defined reporting relationships and funding. The iCase Program Proposal also proposes that the mandate of the iCase Business Team (currently LIMD) as well as the management of the business and legal information should be re-examined in the broader context of departmental law practice management functions and corporate requirements.

We found that the various responsibilities are partly defined in various documents but not appropriately summarized in the portfolio manuals, the iCase User Guide, or the Administrator Guide (see “User Documentation and Help”). Responsibilities are defined with respect to timekeeping in the National Timekeeping Protocol (November 2006) for a timekeeper, manager,

and iCase Administrator. While various documents mention some responsibilities, we did not find a one single document that defines the current responsibilities for the use and management of iCase as a whole. (See “Planning”.)

In practice, LIMD is currently responsible for administering, leading and coordinating the user aspects of iCase. In addition departmental managers are responsible for ensuring their staff use iCase, LIMD has:

- assigned an iCase National Business Application Analyst to each HQ portfolio (as well as to the sections in the ROs related to the portfolio), other headquarters units, and LSUs;
- assigned a Training Officer to develop and conduct national training;
- required its Business Data Systems and Services Section to prepare regular reports from data contained in iCase as well as reports that combine data from iCase, financial systems, and older timekeeping systems;
- led the definition of iCase user requirements and participated in priority setting with the iCase IT Team and IMB management.

LIMD receives requests for iCase functionality changes and additions to the system from all HQ portfolios, ROs, and other units in headquarters. There is a process for reviewing and making decisions on change requests. However, LIMD has limited authority to challenge requests because of its placement in the Department. An improved organizational structure is required and was in the process of being implemented.

LIMD has been dealing primarily and separately with each HQ portfolio as well as with regional offices and LSUs. Each portfolio has a separate iCase committee and a contact person who deals with LIMD on portfolio issues. Nonetheless LIMD strives to establish national standards where possible. Some national reports have been implemented. However, given the Department's organizational structure which includes both line managers and portfolio managers, consolidated horizontal reporting is a challenge. A proper strategy is required to produce more horizontal reports useful to RO directors and units in headquarters that analyze iCase information for the whole Department, such as information on performance and use of resources. The iCase Program Proposal proposes to create a Law Practice Management group and governance body, LPM.COM, that will have the authority to approve iCase national and portfolio/sector-specific law practice standards, iCase service program strategies and annual plan, and a business enhancements plan; and to monitor iCase information integrity/compliance issues. In addition, the iCase Program Proposal proposes responsibilities for iCase users/units. However, there is no explicit mention that business units should designate a person with defined responsibilities to expedite dealings with and decisions required by LIMD.

The iCase Program Proposal proposes that core law practice functions should be identified and assigned to the national business application analysts in addition to their iCase portfolio-specific business support responsibilities. This is with a view to improving law practice information functions beyond those of iCase from a horizontal perspective across all portfolios (which includes ROs and LSUs) in support of national standards. The iCase Program Proposal identifies the following law practice functions to be considered: case management, time management, record management, document management, recoveries management, and knowledge management.

Several sections in IMB are involved in supporting iCase or aspects of the departmental IT infrastructure used by iCase: Technology Infrastructure Section (server operations, network, web servers, secure remote access, departmental network), IMB Help Desk, and the iCase IT Team. The iCase IT Team located in the Application Development Support Section includes the support team (operates the iCase Help Desk), the development team, the optimization team, and a database manager. There is no manager in IMB who monitors all IT aspects of iCase and no document that consolidates the IMB responsibilities for iCase. A definition of IMB responsibilities for iCase is required.

Recommendations and Management Responses

2. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that:

a) Responsibilities for all stakeholders of iCase are further defined and appropriately described in one document.

We agree. A consultative approach will be taken to further define responsibilities of all iCase stakeholders; these will be described in relevant document(s).

b) The responsibilities for IMB are defined.

We agree. There has been progress made in the definition of the roles and responsibilities. One major area of improved delineation is in the change management process. The iCASE function has put in place the use of a formal Change Request process and a tool to improve the communication of requirements and priorities from the business team to the IT team. This has improved the

understanding of IT's roles and responsibilities. More effort is underway in this area.

However, a revamping of and detailing of the roles and responsibilities model will in large measure be dealt with as part of the Next Generation iCASE and related proposals.

3. It is recommended that the Chief Information Officer ensure that an IMB manager is assigned the responsibility of monitoring the IT aspects of iCase.

We agree. At the time of the audit IMB was short staffed. Since then, three additional managers have been recruited and a senior, experienced manager is assigned full time to manage the iCASE IT team and the client portfolio relationship with the client, LPMD. iCASE IT Team Leads (Supervisors) have been recruited and development of the senior technical specialists is underway. Responsibilities have been apportioned.

In addition, the CIO has created the Governance and Decision Support Directorate which will implement IT performance management as an oversight function for all of the operational systems including iCASE. To achieve this fully, significant ongoing funding adjustments of IMB will be required.

2.3 Resources

Resources for iCase are drawn from LIMD and the Review of Legal Services Section, IMB, and user units.

LIMD has 10.5 FTEs. In addition the Director and the Executive Director in the Review of Legal Services Section assist and provide leadership to LIMD on a part-time basis. We were informed that additional staff resources will be required for testing of new iCase builds (upgrades). Also, the new mandate being developed for LIMD and the implementation of the iCase Program Proposal require that the level of resources be reviewed.

Since its creation LIMD has been funded by partial budget allocations during the year and has no permanent budget. As a result, there is funding uncertainty and additional time is required by LIMD management to negotiate required funds. The iCase Program Proposal proposes to allocate permanent funding to LIMD. We concur with this proposal.

In IMB there are staff who directly and indirectly support iCase. IMB staff support IT operations, services, and other applications used by iCase. These include services such as network management, web server management, Help Desk, and office software. The staff assigned full-time or part-time to iCase are located in the Law Practice group, IMB. These include three staff on the iCase support team (iCase Help Desk and data changes), three employees and a contractor on the iCase development team, and three contractors on the iCase optimization team. In addition, there is a database administrator. The costs for these staff are covered from the IMB A-base budget and from special funding approved by BIT.COM for large enhancements or development. Given the number of requests for iCase changes and the need to make improvements to iCase at a faster pace, the number of resources assigned should be reviewed.

Units that use iCase require their staff to spend time on iCase in two capacities: iCase administration and the use of iCase. There are 187 iCase administrators in the Department and 83 in LSUs. For example, one RO has a full-time iCase Administrator for the RO and seven full- or part-time iCase administrators for its sections. Each LSU has at least a staff member (employed by the host department) who performs iCase administration activities, usually on a part-time basis. Headquarters units that use iCase also have iCase administrators. Although iCase use is increasing, no additional staff have been assigned to ROs, HQ units, or LSUs for iCase administration.

iCase users use the system for a variety of tasks. Some provide, enter, or review data and others use iCase as a case management tool. Although not easily quantifiable, the total time spent is substantial, given that there are approximately 5,000 users in the Department.

In a June 2006 presentation, the Director, LIMD indicated that the current annual total costs for iCase associated with LIMD were approximately \$2.2 million. This amount includes the costs for CS resources from IMB and staff from LIMD as well as costs for other expenses such as travel and training of LIMD staff, but does not include the costs for ROs, LSUs, and user committees.

The level of human and financial resources assigned to develop, support, and administer iCase will determine how well iCase functions. A balance must be struck between the potential additional costs for staff in both LIMD and IMB, and the savings and benefits that will result from the use of iCase. Given the increased scope of iCase, its current complexity, and its impact on approximately 5,000 users, both the number of staff and the level of funding need to be reviewed in a business case. We were told that the Review of Legal Services intends to request permanent funding for LIMD.

The iCase Program Proposal briefly refers to iCase administrators as positions that must be staffed by business units. We observed that iCase administrators have a key role in that they support and train the users in their respective units. They also prepare iCase reports and monitor iCase. Given their number and their key role in the success of iCase, a strategy should be developed on the role of these administrators

Recommendations and Management Responses

- 4. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that:**
 - a) a business case outlining the support and resourcing model for the administration of iCase is developed;**
 - b) a strategy is developed on the role of the iCase administrators.**

We agree. A support and resourcing model and a strategy for iCase administrators will be examined in light of the next generation of iCase; this work will be conducted in collaboration with stakeholders.

2.4 Management Reporting

In this section we discuss reports that are available to manage iCase. Reports with iCase information intended for users are discussed in “Satisfaction of User Requirements.”

There are many ongoing projects related to iCase, such as implementation of the iCase Program Proposal, defining national standards, improving national training, and reviewing iCase reports. Also, there are a number of technical projects that are being undertaken by the iCase IT Team. We were informed that there are regular reports to management such as to BIT.COM and the iCase Steering Committee (discontinued). Also, the Annex A (yearly funding request) is prepared for management review. However, there is no consolidated list of iCase related projects and their status. Given the wide scope of activities related to iCase, regular consolidated reports on iCase projects, status, and schedules are required.

We found that the iCase IT Team monitors iCase performance on an ad hoc basis. For example, in 2006 a one-time test was performed of iCase response time over a limited period. However, we found there is no regular reporting that sufficiently analyzes the use, performance, and administration of iCase. On the business side requests and some questions are captured on a tracking system and informal feedback is provided on requests. Formal statistical reporting

would assist in the management of iCase. The reports could provide information on requests for new reports, questions and requests from users, training given, problems with data matching between iCase and other systems when performing reconciliations between different corporate applications to prepare reports. On the IT side, iCase reports could address number of searches performed, number of active and inactive accounts, extent to which iCase functions are used, statistics on the number and type of reports produced, data changes made by the iCase IT Team, response time, number of application errors, iCase downtime (see "System Availability"), and number of calls received by the IMB Help Desk and the iCase Help Desk. Regular reporting of such information would provide for better decision making on priorities and assist in identifying issues that require attention.

In June 2006 a presentation was made by LIMD to the Manager's Forum, which meets every other year. The presentation provided an appropriate description of iCase capabilities and the challenges associated with its implementation. It also listed questions for discussion that are being addressed by the iCase Program Proposal. Moreover, the iCase Program Proposal was presented to BIT.COM at the end of 2006.

Recommendation and Management Responses

- 5. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section, in collaboration with the Chief Information Officer, ensure that regular management reports are prepared on iCase performance and activities.**

We agree; existing means of reporting on iCase performance and activities will evolve to respond to and align with the specific requirements of the next generation of iCase.

With respect to the need for the CIO to improve the reporting of the IT system performance, some progress has been made in that the IT Help and Support team have been keeping records using manual means and trends will be reported for the current fiscal year.

The CIO has identified that a root cause is that IMB has never been funded to select, procure and put into operations a set of professional, industry standard tools for operational monitoring, immediate remedial action and for performance reporting (statistics) of the IT infrastructure, the databases nor the applications. This type of capability could require an investment of \$500K one-time and a third of that ongoing.

In 2008-2009 the CIO has set aside some modest internal monies to investigate the requirements and to identify some options for a basic initial capability and will bring this investment need forward for funding consideration.

2.5 Communicating

LIMD communicates information on iCase through teleconferences with iCase administrators, the iCase Intranet site, and the “Tips and Tricks” publication. Also, information on new builds (iCase upgrades) is sent by e-mail to each iCase user and is very well received.

Monthly teleconferences chaired by the Director, LIMD are held that include all iCase administrators. Minutes for the teleconferences are prepared, sent out by e-mail to all iCase Administrators, and published on the iCase Intranet site. During the audit, separate teleconferences were held for LSUs. In addition, iCase Administrator committees in the portfolios hold monthly or quarterly teleconferences with the participation of LIMD staff.

LIMD prepares and issues a “Tips and Tricks” publication that contains hints on how to best use iCase. This publication is distributed by e-mail to all iCase users and is also published on the iCase Intranet site.

More information could be provided to users or their management on future plans for iCase and the use of iCase information. Information is provided but not sufficiently to all levels of management. iCase is an important resource and managers advised the audit team that they would like to receive information on national plans for iCase.

LIMD maintains an Intranet site with information on iCase that includes report descriptions, various guides, portfolio manuals, aspects of the iCase change management process that relate to users, iCase FAQs, a list of iCase support contacts, iCase technical information, iCase “Tips and Tricks”, iCase training materials, meeting minutes, and the Project Charter (produced in 2002). The site also has a link for readers to provide feedback to LIMD. We were told that many iCase administrators use the information provided on the site. For example, reports are listed by heading and description. iCase administrators and others use the report descriptions to determine the content of reports. However, we found that many listed reports do not have a description or are missing significant information.

Also, the Director, LIMD communicates information on iCase by participating in several committees related to iCase (e.g. information management, iRIMS, performance measurement, records, documents, Information Management System (RDIMS)).

Recommendations and Management Responses

6. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section:

a) Communicate information more broadly on national plans for iCase.

We agree. National plans for iCase will continue to be communicated to all concerned parties.

b) Ensure that report descriptions on the iCase Intranet site are updated.

We agree. As changes are introduced to the suite of iCase reports, descriptions will be updated.

2.6 Human Resources Management

The national business application analysts were recently promoted from the SI-04 classification to SI-05. Furthermore, as the scope of iCase increases and the related fields of knowledge management and legal information management expand, appropriate career opportunities for other LIMD staff will increase.

We found that job descriptions are written for most LIMD staff. At the time of the audit the job description of the Director, LIMD had been written but not approved. With the proposed reorganization of LIMD to a formal departmental unit, positions may change and job descriptions may need to be revised.

We found that some iCase administrators, including the Toronto Regional iCase Administrator, have job descriptions, but in most cases the iCase Administrator tasks at the RO and LSU levels were assigned as extra duties and were not formally recognized in job descriptions. We note that the job description of LSU employees are the responsibilities of the client departments.

Recommendation and Management Responses

- 7. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section pursue the inclusion of iCase responsibilities in Justice job descriptions of iCase administrators.**

We agree. We will continue to work in collaboration with Human Resources specialists to support effort toward ensuring Justice iCase administrators job descriptions adequately reflect responsibilities of the positions. Work will evolve based on the requirements of the next generation of iCase. iCase administrator positions report to and are managed by business units.

2.7 Training

LIMD provides training to iCase administrators and users at the time of iCase implementation. A train the trainers approach is followed with local iCase administrators who are expected to provide ongoing training. LIMD provided refresher training to staff in one RO in November 2006 but refresher training is also needed at other locations. Although some users told the audit team that they do not require more training, most users requested further training. Evaluation sheets completed by attendees rate the training as very good. While the training is focused on the iCase application, consideration should be given in partnership with law practice areas to develop a new model for training to respond to questions about legal issues and local procedures that the LIMD trainer cannot be expected to answer.

Generally, iCase administrators provide training to new users. They also provide one-on-one training on request, but most do not offer formal refresher training. It is advantageous for local iCase administrators to provide training: they know the local processes and are the local contacts for support. iCase administrators vary in their training capabilities, as many do not have the skills to deliver training and are not sufficiently knowledgeable about iCase.

iCase users do not always seek out appropriate help or attend training sessions. Often they use workarounds or seek assistance from colleagues. Therefore, iCase functions are not always used in the best manner. Given that there are approximately 5,000 users of iCase, there is a significant impact if the system is not used efficiently. iCase training that is targeted to managers on the use of iCase as a management tool has also not been sufficiently provided and is required. In our view there is a need for a more proactive approach in contacting users and providing training on iCase.

During the audit, LIMD prepared a draft document outlining a one-year national plan for training. The document indicates that LIMD will pursue alternate forms of training such as online tutorials. Training of some 5,000 users and managers is a complex undertaking, and various parties (i.e. LIMD, local iCase administrators, portfolio staff, and special stakeholders such as Litigation Risk Management) are providing training. A long-term training strategy is essential to ensure proper coordination of training.

Recommendation and Management Responses

- 8. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that a long-term strategy is developed and followed for training users, iCase administrators, and managers.**

We agree. Efforts will continue to develop a long-term strategy for iCase training taking into consideration the transition to the next generation of iCase.

3. iCASE USE

iCase is implemented in all ROs and most LSUs. The system was to be implemented in the remainder of LSUs before the end of March 2007. Of those we contacted, one LSU has access to iCase but was not yet using it. We note that of the LSUs contacted one was using iCase for timekeeping and had its own system for case management.

3.1 Use of iCase Functions and Data

3.1.1 iCase functions

iCase was originally designed to support litigators. Its use has now being extended to advisory and other work. Note that some functions may be specific to certain service areas (such as litigation) or to their operating environment (such as cost recovery) and not intended for general use by all users. When all user areas are considered, staff use most iCase functions. However, a few functions are not often used. For example:

- The Calendar feature is used by some users but not by others. Those who do not use it told us that it is easier to use the Microsoft Outlook Calendar or Word.
- When a user adds a date to a file, iCase can use the Update Outlook feature to make an entry to the Outlook Calendar of certain case participants and optionally send them an e-mail. Users must configure Outlook for this iCase feature to be used. We found that this feature is liked by those who use it but is not often used. Many staff we interviewed were not aware of how to use the feature. Staff have been provided training on this feature in the past, but in our view further training is required.

iCase is used to create or import documents and store them under a case identifier. However, not all documents related to cases are stored in iCase, as discussed in “Data Integrity.”

The various HQ portfolios and ROs use different functions of iCase depending on their specific requirements.

Timekeeping

Timekeeping is used by all sections required to do so. Recording time is mandatory for designated counsel, paralegals, and support staff. This includes all counsel and paralegals who work in support of the Attorney General function.

In ROs we visited time is posted to specific cases as much as possible. In HQ three sections were using iCase for timekeeping. We were informed that elsewhere time is also recorded in all litigation units. Time is also reported against files set up for administrative tasks such as training and attendance at administrative meetings. Time data is used to manage staff workload and for billing clients in some cases. RO directors we interviewed use the time data for various purposes.

Case Management

We observed that ROs enter each litigation, prosecution, and advisory case in iCase mostly as a separate case file. Furthermore, we were told that this is the case for all litigation areas. However, smaller cases or ad hoc activities are entered under multi-case files. However, the primarily legal staff we interviewed could not tell us with certainty when a small case should have its own separate file for recording time against it (i.e. once the case takes more than a number of hours or meets certain conditions). LSUs we contacted are using iCase for timekeeping.

Regarding the use of multi-case files IMB informed us that the decision on when to have a separate case file should be recorded as a business rule and communicated to all members of the business unit. In this regard, IMB is yet to discuss roles with LIMD to standardize practice across portfolios as much as possible. Furthermore, iCase will have program and policy files, for example, of a different nature than litigation files. In some instances administrative sections in ROs already use iCase for conveniently recording document under a file but not for recording time.

Legal agents use iCase depending on the nature of their services to the Department. Most legal agents who conduct criminal prosecutions (but not those involved in civil litigation) were using iCase. Those legal agents who use iCase use it for recording time and preparing their invoices and are required to open separate case files and enter case-related data in iCase according to the iCase Business Standards Manual for the Federal Prosecution Service. However, we found that staff in one RO were creating separate file pockets for a single case for each legal agent because there was too much work involved in creating separate case files. Directives from IMB and

LIMD, as well as training are required for departmental staff who open files for legal agents on when they are required to open a separate file for a case.

While civil agents themselves are not using iCase, litigation files managed by civil agents are captured in iCase. Generally, the files are opened as regular files by a departmental representative and at some point the file is sent to a civil agent. All national and portfolio specific requirements outlined in manuals also apply to files managed by civil agents.

iCase Data

iCase requires managers and staff to complete a number of data fields (elements) for each case. Core data elements include timekeeping, file inventory data (total cases, cases opened, and cases closed), Litigation Risk Management (LRM), litigation outcomes, and complexity level. While a significant amount of this iCase data is used to conduct or manage the cases (i.e. approximately 11 data elements), it is not obvious to those providing or entering the data how the data is used. We were informed that some data is not used directly for case management it is used for preparing templates and management reports. Also, we were informed that different portfolios have different data requirements (e.g. different clients, funding, or types of litigation). Business Manuals explain the purpose of the data elements pertaining to each portfolio. Feedback to users would be an indication that the remaining data elements were being used. Concerned users are informed of request for reports or information received from various stakeholders. However, rarely do users receive questions about the data entered other than with respect to missing mandatory data. We understand that this may change as the use of iCase information increases.

We could not easily determine what data is used. Each data element maintained in iCase has a cost associated with it because it takes time to enter, update, and monitor it. Also, there have been changes to the national requirements for data and some data is just beginning to be used. A review of data use is required to identify data elements that may not be cost beneficial to capture and maintain. We were informed that as part of the project for the next generation of iCase, a review of the usefulness of data elements captured in iCase will be conducted.

Recommendations and Management Responses

9. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that:

- a) In consultations with the Chief Information Officer, standards for the opening of iCase files be reviewed, documented and communicated.**

We agree. Efforts will continue to work in collaboration with Information Management to refine as needed, and document and communicate common standards on file opening.

- b) Training is given to staff on when to record time against specific cases.**

We agree. Further training will be deployed using existing timekeeping training tools available.

- c) An explanation is provided to managers regarding how iCase data is used.**

We agree. Information on the use of iCase data will be included in training and communication materials targeting managers.

- d) The use of data is reviewed to identify data elements that may not be necessary.**

We agree. The usefulness of iCase data will be examined as part of the iCase Next Generation project.

3.2 User Satisfaction

3.2.1 New User Requirements

iCase is used at the operational level for case and document management (including searches, calendar, bring forwards, and templates) as well as for recording time. Generally, iCase meets user requirements for case management, document creation and access, and recording time. We were told, however, that many users are dissatisfied with some aspects of the system. Examples mentioned to us include difficulty of use, lack of certain functionality, response time, and downtime. Users also indicated that they required more training on iCase.

iCase was developed to provide access to information using a Web browser. It replicates the functionality of Caseview while providing some additional features. Initially there were few additional user requirements or requests for management information. As a result of its expanded user base, increased historical data on case management and workloads, and increased population of data elements, there is now significant increased demand for iCase information from management. Also, while staff in ROs have been using iCase for several years, they are just beginning to use several of its features. As they use more iCase features, some users identify new requirements.

We have found that several new requirements have been identified that were not addressed in the initial iCase design. As a result, the system has had some difficulties in meeting these requirements. For example, iCase was initially designed on the Caseview model of segregated case management by individual RO or at HQ. However, some cases are now occurring that relate to more than one regional office and that involve LSUs. To address this new requirement, iCase can set up a national case file to be used by various locations or can have cross-references in files. However, we were told this approach is a system workaround and is not efficient to use. Although there is a procedure for considering and implementing new requests received from users as part of the development of the new version of iCase, the user requirements for iCase need to be totally redesigned to address new requirements.

LIMD recognized and has plans for the replacement of iCase with a new version. Nonetheless there are processes in place to identify new requirements and gather user feedback for the existing version of iCase. These processes gather requirement one at a time and reported by users. In addition, LIMD and IT staff also identify requirements. These are analyzed further and design documents are developed once the request has been retained. Requests are prioritized based on assessments provided by the business and technical teams. However, LIMD needs to periodically conduct user surveys to gather important information that will assist management in

making decisions on priorities. Software is available for the easy distribution of survey questionnaires and compilation of results. We were told that many users consider iCase to be an important tool on which they spend a significant amount of their time. They advised us that they were prepared to take the time to provide input that would contribute to the improvement of iCase. In our view LIMD management needs to take proactive steps to identify the types of improvements for the next generation of iCase.

3.2.2 Ease of Use

It is essential that a widely used system such as iCase be extremely easy to use. While some users find iCase easy to use, many staff who are required to enter data or work with the system online for cases and documents told us that they find it cumbersome and inefficient. Staff reported that iCase requires too many actions to complete some tasks. Also, staff told us that timekeeping, the most widely used function of iCase, responds too slowly for data entry of multiple cases. When adding a time slip and choosing the file, there is a wait time for the system to refresh the screen. Improving staff productivity when using iCase is important because of the large number of iCase users. We understand that planning for the new generation of iCase started recently. However, the planning documents we reviewed do not explicitly mention ease of use as a priority nor do they give this topic sufficient importance. We were informed that improving ease of use was to be addressed when tendering for a new system.

3.2.3 Response Time

We were told that there are issues with iCase such as response time and downtime (downtime is discussed in “System Availability”). Note that a system upgrade (Build Version 1.1.6) was implemented in January 2007 after the audit fieldwork was completed. The build was intended to address some of the issues related to response time and downtime. IMB has studied the problems and is taking further action to resolve the issues (see “Planning” and “iCase Architecture, Design and Infrastructure”) such as implementing further improvements in 2007/08. Because priority was given to improving the speed and stability of iCase, other improvements were rightly postponed until later.

The IT iCase Team conducted a test of the response times in HQ and ROs between January and June 2006 and made changes to the web servers. As a result, the speed and reliability of connections with the Northern Region and iCase response time overall improved. However, based on a study by Microsoft in 2006 as well as on its own analysis, IMB has concluded that further significant work is required. The information we obtained during the audit indicated the following issues:

- Slow response time when entering data has a significant negative impact on staff acceptance and efficient use of iCase.
- iCase occasionally interrupts the user's work with the requirement for the user to log back in or with an indication that the system is unavailable (see "iCase Architecture, Design and Infrastructure" and "System Availability").
- Accessing documents in iCase is much slower than opening a Word document that has been saved on a private or shared network drive.

We were told that iCase functions appropriately for the needs of Agents Affairs Unit, Public Prosecution Service of Canada, except for frequent system interruptions (time outs) for individual legal agents when invoices are being created. As a result about twelve larger legal agent firms were no longer creating invoices in iCase and had asked the Agent Affairs Unit to process their time data directly from iCase. This is on the list of problems awaiting correction.

3.2.4 iCase Reports

iCase produces approximately 196 predefined reports. iCase information is used by various levels of management for planning, performance measurement, memos to Cabinet, reports to Parliament, tracking important cases, budgeting, and providing information to Treasury Board (Departmental Performance Review, Contingent Liability Reports).

Between September 2005 and November 2006 the most frequently used reports were:

- Individual Lawyer Timekeeping, produced 18,065 times.
- Detailed Statement of Account, produced 15,864 times.

Predefined reports are produced from iCase at various levels: locally (ROs, LSUs, and HQ units), by LIMD, and by HQ portfolios. In addition, LIMD produces additional reports (not available in iCase menus) in answer to specific requests. Furthermore, iCase information is frequently manipulated in spreadsheets that combine information from various reports with information obtained from other sources (such as the IFMS and local spreadsheets). In addition to reports available in iCase, LIMD provides iCase data in raw form to meet specific requirements. The unit receiving the raw data uses its own reporting tools to prepare its reports. Some of the difficulties that users identified include:

- Preparing reports that are not predefined in iCase is very time consuming. There is a need for more flexible software that will permit users to define their own reports.

- ROs frequently find it very time consuming to meet information requests from HQ. One RO suggested to the auditors that new information requests should take into account the cost of producing the information.
- Although departmental core data elements have been identified and are the same for all portfolios more aggregation of information across portfolios is required.
- Several managers told us that while they can easily determine the time a lawyer spends on one case or on the total of his/her cases, it is difficult to determine how much time a lawyers spends on several cases. However, LIMD staff informed us that reports are available with the information.
- One RO mentioned it would prefer to have a data dump of its portion of the iCase data and a report generator tool to generate its own reports.
- The reports are slow to run and sometimes time out.

The regional reports that were available in Caseview were implemented in iCase. Initially, iCase had few national reports and management made little use of them. As iCase was implemented in each RO, regional reports were added for the most part and used extensively by regional management. In addition, as iCase was rolled out, HQ began to understand that it could also use iCase data and many reports for national purposes were added. Consequently, over the years, the number of reports has increased but no strategy has been developed to address new reporting requirements. The *iCase Program Proposal* contains the rationalization of report and data services delivery approach as an objective. Furthermore, in December 2006, LIMD set up a task force to review the iCase reports related to the core data elements such as timekeeping, file inventory data (total cases, cases opened, and cases closed), Litigation Risk Management (LRM), litigation outcomes, and complexity level. The task force's purpose was to simplify, combine, and make the reports more user-friendly, as well as to develop training modules on them. We were informed that approved changes to reports will be incorporated into the next iCase build. We concur that all reports including those not related to the core data elements need to be rationalized.

Limits need to be established to the scope of reporting from both iCase and the Business Data Systems and Services section in LIMD. To this end IMB is investigating alternate management information systems such as Eureka that may be used to obtain and combine reporting information from various systems.

The use of reporting tools, such as Eureka and other ones need to be considered to meet the needs of users in an efficient fashion and to ensure information consistency.

3.2.5 Search Function

The search function is useful but we were told that many find it unreliable. Generally, it is used for cases and less often for documents. Some of the difficulties users reported include:

- It is very slow.
- We were told that a few known cases are not easily found with the search function.
- More selection parameters are required.
- It does not work well with old case files, which often are missing data. This is because mandatory data requirements have changed over time. We were told that senior management has often decided not to update data in older cases to focus efforts on existing and new cases.
- When someone does a national search (i.e. searching a high volume of files) on the production database, it has the effect of slowing down iCase performance overall. As a result, procedures currently indicate that users are not to perform national searches. There are plans to change the iCase system to automatically prevent national searches by regular administrators. National searches will be run off the report database (one day old data) and Super Administrators will have the ability to run them off the production database.
- Searches require “%” for a wildcard character⁴ instead of the more widely used * or ?.
- iCase cannot search on telephone numbers.
- Names of lead lawyers are not displayed on the returned list of cases. The iCase team told us that the basic search parameters can include the lead lawyer and users must select the option to include the lead name in the search results.
- The Quick Search does not always provide desired results and the Advanced Search is difficult to use.

The iCase team told us that it has not received requests for some of the requirements mentioned to the auditors. As we suggested earlier the iCase Team should approach users periodically to solicit requirements. Users do not always take the time or have the knowledge to formulate requests and forward them through appropriate channels even though instructions are outlined on the intranet site.

Users who work with iCase documents can find them in the iCase multi-grid format with the ability to view a sub-list of documents through File Groups for each of their cases. Some of the difficulties users reported include:

- It is much easier to retrieve documents from the private or shared network drives.

⁴ This is a character that represents ‘any character’ in a search for combinations of characters in alphanumeric and symbolic names. When comparing strings, the computer does not seek a precise match for a wildcard character. An asterisk (*) or question mark (?) are typically used to represent multiple (*) or single (?) characters.

- It is not possible to do a second search of the results of the first search.
- Too many mouse clicks and scrolls (with a few seconds of waiting time) at each step are required to select a document.

3.2.6 Alignment of Information

There is a need to bring together iCase and other departmental systems to facilitate reporting and analysis. A working group was being formed with representatives from LIMD, Finance, and Human Resources to address the alignment of iCase and PeopleSoft. We were told that progress is being made with this issue.

iCase relates data to organizational units which do not always correspond to cost centres. This affects the analysis of costs based on iCase data. Resolution of this issue should save time, for example, for users who now must adjust iCase reports to relate staff time to cost centres. LIMD was in the process of addressing this issue. Also, there is a manual data match to determine what organizational unit some employee are assigned to since there is no full automatic matching of all employees between iCase and the Salary Management System (SMS) and between iCase and the PeopleSoft system. In addition, PeopleSoft and SMS are not updated for all employees on a timely fashion and employee names could be recorded incorrectly.

3.2.7 Other User Issues

Other issues that users raised with us include:

- Some templates require improvement. The iCase administrator of an organizational unit creates and changes templates. The iCase Team told us that iCase administrators are provided with template training but there is a need for more regular training which will be addressed in the National Training Program.
- In the drop-down menu choices of case issues were problematic for three of the ROs we visited.
- An entry in the Address Book belongs to its creator. If another user wishes to make an entry of the same name but for a different person, the creator of the existing entry must be contacted, which adds time to the process. Furthermore, the creator may have left the Department. Also, variations of a name may need to be entered to match how the person has been named in court documents. The iCase Team told us that the previous statements are incorrect. An entry can be created and the creator will receive a message. Furthermore they told us that the creator may also be contacted by iCase support staff or a National Business Analyst to ensure the entry is in fact not a duplicate.

- When the lead counsel changes in a case, there is incomplete history in iCase of previous lead counsels. There is a method to enter the history of previous lead lawyers but is not always followed and there is no national standard that requires a complete history. iRIMS maintains a history in its charged-out records; however, obtaining the information causes delays.
- iCase data element codes are set up by individual HQ portfolios. Each portfolio establishes standards for which codes are to be used for specific data elements. Some HQ units deal with cases that involve more than one portfolio. For these cases, the home organization of the lead lawyer determines what portfolio standards will be used. This is a compromise but we were informed that there is no desire to add a new set of codes for mixed cases because of the added complexity. As it is, lawyers working on mixed portfolio cases must learn the codes of other portfolios.
- Documents that are on the private or shared drives are appropriately named. However, when e-mailing a document from iCase, the name is changed to a number, which is meaningless. The iCase team told us that a prototype integrating iCase with RDIMS demonstrates that this issue would be addressed as RDIMS will display the actual saved named of the document when it is e-mailed.
- There is a process for submitting requests for changes to iCase to the iCase Help Desk and LIMD. (See “User Support”.)

Recommendations and Management Responses

10. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that:

- a) The user requirements for iCase are redefined for the next generation of iCase, as indicated in current plans.**

We agree. The definition of business requirements is part of the iCase Next Generation project.

- b) Explicit priority is given to making iCase easier to use.**

We agree. Ease of use is an integral criterion in planning and developing new technical solutions for iCase users.

- c) The current generation of iCase is continuously improved, including the proactive identification of improvements required by users.**

We agree. We will continue to improve the current version of iCase based on specific criteria approved by relevant governance committees.

d) Improvements identified by the LIMD task force that is reviewing current reports are implemented.

We agree. These enhancements have been included in our planned application upgrades.

e) The search functions are reviewed and improved.

We agree. Enhancements to the search function have been included in our annual plan.

f) The relationship between cases and cost centres is simplified.

We agree. The alignment between cases and cost centres will continue to be maintained in iCase.

11. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section in collaboration with the Chief Information Officer investigate improved reporting software and iCase response times.

We agree. Improving the performance of the reporting software / solution is part of our annual plan.

The CIO has taken some initial steps over the past eighteen months to improve iCASE reporting performance. A total of four IT system releases, most of which are targeted at addressing previously identified issues in the area of performance and stability, will be completed by December, 2008. This Stabilization effort and Optimization effort have already yielded benefits.

In addition, the CIO has seen to the procurement of an up-to-date platform for Data warehouse and that platform will be considered not only as part of the architecture of the Next Generation iCASE but may prove effective in improving some of the current iCASE reports. A careful balance in the investment of time and money will be needed to ensure that IMB does not invest too aggressively in the current generation of iCASE,

which is to be replaced. It is essential to note that further significant improvements in the reporting software will require investment funding under the Next Generation iCASE initiative.

3.3 Data Integrity

Data integrity applies to both case data and documents.

The National Timekeeping Protocol and the portfolio business manuals define the data that is required to be entered into iCase for cases. Because of efforts to improve both case management and management of resources, there has been a substantial increase in management demand for iCase management reports. There has also been an increased emphasis on ensuring that mandatory data is entered and cases are closed. The iCase audit reports provide statistics on missing mandatory data, which helps to ensure that this issue is addressed. Some audit reports are produced by the units and others quarterly by LIMD. We were told that an additional set of audit reports was to be implemented to identify poor timekeeping practices and that the process for using the audit reports is continually improving.

We were informed that case data quality has improved significantly as a result of the use of the audit reports and the appointment of iCase administrators. The iCase administrators provide training and assist managers with monitoring to ensure that data entry is complete.

The current iCase audit reports identify which cases are missing data, but there are insufficient business processes to ensure the accuracy of the data. As noted earlier, core data elements include timekeeping, file inventory data (total cases, cases opened, and cases closed), litigation risk level, litigation outcomes, and complexity level. Business units frequently review a few of these data elements such as risk level. However, they review other data elements only when they are used in reports. Yet, it is not always practicable to correct historical data (e.g. when producing statistical time series analysis that involves a significant amount of data over long time periods). In addition, corrections to data delay the preparation of reports by at least one day, since the database used to prepare the reports is updated overnight. We were informed that for certain requests a day's delay would be too long. At least one portfolio has recognized this problem and has established a project to review all mandatory data from a set date. By the time the data is aggregated at higher levels, it is not possible to detect whether the data is reasonable and correct. An accepted industry practice is to ensure that data is correct when entered or shortly thereafter. Improving the accuracy of data will improve accuracy of statistical and other reports.

Stronger edits for data entry are required in iCase as well as a process for requiring special authorization for incomplete data. We found the following issues:

- Time is entered retroactively after a lengthy period.
- The lead counsel is not required to periodically provide an official record of assurance that the time charged to cases is correct (managers involved in cost recovery do review time reports for the files they are responsible for).
- Data and documents can be changed after a case has been closed. As a result, accidental or deliberate changes could be made to the data of closed cases and completed documents. All users in an organizational unit are allowed to make changes to cases and related documents.
- Certain data elements are entered once and are not updated as changes occur during a case.

As we discussed in “Use of iCase Functions and Data”, users do not receive feedback on much of the data they enter and therefore are not motivated to ensure that data is accurate.

However, a few sections review data accuracy on a sampling basis each week. This is a good business practice for improving data accuracy. The completeness and accuracy of iCase data depend on management providing leadership to enforce compliance and monitor consistency. We found that management accountability needs improvement in this regard.

There have been some poor timekeeping practices by certain sections or staff, such as some bulk entry of time against a few files and time recorded infrequently. These practices are likely to introduce inaccuracies. However, we found that departmental management is addressing this problem. For example, a memo by the A/Assistant Deputy Minister, Corporate Services confirming that mandatory timekeeping is required was issued in December 2006 along with the National Timekeeping Protocol, November 2006.

iCase is not the departmental document management system, Users are encouraged (during training) to ensure all documents associated with a file be either created in or imported to iCase. IMB is selecting a new system to manage electronic documents for the Department and is committed to working with the iCase team regarding documents related to cases. We found the following document management issues which require records management leadership from IMB:

- There are no rules for which documents must be recorded in iCase. Each user decides on which documents are entered in iCase.
- There is no monitoring of whether the recording of documents related to a case is complete.

- Documents can be in draft, final, waiting-for-approval, or issued form. This information does not appear on the documents.
- There are no naming conventions for documents. As a result, staff use inconsistent terminology, which makes it more difficult to find documents.
- There are no controls in place to prevent changes to the final version of documents. As a result, accidental or deliberate changes could be made to the data of completed documents. Since all staff of an organizational unit can access cases and documents, unauthorized changes could occur. The official final documents are printed and placed in a paper file but that practice will be discontinued as the Department moves to the use of electronic documents as the primary records.
- E-mails are prepared in Outlook and frequently not imported into iCase. E-mails contain a significant portion of the information related to a case.
- Some documents are prepared outside of iCase using the private or shared network drives for convenience, faster access, or because counsel do not want others to see them in draft form.
- Two satellite offices of the British Columbia RO used iCase for case data and timekeeping but not for documents.

We also found other issues regarding documents which are not related to records management:

- There is no verification to ensure the continued validity of the linkages created in the iCase database pointing to documents saved on regional document servers. By matching the data regularly, it could more easily be determined whether the documents associated to a given file based on the link created in iCase are still available on the document servers
- We were informed that because iCase has frequent downtime, storing documents on the shared or private drives provides more reliable access to them.
- There are no controls in place to prevent changes to closed cases.

Recommendations and Management Responses

- 12. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section in collaboration with the Chief Information Officer ensure that measures to improve data accuracy are expanded.**

We agree. Improving data accuracy is identified in our annual plan and priorities. This work will continue in collaboration with business units.

The CIO's iCASE team will implement the priority change requests brought forward by the business team in this area, as per the agreed plan.

13. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section request that the Chief Information Officer ensure that:

- a) a strategy to capture required documents is developed and implemented;**
- b) the use of standards for the naming of documents and document version standards is investigated.**

We agree. Work will continue in collaboration with the Information Management Branch to identify documents to be captured with respect to legal service activities and to communicate related processes and any departmental standards pertaining to document management.

14. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that controls over changing closed case data are improved.

We agree. Business rules with respect to modifying data on close files will be further improved in collaboration with business units.

3.4 User Support

Responses to users' questions are first provided by local iCase administrators. These administrators in turn may contact LIMD's national business application analysts who are assigned to each portfolio. In our view the support provided to users is generally appropriate. However, not all local iCase administrators are sufficiently qualified or have the required time to fulfill their role. Usually national business application analysts resolve problems when contacted. However, users do not always ask for help, with the result that inappropriate practices could develop and continue. During the audit, the Toronto RO had assigned a full-time RO iCase Administrator as a pilot project, which should significantly improve the use of iCase in that region. Other regions had not yet done this, either because they did not have sufficient resources or because they have sufficient part-time iCase administrators for their needs.

Technical issues are usually referred to the IMB Help Desk, the iCase Help Desk, or directly to an iCase IT Team member. Urgent problems are investigated right away. Requests for changes to iCase functionality are usually directed to LIMD. A record is kept of these requests and they are discussed by the iCase IT Team and LIMD. A priority is then assigned to them. Due to the complexities of changing iCase and limited resources, requests received by LIMD may not be addressed for several months. At the time of the audit, responses to recent change requests had

been delayed because management had given priority to making changes that improve iCase response time. Furthermore, in order to be efficient, a new build needs to incorporate a number of required changes and this will take a few months to develop.

The iCase IT Team is not available to support all time zones. Usually staff are available from 7:30 am to 5:00 pm EST. There is an informal agreement with the British Columbia RO for a CS in Vancouver to support iCase after 5:00 pm EST. However, this person has no backup and no access to the resources of the iCase IT Team. We were told that the iCase system has been down for a few hours in the Prairie, Pacific, and Northern regions because of the unavailability of IT support. An improved process is required to support all time zones in Canada.

A service level support agreement for iCase system users was yet to be defined and documented at the time of the audit. We were told that one was requested.

Recommendations and Management Responses

- 15. It is recommended that, depending on the results of the pilot project in Toronto, the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section discuss with regional directors the need for RO iCase administrators.**

We agree. The lessons learned from Toronto pilot project (creation of an SI-03 position) will be considered as part of the development of the support and resourcing model for iCase administration with a view to align with the requirements of iCase next generation. These positions report to and are managed by the business units.

- 16. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that a service level support agreement for iCase is defined and documented.**

We agree that a service level support agreement with IMB is required.

- 17. It is recommended that the Chief Information Officer ensure that an improved process is implemented to support all time zones in Canada.**

We agree. It is noted that the ongoing funding for iCASE has not permitted the growth of the iCASE IT Support team. As detailed in the report, the CIO has made arrangements with the BCRO IT team to provide some support for hours after 5:00 pm ET. The CIO will work to improve this given the constraints on FTE funding and O&M, but IMB as a whole is in a situation of risk managing in excess of \$2M in salaries. A systemic

correction of the funding model for IMB is required in order to resource a national, integrated application technical support function for iCASE and the other applications supported by the CIO.

3.5 Benefits

The audit team notes that iCase has produced the following benefits:

- iCase is a single national system capable of providing a consistent approach to working with cases and case documents as well as for time recording.
- National and portfolio standards have been defined, making case information easier to consolidate and analyze.
- Senior management is using reports for budgeting, resource allocation, planning, strategies, and for input to the Departmental Performance Reporting process.
- RO directors (and we were informed that managers of other units conducting litigation work) use the iCase information to monitor various aspects of legal work.
- iCase allows for the sharing of information pertaining to cases and related documents.
- iCase is the only application that can quantitatively measure departmental level of effort in relation to volume and type of legal cases.
- iCase is available to users working outside the Department's WAN such as LSUs, staff in small satellite offices, staff assigned to work on client sites, teleworkers, and legal agents.
- iCase can be used to search for those counsel who have experience in a particular legal area.
- iCase can shorten the time to prepare documents by using previous similar documents and templates.
- Counsel and managers can view case information online during telephone discussions with clients or opposing counsel.
- iCase can be used to track dates related to a case.
- iCase information is used to analyze work related to special legal initiatives such as the Toronto Drug Treatment Court.
- Operational managers can monitor time spent by staff and the status of cases.
- It is easier to produce reports that previously would have required data to be collected from various timekeeping systems.
- Recorded time is used to report training time to legal professional associations where required.

4. TECHNICAL, CHANGE, AND INTEGRATION ASPECTS

4.1 iCase Architecture, Design, and Infrastructure

iCase is used by departmental and external users as well as LSUs and legal agents. iCase architecture is complex. It uses the Justice IT infrastructure that includes databases, web servers, communication networks, and PCs. In addition, external users use PCs that are not under the control of the Department, the Internet, secure remote access (Public Key Infrastructure encryption and CryptoCard), and the infrastructure of the remote locations that include a variety of firewalls. In the Department, iCase has a link with iRIMS and the MS Office Suite. The design of the next generation of iCase will need to consider new technology, new departmental systems initiatives, and new user requirements. New departmental system initiatives include Eureka, RDIMS, the information and application architecture for legal systems, and knowledge management.

iCase itself uses:

- three central operational databases – production, reports, consolidation (to pull new accounts from iRIMS databases);
- two test databases for iCase development and iCase reports development;
- three web servers;
- file servers in each regional office for the documents of the respective RO.

As mentioned in “User Satisfaction”, in June 2006 a consulting firm reviewed the technical aspects of iCase and recommended significant changes to improve performance and take advantage of new technology. For example, there is now an improved version of the programming language used for iCase. In January 2007, the IT iCase Team was preparing an optimization project plan and had prepared an *iCase Performance Optimization - iCase Review* report that discusses the technical issues and presents an approach for improving iCase that includes:

- improving the management of user sessions;

- improved workload balancing among the web servers (these will be clustered so if one is down, the users will be switched to the remaining servers);
- studying the performance of the database server;
- improving testing tools for measuring and monitoring iCase performance.

The study mentions that a next version of iCase should be developed or obtained (if a ready application is chosen). In addition, a new application development framework was to be implemented.

In our opinion, the iCase IT Team is following a reasonable approach and improvements should occur. It is important that improved monitoring processes of iCase performance are put in place and appropriate information produced for decisions on the required rate of improvement of iCase.

The iCase IT Team informed us that the selection of report generators or related software is being addressed by other teams in IMB and is outside the scope of their responsibility.

We were informed that there are no issues with the departmental IT infrastructure capacity such as disk capacity and data communications speed.

Recommendations and Management Responses

18. It is recommended that the Chief Information Officer ensure that:

- a) **The design of the next generation of iCase consider new technology, new departmental systems initiatives, the strategy for the use of legal information, and new user requirements.**

We agree. Several related and integrated activities have been completed and more are underway in the area of defining a future “platform” for the applications.

- An Application Integration Architecture Vision was completed last year and Microsoft Sharepoint 2007 was selected and procured as one component.
- An integrated look at the future Government of Canada architectural options for the IM Platform (the RDIMS evolution) the Next Generation iCASE, the Knowledge Management Portal, Business Intelligence an data

warehouse platform, Content Management System and related infrastructure components is underway in 2008-2009.

- In addition, there is specific money allocated to leverage this architecture and the Next Generation iCASE to hire architects to develop the Next Generation iCASE application architecture vision and associated plans.

These recommendations will support significant investment funding requests.

- b) The recommendations from the consulting study of June 2006 are addressed where appropriate.**

We agree. As mentioned previously, a total of four technology releases of iCASE will have been completed by the end of 2008. Those recommendations in the consulting study which were accurate and of value will have, in large measure, been implemented along with many other improvements. It is projected (and is observed so already) that the current iCASE will be significantly more responsive, stable and maintainable due to these improvements.

4.2 iCase Integration and Interfaces With Other Systems

iCase has a data interface with iRIMS to coordinate the opening and closing of files. This interface works well but there are occasional problems when the data is not transferred from iRIMS to iCase or vice versa. The IT iCase Team is aware of this issue but has yet to address it. Generally users open files in iRIMS. However, the files of legal agents and of one LSU we contacted were opened directly in iCase and not as a result of an iRIMS interface. We were informed that LIMD will be addressing this issue to ensure that all files will be opened in iRIMS.

IMB has studied (with the participation of LIMD) the use of Eureka for departmental reports. IMB is considering the use of Eureka to produce reports with information from iCase and other systems such as IFMS, SMS, and PeopleSoft. A report on the Eureka pilot mentions that the Deputy Minister (DM) Team made a decision on April 28, 2005 to approve the establishment of a single official electronic repository to integrate and disseminate strategic management information.

The Caseview active files were converted to iCase as of April 1, 2002. Inactive cases remain in Caseview databases in each RO. The Caseview records are not easily accessible and in our view a decision is required on whether to make them more easily accessible to users.

Recommendation and Management Responses

19. It is recommended that the Chief Information Officer continue efforts to resolve the problems of the interface between iCase and iRIMS.

We Agree. Some basic IT issues have been resolved but there remains a significant technical issue that has been analysed from both a business process and IT interface and application system perspective and several options were identified. These are currently under consideration.

It will be necessary to invest in only the core, essential changes as iRIMS is an end-of-life product and Next Generation iCASE will be integrated with the future IM platform.

4.3 Documentation and Help

There are various manuals available to iCase administrators and users. Also, iCase has a useful online Help function. Manuals and other references include:

- iCase Documents/ Publications
 - User and Administrator Guides
 - Document Template Creation in iCase
 - Business Standards Manuals (portfolio manuals and National Timekeeping Protocol)
 - Formalized Change Management Process
 - Procedures for New and Departing Employees and Agents
 - Project Charter
 - Report Descriptions
 - Training Materials
- iCase Tips & Tricks
- iCase Technical Information
- iCase Implementation with information on implementation history, roles and responsibilities, implementation plans, and checklists
- iCase FAQs
- iCase List of Support Contacts

In our view these manuals contain useful information and are necessary to document expected practices. Most staff we interviewed who had used them indicated that they are useful references. We found however that although iCase administrators use the manuals, most iCase users do not.

Responsibilities for the use and management of iCase as a whole are partly defined in various documents but not sufficiently in the portfolio manuals, the iCase User Guide, or the Administrator Guide. They are defined in respect to timekeeping in the National Timekeeping Protocol, November 2006 for timekeeper, manager, and iCase administrator. Also, some responsibilities are mentioned in various documents, but we did not find one document that defines the current responsibilities.

There are Business Standards Manuals for each portfolio. They provide much guidance on when staff are required to open a separate file for a case. However, they can be improved and supplemented with training for the opening of new files. The practice is that cases that require little time or are of low significance are kept under a miscellaneous file. Staff we interviewed could not tell us the criteria for creating a specific file for a case.

Because iCase has many features and is flexible to use, for certain tasks some staff have developed brief reference documents of local procedures that are easier to use than the large iCase manuals. We found that generally these local reference documents have not been shared with other offices. Sharing of these documents would assist all offices in preparing their own local procedures.

When a new build is implemented, release notes are prepared and distributed to iCase administrators to distribute to their respective users. We reviewed the Build 1.1.6 Release Notes, released in January, 2007. We found that these documents could be better organized and more clearly written to be more useful to the average user. The notes currently are divided into sections on bug fixes and new features. It would be useful to document which fixes/features are for the benefit of administrators, general users, or special groups of users such as legal agents. Also, descriptions could be more clearly written to provide more complete explanations while avoiding the use of technical jargon and abbreviations.

The technical documentation for iCase has not been updated since iCase was first developed. We were informed that critical developments and system operation documentation were in the process of being updated. We note that since a new version of iCase should be available in a few years, it may not be a good investment to update all the technical documentation at this time.

Recommendations and Management Responses

20. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section and the CIO ensure that:

a) Sharing of local manuals and guides among iCase user units is promoted and facilitated.

We agree. All manuals are available on the iCase website.

b) Release notes of new builds are more clearly written.

We agree. The new build release notes are an IMB responsibility; we will work in collaboration with IMB as needed.

c) Critical technical system documentation is kept up-to-date by the iCase IT Team.

We agree. The iCASE IT team is accountable for this documentation. Significant improvements in the technical documentation have been realised over the past 18 months and more is ongoing.

Proper funding of the CIO function in Justice would permit the establishment of Application Engineering Services which will have a Project Management section offering services and monitoring performance of all of the projects, including in the area of system documentation standards and project compliance. In addition, GDSS will play a role in the overall standards and will track and report on this aspect within the governance framework.

4.4 Connectivity

iCase can be used by users outside the Department. They must perform an additional logon to gain secure encrypted access to the Department of Justice network after which they can sign on to iCase. While the procedure works well, some users do not like the procedure because of the extra time required for an additional logon. However, in the view of the audit team this is a necessary security requirement.

4.5 System Availability

iCase has had periods of downtime that are a concern to users and IMB given its widespread use and the impact of its unavailability. On the other hand the iCase periods of downtime have not been lengthy. As we discussed in “Management Reporting”, there are no regular and complete reports on all downtime periods. However, statistics are kept on reboots of the Web or database servers, restarting of Internet Information Services (ISS), and planned outages by the iCase IT Team. The statistics show that between April 2006 and January 2007 there were 18 planned reboots and seven unplanned interruptions. The report had no figures for cause or length of time of the downtime. These statistics do not include problems caused by software other than iCase or hardware not fully dedicated to iCase, such as communications equipment and remote access services. Also, the statistics do not track the many temporary errors that occur where a corrective action is not required. Moreover, they do not track problems in ROs or LSUs related to the local office IT environment. Therefore, some technical problems are difficult to identify.

Examples of problems caused by other IT services or software used by iCase are:

- In one RO iCase was interrupted because of issues related to the local IT infrastructure.
- Problems have occurred related to the configuration of PCs.
- In September 2006, Outlook was down, which affected iCase.
- In February 2006, an upgrade of Word caused documents to be distorted and a Word software patch was required.

A frequent reason for the system being down has been the need to reboot Web servers during regular office hours. As discussed in “Planning” and “iCase Architecture, Design and Infrastructure”, we were told that the IT iCase Team intends to alter the configuration of these servers so that if one fails the others would continue to provide service.

The implementation of the plans (discussed in “Planning” and “System Upgrades and Change Control Management”) to improve the testing of iCase should decrease downtime.

Recommendation and Management Responses

- 21. It is recommended that the Chief Information Officer ensure that steps continue to be taken to decrease iCase downtime.**

We agree. The entire server architecture of iCASE has been replaced over the past 18 months and many of the recommendations of the 2005 Microsoft study on optimization

and stabilization implemented. There is a significant decrease in iCASE downtime and further improvements are expected in the two fall technical releases. It is anticipated that the iCASE service level will be sufficient to meet user's needs while the Next Generation iCASE is being developed.

4.6 Information Technology Security and Privacy

There are features in iCase to control access to cases and related documents. Usually access to the cases and documents of an organizational unit is provided to all its staff. Access to all, or only specific, cases and documents can be provided to staff from other units or locations with special approval. The existing access control is necessary and satisfies most users. However, some users told us that they require a faster process to obtain access to cases and documents outside their organizational unit.

A Threat and Risk Assessment (TRA) was prepared in 2004 and concluded that the existing level of risk was higher than acceptable. A Certification and Accreditation document was prepared in 2006 which mentioned that progress has been made. iCase was accredited with conditions due to a few recommendations pending implementation (stated in the TRA, Certification and Accreditation documents).

A Business Continuity Plan (BCP) was available in draft form. The BCP could not be completed until an assessment was made as to whether the required 48-hour recovery time could be met. Given the importance of iCase to the Department, the BCP needs to be completed as soon as possible.

The iCase IT Team informed us that there are various audit trails:

- The iCase Web servers have audit trails.
- The iCase database has two audit trails: one for all iCase access and a History Audit Trail for changes to certain tables and backdoor changes⁵.

The audit trails are frequently used to determine the nature of changes and who made the change or deleted data. However, better documentation is needed.

Not all required data changes can be made using the iCase application software. Backdoor changes are made directly to the database by the iCase IT Team when requested by the national business application analysts. For example, the team makes many fixes to legal agents' billing

⁵ A change made to data by IT staff without using the iCase application.

data because the changes cannot be made in iCase once the invoices have been submitted. Backdoor changes are more subject to error than when data is updated using the iCase application. It is also possible to make unauthorized changes. The number of backdoor changes need to be reduced by changing the iCase application software, and improved controls must be implemented on who can make the changes. For example, the iCase development team members should not make such changes. There is better control and less chance of errors when software development staff have no access to changing production data.

An iCase Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) was prepared in January 2005. The PIA states that compliance with privacy requirements depends on improved security as recommended by the TRA. As discussed previously in this section the TRA recommendations are being addressed.

Recommendations and Management Responses

- 22. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section in collaboration with the Chief Information Officer ensure that the Business Continuity Plan is completed.**

We agree. The business continuity plan will be completed and adjusted as needed to reflect the requirements of the next generation of iCase.

The CIO has taken several steps to ensure that iCASE will be more capable of recovery and business resumption. A set of iCASE Start-up “Kits” have been developed and the intention is to perform a recovery exercise in the Justice environment and then to move to a recovery exercise at the MacDonal Cartier Data Centre prior to April 2009. This will initial capability will be of a basic nature since significant additional funding is required to put in place a robust failure tolerant and recovery enabled architecture and set of processes. The CIO plans to approach senior committee to suggest that a project be funded to address all areas of IM/IT related to full recovery and business resumption requirements.

- 23 It is recommended that the Chief Information Officer ensure that:**

- a) The audit trails are appropriately documented.**

We agree. The migration to the modern Microsoft SQL Server 2005 which is currently underway will provide better tools with which to improve this aspect. Requirements need to be further documented and analyzed to determine

appropriate levels of audit and what solutions can be implemented. Moving to the Next Generation iCASE will address many issues that are outstanding:

b) The number of backdoor changes to the database are reduced and improved controls are implemented on who can make the changes.

We agree. The CIO's team is ensuring that, where possible changes are done via the front-end application. Any essential backdoor change requests are being documented through the CR process, using the JUST or REMEDY tools and then performed. This discipline provides a clear, readable log of such events.

Controls over database access have been tightened up within the IT team. However, full implementation of proper measures will require the Next Generation iCASE accompanied by an investment in a larger and reorganized IMB that fundamentally creates a separation of the roles of the various IT professionals (i.e. operations versus development).

Initial Measures: Verifications on who can request the changes and who can actually perform them will be investigated further and a manual process will be implemented as soon as resources will be available. Progress on this will be reported on in the end-of-year report

4.7 System Upgrades and Change Management Process

There is a change management process with respect to definition of requirements, development, testing, and user acceptance for iCase and related documentation but it needs improvement. Requests are received from various sources and reviewed by the iCase Change Management Committee. This committee is composed of all national business application analysts and a representative of the iCase IT Team. The committee meets every two months to review requests, assign them a priority, and decide on how best to meet requests. We were told that LIMD management and the iCase IT Team intended to:

- improve technical and user testing;
- improve the management of the application programming code by separating the responsibilities for development and implementation of the code (This requires an additional staff member and we were informed that the position had been approved.);

- improve the system development process by following a similar one to that used for the FOAEA system. (It should be understood that the Department does not have a systems development methodology.)

There is a separate testing environment. However, it does not sufficiently replicate the actual operating environment. We were told that the iCase IT Team intended to acquire new testing tools and set up a testing environment that more closely resembles the real operational environment. This will include the implementation of regression testing⁶ and a new process for user testing. Also, LIMD management was considering assigning additional staff to expedite and enhance user testing.

New builds are implemented periodically. The last one was implemented in January 2007. It consisted of 17 bug fixes and nine new features including two for the separation of the Public Prosecution Service of Canada.

Recommendations and Management Responses

- 24. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section in collaboration with the Chief Information Officer ensure that planned improvements to the change management process are implemented.**

We agree. Improvements to the change management process are identified of our annual plan; this work will be conducted in collaboration with IMB.

The CIO's IT team has implemented a basic change management tracking tool (JUST) and process and this process has enjoyed improvement over the last 18 months. However, as noted in the CIO's opening comments, significant additional on-going investments are required to build robust engineering processes. The lack of proper funding for Change Management functions in IMB have, in particular, been emphasized by the CIO in the risk reports and in the five year IM/IT Strategic Plan tabled at senior management committee.

⁶ Regression testing is the selective retesting of an application system that has been modified to ensure that any changes work as intended and that no other previously working functions fail.

25. It is recommended that the Chief Information Officer ensure that:

a) Tools to analyze iCase performance are improved.

We agree. This was detailed in the CIO's response to recommendation 5.

b) Planned improvements to the IT testing environment and processes are implemented.

We agree. Significant improvements in this area and in the related area of building the test team and implementing new tools such as automated test scripts has already been made. An Application Environment Unit has been started with limited resources.

However, the iCASE project alone cannot fund and correct the larger issue of a systemic lack of funding for the core engineering functions, processes and tools.

5. LEGAL SERVICES UNITS

There are 42 LSUs with approximately 1,200 iCase users. LSUs primarily provide advisory services and also support litigation related to their respective client departments. A few perform litigation for their client departments. Furthermore, LSUs support the development of legislation related to their respective clients. While counsel staff are employees of the Department, support staff who use iCase are employees of client departments.

There are technical differences between LSUs and ROs with respect to iCase. LSUs are not part of the Department of Justice Intranet network and use secure remote access to connect to iCase. LSUs must use Citrix and the connection is made through the firewalls of both the client department and the Department of Justice. This connection method can significantly slow down the iCase response time. Furthermore, while ROs have their own iCase document servers, LSUs have a document server located at HQ (this is yet to be used).

All LSUs we visited had implemented iCase during 2006 and 2007. As a result, they lacked experience in using the system. Most LSUs were using iCase only for timekeeping but we were informed that three were also using it for case management. We were told that a few LSUs intend to use the iCase management features of iCase and some plan to use iCase for document creation and recording. One difficulty in using iCase for document creation is that the iCase features that are integrated with MS Office Suite (such as email and calendar) do not work with the MS Office Suite of the client departments hosting the Legal Service Units.

So far the implementation of iCase in LSUs has had mixed results. The larger LSUs reported that they are generally satisfied with iCase. Although they have had some problems, they recognize that there are benefits. They expect that improvements to iCase will be forthcoming and their use of iCase will improve with practice. Staff in the small LSUs told the audit team that they are dissatisfied with the system. In their view iCase is a burden that provides no benefit to them. They do not have sufficient staff to have an iCase Administrator who would have sufficient knowledge and time to provide the required support. Also, there would be no backup staff for the iCase Administrator. Mid-size LSUs reported satisfaction levels that are somewhere in the middle of these two extremes.

All LSUs visited told us that their main requirement is the recording and accessing of legal opinions. However, LIMD indicated that supporting research of legal opinions is not within the scope of iCase but rather would be dealt with under a separate knowledge management solution.

Potential benefits for LSUs are:

- iCase is expected to improve timekeeping.
- iCase provides LSUs with access to RO files and has given visibility to some issues relating to case management that require more coordination between the LSUs and the ROs.
- An LSU may be able to share common files with other departmental offices (including ROs) on the same case.
- For those LSUs that previously had a timekeeping system, more reports are available in iCase. iCase will produce more reports than other timekeeping systems.
- Case data that is available in iCase, such as contingent liability, is useful and important for the client department.

For the features they use, LSUs reported some of the same issues as mentioned in previous sections of this report. Generally issues specific to LSUs are:

- Some LSUs reported that iCase sessions are frequently interrupted. One LSU reported that in January 2007 iCase use was interrupted for several days until a workaround for the problem could be found. We were informed that the LSUs connection difficulties are related to the IT infrastructures of the client departments.
- One LSU reported problems with the secure remote access connection in that some users had to restart the sign-on several times before gaining access.
- Not all categories for recording time are appropriate, or not all displayed categories are required. We note that one LSU had analyzed the categories it required to record time. This LSU proposed new categories to its portfolio management and the categories were added in December 2006.
- Often LSUs use general files to record time. They mentioned that this is enough for their purposes since they only need to track the time related to their client's organizational units. Specific case files are usually only opened for important litigation cases.
- Some LSUs were not using the iCase audit reports.
- One LSU had to hire a contractor to write a script to run a required report from the iCase data because they could not wait for HQ to prepare the report.
- One LSU was not using iRIMS to open cases, which is the normal process for iCase users, but opened cases directly in iCase. (When a case is opened in iRIMS, there is an automatic interface that opens the case in iCase. This ensures that both systems contain the same cases.)

- One LSU had a Lotus Notes system for case management and records management.

Most LSUs visited had not yet used the iCase management reports.

Recommendation and Management Response

- 26. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that the need for additional support to small and some medium-sized LSUs is reviewed.**

We agree. This will be examined as part of the support and resourcing model for iCase administrators with a view to align with the requirements of iCase next generation.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES

- 1. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that the iCase Program Proposal is fully implemented.19**

We agree. All components of the iCase Program Proposal are being addressed in short and medium-term strategies developed by the Business Practices Service of the Law Practice Management Directorate.

- 2. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that:21**

- a) Responsibilities for all stakeholders of iCase are further defined and appropriately described in one document.**

We agree. A consultative approach will be taken to further define responsibilities of all iCase stakeholders; these will be described in relevant document(s).

- b) The responsibilities for IMB are defined.**

We agree. There has been progress made in the definition of the roles and responsibilities. One major area of improved delineation is in the change management process. The iCASE function has put in place the use of a formal Change Request process and a tool to improve the communication of requirements and priorities from the business team to the IT team. This has improved the understanding of IT's roles and responsibilities. More effort is underway in this area.

However, a revamping of and detailing of the roles and responsibilities model will in large measure be dealt with as part of the Next Generation iCASE and related proposals.

3. It is recommended that the Chief Information Officer ensure that an IMB manager is assigned the responsibility of monitoring the IT aspects of iCase.....22

We agree. At the time of the audit IMB was short staffed. Since then, three additional managers have been recruited and a senior, experienced manager is assigned full time to manage the iCASE IT team and the client portfolio relationship with the client, LPMD. iCASE IT Team Leads (Supervisors) have been recruited and development of the senior technical specialists is underway. Responsibilities have been apportioned.

In addition, the CIO has created the Governance and Decision Support Directorate which will implement IT performance management as an oversight function for all of the operational systems including iCASE. To achieve this fully, significant ongoing funding adjustments of IMB will be required.

4. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that:24

- a) a business case outlining the support and resourcing model for the administration of iCase is developed;
- b) a strategy is developed on the role of the iCase administrators.

We agree. A support and resourcing model and a strategy for iCase administrators will be examined in light of the next generation of iCase; this work will be conducted in collaboration with stakeholders.

5. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section, in collaboration with the Chief Information Officer, ensure that regular management reports are prepared on iCase performance and activities.....25

We agree; existing means of reporting on iCase performance and activities will evolve to respond to and align with the specific requirements of the next generation of iCase.

With respect to the need for the CIO to improve the reporting of the IT system performance, some progress has been made in that the IT Help and Support team have been keeping records using manual means and trends will be reported for the current fiscal year.

The CIO has identified that a root cause is that IMB has never been funded to select, procure and put into operations a set of professional, industry standard tools for operational monitoring, immediate remedial action and for performance reporting (statistics) of the IT infrastructure, the databases nor the applications. This type of capability could require an investment of \$500K one-time and a third of that ongoing.

In 2008-2009 the CIO has set aside some modest internal monies to investigate the requirements and to identify some options for a basic initial capability and will bring this investment need forward for funding consideration.

6. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section: .27

a) Communicate information more broadly on national plans for iCase.

We agree. National plans for iCase will continue to be communicated to all concerned parties.

b) Ensure that report descriptions on the iCase Intranet site are updated.

We agree. As changes are introduced to the suite of iCase reports, descriptions will be updated.

7. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section pursue the inclusion of iCase responsibilities in Justice job descriptions of iCase administrators.28

We agree. We will continue to work in collaboration with Human Resources specialists to support effort toward ensuring Justice iCase administrators job descriptions adequately reflect responsibilities of the positions. Work will evolve based on the requirements of the next generation of iCase. iCase administrator positions report to and are managed by business units.

8. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that a long-term strategy is developed and followed for training users, iCase administrators, and managers.29

We agree. Efforts will continue to develop a long-term strategy for iCase training taking into consideration the transition to the next generation of iCase.

9. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that:34

- a) In consultations with the Chief Information Officer, standards for the opening of iCase files be reviewed, documented and communicated.**

We agree. Efforts will continue to work in collaboration with Information Management to refine as needed, and document and communicate common standards on file opening.

- b) Training is given to staff on when to record time against specific cases.**

We agree. Further training will be deployed using existing timekeeping training tools available.

- c) An explanation is provided to managers regarding how iCase data is used.**

We agree. Information on the use of iCase data will be included in training and communication materials targeting managers.

- d) The use of data is reviewed to identify data elements that may not be necessary.**

We agree. The usefulness of iCase data will be examined as part of the iCase Next Generation project.

10. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that:41

- a) The user requirements for iCase are redefined for the next generation of iCase, as indicated in current plans.**

We agree. The definition of business requirements is part of the iCase Next Generation project.

b) Explicit priority is given to making iCase easier to use.

We agree. Ease of use is an integral criterion in planning and developing new technical solutions for iCase users.

c) The current generation of iCase is continuously improved, including the proactive identification of improvements required by users.

We agree. We will continue to improve the current version of iCase based on specific criteria approved by relevant governance committees.

d) Improvements identified by the LIMD task force that is reviewing current reports are implemented.

We agree. These enhancements have been included in our planned application upgrades.

e) The search functions are reviewed and improved.

We agree. Enhancements to the search function have been included in our annual plan.

f) The relationship between cases and cost centres is simplified.

We agree. The alignment between cases and cost centres will continue to be maintained in iCase.

11. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section in collaboration with the Chief Information Officer investigate improved reporting software and iCase response times.....42

We agree. Improving the performance of the reporting software / solution is part of our annual plan.

The CIO has taken some initial steps over the past eighteen months to improve iCASE reporting performance. A total of four IT system releases, most of which are targeted at addressing previously identified issues in the area of performance and stability, will be

completed by December, 2008. This Stabilization effort and Optimization effort have already yielded benefits.

In addition, the CIO has seen to the procurement of an up-to-date platform for Data warehouse and that platform will be considered not only as part of the architecture of the Next Generation iCASE but may prove effective in improving some of the current iCASE reports. A careful balance in the investment of time and money will be needed to ensure that IMB does not invest too aggressively in the current generation of iCASE, which is to be replaced. It is essential to note that further significant improvements in the reporting software will require investment funding under the Next Generation iCASE initiative.

- 12. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section in collaboration with the Chief Information Officer ensure that measures to improve data accuracy are expanded.....45**

We agree. Improving data accuracy is identified in our annual plan and priorities. This work will continue in collaboration with business units.

The CIO's iCASE team will implement the priority change requests brought forward by the business team in this area, as per the agreed plan.

- 13. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section request that the Chief Information Officer ensure that:46**
- a) a strategy to capture required documents is developed and implemented;**
 - b) the use of standards for the naming of documents and document version standards is investigated.**

We agree. Work will continue in collaboration with the Information Management Branch to identify documents to be captured with respect to legal service activities and to communicate related processes and any departmental standards pertaining to document management.

- 14. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that controls over changing closed case data are improved.46**

We agree. Business rules with respect to modifying data on close files will be further improved in collaboration with business units.

- 15. It is recommended that, depending on the results of the pilot project in Toronto, the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section discuss with regional directors the need for RO iCase administrators.47**

We agree. The lessons learned from Toronto pilot project (creation of an SI-03 position) will be considered as part of the development of the support and resourcing model for iCase administration with a view to align with the requirements of iCase next generation. These positions report to and are managed by the business units.

- 16. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that a service level support agreement for iCase is defined and documented.47**

We agree that a service level support agreement with IMB is required.

- 17. It is recommended that the Chief Information Officer ensure that an improved process is implemented to support all time zones in Canada.47**

We agree. It is noted that the ongoing funding for iCASE has not permitted the growth of the iCASE IT Support team. As detailed in the report, the CIO has made arrangements with the BCRO IT team to provide some support for hours after 5:00 pm ET. The CIO will work to improve this given the constraints on FTE funding and O&M, but IMB as a whole is in a situation of risk managing in excess of \$2M in salaries. A systemic correction of the funding model for IMB is required in order to resource a national, integrated application technical support function for iCASE and the other applications supported by the CIO.

- 18. It is recommended that the Chief Information Officer ensure that:50**

- a) The design of the next generation of iCase consider new technology, new departmental systems initiatives, the strategy for the use of legal information, and new user requirements.**

We agree. Several related and integrated activities have been completed and more are underway in the area of defining a future “platform” for the applications.

- An Application Integration Architecture Vision was completed last year and Microsoft Sharepoint 2007 was selected and procured as one component.
- An integrated look at the future Government of Canada architectural options for the IM Platform (the RDIMS evolution) the Next Generation iCASE, the Knowledge Management Portal, Business Intelligence an data warehouse platform, Content Management System and related infrastructure components is underway in 2008-2009.
- In addition, there is specific money allocated to leverage this architecture and the Next Generation iCASE to hire architects to develop the Next Generation iCASE application architecture vision and associated plans.

These recommendations will support significant investment funding requests.

b) The recommendations from the consulting study of June 2006 are addressed where appropriate.

We agree. As mentioned previously, a total of four technology releases of iCASE will have been completed by the end of 2008. Those recommendations in the consulting study which were accurate and of value will have, in large measure, been implemented along with many other improvements. It is projected (and is observed so already) that the current iCASE will be significantly more responsive, stable and maintainable due to these improvements.

19. It is recommended that the Chief Information Officer continue efforts to resolve the problems of the interface between iCase and iRIMS.52

We Agree. Some basic IT issues have been resolved but there remains a significant technical issue that has been analysed from both a business process and IT interface and application system perspective and several options were identified. These are currently under consideration.

It will be necessary to invest in only the core, essential changes as iRIMS is an end-of-life product and Next Generation iCASE will be integrated with the future IM platform.

20. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section and the CIO ensure that:.....54

- a) Sharing of local manuals and guides among iCase user units is promoted and facilitated.**

We agree. All manuals are available on the iCase website.

- b) Release notes of new builds are more clearly written.**

We agree. The new build release notes are an IMB responsibility; we will work in collaboration with IMB as needed.

- c) Critical technical system documentation is kept up-to-date by the iCase IT Team.**

We agree. The iCASE IT team is accountable for this documentation. Significant improvements in the technical documentation have been realised over the past 18 months and more is ongoing.

Proper funding of the CIO function in Justice would permit the establishment of Application Engineering Services which will have a Project Management section offering services and monitoring performance of all of the projects, including in the area of system documentation standards and project compliance. In addition, GDSS will play a role in the overall standards and will track and report on this aspect within the governance framework.

21. It is recommended that the Chief Information Officer ensure that steps continue to be taken to decrease iCase downtime.....55

We agree. The entire server architecture of iCASE has been replaced over the past 18 months and many of the recommendations of the 2005 Microsoft study on optimization and stabilization implemented. There is a significant decrease in iCASE downtime and further improvements are expected in the two fall technical releases. It is anticipated that the iCASE service level will be sufficient to meet user's needs while the Next Generation iCASE is being developed.

22. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section in collaboration with the Chief Information Officer ensure that the Business Continuity Plan is completed.57

We agree. The business continuity plan will be completed and adjusted as needed to reflect the requirements of the next generation of iCase.

The CIO has taken several steps to ensure that iCASE will be more capable of recovery and business resumption. A set of iCASE Start-up “Kits” have been developed and the intention is to perform a recovery exercise in the Justice environment and then to move to a recovery exercise at the MacDonald Cartier Data Centre prior to April 2009. This will initial capability will be of a basic nature since significant additional funding is required to put in place a robust failure tolerant and recovery enabled architecture and set of processes. The CIO plans to approach senior committee to suggest that a project be funded to address all areas of IM/IT related to full recovery and business resumption requirements.

23 It is recommended that the Chief Information Officer ensure that:57

a) The audit trails are appropriately documented.

We agree. The migration to the modern Microsoft SQL Server 2005 which is currently underway will provide better tools with which to improve this aspect. Requirements need to be further documented and analyzed to determine appropriate levels of audit and what solutions can be implemented. Moving to the Next Generation iCASE will address many issues that are outstanding:

b) The number of backdoor changes to the database are reduced and improved controls are implemented on who can make the changes.

We agree. The CIO’s team is ensuring that, where possible changes are done via the front-end application. Any essential backdoor change requests are being documented through the CR process, using the JUST or REMEDY tools and then performed. This discipline provides a clear, readable log of such events.

Controls over database access have been tightened up within the IT team. However, full implementation of proper measures will require the Next Generation iCASE accompanied by an investment in a larger and reorganised

IMB that fundamentally creates a separation of the roles of the various IT professionals (i.e. operations versus development).

Initial Measures: Verifications on who can request the changes and who can actually perform them will be investigated further and a manual process will be implemented as soon as resources will be available. Progress on this will be reported on in the end-of-year report

- 24. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section in collaboration with the Chief Information Officer ensure that planned improvements to the change management process are implemented.59**

We agree. Improvements to the change management process are identified of our annual plan; this work will be conducted in collaboration with IMB.

The CIO's IT team has implemented a basic change management tracking tool (JUST) and process and this process has enjoyed improvement over the last 18 months. However, as noted in the CIO's opening comments, significant additional on-going investments are required to build robust engineering processes. The lack of proper funding for Change Management functions in IMB have, in particular, been emphasized by the CIO in the risk reports and in the five year IM/IT Strategic Plan tabled at senior management committee.

- 25. It is recommended that the Chief Information Officer ensure that:60**

- a) Tools to analyze iCase performance are improved.**

We agree. This was detailed in the CIO's response to recommendation 5.

- b) Planned improvements to the IT testing environment and processes are implemented.**

We agree. Significant improvements in this area and in the related area of building the test team and implementing new tools such as automated test scripts has already been made. An Application Environment Unit has been started with limited resources.

However, the iCASE project alone cannot fund and correct the larger issue of a systemic lack of funding for the core engineering functions, processes and tools.

- 26. It is recommended that the Executive Director, Review of Legal Services Section ensure that the need for additional support to small and some medium-sized LSUs is reviewed.63**

We agree. This will be examined as part of the support and resourcing model for iCase administrators with a view to align with the requirements of iCase next generation.