

Detailed Scoring Rubric for:
I&IT-Enabled
Business Transformation Initiative
Scorecard

Table of Contents

Alignment with Government Priorities: Non-Discretionary

- Required by Legislation/Regulation/Policy 3
- Contractual Obligation 3
- Required for Ongoing Delivery of Mandatory Programs and Services 3
- Government Commitment With Identified Time Frame 3

Alignment with Government Priorities: Discretionary

- Government Announcement – No Time Frame 4
- Delivers Harvestable Financial Benefits 4
- Serves the Public Interest 5
- Delivers OPS e-Ontario Strategy 5

Quality of Proposed Solution and Business Case

- Full Scope of Practical Alternatives Explored 6
- Financial Benefits Exceed Costs 7
- Client Service Benefits 8
- Enterprise Architecture & Technology Standards 9
- Procurement Practices and Requirements 10
- Human Resources Strategies, Policies and Requirements 12
- Performance Measures 13

Scope of Risk and Risk Management

- \$ Size of Proposed Project 14
- Duration of Proposed Project 15
- Technology for Project 16
- Business Impact / Scope of Change 17
- Stakeholder / Constituency Impact 19
- Privacy and Security Assessments 21
- Implementation Strategy 24
- Capacity Assessment (Use Tool) 26
- Leadership and Governance Structures for Project 27

Alignment with Government Priorities: Non-Discretionary
Required by Legislation/Regulation/Policy

Yes, if: (Otherwise, not marked)

- Adherence to an Act or Regulation mandates approval of initiative or request.
and/or
- Adherence to municipal, provincial, federal and/or international laws and/or agreements and/or Acts awaiting Royal Assent depend upon approval of initiative or request.
and/or
- Government inquest recommendation mandates approval of initiative or request.

Alignment with Government Priorities: Non-Discretionary
Contractual Obligation

Yes, if: (Otherwise, not marked)

- Fulfilling contractual obligations to vendor(s) depends upon approval of initiative or request.

Alignment with Government Priorities: Non-Discretionary
Required for Ongoing Delivery of Mandatory Programs and Services

Yes, if: (Otherwise, not marked)

- Initiative is critical enabler for ongoing delivery of statutory programs and core services.
and/or
- Initiative forms core component of statutory program and service delivery.
and/or
- Initiative represents one or more mission critical systems.

Alignment with Government Priorities: Non-Discretionary
Government Commitment With Identified Time Frame

Yes, if: (Otherwise, not marked)

- Initiative funding approved in Budget Minute.
and/or
- Described in *detail* in the Throne Speech as a priority government initiative.
and/or
- Described in Throne Speech as a *critical* enabler of a priority government initiative.

Alignment with Government Priorities: Discretionary

Government Announcement – No Time Frame

Yes, if: (Otherwise, not marked)

- Delivers Government Priority of Success for Students — Higher literacy and math achievement and/or Lower high school drop-out rate.
and/or
- Delivers Government Priority of Better Health — Shorter waiting times for key services, and/or More families with access to primary health care, and/or Preventing illness, promoting wellness.
and/or
- Delivers Government Priority of Strong People, Strong Economy — Skilled workforce, and/or Competitive business environment, and/or Modern, efficient public services.
- Delivers Stronger, Safer Communities – Reduced Sprawl and/or More protection for Greenspace and/or Increased public transit ridership and/or More affordable housing and/or Making Ontarians safer in their communities and/or Enable young offenders to become contributing members of society and/or Make Ontario a safer place for victims of domestic violence and/or Better protect Ontario’s children.
and/or
- Delivers Stronger Democracy – More people contributing to democracy.

Alignment with Government Priorities: Discretionary

Delivers Harvestable Financial Benefits

Yes, if: (Otherwise, not marked)

- Savings exceed costs in current and/or subsequent fiscal year and will be deducted from Ministry’s allocation for that fiscal year, or provided as an internal offset toward other one-time pressures.
and/or
- Savings exceed costs in current and/or subsequent fiscal year and will be deducted from Ministry’s base allocation, or provided as an internal offset toward other base pressures.
and/or
- Revenue enhancements are expected within current and/or subsequent fiscal year and provided as an internal offset toward other one-time pressures.
and/or
- Ongoing revenue enhancements are expected within current and/or subsequent fiscal year and provided as an internal offset toward other base pressures.

Alignment with Government Priorities: Discretionary

Serves the Public Interest

Yes, if: (Otherwise, not marked)

- Serves a vital public interest, e.g., assisting vulnerable citizens, although it does not contribute directly to achievement of one of the Government Priorities.

Alignment with Government Priorities: Discretionary

Delivers OPS e-Ontario Strategy

Yes, if: (Otherwise, not marked)

- Contributes directly to achieving e-Ontario savings target and other objectives.
and/or
- Supports modernization within the OPS and/or new collaborative partnerships with the Broader Public Sector and other levels of government.

Quality of Proposed Solution and Business Case

Full Scope of Practical Alternatives Explored*

Score 4 if assessed as “Complete”, meaning:

- All possible options explored and summarized, description and business case (including cost-benefit analysis) presented for each option.
- RFI results or environmental scan/market analysis provided to substantiate approaches and costing of options.
- Ministry-recommended option fully compliant with corporate I&IT strategic directions.
- Ministry-recommended option is clearly superior to the others on all evaluation criteria.

Score 3 if assessed as “Almost Complete”, meaning:

- All possible options explored and summarized, description and business case (including cost-benefit analysis) presented for each option.
- Inadequate or missing substantiation of approaches and costing of options through RFI results, or environmental scan/market analysis.
- Ministry-recommended option fully compliant with corporate I&IT strategic directions.
- Ministry-recommended option is clearly superior to the others in most evaluation criteria.

Score 2 if assessed as “Partial”, meaning:

- All possible options explored and summarized; business case (including cost-benefit analysis) presented for Ministry-recommended option only.
- Ministry-recommended approach only partially compliant with corporate I&IT strategic directions.
- Ministry-recommended option is superior to others in about half the evaluation criteria.

Score 1 if assessed as “Two Only”, meaning:

- Only one option provided beyond Ministry-recommended option; no business case (including cost-benefit analysis) provided for any option.
- Ministry-recommended approach only partially compliant with corporate I&IT strategic directions.
- Ministry-recommended option is similar to the other option presented according to the evaluation criteria.

Score 0 if assessed as “One Only”, meaning:

- No options presented beyond Ministry-recommended option, i.e., no comparison to status quo or explanation of how this is better than “do nothing”; no business case (including cost-benefit analysis) provided for Ministry-recommended option.
- Ministry-recommended approach not compliant with corporate I&IT strategic directions.
- Ministry-recommended option is not rated against evaluation criteria.

* Note: For each score ALL requirements should be met or best fit used.

Quality of Proposed Solution and Business Case Readiness

Financial Benefits Exceed Costs*

Score 4 if assessed as “Fully Met”, meaning:

- Ministry-recommended option includes strong business case with detailed assumptions, demonstrating positive net financial benefit stream (i.e., financial benefits exceed costs), within four-year time horizon.
- Cost estimates related to the initiative are comprehensive and based on accepted methodology (e.g., MGS I&IT Costing Template, COCOMO II).
- Comprehensive solution presented, with detailed annual costs and financial benefits substantiating implementation strategy or initiative rollout schedule.
- Projections for long-term financial impacts and/or ongoing operations and maintenance costs detailed.
- Cost off-sets provided through de-commissioning of system being replaced, where relevant.
- Full costing provided per Costing and Pricing Directive.

Score 3 if assessed as “Almost Met”, meaning:

- Ministry-recommended option includes business case with assumptions, demonstrating positive net financial benefit stream (i.e., financial benefits exceed costs), beyond four-year time horizon, but less than eight years.
- Cost estimates related to the initiative are high level and based on accepted methodology (e.g., MGS IT Costing Template, COCOMO II).
- Solution presented with high-level annual costs and financial benefits mapped to implementation strategy or initiative rollout schedule.
- Projections for long-term financial impacts and/or ongoing operations and maintenance costs detailed.

Score 2 if assessed as “Partial”, meaning:

- Ministry-recommended option includes business case with detailed costs provided that show a positive net financial benefit stream (i.e., financial benefits exceed costs) exceeding eight years.
- Solution presented with only annual costs mapped to implementation strategy or initiative rollout schedule (annual financial benefits not provided).
- High level projections for long-term financial impacts and/or ongoing operations and maintenance costs are provided.

Score 1 if assessed as “Weak”, meaning:

- Ministry-recommended option includes only high-level cost estimates and unsubstantiated or intangible financial benefits.
- Solution presented with high-level annual costs.
- No consideration of ongoing costs related to initiative.

Score 0 if assessed as “Non-Existent”, meaning:

- Ministry-recommended option includes vague cost estimates and no financial benefits.
- Solution presented with no annual cost breakdown.
- No consideration of ongoing costs related to initiative.

*Note: For each score ALL requirements should be met or best fit used.

Quality of Proposed Solution and Business Case Readiness

Client Service Benefits*

Score 4 if assessed as “Fully Met”, meaning:

- Ministry-recommended option includes strong business case with detailed assumptions, demonstrating significant quantifiable client service benefits, e.g., over 50% improvement in turnaround or wait times, within two-year time horizon.
- Ministry-recommended option uses technology to provide a significant increase in access to services, including all of the following: from anywhere, anytime, and via any channel.

Score 3 if assessed as “Almost Met”, meaning:

- Ministry-recommended option includes business case with assumptions, demonstrating significant quantifiable client service benefits, e.g., over 50% improvement in turnaround or wait times, within four-year time horizon.
- Ministry-recommended option uses technology to provide a moderate increase in access to services, including any two of the following: from anywhere, anytime, via any channel.

Score 2 if assessed as “Partial”, meaning:

- Ministry-recommended option includes business case with detailed costs provided and moderate quantifiable client service benefits, e.g., 25%-50% improvement within four-year time horizon or 10%-25% improvement within two-year time horizon.
- Ministry-recommended option uses technology to provide an increase in access to services, including any one of the following: from anywhere, or anytime, or via any channel.

Score 1 if assessed as “Weak”, meaning:

- Ministry-recommended option includes only high-level cost estimates and moderate quantifiable client service benefits, e.g., 10%-25% improvement, within four-year time horizon.
- Ministry-recommended option uses technology to provide a limited increase in access to services: from more locations, or longer hours, or via more channels.

Score 0 if assessed as “Non-Existent”, meaning:

- Ministry-recommended option includes vague cost estimates and no quantifiable client service benefits, e.g., less than 10% improvement.
- Ministry-recommended option uses technology to provide a negligible increase or actual reduction in access to services, in terms of number of locations, or hours of operation, or choice of channels.

* Note: For each score ALL requirements should be met or best fit used.

Quality of Proposed Solution and Business Case Readiness **Enterprise Architecture & Technology Standards***

Score 4 if assessed as “Fully Compliant”, meaning:

- Full compliance with OPS Enterprise Architecture, Standards (GOITS) and ITSM principles, policies, and practices.
- All ARB (Architecture Review Board) requirements are met and approvals obtained (cluster and/or corporate) or project head has committed in writing to architectural governance process throughout the lifecycle of project.
- Enterprise architecture review approvals, deliverables and artifacts included as part of project deliverables.

Score 3 if assessed as “Significant Compliance”, meaning:

- Significant compliance with most OPS Enterprise Architecture, Standards (GOITS) and ITSM principles, policies, and practices.
- Project has successfully been approved with caveats or exemptions by Architecture Review Board (cluster and/or corporate) or project head has committed in writing to architectural governance process by a specific date.
- Enterprise architecture review approvals, deliverables and artifacts included as part of project deliverables.

Score 2 if assessed as “Partial Compliance”, meaning:

- Partial compliance with some OPS Enterprise Architecture, Standards (GOITS) and ITSM principles, policies, and practices.
- Project has not been approved by Architecture Review Board (cluster and/or corporate) or project head has not committed in writing to architectural governance process by a specific date.
- Enterprise architecture review approvals, deliverables and artifacts not included as part of project deliverables.

Score 1 if assessed as “Some Compliance”, meaning:

- Minimal compliance with OPS Enterprise Architecture, Standards (GOITS) and ITSM principles, policies, and practices.
- Project has not been approved by Architecture Review Board (cluster and/or corporate) or project head has not committed in writing to architectural governance process by a specific date.
- Enterprise architecture review approvals, deliverables and artifacts not included as part of project deliverables.

Score 0 if assessed as “Non-Compliant”, meaning:

- Project violates key OPS Enterprise Architecture, Standards (GOITS) and ITSM principles, policies, and practices.
- Not consistent with OPS architecture review processes and/or project has avoided architectural governance.
- Enterprise architecture review approvals, deliverables and artifacts not included as part of project deliverables.

* Note: For each score ALL requirements should be met or best fit used.

Quality of Proposed Solution and Business Case Readiness

Procurement Practices and Requirements*

Score 4 if assessed as “Fully Met”, meaning:

- Documented endorsement or approval, as applicable, from all required OPS procurement governance bodies.
- Proposed procurements follow all I&IT-related OPS procurement policies and practices.
- Submission documents that investigation has been done to identify any related procurements or procurement experiences in other ministries, and that all associated OPS procurement knowledge is being utilized.
- Project manager is trained on procurement process, develops procurement documentation along with the business area to ensure user requirements are well articulated, and process is fair, open and competitive.

Score 3 if assessed as “Almost Complete”, meaning:

- Proposed procurements have been vetted by all required OPS procurement governance bodies, with documented status of no major issues, and action plan to resolve remaining minor issues.
- Proposed procurements follow all I&IT-related OPS procurement policies and practices.
- Submission documents that investigation has been done to identify any related procurements or procurement experiences in other ministries, and that all associated OPS procurement knowledge is being utilized.
- Project manager develops procurement documentation along with the business area to ensure user requirements are well articulated, and process is fair, open and competitive.

Score 2 if assessed as “Partial”, meaning:

- Proposed procurements have been vetted by all required OPS procurement governance bodies, and remaining issues are documented with action plans for resolution.
- Proposed procurements follow all I&IT-related OPS procurement policies and practices.
- Submission documents that investigation has been done to identify related procurements or procurement experiences in other ministries, and that associated OPS procurement knowledge is being utilized.
- Project manager develops procurement documentation and process is fair, open and competitive.

Score 1 if assessed as “Weak”, meaning:

- Proposed procurements have been vetted by all required OPS procurement governance bodies, with major issues still under discussion.
- Proposed procurements violate one I&IT-related OPS procurement policies or practices.
- Submission indicates that investigation has been done to identify related procurements and procurement experiences in other ministries, but few details are provided on the findings and how the information has been used.
- Procurement develops procurement documentation and process is fair, open and competitive.

* Note: For each score ALL requirements should be met or best fit used.

Quality of Proposed Solution and Business Case Readiness

Procurement Practices and Requirements (Cont'd)

Score 0 if assessed as “Not Addressed”, meaning:

- Proposed procurements have not yet been vetted by required OPS procurement governance bodies.
- Proposed procurements violate several I&IT-related OPS procurement policies or practices.
- No evidence that investigation has been done to identify related procurements and procurement practices in other ministries.
- Unjustified single or sole sourcing proposed.

* Note: For each score ALL requirements should be met or best fit used.

Quality of Proposed Solution and Business Case Readiness

Human Resources (HR) Strategies, Policies and Requirements*

Score 4 if assessed as “Fully Met”, meaning:

- A high-level human resources plan has been developed as part of the planning for the initiative and the development of the submission, with sign-off by HR directors in all affected ministries.
- All labour relations implications of the proposed solution have been identified and addressed in the high-level human resources plan, including fit with/impacts on existing collective agreements.
- A comprehensive staffing, deployment/redeployment, and learning & development plan for the proposed solution is included in the high-level human resources plan.
- A comprehensive communication plan to staff impacted by the initiative has been developed as part of the high-level human resources plan, reviewed by Cabinet Office if relevant, and submitted with the MB20.
- A comprehensive change management plan has been developed.

Score 3 if assessed as “Almost Complete”, meaning:

- Any four of the above.

Score 2 if assessed as “Partial”, meaning:

- Any three of the above.

Score 1 if assessed as “Weak”, meaning:

- Any one or two of the above.

Score 0 if assessed as “Non-Existent”, meaning:

- None of the above.

* Note: For each score ALL requirements should be met or best fit used.

Quality of Proposed Solution and Business Case Readiness

Performance Measures*

Score 4 if assessed as “Linked to Government Priorities”, meaning:

- Performance measures provided include outcome and output measures.
- Performance measures provided are essential enablers of program and/or Ministry level outcome measures.
- Measures are well documented, quantifiable, measured and tracked.

Score 3 if assessed as “Outcome Measures”, meaning:

- Performance measures provided include outcome and output measures.
- Performance measures provided are essential enablers of program and/or Ministry level outcome measures.
- Measures are well documented but no tracking mechanisms in place.

Score 2 if assessed as “Output Measures Only”, meaning:

- Performance measures provided are considered output measures only.
- Performance measures provided are essential enablers of program and/or Ministry level output measures (but not outcome measures).
- Measures are well documented and tracked.

Score 1 if assessed as “Development Plans Only”, meaning:

- Ministry in process of developing performance measures for project or initiative.
- Intention to align project or initiative performance measures with existing program and/or Ministry level outcome-based performance measures or government priority results.

Score 0 if assessed as “None”, meaning:

- No performance measures for project or initiative are in development.
- No intention to align project or initiative performance measures with existing program and/or Ministry level outcome-based performance measures or government priority results.

* Note: For each score ALL requirements should be met or best fit used.

Scope of Risk and Risk Management

\$ Size of Proposed Project*

Score 4 if assessed as “Lower Risk”, meaning:

- Less than \$15 million
or
- Phases are each less than \$15 million, with discrete deliverables and off-ramps built into vendor contracts.

Score 3 if assessed as “Increased Risk”, meaning:

- \$15-\$30 million
or
- Phases are each \$15-\$30 million, with discrete deliverables and off-ramps built into vendor contracts.

Score 2 if assessed as “Escalating Risk”, meaning:

- Greater than \$30 million but less than \$60 million size, without being divided into phases of <\$30 million and discrete deliverables and off-ramps built into vendor contracts.

Score 1 if assessed as “High Risk”, meaning:

- Greater than \$60 million but less than \$120 million size, without being divided into phases of <\$30 million and discrete deliverables and off-ramps built into vendor contracts.

Score 0 if assessed as “Highest Risk”, meaning:

- Greater than \$120 million, without being divided into phases of <\$30 million and discrete deliverables and off-ramps built into vendor contracts.

* Note: For each score ALL requirements should be met or best fit used.

Scope of Risk and Risk Management **Duration of Proposed Project***

Score 4 if assessed as “Lower Risk”, meaning:

- Less than 1 year in duration
or
- Phases are each less than 1 year in duration, with discrete deliverables and off-ramps built into vendor contracts.

Score 3 if assessed as “Increased Risk”, meaning:

- 1 year to 18 months in duration
or
- Phases are each 1 year to 18 months in duration, with discrete deliverables and off-ramps built into vendor contracts.

Score 2 if assessed as “Escalating Risk”, meaning:

- Greater than 18 months but less than 24 months in duration
or
- Phases are each greater than 18 months but less than 24 months in duration, with discrete deliverables and off-ramps built into vendor contracts.

Score 1 if assessed as “High Risk”, meaning:

- Greater than 24 months in duration, with discrete deliverables and off-ramps built into vendor contracts.

Score 0 if assessed as “Highest Risk”, meaning:

- Greater than 24 months in duration, without discrete deliverables and off-ramps built into vendor contracts.

* Note: For each score ALL requirements should be met or best fit used.

Scope of Risk and Risk Management

Technology for Project*

Score 4 if assessed as “Lowest Risk”, meaning:

- Technology is well-tested in the OPS, with successful implementation on major projects.
- OPS has developed best practices for using the technology, aligned with industry best practices, and the best practices are widely used in the OPS.
- OPS standards for the technology have been developed and approved.
- Technology is mature and stable and is expected to evolve continuously in terms of price/performance, according to research advisory groups.
- Ministry-recommended option is to buy with no customization.

Score 3 if assessed as “Low Risk”, meaning:

- Technology is relatively new in the OPS but it is well-tested in other large organizations on major projects, and the OPS has obtained information from their experiences.
- Best practices for using the technology have been developed in other organizations, and the OPS has obtained that best practice information and intends to use it.
- Industry standards for the technology have been developed and will be used.
- Technology is stable and expected to evolve continuously, according to research groups.
- Ministry-recommended option is to buy with some customization.

Score 2 if assessed as “Moderate Risk”, meaning:

- Technology is relatively new but other organizations have used it successfully on major projects, and the OPS has obtained information from their experiences.
- Best practices are being developed for using the technology, and the OPS is linked in.
- Industry standards for the technology are being developed.
- Technology is expected to evolve continuously, according to research advisory groups.
- Ministry-recommended option is to buy with extensive customization.

Score 1 if assessed as “High Risk”, meaning:

- Technology is new, but other organizations are choosing it for major new projects.
- Need for best practices is recognized but must come from first full implementations.
- Need for industry standards is recognized, and standards development is being initiated.
- Technology is expected to succeed in the marketplace, according to research groups.
- Ministry-recommended option is to build new.

Score 0 if assessed as “Very High Risk”, meaning:

- Technology has not yet been used anywhere on a major project.
- Usage guidelines are evolving as technology deployment increases.
- Product implementations of the technology are the only “standards” at this time.
- Future success of the technology is yet to be determined, according to research groups.
- Ministry-recommended option does not include a recommendation on buy or build.

* Note: For each score ALL requirements should be met or best fit used.

Scope of Risk and Risk Management

Business Impact / Scope of Change*

Score 4 if assessed as “Very Low Risk”, meaning:

- Success of I&IT project does not depend upon business reengineering or increases in HR capacity; existing processes, organizational structure, and human resources are capable of supporting the system.
- No impact upon ministry’s divisions, or other related organizations.
- Does not involve changeover from legacy business approach.
- Does not require significant testing or training for users.
- No impact upon business continuity.

Score 3 if assessed as “Low Risk”, meaning:

- I&IT project being considered is somewhat dependent upon business reengineering or increases in HR capacity; existing processes, organizational structure, and/or human resources require minor changes in order to support the system.
- Low degree of impact upon ministry’s divisions, or other related organizations.
- Minimal impact upon business continuity.

Score 2 if assessed as “Moderate Risk”, meaning:

- I&IT project being considered is highly dependent upon significant business reengineering and/or significant increases in HR capacity; a significant increase is needed either in staffing or in capabilities to support the new system, and/or process reengineering and organizational redesign are needed.
- Introducing new technology to a small un-tested/un-trained user group.
- Involves some change to entrenched legacy business approach.
- Some degree of impact upon ministry’s divisions, or other related organizations.
- Business continuity issues need to be addressed and managed.

Score 1 if assessed as “High Risk”, meaning:

- Success of I&IT project is entirely dependent upon large or significant business reengineering and/or increases in HR capacity; a significant increase is needed in both staffing and capabilities to support the new system, and/or process reengineering and organizational redesign are needed.
- Introducing new technology to an un-tested/un-trained user group.
- Involves significant change to entrenched legacy business approach.
- High degree of impact upon ministry’s divisions, or other related organizations.
- Business continuity is at risk but comprehensive plan has been developed to address it; revised business continuity plan represents no significant additional cost to the organization.

Scope of Risk and Risk Management

Business Impact / Scope of Change* (Cont'd)

Score 0 if assessed as “Very High Risk”, meaning:

- Success of I&IT project is entirely dependent upon significant business reengineering and/or significant increases in HR capacity; specialized resources are needed to support the system, and/or process reengineering and organizational redesign are needed.
- Introducing new technology to an un-tested/un-trained user group.
- Involves significant change to entrenched legacy business approach.
- High degree of impact upon ministry’s divisions, or other related organizations.
- Represents changes to multiple channels with multiple interdependencies, affecting other projects within the ministry and/or cluster.
- Business continuity is at risk and there is no plan to address it; for instance, payments to a vulnerable client group would stop if system goes down.

* Note: For each score ALL requirements should be met or best fit used.

Scope of Risk and Risk Management

Stakeholder / Constituency Impact**

Score 4 if assessed as “Very Low Risk”, meaning:

- No apparent stakeholder and/or constituent issues within submission.
- No apparent potential for media or external communications issues to arise.

Score 3 if assessed as “Low Risk”, meaning:

- Ministry-recommended option is unlikely to meet with opposition by stakeholders and/or constituents.
- Proposal is unrelated to pre-existing Ministry and/or broader OPS-level concerns.
- Low likelihood of escalation through MPP, Minister, and Premier’s Offices by stakeholders and/or constituents if Ministry recommended option is approved.
- Low likelihood of negative media exposure through escalation by stakeholders and/or constituents if Ministry recommended option is approved.

Score 2 if assessed as “Moderate Risk”, meaning:

- Ministry-recommended option may meet with opposition from a small minority of stakeholders and/or constituents, e.g., clients or taxpayers.
- Proposal is indirectly related to more sensitive or high-risk pre-existing Ministry and/or broader OPS-level concerns.
- Likelihood of escalation through MPP, Minister, and Premier’s Offices by a small minority of stakeholders and/or constituents if Ministry-recommended option is approved.
- Moderate likelihood of negative media exposure — within low-reach publications or local or trade-specific media outlets — by stakeholders and/or constituents if Ministry-recommended option is approved.
- Moderate potential for intervention of Premier’s Office/Cabinet Office.

Score 1 if assessed as “High Risk”, meaning:

- Ministry-recommended option will meet with potentially sizeable stakeholder and/or constituency opposition, e.g., unions and professional organizations.
- Political sensitivity to issue already exists at Ministry and/or broader OPS-level.
- Proposal can be perceived as contradictory to a stated Government Priority.
- Likelihood of escalation through MPP, Minister, and Premier’s Offices by stakeholders and/or constituents if Ministry-recommended option is approved.
- Likelihood of negative media exposure by stakeholders and/or constituents if Ministry-recommended option is approved.
- High potential for intervention of Premier’s Office/Cabinet Office.

Scope of Risk and Risk Management

Stakeholder / Constituency Impact ** (Cont'd)

Score 0 if assessed as “Very High Risk”, meaning:

- Ministry-recommended option will meet with broad and grave stakeholder and/or constituency opposition, e.g., strikes, protest marches.
- Very high political sensitivity to issue already exists at Ministry and/or broader OPS-level.
- Proposal is in direct contradiction to a stated Government Priority.
- Very high likelihood of immediate escalation through MPP, Minister, and Premier’s Offices by stakeholders and/or constituents if Ministry-recommended option is approved.
- Very high likelihood of unsavoury immediate media exposure by stakeholders and/or constituents if Ministry-recommended option is approved.
- High potential for intervention of Premier’s Office/Cabinet Office.

** Note: For each score ONLY ONE (the lowest) criterion needs to be met to achieve the score.

Scope of Risk and Risk Management

Privacy and Security Assessments*

MANDATORY REQUIREMENT FOR ALL RISK LEVELS: Regardless of the risk level, or the number of criteria that have been met, it is mandatory for the program and senior management of the business area to sign off and accept the risk on the Threat Risk Assessment. If the risk has not been accepted then the project will not be recommended to go forward to Cabinet for funding.

Score 4 if assessed as “Lowest Risk”, meaning:

For Privacy:

- Privacy risks of proposed solution have been fully identified, including completion of a Privacy Impact Assessment, and the risks are well-understood in the privacy community.
- Privacy risks of proposed solution have been fully resolved, including consultation with MGS Access and Privacy Office and, if appropriate, the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner, with signed-off agreement on the risks and approaches for mitigation.

For Security:

- There is no access to the information system from external business partners or citizens.
- A security risk assessment has been completed which identifies the sensitivity of the information that will reside on or can be accessed by the technology.
- The technology is available from a wide range of reputable vendors with excellent support.
- Appropriate administrative, personnel, physical, logical and technical controls are included in the architecture and design of the project and will be implemented.
- A service level agreement has been developed that outlines the security requirements for hosting if appropriate.
- Risk mitigation strategies have been identified or developed for business continuity and disaster recovery planning.
- Senior Management of the business have signed off on and accepted the residual risk.

Score 3 if assessed as “Low Risk”, meaning:

For Privacy:

- Privacy risks of proposed solution have been fully identified, including completion of a Privacy Impact Assessment, and the risks are well-understood in the privacy community.
- Privacy risks of proposed solution have been fully discussed, including consultation with MGS Access and Privacy Office and, if appropriate, the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner, with documented agreement on the risks and approaches for mitigation.

For Security:

- There is no access to the information system from external business partners or citizens.
- A security risk assessment has been completed which identifies the sensitivity of the information that will reside on or can be accessed by the technology.
- Appropriate administrative, personnel, physical, logical and technical controls are included in the architecture and design of the project and will be implemented.
- A service level agreement has been developed that outlines the security requirements for hosting if appropriate.
- Risk mitigation strategies have been identified or developed for business continuity and disaster recovery planning.
- Senior Management of the business have signed off on and accepted the residual risk.

Scope of Risk and Risk Management

Privacy and Security Assessments* (Cont'd)

Score 2 if assessed as “Moderate Risk”, meaning:

For Privacy:

- Privacy risks of proposed solution have been identified, including completion of a Privacy Impact Assessment, and the risks are not new to the privacy community, e.g., not unique to the proposed solution.
- Privacy risks of proposed solution have been fully discussed, including consultation with MGS Access and Privacy Office and, if appropriate, the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner, with documented agreement on the risks and approaches for mitigation.

For Security:

- The project is intended to deliver service in such a way that access is required for business partners and/or citizens.
- A security risk assessment has been completed which identifies the sensitivity of the information that will reside on or can be accessed by the technology
- Appropriate administrative, personnel, physical, logical and technical controls are included in the architecture and design of the project and will be implemented.
- Risk mitigation strategies have been identified or developed for business continuity and disaster recovery planning.
- Senior Management of the business have signed off on and accepted the residual risk.

Score 1 if assessed as “High Risk”, meaning:

For Privacy:

- Privacy risks of proposed solution have been identified, including completion of a Privacy Impact Assessment, and the risks are new to the privacy community and are currently a topic of extensive discussion and study.
- or
- Privacy risks of proposed solution have not been fully identified, e.g., Privacy Impact Assessment is not yet complete.
- Privacy risks of proposed solution have been discussed with MGS Access and Privacy Office, and legal aspects of privacy requirements have been met.

For Security:

- The project is intended to deliver service in such a way that access is required for business partners and/or citizens.
- A security risk assessment has been completed which identifies the sensitivity of the information that will reside on or can be accessed by the technology as high or medium sensitivity, where the consequences of ‘harm or injury’ could be great if there is unauthorized access or release.
- Not all of the control factors have been addressed in the architecture and design of the project e.g., may have logical and technical but not physical and personnel.
- A service level agreement has **not** been developed that outlines the security requirements for hosting if appropriate.
- Risk mitigation strategies **have not** been identified or developed for business continuity or disaster recovery planning.
- Senior Management of the business **have not** signed off on and accepted the residual risk.

Scope of Risk and Risk Management

Privacy and Security Assessments* (Cont'd)

Score 0 if assessed as “Very High Risk”, meaning:

For Privacy:

- Privacy risks of proposed solution have not been fully identified, e.g., Privacy Impact Assessment is not yet complete.
- Only preliminary discussions on privacy risks of proposed solution with MGS Access and Privacy Office, and adherence to legal requirements of privacy legislation has not yet been confirmed.

For Security:

- The project is intended to deliver service in such a way that access is required for business partners and/or citizens.
- The sensitivity of the information that will reside on or be connected to the technology **has not** been classified to determine ‘harm and injury’ potential.
- The vendor for the technology is single source.
- Not all of the control factors have been addressed in the architecture and design of the project e.g., may have logical and technical but not physical and personnel.
- A service level agreement has **not** been developed that outlines the security requirements for hosting if appropriate.
- Risk mitigation strategies **have not** been identified or developed for business continuity or disaster recovery planning.
- Senior Management of the business **have not** signed off on and accepted the residual risk.

* Note: For each score ALL requirements should be met or best fit used.

Scope of Risk and Risk Management

Implementation Strategy*

Score 4 if assessed as “Fully Met”, meaning:

- Comprehensive and rigorous implementation strategy provided that: aligns with business case, annual cost and benefit estimates, FTE and procurement requests.
- Includes resource-loaded project schedule with an accepted monitoring and control plan (based on Earned Value).
- Implementation strategy considers inter-project (or inter-program) dependencies.
- Project has a risk management plan that identifies and addresses risks.
- Uses required project methodology (i.e., [IPMFM](#)).
- Project deliverables are fully detailed, and interim and final milestones are fully described.
- Implementation strategy follows an incremental or modular approach, with discrete interim deliverables, and off-ramps.

Score 3 if assessed as “Mostly Complete”, meaning:

- Comprehensive and rigorous implementation strategy provided that: aligns with annual cost and benefit estimates, FTE and procurement requests.
- Implementation strategy provides incomplete identification of inter-project (or inter-program) dependencies.
- Project has a risk management plan that identifies and addresses risks.
- Uses required project methodology (i.e., [IPMFM](#)).
- Project deliverables are fully detailed, and interim and final milestones are fully described.
- Implementation strategy follows an incremental or modular approach, through interim deliverables, and off-ramps are only vaguely described.

Score 2 if assessed as “Partial”, meaning:

- Detailed implementation strategy provided that aligns with annual cost estimates.
- Lack of detail or alignment between implementation strategy and FTE and/or procurement requests.
- Inter-project (or inter-program) dependencies are not identified or addressed.
- Does not use accepted project methodology.
- Project deliverables are detailed, but interim/final milestones are not well described.
- Implementation strategy does not follow a modular approach with off-ramps.

Score 1 if assessed as “Weak”, meaning:

- High-level implementation strategy only is provided.
- No alignment of implementation strategy or deliverables against project or program cost projections.
- Lack of detail or alignment between implementation strategy and FTE and/or procurement requests.
- Inter-project (or inter-program) dependencies are not identified or addressed.
- Project deliverables and/or end-state are described only vaguely.
- Interim and/or final milestones are poorly defined.
- Implementation strategy does not follow a modular approach with off-ramps.
- No project methodology referenced.

Scope of Risk and Risk Management

Implementation Strategy* (Cont'd)

Score 0 if assessed as “Not Addressed”, meaning:

- No implementation strategy provided (i.e., “Back of the envelope” approach).
- No alignment of implementation strategy or deliverables against project or program cost projections.
- Project deliverables and/or end-state are not described.
- No project methodology referenced.

* Note: For each score ALL requirements should be met or best fit used.

Scope of Risk and Risk Management Capacity Assessment (Use Tool)

Score 4 if assessed as “Lowest”, meaning:

- 20%-35%***

Score 3 if assessed as “Low”, meaning:

- 36%-52%

Score 2 if assessed as “Moderate”, meaning:

- 53%-68%

Score 1 if assessed as “High”, meaning:

- 69%-84%

Score 0 if assessed as “Very High”, meaning:

- 85%-100%

***There are 24 questions in the Capacity Assessment tool. The lowest possible score is 24; the highest possible score is 120. $24/120 = 20\%$. Therefore the range is 20% to 100%.

Scope of Risk and Risk Management

Leadership and Governance Structures for Project*

Score 4 if assessed as “Complete”, meaning:

- Deputy Minister (DM)-level project sponsorship and/or DM included in project governance structure for projects over \$60M or with corporate government impacts; Assistant Deputy Minister (ADM)-level project sponsorship and/or ADM included in project governance structure for \$10 - \$60M projects and without corporate government impacts.
- At least Director-led project Operational (or Advisory) governance committee.
- CIO or delegate plays key role in all governance committees.
- For procurements over \$60M, third-party observer hired to ensure fair vendor selection and/or transparent two-stage procurement process adhered to.
- Well-outlined issues resolution process in place.
- Plans to provide quarterly project status updates to DM and CIO for projects over \$60M or ADM and CIO for projects between \$10-\$60M.
- Transparent accountability that is assigned to one individual at the highest level.
- Same people expected to sponsor and manage the project from beginning to end.

Score 3 if assessed as “Almost Complete”, meaning:

- ADM-level project sponsorship for projects over \$60M or with corporate government impacts. Director-level project sponsorship for \$10 - \$60M projects and without corporate government impacts.
- Director-led project Operational (or Advisory) governance committee
- CIO or delegate plays key role in all governance committees.
- Well-outlined issues resolution process in place.
- Quarterly project status updates provided to ADM level and CIO for projects over \$60M or Director and CIO for projects between \$10-\$60M.
- Local and transparent accountability that is shared at the highest level.
- Same person expected to either sponsor or manage the project from beginning to end.

Score 2 if assessed as “Partial”, meaning:

- Director-level project sponsorship for projects over \$60M or with corporate government impacts. At least Senior Manager-level project sponsorship for \$10- \$60M projects and without corporate government impacts.
- Senior Manager-led project Operational (or Advisory) governance committee.
- Role of Cluster and CIO is not outlined.
- No issues resolution process is outlined.
- Annual project status updates to Ministry Senior Executives.
- Plan to provide localized and transparent accountability are shared among multiple organizations.

Scope of Risk and Risk Management

Leadership and Governance Structures for Project* (Cont'd)

Score 1 if assessed as “Weak”, meaning:

- Senior Manager-level project sponsorship for projects over \$60M or with corporate government impacts. At least Manager-level project sponsorship for \$10 - \$60M projects and without corporate government impacts.
- No project governance committees.
- Role of Cluster and CIO is not outlined.
- No issues resolution process is outlined.
- No project status updates planned with Ministry Senior Executives.
- Weak locus of control and shared accountability

Score 0 if assessed as “None”, meaning:

- Project championship/sponsorship not described.
- No project governance committees.
- Role of Cluster and CIO is not outlined.
- No issues resolution process is outlined.
- No project status updates planned with Ministry Senior Executives.
- Weak locus of control and shared accountability.
- No plan for keeping same project sponsor and/or manager.

* Note: For each score ALL requirements should be met or best fit used.