# **Organizational Feasibility**

* **Will the organization use what is requested?**
  + Yes. The Community Engagement team is small and eager to use the system to decrease their manual workload.
* **Will end users adopt the system?**
  + One potential area of friction is adoption by end users. The department will have to inform the community about the system by distributing marketing materials and partnering with local libraries, schools, etc. to assist in promotion. However, the community is young and tech-savvy; once made aware of the application, adoption is likely to be high.
* **Will the management support the project?** 
  + The project has support at all levels of County management. The creation of the application will align with the Department’s initiative to promote physical activity and foster a sense of community
* **Is there a champion for the Project?**
  + The Department’s Director of Community Engagement is the primary stakeholder and project champion. She is committed to ensuring that the project has the internal resources necessary to succeed.

# Technical Feasibility:

* **Familiarity with application**:
  + The general public has more and more interaction with technology by the day. Matchmaking services are common in online game systems, and are themselves based on things like traditional sports brackets, which many people are familiar with. Keeping these models in mind also serves as a point of familiarity for the development team. Digital forms, such as for account creation or surveys, are familiar concepts and are a large portion of the application's interface. However, this is mostly applicable to users 16-55. Outside of this age range the risk is increased.
* **Familiarity with technology**:
  + The project is based on a SQL database, .NET and Sencha Ext JS. SQL is already in use within the Department for inventory and HR management, and .NET is a common technology that most of the internal development team has experience with. Sencha Ext JS is well documented and has extensive use in enterprise technology, but does introduce minor risk.
* **Project size**:
  + The project consists of a user and spaces database, a web front end, and a .NET backend. The development team needed to manage this is fairly small - at most six developers. Two front end developers, two back end developers, one database architect, and one senior full stack engineer. The development can start with a single front end developer, single back end developer, and senior full stack engineer and then scale up as needed.   
      
    At the beginning stages of development there will not be a need for extensive graphic design until prototyping is over, however after initial prototyping a design consultant will be needed.  
      
    Thorough testing will be necessary for this project, and towards the end of the project timeline at least one full time test engineer should be added to the project.
* **Compatibility**:
  + The project  will need access to any other scheduling stores that are in use for the Department, such as party rentals, Department run children's sports, after school services and community events. These are already stored in a SQL database so integration is trivial.
* Overall, the project is narrow in scope and presents low risk, as it primarily uses technologies already in use by the Department, is based on familiar models to users, and requires a small development team. Because the project is not beholden to a hard deadline - there are no other services which depend on this one, the project also does not risk tying up development resources that may be needed elsewhere.

# **Risk assessment score sheet**

1. How long will it take to implement the game matchmaker?

X 1 to 6 months ……………………………………………………………………………….. 1

7 to 9 months ………………………………………………………………………………. 10

10 to 12 months ….………………………………………………………………………… 50

13 to 18 months ……………………………………………………………………………. 100

19 to 24 months …………………………………………………………………………… 250

Greater than 24 months ………………..………………………………………………….. 500

1. What is the estimated project cost?

$25,000 to 75,000 ………………………………………………………………………… 1

**X** $75,001 to $150,000 ………………………………………………………………….. 10

$150,0001 to 250,00 ………………………………………………………………….. 50

$250,001 to 500,000 ………………………………………………………………… 100

$500,001 to 1,000,000 ………….…………………………………………………… 250

$1,000,001 to 3,000,000 ………….………………………………………………… 500

Greater than $3,000,000 ………….………………………………………………….1000

1. Degree of anticipated change to existing business processes:

Low ….……………………………………………………………………………….. 1

Medium.………………………………………………………………………………. 10

High.………………………………………………………………………………….. 100

X Very High …………………………………………………………………………….. 250

1. Number of employees impacted by the system:

1 to 20 …………………………………………………………………………………. 1

21 to 50...…..…………………………………………………………………………… 10

X 51 to 100 ……………………………………………………………………………….. 50

101 to 250 ……………………………………………………………………………… 100

b 251 to 500 ……………………………………………………………………………… 250

501 to 1,000 …………………………………………………………………………… 500

Greater than 1,000 ……………………………..………………………………………. 1000

1. Number of agencies impacted by the system:

1 ………………………………………………………………………………………… 1

2 to 3 …………………………………………………………………………………….. 50

4 to 8 ………………………….………………………………………………………… 100

X Greater 8 …………………………..……………………………………………………. 250

1. Anticipated user attitude to the new system:

X Very Favorable …………………………………………………………………………. 1

Favorable ………………………………………………………………………………. 10

Neutral ………………………………………………………………………………….. 100

Unfavorable …………………………….……………………………………………….. 250

Very unfavorable ………………………………..……………………………………… 500

1. Number of existing applications that must receive data from the new system:

0 …………………………………………………………………………………………. 1

1 …………………………………………………………………………………………. 10

2 to 3 ……………………….…………………………………………………………... 100

X 4 to 5 ……………………………………………………………………………………. 250

Greater than 5 ………………………..…………………………………………………. 500

1. Volume of required data to be converted from existing system to new system:

X None ………………….………………………………………………………………… 1

1 to 10,000 records ……………………………...……………………………………… 10

10,001 to 50,000 records ………………………………………..……………………… 50

50,001 to 100,000 records ………………………………....…………………………….100

100,001 to 250,000 records …………………………………………………………….. 250

Greater than 250,000 records ………………………………….……………………….. 500

1. Complexity of the required conversion:

X No conversion required ………………………………………….………………………...1

Low …………………………………….…………………………………………………100

Medium …………………………………….……………………………………………. 250

High ……………………………………………………………………………………… 500

1. Will the system be implemented with an of the shelf system?

Partial ……………………………………………………………………………………. 100

Total ………………………………………………………………………………………. 250

X No …………………………………………………………………………………………. 500

1. Has the organization implemented similar system in size and complexity in the past?

X Yes …………………………………………………………………………………………. 1

No ………………….……………………………………………………………………… 500

1. Project team’s level of experience with the business being impacted:

X High ………………………………………………………………………………………… 1

Medium ……………………………...……………………………………………………. 100

Low ………….……………………………………………………………………………. 250

1. OIT staffs experience implementing systems with similar technologies:

X High ………………………………………………………………………………………… 1

Medium …………………………………………………………………………………….100

Low ………………………………………………………………………………………... 250

1. Senior executives’ support in the impacted agencies:

X High ………………………………………………………………………………………… 1

Medium …………………...………………………………………………………………. 100

Low …………….…………………………………………………………………………. 500

1. Other external entity such as the state is involved in the project:

X No external entity involved …………………………………….…………………………. 1

External entity is playing a minor role……………………………………………………. 250

External entity is an equal partner in the project.…………………………………………. 500

External entity is primarily in control of the project.…………………………………… 1000

Project score: 1319

Risk assessment based on the project score:

Very Low….…….………………………………………………………………. 113 to 1,000

X Low …….……………………………………………………………………….1,0001 to 2,500

Medium …………...….………………………………………………………….2,501 to 5,000

High …...…………….………………………………………………………….5,001 to 6,500

Very High …….…….………………………………………………………….6,501 to 7,750

Based on the risk analysis and assessment score of 1319, the project falls in the category of low risk. Therefore, the project has a higher chance of success to implement.