

455 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102-3688 Tel 415-865-4200 TDD 415-865-4272 Fax 415-865-4205 www.courts.ca.gov

HON. TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE Chief Justice of California Chair of the Judicial Council

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO Administrative Director, Judicial Council

#### TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

HON. JAMES E. HERMAN Chair

HON. DAVID DE ALBA Vice-chair

Hon. Ming W. Chin Mr. Mark G. Bonino Hon. Daniel J. Buckley Hon. Emilie H. Elias Mr. Richard D. Feldstein Hon. Gary Nadler

# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

Date January 23, 2015

**To** The Judicial Council Technology Committee

#### From

Hon. James E. Herman, Chair, Judicial Council Technology Committee

#### Subject

Modoc request for Case Management System configuration changes Action Requested Please vote

 $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Deadline} \\ N/A \end{array}$ 

Contact Judge Herman jherman@sbcourts.org

Virginia Sanders-Hinds, Judicial Council Information Technology (IT) (415) 865-4617 <u>Virginia.Sanders-</u> <u>Hinds@jud.ca.gov</u>

David Koon, Judicial Council IT (415) 865-4618 <u>David.Koon@jud.ca.gov</u>

The purpose of this memorandum is to request the Judicial Council Technology Committee review and vote on the recommendation concerning the following item:

# **Request from the Modoc Superior Court to Update Sustain Justice Edition** (SJE) Accounting Configuration.

The Modoc Court has requested the JCC's assistance to modify their SJE configuration to include the ability to perform top down distribution of fees and fines. The top down distribution of fees/fines occurs when a defendant appears before a judge and the judge sentences the defendant to pay a total fine amount.

Without SJE being configured to perform top down distribution of fees/fines, the base fine must be manually calculated from the total fine amount assessed in the courtroom. This increases the risk of error and inaccurate distributions as well as being less efficient.

January 23, 2015 Page 2

Making the requested modification to the SJE configuration is estimated to take 100 hours of JCC IT staff resource time and have an external consultant cost of \$11,500. Attached for your reference is a project assessment form for the requested Modoc Top Down Accounting Project. As this request exceeds 50 hours of JCC resource time, it requires JCTC approval.

#### **Recommendation:**

The recommendation is to approve the request from the Modoc Court.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

James E. Herman, Chair Technology Committee

Attachment

Modoc top down accounting



#### JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

This form is used by ITSO to describe, size, and categorize requests as small, medium, or large. For small projects, it is also used to document impact and risk analyses, and to obtain project approval from the appropriate change board.

### 1 PROJECT REQUEST: 0076



PR\_SJE\_Modoc Top C

| Project Name            | Modoc top down accounting.   |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Requirements            | Modify Modoc's existing base up accounting configuration to also include top down accounting configuration.  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach                | Contract with Donna Argo to create the requirements, configuration changes and testing.  |  |  |  |  |
| Alternatives            | Continue as is. Court is using the existing base-up accounting configuration and then manually adjusting the amounts to be top down accounting.  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Contract with Donna Argo to create requirements, configuration changes and testing.  |  |  |  |  |
| Workarounds             | Court is using the existing base-up accounting configuration and then manually adjusting the amounts to be top down accounting.  |  |  |  |  |
| Assumptions/Constraints | Constraint: Resource constraints: 1. Donna Argo work must be incorporated into Donna Argo's other contractual work 2. Judicial Council resources –this work will have to be incorporated into other SJE program priorities. 3. Court resources—Modoc is a small court and resources are sometimes redirected to production/court operation issues. |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Assumption: We can re-use much of the other court's top-down accounting configurations.  |  |  |  |  |
| Risks                   | Work must be incorporated into the other SJE program priorities.<br>Other accounting issues could be identified during requirements gathering creating additional scope to fix.  |  |  |  |  |

#### 2 REQUEST APPROACH (To be completed by App/Infra Lead)

## **3 ROUGH ORDER OF MAGNITUDE (ROM) ESTIMATES**

(To be completed by App/Infra Lead and, if applicable, Infra Architect based on preliminary estimates.)

#### 3.1 LEVEL OF EFFORT (LOE)

| Functional Area <sup>1</sup>    | Est Hrs <sup>2</sup> |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| ICMS Application and PM support | 30                   |
| Donna Argo                      | 80                   |
| Total:                          | 110                  |

<sup>1</sup>LOE can be provided by area or for entire effort <sup>2</sup>Hours; for CCTC-hosted apps/infra, also inc. SAIC hours

15 hrs for application support and 15 for project management.

Requirements, configuration & testing.

Modoc top down accounting



#### JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

#### 3.2 DURATION

Months expected to take once approved, per resource availability, other priorities, etc.

Est Mos<sup>1</sup> 3 months <sup>1</sup>Months; for CCTC-hosted apps/infra, also inc. SAIC months

#### 3.3 COSTS<sup>1,2</sup>

When completing this section, note that costs included here are intended to be **rough order of magnitude** ones, i.e., high-level, bestguess estimates per what may be limited on-hand information, for specific use in helping to determine the project category. The intent is **not** for detailed numbers to which project and/or collaborating SME resources are to be held accountable beyond the assessment itself; rather, project costs shall be revisited in more detail in the Business Case, if a project is approved.

| Cost Category     | Application                   |       | Infrastructure |                      | Commonto                                     |  |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|-------|----------------|----------------------|--|--|
| Cost Category     | One-Time Ongoing <sup>3</sup> |       | One-Time       | Ongoing <sup>3</sup> | Comments                                     |  |
| Hardware          | N/A                           | N/A   | N/A            | N/A                  |  |  |
| Software          | N/A                           | N/A   | N/A            | N/A                  |  |  |
| Telecomms         | N/A                           | N/A   | N/A            | N/A                  |  |  |
| Contract Srvcs    | \$11,500.00                   | N/A   | N/A            | N/A                  | \$10,000 for Donna Argo and \$1,500 for JCC. |  |
| CCTC Data Center  | N/A.                          | N/A   | N/A            | N/A                  |  |  |
| Agency Facilities | N/A                           | N/A   | N/A            | N/A                  |  |  |
| Other (specify)   | N/A                           | N/A   | N/A            | N/A                  |  |  |
| Sub-Totals        | N/A                           | N/A   | N/A            | N/A                  |  |  |
|                   |                               |       |                |                      | •  |  |
| One-Time Total    | \$11,50                       | 00.00 | N/A            | Ongoi                | ingTotal <sup>3</sup>                        |  |

<sup>1</sup> Cost categories and table format are provided as suggestions and may be modified per stakeholder needs/expectations.

<sup>2</sup> Budget does not include FTE costs, but does include costs for external consultants, software, hardware, etc. Budget amount is for total project (i.e., not a phase or subset of functionality), regardless of whether or not funding has been secured. • <sup>3</sup> Annual

#### **COSTS FOR EXTERNAL ENTITIES**

N/A.

#### 4 PROJECT CATEGORY

|                    | Criteria <sup>1</sup> |       |                    |    |                            | <sup>1</sup> Senior manager approval required to classify a project  |  |  |  |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|----|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Category           | LOE<br>(hrs.)         |       | Duration<br>(mos.) |    | Budget<br>(k) <sup>2</sup> | differently than stipulated by criteria. Projects with<br>projected duration > 24 mos. require special approval by<br>ITSO Director. |  |  |  |
| Large              | > 500                 | Or    | > 9                | Or | > \$250                    | <sup>2</sup> One-time total; not ongoing costs.  |  |  |  |
| Medium             | 160 - 500             | Or    | 3 – 9              | Or | \$100 - \$250              | <sup>3</sup> Examples of "small" infrastructure projects include:<br>memory additions, firewall changes, "like" server               |  |  |  |
| Small <sup>3</sup> | 50 - 160              | Or    | <3 <sup>4</sup>    | Or | < \$100 <sup>4</sup>       | additions (up to n), etc<br><sup>4</sup> Low end of Duration and Budget thresholds at  |  |  |  |
| Category Ass       | igned                 | Small |                    |    |                            | discretion of applicable senior manager  |  |  |  |
| Rationale          | I                     | N/A   |                    |    |                            |  |  |  |  |

Modoc top down accounting



#### JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

#### **Next Steps**

- 1. "Medium" and "large" projects **STOP HERE**. "Medium" and "large" projects do **not** complete the remaining sections of this form (and can delete them); rather, they must be submitted to the ITOC for approval, based on the information provided in sections one through four above.
- 2. "Small" projects only continue to the Organizational Impact Assessment section of this form.

### **5 ORGANIZATIONAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<To be completed by "small" projects only.>

| Team                      | Assigned To                          | Assessment  |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Business                  | Ronda Gysin, Modoc<br>Superior Court | Without changes court risks accounting discrepancies especially during audit because of the current practice of manual manipulation of the numbers. |
| Application(s)            | Herman Trinh                         | Herman—Will do general troubleshooting & log in issues and environment refreshes.<br>Donna—Will do requirements, configuration changes & testing.   |
| Data Integration          | None.                                | None.   |
| Enterprise Architecture   | None.                                | None.   |
| Infrastructure & Security | None.                                | None.   |
| Other                     | None.                                | None.   |

#### 5.1 INFRASTRUCTURE

#### No changes required.

| Network          | Assessment |
|------------------|------------|
| Network Topology |            |
| Other            |            |

| Info | Security        | Assessment |
|------|-----------------|------------|
|      | Firewall        |            |
|      | Interfaces      |            |
|      | Data Encryption |            |
|      | Other           |            |

| Data | a Center (CCTC or IT) | Assessment |
|------|-----------------------|------------|
|      | Infrastructure        |            |
|      | Server Specifications |            |
|      | User Security Setup   |            |
|      | Other                 |            |

#### **5.2 DOCUMENTATION** (*To be completed by App/Infra Lead*)

Not applicable at this time.

Modoc top down accounting



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

### 6 LEVEL-OF-EFFORT (LOE) ESTIMATE

Concurrent with updating the LOE hours in the table below, the <u>Costs</u> table should be updated, if any significant changes result from the impact analysis.

| Bus Team | App Supp | Middle/ISB | EA | Security | Network | Data Ctr <sup>1</sup> | QA | TOTAL | +/-2 |
|----------|----------|------------|----|----------|---------|-----------------------|----|-------|------|
|          | 95       |            |    |          |         |                       | 15 | 110   |      |

<sup>1</sup> For CCTC-hosted apps/infra, include SAIC hours  $\blacklozenge$  <sup>2</sup> Percentage confidence in estimate

## 7 REVIEW CERTIFICATION

| Role                                   | Name | Signature/Link to Electronic Approval | Date |
|--|------|---------------------------------------|------|
| Business Application Analyst (SME)     |      |                                       |      |
| Application and/or Infrastructure Lead |      |                                       |      |

Upon review certification, this form is submitted to the appropriate senior manager for review and approval, after which it proceeds to the applicable (i.e., program) change board for final approval. If/when the senior manager is on the change board, the two steps may be one in the same.