



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date	Action Requested
April 11, 2018	Please Review and Recommend
To	Deadline
Members of the Judicial Council Technology Committee	April 16, 2018
From	Contact
Hon. Marsha Slough Chair, Judicial Council Technology Committee	Mark Dusman Information Technology mark.dusman@jud.ca.gov
Robert Oyung Chief Operating Officer, Judicial Council	Jamel Jones Information Technology jamel.jones@jud.ca.gov
Mark Dusman Principal Manager, Information Technology	
Subject	
Prioritization of FY19/20 Technology Initial Funding Requests	

The purpose of this memorandum is to request that the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) expeditiously consider approving a proposed approach and recommendation for prioritizing the FY19/20 technology initial funding requests (IFRs), which would be presented to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (JBBC) at its April 17, 2018 meeting.

Background and Approach

At its March meeting, the JBBC provided feedback to be addressed in revising a preliminary set of technology-related IFRs. Those comments included to insert approximate cost estimates or

ranges; to clarify anticipated one-time versus ongoing funding; and to redraft technical verbiage into plain language for improved comprehension by non-technologists.

In addition to addressing these updates to the proposals, the JCTC is also requested to prioritize the requests for consideration by the JBBC on April 17. Unfortunately, the timing of the JBBC meeting precludes this Committee from conducting a meeting to adequately facilitate a more formal approach to this prioritization; thus, as chair, I worked with staff to propose an approach and prepare a recommendation for you to consider via email.

Our approach to prioritizing the requests is two-fold:

First, we selected a subset of requests to move forward now, and thus would defer the remaining requests for future consideration.

Second, in selecting the subset of proposals to move forward, we considered:

- Input received at previous meetings of the JCTC;
- The readiness of new programs;
- Previous requests for funding, including FY18/19 budget change proposals that were denied and their criticality; and
- Overall strategic importance of the programs in support of the *Judicial Branch Strategic Plan for Technology*.

Recommendation: Proposed Approach and Prioritization

Based on this approach, criterion, and consultation with staff, it is proposed that the JCTC recommend six (6) technology IFRs proceed, with the remaining being deferred for a future time.

The proposed list of IFRs to move forward are:

- Case Management System (CMS) Replacement for Trial Courts*
To continue progress with our existing strategy of providing foundational CMS platforms to the courts.
- Digitizing Documents for the Superior and Appellate Courts*
To continue our strategy of enabling a digital court by automating manual paper-based processes.

- Using Business Intelligence and Data Analytics (BI/DA) to Transform the Enterprise
In support of the Information Technology Advisory Committee's workstream to better use and share court data.
- Single Sign On Solution for the Judicial Branch*
To enable single sign on capabilities for judicial officers and court personnel for selected applications branchwide.
- Implementation of Phoenix Roadmap*—Cloud Migration, Technical Upgrade and Functional Improvements
Continued enhancement of the Phoenix platform.
- Phoenix HR Payroll Deployments
Continued support for additional deployments of Phoenix HR.

** Requests marked with an asterisk are resubmittals of FY18/19 BCPs that to this point have not been included in the Governor's Budget. If they are approved, we will work with the JBBC to determine if we can update our request.*

The above list leaves the following programs for consideration as funding requests for future years:

- Disaster Recovery
- Digital Evidence
- Collaboration Platform
- Next-Generation IT Hosting
- Modernization of Judicial Council Forms/Intelligent Forms
- Futures Commission Recommendations in support of Remote Video, Intelligent Chat, and Voice-to-Text Translation Services

All technology IFRs—including those deferred—are provided as attachments to this memorandum. The updated documents address the comments and direction provided by the JBBC.

Requested Action

The Committee is asked to consider recommending this prioritization of the IFRs for presentation to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee at its April 17, 2018 meeting.

Attachment A. Binder of Technology Initial Funding Requests

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Information Technology Office

Contact: Mark Dusman

Date Prepared: 2/23/2018

Budget Services Liaison: Mary Jo Ejercito

Document Tracking Number: IFR-19-08

A. Working Title: Collaboration Platform for the Branch IT Community

B. Description of Funding Request: The Judicial Council is requesting a General Fund augmentation estimated to be \$755,000 in one-time costs and from approximately \$450,000 - \$510,000 annual ongoing costs to acquire, configure, deploy and maintain the modern software tools necessary to further enable innovation and collaboration for the branch IT community and its stakeholders. The tools are today often referred to collectively as enterprise content collaboration platforms.

The Branch's IT Community faces a significantly increased emphasis on collaboration and is greatly challenged by the geographic separation of the 58 trial courts. The need for more effective and efficient collaboration arises with the growth of Information Technology Advisory Committee's (ITAC's) use of workstreams, several state and local technology pilot programs, the implementation of the Judicial Council's Innovation Grants, in addition to the successful use of cross-court innovation around case management, digitized service delivery, self-represented litigants, and various web-based solutions. In each of these areas, success is dependent on the ability to quickly and efficiently leverage knowledge, expertise and experience across and between courts, the Judicial Council, state, local and national justice partners, external vendors, and other stakeholders such as self-help providers and academics.

This year the ITAC is sponsoring a workstream to further enhance and build upon the tremendous success of the branch's IT Community collaboration and innovation. One of the objectives of the workstream will be to "Identify, prioritize, and report on collaboration needs and tools for use within the branch and to evaluate and prioritize possible technologies to improve advisory body and workstream meeting administration; pilot recommended solutions with the committee."

As part of its directive, the IT Community workstream will recommend technologies that will enable and enhance this level of sharing during the innovation and development phases of technology initiatives. The technologies today are grouped by the industry into what is often referred to as content collaboration platforms (CCP). A content collaboration platform is a core enabling component of digital workplace transformation. Innovative organizations consider CCPs a priority for enabling better productivity, external document sharing, team collaboration, internal/operational efficiencies, and data infrastructure modernization. Gartner, Inc summarizes the capabilities of these technologies:

- "Workforce productivity — Enabling general-purpose, nonroutine working experiences on documents, from different locations and across multiple devices. It includes enhanced syncing and access capabilities. Content creation is often a key requirement for productivity.
- Extended collaboration — Supporting file sharing between people or in a team, inside and outside of the organization, with support for commenting, versioning, notification, data protection, and rights management capabilities.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

- Centralized content protection — Supplying a locked-down document collaboration environment with support for policy enforcement, data protection, audit trail, e-discovery, and data residency.
- Lightweight workflow — Enabling automation of simple tasks related to document flows, involving document management and team collaboration capabilities.”

The requested funding would be needed to acquire the tools and practices recommended by the IT Community workstream. Once selected the platform tools would need to be implemented. The successful use of these types of resources are highly dependent on the development of a specific, well-planned strategy for using and maintaining the platform. The additional FTEs requested would be responsible for working with the various stakeholders to define that strategy, configuring the tools to accommodate those requirements, testing, piloting and deploying the solution. Ongoing maintenance would be required to maintain the technical components of the platform as well as to continue to deploy the solution to new collaboration teams and workstreams as they are formed.

C. Estimated Costs: One Time \$755,000 Ongoing \$450,000-\$510,000

At this time, the cost to implement a content collaboration platform are not fully known. It is critical to select a solution that will meet the requirements for security, privacy, accessibility, and cost-effectiveness, as well as the ability to scale to a level that will support the 58 trial courts, the 6 appellate courts, and the California Supreme Court.

Ongoing funding will also be needed for 2 FTE for the Judicial Council: 2 Senior Business Systems Analysts to help onboard the courts to the solution and to provide ongoing consulting and management of the digital evidence provider.

To facilitate the evaluation of this initial funding concept, the Judicial Council Information Technology office used industry standard estimates for similar programs, software and platform acquisitions and hosting costs. We also included standardized Judicial Council costs estimates for the requested staffing to support this effort. The table below outlines those estimates.

	Annual Cost	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24
Senior Business Systems Analyst		\$152,417	\$160,038	\$168,040	\$176,442	\$185,264
Senior Business Systems Analyst		\$152,417	\$160,038	\$168,040	\$176,442	\$185,264
Content Collaboration Software	\$350,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000
Platform Hardware	\$200,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000
Ongoing Annual Hosting	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000
One-time Implementation Costs	\$175,000					
Total One Time Costs	\$755,000					

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Total Ongoing Annual Costs		\$444,834	\$460,076	\$476,080	\$492,884	\$510,528
----------------------------	--	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: Goal 2 of the Judicial Branch Strategic Plan for Technology - Optimize Branch Resources states, “the judicial branch will maximize the potential and efficiency of its technology resources by fully supporting existing and future required infrastructure and assets, and leveraging branchwide information technology resources through procurement, collaboration, communication, and education.” Providing a platform which would enable innovation through efficient and effecting sharing and collaboration is an area of focus prescribed in the plan. ITAC, in support of this goal is sponsoring a workstream on IT Community which has a state objective to “identify, prioritize, and report on collaboration needs and tools for use within the branch.”

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Information Technology Advisory Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Judicial Council Technology Committee take on the lead advisory role as the JCTC oversees the council’s policies concerning technology and is responsible in partnership with the courts for coordinating with the Administrative Director and all internal committees, advisory committees, commissions, working groups, task forces, justice partners and stakeholders on technological issues relating to the branch and the courts.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Information Technology Office

Contact: Kathleen Fink

Date Prepared: 4/9/2018

Budget Services Liaison: Mary Jo Ejercito

Document Tracking Number: IFR-19-09

A. Working Title: Management of Digital Evidence in the Courts - Pilot

B. Description of Funding Request: A General Fund augmentation, estimated at between \$650 thousand and \$1 million for a digital evidence storage and playback service and 3.0 FTE positions, to pilot services at 3-5 courts in support of managing digital evidence in the courts. All costs are ongoing.

Digital evidence, also known as electronic evidence, is any evidence created, received, stored, or transmitted in digital format, such as photographs, video recordings, and documents in pdf format.

Body cameras, video surveillance, personal cell phones, social media: these are all contributing to the exponential growth in digital evidence and questions on how to manage it in the courts. Courts are already experiencing digital evidence in increasing volume and in various standards and formats. Add to that the need to maintain security and chain of custody while making the evidence available to the appropriate parties and the potential for the introduction of malware, such as computer viruses, via submitted digital evidence, and this becomes a situation the courts must address quickly.

The Information Technology Advisory Committee's Digital Evidence Workstream, as one of the results of its analysis, will recommend a secure, cost-effective solution to provide a storage and playback service that courts will be able to use to manage digital evidence. A pilot of the service will assess the effectiveness of the solution and will generate information on next steps, best practices, and costs for onboarding additional courts. As more courts use the service, it will generate business intelligence for the judicial branch on how digital evidence is impacting the courts, for example, the volume and types of digital evidence, as well as new types of digital evidence that may appear.

C. Estimated Costs: One Time _____ Ongoing \$650,000- \$1.3 million

At this time, the cost to acquire and support a repository and secure playback, or "streaming", service is unknown. However, a range of low to high costs are indicated in the table below. It is critical to select a solution that will meet the requirements for security, privacy, accessibility, and cost-effectiveness, as well as the ability to scale to a level that will support the 58 trial courts, the 6 appellate courts, and the California Supreme Court.

Ongoing funding will also be needed for 3.0 positions for the Judicial Council: 1.0 Senior Business Systems Analyst and 1.0 Business Systems Analyst to help onboard the courts to the solution and to provide ongoing consulting and management of the digital evidence provider. 1.0 Enterprise Architect is needed for solution design and ongoing consulting – this headcount can be shared by the Business Intelligence program.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

	Annual Cost	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24
Sr. Business Systems Analyst	\$145,159	\$152,417	\$160,038	\$168,040	\$176,442	\$185,264
Business Systems Analyst	\$129,629	\$136,110	\$142,916	\$150,062	\$157,565	\$165,443
Enterprise Architect	\$171,007	\$89,779	\$94,268	\$98,981	\$103,930	\$109,127
Digital Evidence Service - low	\$250,000	\$275,000	\$302,500	\$332,750	\$366,025	\$402,628
Digital Evidence Service - high	\$500,000	\$550,000	\$605,000	\$665,500	\$732,050	\$805,255
Total Low		\$653,306	\$699,721	\$749,832	\$803,961	\$862,461
Total High		\$928,306	\$1,002,221	\$1,082,582	\$1,169,986	\$1,265,088

Note 1: The cost of the Enterprise Architect is assumed to be shared with the Business Intelligence program and is divided in half.

Note 2: The salaries of the FTE are assumed to increase 5% each year. The Digital Evidence Service is assumed to increase 10% each year.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: This request will support Court Technology Strategic Goal # 1 – Promote the Digital Court, by implementing a branchwide solution for managing digital evidence. Courts currently maintain most digital evidence in physical format such as flash drives, DVD's, and memory chips. Electronic storage will enable courts to securely receive, store, present, and transmit digital evidence as needed.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Information Technology Advisory Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Information Technology Advisory Committee take on the lead advisory role as the ITAC promotes, coordinates, and acts as executive sponsor for projects and initiatives that apply technology to the work of the courts. Further, ITAC's Digital Evidence Workstream is specifically tasked with assessing the current challenges the courts face in managing digital evidence and recommending statewide solutions to meet those challenges.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Information Technology Office

Contact: Robert Oyung

Date Prepared: 2/21/2018

Budget Services Liaison: Mary Jo Ejercito

Document Tracking Number: IFR-19-10

A. Working Title: Digitizing Documents Phase One for the Appellate and Superior Courts

B. Description of Funding Request: The Judicial Council is requesting a one-time General Fund augmentation of an estimated \$5.7 million in FY 2018-19 and an ongoing augmentation funding of \$170,000/yr. for a Senior Business Systems Analyst. The funding will support a pilot program (focusing on 6 to 8 courts) for digitizing paper and/or filmed case files for the Appellate and Superior Courts. The target for this pilot is the equivalent of 22,000 linear feet of paper case files. After this pilot, the data will be used to develop cost estimates, and identify potential processes and techniques needed for courts looking to digitize documents in the future. This request includes 1.0 FTE position (Senior Business Systems Analyst) to function as the project manager to oversee activities for the digitization pilot, develop and maintain the project plan and assist subsequent courts with document digitizing efforts.

The California court system is the largest in the nation, with more than 19,000 court employees. It serves a population of about 39 million people – 12.5 percent of the nation. During FY 2014-2015, over 6.8 million cases were filed statewide in the Superior Courts, alone. The Courts of Appeal had approximately 23,000 filings and the Supreme Court had 7,868 filings over the same time. Case files are associated with each one of those filings, and each case file contains multiple documents over the life of the case (docket, briefs, motions, pleadings, etc.). Court operations center on the receipt, creation, processing and preservation of these court documents. The major part of the historical records and much of the current volume consists of paper or filmed (microfilm or microfiche) documents. Management of paper and film case files is very labor intensive and even storage of those files competes with valuable courtroom space. In some courts, equipment to view microfilm and microfiche is becoming obsolete and is increasingly difficult and expensive to maintain and repair. If readers are not available, viewing documents will not be possible without converting them to another format. If stored externally, the cost represents a significant expense.

Electronic case files lessen the burden of processing case documents and has the potential to greatly reduce the need for physical storage space facilities (file rooms, multi-level filing cabinets, boxes of records in archival storage). As the courts migrate from older legacy-case management systems, they can take advantage of electronic documents and electronic document processing, but they need a mechanism to convert existing paper and filmed case files into electronic format. Electronic case files will eliminate the need for physical storage facilities and would allow for greater public access and convenience.

To assess demand for the digitizing paper and/or film, and interest in a pilot project, a survey was developed and sent to all California Appellate and Superior Courts (<https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-97YWNCNW8/browse/>). Of the courts surveyed, 31-courts responded and of those, 29 wanted to participate in a pilot. Of the 29 wanting to participate in a

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

pilot, 22 were committed, willing to re-engineer their business processes, provide staffing for the pilot and provide documentation of their experiences so that future implementations would go more smoothly (DigitizingPaperSurvey.xlsx). Each court measured or provided estimates for the quantity of paper and filmed files, for both active and archived cases. In total, the 29 courts reported more than 300,000 linear feet of active case paper files (more than 56 miles). The response to the survey identifies an opportunity for substantial reductions in physical storage, through the digitizing of paper.

C. Estimated Costs: One Time \$5.8 million Ongoing \$170,000

To estimate the cost associated with this request, 20 scanning vendors were contacted and 7 responded with detailed pricing estimates ranging from \$105/box to \$368/box (ScanningVendors.xlsx). The average cost per 15” box of files was \$203. Using this average scanning cost for 22,000 linear feet of paper files amounts to \$4.5 million. Included in the cost projection is an additional \$650,000 for a bulk scanning equipment and for desktop scanning equipment so that pilot courts can scan files as they come in, based on their modified workflow. Given the number of active case linear feet are estimates, there is a 10% contingency of \$500,000. Below is a chart outlining projected costs for staff and pilot operations.

	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24
Sr. Business Systems Analyst	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$170,000
Scanning Services	\$4,466,000				
Scanning Equipment	\$650,000				
Case Volume Contingency (10%)	\$500,000				
Total:	\$5,786,000	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$170,000

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests:

The 2014-2018, Strategic Plan for Technology (<http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jctc-Court-Technology-Strategic-Plan.pdf>), puts emphasis on the need to Promote the Digital Court. There were four key technology goals identified in the Strategic Plan and this budget change proposal directly aligns with the following three goals.

- Promote the Digital Court
- Optimize Branch Resources
- Optimize Infrastructure

Digitizing paper and film files is a necessary and foundational part of realizing the larger goal of transforming a court that relies on paper files into a Digital Court. The main barrier to implementing electronic documents for a Digital Court is the reliance on historical paper documents. It is labor intensive to maintain both paper and electronic versions of a document. One large court with approximately 700 employees estimated they had 100 people spending 25% of their time processing paper documents.

In pursuit of the goal of the Digital Court, multiple courts are currently leveraging a branchwide Master Services Agreement (MSA) to implement new systems with capabilities to utilize electronic documents. These agreements include case management systems, e-filing systems and document

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

management systems. Funding to support a transition to electronic documents will assist the courts in integrating with these systems and supporting their efforts to meet the goal of establishing a Digital Court.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Information Technology Advisory Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Judicial Council Technology Committee take the lead advisory role. The JCTC oversees the council's policies concerning technology and is responsible in partnership with the courts for coordinating with the Administrative Director and all internal committees, advisory committees, commissions, working groups, task forces, justice partners and stakeholders on technological issues relating to the branch and the courts.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Information Technology Office

Contact: Fati Farmanfarmaian

Date Prepared: 2/22/2018

Budget Services Liaison: Mary Jo Ejercito

Document Tracking Number: IFR-19-11

A. Working Title: Futures Commission Directives for the Expansion of Technology in the Courts.

B. Description of Funding Request: A General Fund augmentation of an estimated \$1,179,000 (\$220,000 one-time and \$959,000 ongoing) to provide funding for implementing pilot programs at 3-5 courts for intelligent chat, video remote hearings, and natural language voice-to-text translation services in support of Futures Commission recommendations directed by the Chief Justice. Judicial Council Information Technology (JCIT) will be responsible for supporting these services. Funding would include one-time funding for software and equipment, and ongoing funding for full-time staff resources and services to enable JCIT to operationalize the solutions, with the goal of expanding them and eventually making them available to all courts.

The Chief Justice has directed the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) to report on the feasibility and resources necessary to pilot three technology innovations recommended by the Futures Commission: remote appearances for most noncriminal court proceedings; voice-to-text language interpretation services at court filing, service counters, and in self-help centers; and intelligent chat technology to provide self-help services. Where pilot projects are implemented, the committee has been directed to report back to the Judicial Council on outcomes and make recommendations for statewide expansion.

The workplans for each initiative envision a two-phased pilot approach in which quick, small-scale, investigative proofs-of-concepts will be deployed in three to six months prior to conducting larger and more formalized pilot projects. This strategy allows ITAC and the project evaluation teams to quickly learn about potential uses and deployment of the technologies in controlled environments. The first phase of the projects is expected to be funded through existing budget and provide quick but limited information. Funding to support the second phase of each project will provide for more formalized and extensive piloting, provide data for statewide recommendations, and ongoing support to productize and operationalize the programs.

Examples of this may include:

- Establishing a technical laboratory environment at the Judicial Council to test various voice-to-text language services to gauge alignment of the technical tools to deliver accurate and useful translation within a complex environment; thereafter, to test the voice-to-text service in a specific subject at a court location.
- After collecting findings from mock remote video hearings at various courts and assessing the viability of broadened expansion, the pilot would likely include delivering remote video programs in 3-5 courts as recommended.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

- Conducting a series of individual proofs of concepts using intelligent chat (a computer program which conducts a conversation via auditory or textual methods) to assess technology readiness, benchmarks for success, and learnings; thereafter, to deliver the intelligent chat service as part of the council’s online digital service implementation in select self-help subject areas.

These three programs will provide the branch with proven methods and tools for improving remote and modernized access to the courts for Californians. Expanding the use of technology in this manner will increase access to justice, supporting a key tenet of the Chief Justice’s access 3D initiative.

C. Estimated Costs: One Time \$220,000 Ongoing \$959,000

At this time, the cost to implement the pilot programs in the three areas identified is not fully known, but is estimated to be approximately \$1,178,954. The first phase proof of concept efforts for each initiative is being conducted this year (2018) and will include an assessment of what funding would be necessary to achieve the more robust pilot program.

However, below is an estimated total cost for software, equipment, maintenance, and services.

Estimates for remote appearances are based on the Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Pilot cost estimate included in the FY16/17 Language Access Plan BCP. Estimates for intelligent chat and voice to text are based on pricing information available on public websites. Following the proof of concept phase, the final cost for more formal piloting at 3 to 5 courts will be provided after a more extensive feasibility study and analysis. Ongoing full-time staff costs include 1 Senior Business Systems Analyst for each pilot area (three in total) to coordinate, implement, and support the pilot and future deployment, and 1 Senior Application Developer for the intelligent chat and the video to text initiatives (two in total) to develop the solutions to be implemented. The pilot programs and support for their broadened productizing and operationalization will require continued support that is the responsibility of the Judicial Council Information Technology office.

Estimated costs:

			FY19/20	
			One time	Ongoing
Full Time Staff Costs				
	1 Senior Business Systems Analyst at mid-range for each of the 3 initiatives	\$160,038.00		\$ 480,114.00
	1 Senior Application Developer at mid-range	\$165,420.00		\$ 330,840.00
Video Remote (Based on the VRI Pilot)				
	Special equipment for provider courts:			

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

	Infrastructure at the courts for confidential room: Provider Court Studio Space (Might be in-kind) Set up @\$7,000 per each of 5 courts- one-time equipment and ongoing 10% maintenance		\$ 35,000.00	\$ 3,500.00
	An integrated courtroom at each \$15,000-\$25,000 per courtroom ---one courtroom at each of 5 courts	\$25,000.00	\$ 125,000.00	\$ 12,500.00
	Each court to have 2-3 types of lower cost mobile end points (different from the integrated courtroom):			
	<i>higher end mobile endpoint</i>	\$8,000		
	<i>mid-range mobile endpoint</i>	\$3,000		
	<i>just a software endpoint</i>	\$1,000		
	AVERAGE PER COURT per each of 5 courts with mobile endpoints and ongoing 10% maintenance	\$12,000	\$ 60,000.00	\$ 6,000.00
	Total Video Remote		\$ 220,000.00	\$ 22,000.00
	Intelligent Chat			
	2,000,000 Text Conversations per Month			\$ 48,000.00
	Video to Text			
	1,000,000 Voice Interactions per Month			\$ 78,000.00
	Totals		\$ 220,000.00	\$ 958,954.00

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: The final report of the Commission on the Future of California’s Court System (Futures Commission) sets forth recommendations for legal and structural reforms for the judicial branch of government to improve access to justice and to better serve current and future generations of Californians. One of those recommendations is to expand technology in the courts. This aligns with and contributes to “Promoting the Digital Court” and “Optimizing Branch Resources,” two of the goals in the *Judicial Branch Strategic Plan for Technology*. Contributing to the support of these goals, as well as responding to the specific directives of the Chief Justice, are key branch priorities with regards to technology.

There has been innovation grant funding relative to video hearings and avatars starting in FY17, which was provided to individual courts. This program will leverage these projects—and any other—existing pilot efforts to minimize costs. No other similar requests for funding are known, at this time.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Information Technology Advisory Committee
- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that ITAC take on the lead advisory role, as the Chief Justice specifically directed the committee to take immediate action in these three areas.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Information Technology Office

Contact: Donna Keating

Date Prepared: 3/02/18

Budget Services Liaison: Mary Jo Ejercito

Document Tracking Number: IFR-19-12

A. Working Title: Pilot Next Generation Hosting concepts at one or more courts.

B. Description of Funding Request: We are requesting approval for a one-time General Fund augmentation in the estimated range of \$963,532 to \$1,295,862 in 2019-20 to pilot Next Generation Hosting concepts at one or more courts. Funding would be used to operationalize a set of branch-level recommendations developed by the Information Technology Advisory Committee’s Next Generation Hosting Workstream. “Hosting” refers to the services, methods, and technologies available to house and manage the servers, network, and software for court applications.

The Next Generation Hosting Workstream recommendations present guidelines to assist courts in making decisions on hosting court technology systems using modern, scalable and flexible models. The models range from on premise local solutions to regional court data centers to cloud computing. The pilot would allow courts to test framework guidelines, to use and refine common service level definitions and expectations, and to take advantage of new hosting technologies available to the branch. Courts may leverage master service agreements negotiated with providers for hosting support for critical applications including; court case management systems, jury systems, financial and email systems and web services. This request will enable the courts to leverage the workstream recommendations to pilot solutions that better utilize modern, agile, flexible and cost-effective hosting solutions that are appropriate for their court’s technology environments and needs.

C. Estimated Costs: One Time \$964,000 - \$1.3 million Ongoing \$145,000 - \$185,000

At this time, the cost to pilot Next Generation Hosting Solutions is unknown but as the assessment moves forward we will be better able to gauge the resources needed for this effort. At this point in time, funding for the pilot is expected to include:

- One-time hardware, software, and services for the pilot
- One FTE for JCC: One Senior Business Systems Analyst to work with pilot courts to provide hosting guidance, to maintain and refine the framework, and to coordinate procurement of services including; developing RFP’s, selecting vendors and executing contracts.
- No on-going funding is requested for pilot courts. Courts wishing to continue their pilot implementation would fund any on-going costs.
- The cost estimates are for pilot services for one medium sized court for hardware, software, and services and are based on current CCTC pricing models

Category	One Time Costs
Hardware	\$190,120
Software	\$125,320
Services	\$595,583

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

Initial Set Up Cost	\$224,801					
	Annual Cost	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24
Senior Business Systems Analyst	\$145,159	\$152,417	\$160,038	\$168,040	\$176,442	\$185,264

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: While next generation hosting is expressly called out under Goal Three, Optimize Infrastructure, it also has a direct impact on the branch's ability to accomplish two more of its strategic technology goals: Promote the Digital Court and Optimize Branch Resources. A modern, flexible, scalable, and cost-effective hosting foundation is critical to providing services that extend and enhance public access to the courts, that enable data-sharing among the courts, and that promote collaboration across the judicial branch, to name just a few objectives. The hosting framework made recommendations based upon the Court Technology Strategic and Tactical Plan and the best likelihood for achieving the defined goals and objectives. The Workstream also partnered with ITAC's Disaster Recovery Workstream to ensure report findings were in alignment with related initiatives in the Tactical Plan.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Information Technology Advisory Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Judicial Council Technology Committee take on the lead advisory role as JCTC oversees the council's policies concerning technology and is responsible in partnership with the courts for coordinating with the Administrative Director and all internal committees, advisory committees, commissions, working groups, task forces, justice partners and stakeholders on technological issues relating to the branch and the courts.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: ITAC Intelligent Forms Workstream

Contact: Camilla Kieliger/Mark Gelade

Budget Services Liaison: Mary Jo Ejercito

Date Prepared: 2/28/2018

Document Tracking Number: IFR-19-13

A. Working Title: Modernization of Judicial Council Forms Technology/Intelligent Forms

B. Description of Funding Request: In support of the Judicial Branch Strategic Plan for Technology, the Judicial Council requests an estimated General Fund augmentation of \$2,100,000.00 for one-time cost for the modernization and transformation of Judicial Council Forms, and \$403,000 ongoing for four new analyst positions to support operational preparedness and production deployment of intelligent Forms, with refinement of the estimate pending completion of a Request for Information (RFI) in July 2018.

Today, Judicial Council forms exist in PDF format only, and the information within them cannot easily be exchanged with court case management systems. In addition, they not fully ADA accessible do not work as expected on all browsers, and do not display well mobile devices. In our ongoing efforts to create the 'digital court' this project proposes a 'digital transformation' of Judicial Council forms so that they can be more adaptive and e-filed with the courts

Judicial Council forms have traditionally been used to produce paper documents. While paper-based forms serve an important purpose, new technologies like e-filing, e-service, and new court case management systems will require better data portability between forms and these systems.

The project is also fundamental to developing true e-filing. E-filing is more than simply transmitting case documents to the court to be processed by the Clerk. True e-filing not only handles the document transmission but also integrates the documents and corresponding case information into the Court's Case Management System (CMS). This provides for a much quicker, more automated, and more efficient process. To enable this process, the underlying documents must be standardized and published with adequate and consumable metadata and a data mapping schema.

Fundamental to increasing access to justice is dependable and accessible forms that can be used remotely and at no charge. According to Pew Research Center (2017), 77% of US adults own a smartphone, and 12% rely exclusively on their smartphones to access the internet. In the younger generation, those between 18 and 29 years old, 92% own smartphones. Perhaps most importantly, twenty percent of adults living in households earning less than \$30,000/year are smartphone-only internet users. It is axiomatic that these lower-income households are the most likely to be self-represented. There is not only an expectation, but also a growing need, for people to interact with public entities remotely. Judicial Council forms do not currently meet those needs and expectations.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

The Information Technology Advisory Committee established the Intelligent Forms Workstream to examine the use of court forms and investigate options for modernizing the electronic format and delivery of Judicial Council forms. The project proposed by the Intelligent Forms Workstream would:

- Authenticate all Judicial Council forms
- Populate authenticated forms with data
- Host all Judicial Council forms on a separate forms server
- Create and publish form Application Programming Interfaces (APIs)
- Accept structured data through a web request
- Respond to the requester with an authenticated and populated form

This would ensure the integrity of Judicial Council forms, but would also allow third parties to develop constituent-specific data-gathering tools while still outputting authentic Judicial Council forms.

Forms must be usable by people with disabilities. The legacy Judicial Council forms must be updated to comply with current accessibility legislations, rules, and standards. Future forms development must be accessible to comply with federal and state laws, as well as information technology best practices.

Finally, the Judicial Council revises and approves forms throughout the year. Courts and vendors receive PDFs, but must look to the Judicial Council report for guidance on what changed. However, the changes that are the most difficult to implement, namely those that involve updates to local CMSs and other systems, are rarely described, at least not in necessary detail. The absence of adequate and standardized documentation can cause implementation delays.

C. Estimated Costs: One Time \$2.1 million Ongoing \$403,000

Costs to implement this project are only estimated at present. A Request for Information (RFI) will be conducted in July 2018 to obtain more detailed cost information.

		FY19/20	
		One time	Ongoing
<i>Full Time Staff Costs</i>			
	2 Business Systems Analyst at mid-range		\$268,516.00
	1 Analyst		\$134,258.00
<i>Operational and Deployment Costs</i>			
	Forms server; APIs, Electronic Filing Manager integration; Adaptive Forms Builder; Certification and e-Signature; Versioning.	\$2,100,000.00 (Est.)	

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: The *Strategic Plan for California's Judicial Branch* and the *Judicial Branch Strategic Plan for Technology* both list access to justice as Goal 1. In 2013, Chief Justice Cantil-Sakauye launched Access 3D, which led to the establishment of the Commission on the Future of California's Court System in July 2014. The Commission's charge was to study and recommend initiatives to effectively and efficiently serve California's diverse and dynamic population by enhancing access to justice.

Remote access to reliable, legally accurate and accessible forms is foundational to access to justice. It further enhances the move towards a "digital court," and has the potential to significantly increase efficiency as data migrates from the face of a paper form that must be manually input to seamless integration through e-filing and remote interaction.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)
- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: ITAC should be the lead committee, coordinating existing and future workstreams (Self-Represented Litigants (SRLs) e-services, next generation hosting, data exchange, forms modernization) that can effectively collaborate on the form server solution proposed.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request**Requesting Entity:** Judicial Council Information Technology Office**Contact:** David Koon**Date Prepared:** 04/09/018**Budget Services Liaison:** Mary Jo Ejercito**Document Tracking Number:** IFR-19-14**A. Working Title:** Case Management System (CMS) Replacement for Trial Courts

B. Description of Funding Request: A one-time General Fund augmentation of \$22 million in fiscal year 2019-2020, \$7.4 million in 2020-21, \$3.2 million in 2021-22, \$470,000 in 2022-23, and \$120,000 in 2023-24. This one-time funding will be used by 10 courts (Amador, Colusa, Contra Costa, Lassen, Marin, Mariposa, Mono, Nevada, Solano and Shasta Courts) for the procurement and deployment of a modern, commercial, off-the-shelf case management system to replace their legacy case management systems (CMS). This funding request also includes additional on-going funding of approximately \$350,000 annually for 2.0 positions (Senior Business Systems Analyst) at the Judicial Council to support the administration of multiple statewide master service agreements (MSA) with four case management system vendors as well assist with the distribution of BCP funding and project status reporting for CMS deployments. The funding amount being requested in this BCP for the 10 trial courts will need to be validated/refined as part of developing the FY 19-20 BCP.

Today these 10 courts still have outdated or unsupported case management systems developed with older technology and lack sufficient funds to replace them. These legacy systems do not have the ability to integrate with document management systems and e-filing services - foundations for modern case management systems. Obtaining funding to replace these outdated or unsupported systems with a modern case management system is the next step towards the first goal in the *Court Technology Strategic Plan* (Goal 1: Promote the Digital Court). The Judicial Council Technology Committee and Judicial Council staff have previously worked with courts on a path forward to replace the V3 and Sustain Justice Edition case management system. The 2016 Budget Act included \$25.0 million over three years to replace CCMS V3 in four courts and the 2017-18 Governor's Budget proposes \$5.0 million over two years to replace SJE in nine courts. This BCP initiative is the funding needed for the next phase of courts in need of a replacement for their outdated legacy systems. Initially, there was a CMS BCP submitted for FY 18/19 for nine trial courts to replace their legacy case management systems. The DOF deferred consideration for the FY 18/19 CMS BCP to FY 19/20. The Nevada Court will be added to the FY 19/20 BCP.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

C. Estimated Costs: **One Time \$34.9 million (over 5 years)** **Ongoing**

The estimated one-time costs per fiscal year for the 10 trial courts (Amador, Colusa, Contra Costa, Lassen, Marin, Mariposa, Mono, Nevada, Solano and Shasta Courts) in this BCP to replace their legacy case management systems are shown in the table below. The table also includes on-going funding for 2.0 Judicial Council Senior Business Systems Analysts to support the administration of multiple statewide master service agreements as well as provide project status reporting on CMS deployment projects.

Estimated FY 19/20 CMS BCP Costs by Fiscal Year

Description	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24	5 - Yr Total
One-Time Funding Needed (10 Courts)	\$ 21,960,000	\$ 7,353,000	\$ 3,214,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 33,117,000
On-Going Funding Needed (2 Sr. BSA's)	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	1,750,000
Total Funding Needed by Fiscal Year	\$ 22,310,000	\$ 7,703,000	\$ 3,564,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 34,867,000

The basis for the estimated costs is from the FY 18/19 CMS BCP for nine courts to replace their legacy case management systems. The one-time cost estimates include funding for the procurement and deployment of a modern, off-the shelf case management system which includes items such as, but not limited to, software, hardware and professional services. The cost estimates for the Nevada Court which was not initially included in the FY 18/19 CMS BCP was based off a court of similar size which had been included in the FY 18/19 BCP. The cost estimates for each of the 10 courts will need to be validated/refined as part of the FY 19/20 BCP process. Specifically, the costs associated with the software and professional services for the procurement of CMS software and deployment services will need to be refined as it is expected that the Judicial Council will have four master service agreements in place which will provide updated CMS pricing to utilize in estimating costs for each court.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: “Promoting the Digital Court” by implementing modern and supportable case management systems was approved as the highest priority in the Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan. The Judicial Council Technology Committee and Judicial Council staff have previously worked with courts on a path forward to replace the V3, Sustain Justice Edition, and nine other trial courts legacy case management systems. This funding initiative will address those courts which have moved some case types to a new case management system but are in need of assistance to move additional case types off of legacy systems.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee:

Budget Services proposes that the Judicial Council Technology Committee take on the lead advisory role as JCTC oversees the council's policies concerning technology and is responsible in partnership with the courts for coordinating with the Administrative Director and all internal committees, advisory committees, commissions, working groups, task forces, justice partners and stakeholders on technological issues relating to the branch and the courts.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Information Technology Office

Contact: John Yee

Date Prepared: 3/02/2018

Budget Services Liaison: Mary Jo Ejercito

Document Tracking Number: IFR-19-15

A. Working Title: Business Intelligence and Data Analytics (BI/DA)

B. Description of Funding Request: A General Fund augmentation is requested to pilot a business intelligence and data analytics project to help improve court efficiencies and to identify opportunities to improve service to the public. The scope of this request will be limited to 3-5 courts and 2-4 Judicial Council offices (JBSIS, Criminal Justice Services, etc.). The estimated funding amount for this project request is between \$1.9M to \$2.9M.

In FY 2018-19, an Information Technology Advisory Committee workstream was launched to determine how business intelligence and data analytics (BI/DA) can help identify opportunities for improvement for the branch and the courts. The workstream's goals were to identify what business scenarios, problems and/or opportunities where the BI/DA technology can be used to aid in improving productivity, reducing cost and improving services to the public. In addition to the workstream, information and lessons learned from the "Improving Court Operations through Data Analytics" innovations grants will be used to help develop a better pilot implementation for the courts and offices.

Today, the courts and the other judicial branch entities (JBEs) collect data and produce reports to help with their daily job functions. Many use only the tools that are at their disposal. Some of these tools are archaic and/or inefficient. The courts and JBE's need a modern tool that will allow them to see patterns and information that cannot be gleaned from their existing approaches. As the complexity of court and business operations continue to grow, more data will be collected, and more analytic processes will be created. Additional staff would be needed to support the increased analytical processes. A modern approach is needed.

With the advances in data science and modern data analytics tools and systems, data that was once collected, can be used to derive useful information and develop knowledge that can help improve the productivity, reduce operational cost and identify opportunities that can improve services for the general public. These tools are being developed by well-known vendors. Many companies and government agencies are now exploring how to leverage these latest technology advances to develop a competitive advantage, reduce cost and improve services.

The goal of the pilot is to take advantage of the modern business intelligence and analytics platform, so that the branch and the courts can achieve improvements in productivity, cost reductions and greater services to the general public. Through the pilot, we expect to learn, identify and refine policies, processes and techniques that can be leveraged and shared with other courts and judicial branch entities.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

C. Estimated Costs: **One Time** **\$1.2m -\$1.9 m** **Ongoing** **\$700,000 – \$943,000**

At this time, the estimated costs are based on assumptions on what may be needed to support this effort. A better cost estimated cost will be developed as the project details and requirements are more clearly defined.

The following projected estimated costs includes:

- Procurement of cloud based business intelligence and data analytic services
- Consulting/Contract services to assist the courts and offices to integrate with the BI/DA platform
- Staffing
 - 4 FTE for JCC:
 - 2 BSA to coordinate and implement processes, policies, and data governance
 - 1 ADA to evaluate, configure, and consult on tools
 - 1 Enterprise Architect for solution design and ongoing consulting - this headcount can be shared by the Digital Evidence program.

Cost Table Summary

Description	Low		High	
	One Time Cost	On Going Costs	One Time Cost	On Going Costs
Full Time Staff		506,145		759,226
Contracted Services	1,152,000		1,920,000	
BI/Data Analytics Platform		183,778		183,778
TOTALS	1,152,000	689,923	1,920,000	943,004

Low Estimate Total Cost: \$1,841,923

High Estimate Total Cost: \$2,863,004

Cost Estimation Tables for Reference

	Units	Low		High	
		One Time	On Going	One Time	On Going
Full Time Staff Costs					
Sr. BSA	2	115,083.36	172,625.04		345,250.08
Sr. ADA	1	132,335.28	198,502.92		198,502.92
1 EA	1	143,642.52	215,472.60		215,472.60
Full Time Staff Costs				506,144.52	759,225.60
Contracting Services					
Data Integration/Migration Services					
Courts	4	144000	240000	576,000.00	960,000.00
Offices	4	144000	240000	576,000.00	960,000.00
Contacting Services Total				1,152,000.00	1,920,000.00

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

Business Intelligence/Data Analytics Platform Services				
	Units	Unit Price	Ext Monthly Price	Ext Annual Price
Analytics Services				
Standard Services	4	1481.9	5927.6	71,131.20
Scale Out Services	2	1481.9	2963.8	35,565.60
Machine Learning (1000 Managed Model/100 m	1	374.5	374.5	4,494.00
BI Tools	8	484	3872	46,464.00
Estimated Analytic Services Total				157,654.80
Storage Services				
Block Blobs (GBs) (50 TBs)				
Hot	50000	0.0184		11,040.00
Managed Disks (SSDs for fast access)	8	143.36		13,762.56
Files (GBs)		0.06		-
Queues				-
Storage (GB)	1000	0.07		840.00
Transactions (10,000/unit)	100000	0.0004		480.00
Estimate Storage Service Total				26,122.56
Estimated Platform Cost Total				183,777.36

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: Business Intelligence and Data Analytics pilot project aligns with all four goals of the Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan.

- “Promoting the Digital Court”
Provide the courts and offices with new capabilities to improve operations and to help better serve the general public through understanding, recognition of patterns, trends and insight.
- “Optimizing Branch Resources”
Analyzing and assessing utilization of court and branch resources to help identify and shift needs
- “Optimize Infrastructure” -
Help analyze and identify where infrastructure is over or underutilized.
- “Promote Rules and Legislative Changes”
Potential use to determine the impact and effectiveness of rules and legislative changes

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Information Technology Advisory Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Judicial Council Technology Committee take the lead advisory role as the JCTC oversees the council's policies concerning technology and is responsible in partnership with the courts for coordinating with the Administrative Director and all internal committees, advisory committees, commissions, working groups, task forces, justice partners and stakeholders on technological issues relating to the branch and the courts.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Information Technology Office

Contact: Michael Derr

Date Prepared: 4/9/2018

Budget Services Liaison: Mary Jo Ejercito

Document Tracking Number: IFR-19-16

A. Working Title: Disaster Recovery Framework Implementation Pilot

B. Description of Funding Request: The Judicial Council Information Technology Office proposes a general fund augmentation in Fiscal Year 2019-20 of \$1.3M and ongoing funding in the amount of \$180k to pilot disaster recovery concepts as outlined in the disaster recovery workstream framework at one of more courts. Funding would include one-time hardware, software, and services for the pilot and ongoing funding for one FTE within the Judicial Council Information Technology Office to provide guidance to the courts on the subject of disaster recovery. It is proposed that this position would fall within the Business Systems Analyst job family. Courts participating in the pilot would be required to take over ongoing funding for hardware, software and services implemented via this pilot.

C. Estimated Costs: **One Time** \$1.3 million **Ongoing** \$180,000

Estimated costs for this pilot are \$1.3M, which includes:

One-Time

- Modern backup infrastructure for participating courts that would provide the capability to replicate backups to an alternate site and/or the cloud
- Provisions for cloud-based data storage in support of court backups
- Provisions for the use of server virtualization technology to allow shorter recovery times at an alternate hosting location.
- Cloud connectivity of sufficient bandwidth to support backup and recovery functions

Ongoing

- Establishment of an FTE staff resource within the Judicial Council to provide guidance to the courts on the subject of disaster recovery

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: This funding request is in direct support of the Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan.

- “Optimizing Branch Resources” - Analyzing and assessing utilization of court and branch resources to help identify and shift needs
- “Optimize Infrastructure” - Help analyze and identify where infrastructure is over or underutilized.

Specifically, it will serve to facilitate compliance with the Judicial Branch security framework, which specifies that effective controls be in place for contingency planning.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Information Technology Advisory Committee
- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: It is proposed that the Information Technology Advisory Committee be designated as the lead advisory committee for this request. This is based on ITAC's role as sponsor over the Disaster Recovery Framework workstream, from which this pilot initiative originated.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Branch Accounting and Procurement

Contact: Bobby Brow

Date Prepared: 2/1/2018

Budget Services Liaison: Michael Sun

Document Tracking Number: IFR-19-20

A. Working Title: Implementation of Phoenix Roadmap – Cloud Migration, Technical Upgrade and Functional Improvements

B. Description of Funding Request: The Judicial Council requests \$9.0 million General Fund in 2019-20, \$6.8 million in 2020-21, and \$7.6 million in 2021-22 and ongoing to update and expand the Phoenix System and platform to improve the administrative infrastructure supporting trial courts. The Phoenix System is the financial and procurement system for the 58 trial courts, and the payroll system for 13 trial courts. This request will also provide funding to the Judicial Council to support 4.0 positions to be phased in over three years. This request will update the Phoenix system to stay ahead of the end-of-life of the current on-premise version of SAP, and add functional requirements required by the trial courts.

The last major upgrade of the Phoenix system was completed in 2008-09. The Program is nearing the end of support on its current platform, and there aren't sufficient resources available to improve it to a more efficient and desired state. It is necessary to update the current technology and advisable to invest in new functionality that the trial courts require according to recent studies of their needs. These studies included review of past requirements and requests, a comprehensive stakeholder survey, and requirement workshops with key stakeholders across the state. The highest priority improvements include Document Management, Budget Preparation, Enhanced Procurement, and Talent Management Functions.

Included in this request is \$3.5 million to cover costs currently being provided by the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF).

C. Estimated Costs: **One Time \$5.222 million in 2019-20** **Ongoing \$3.757 million in 2019-20** (See table below for further detail or out year one time and ongoing costs).

Currently, approximately \$3.7 million is expended annually from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) to support the Phoenix Program. This request will eliminate the expenditures from the IMF and request General Fund for the costs to update and expand the Phoenix Program, as well as for the ongoing maintenance/hosting of the system (which is currently funded from the IMF). If this request is approved, the system update will result in annual maintenance/hosting savings of approximately \$265,000. The table below indicates the requested General Fund amounts by fiscal year.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request

General Fund Request:

	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	Total
Requested Positions (year of phase in)	2.0	1.0	1.0	4.0
Ongoing Expenses	3,757,000	4,733,000	5,811,000	14,301,000
1-Time Expenses	5,222,000	2,044,000	1,777,000	9,043,000
Total	8,979,000	6,777,000	7,588,000	

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: The Phoenix system is the enterprise financial and procurement system for all 58 Trial Courts, and the payroll system for 13 courts, and as such requires constant maintenance and further innovation to adequately support the administrative needs of the courts, and the branch as a whole.

The Phoenix Program has enjoyed great success and continues to receive positive feedback across the state as a valued partner of the courts and good steward of public resources.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Judicial Council Technology Committee take on the lead advisory role as it must review and approve all technology related requests. The Phoenix Program, although more broadly serves an administrative function, is also a technology provider, as it encompasses the deployment and maintenance of the Phoenix Financial, Procurement, and HR Payroll System.

2019-20 Initial Funding Request**Requesting Entity:** Branch Accounting and Procurement (Trial Court Administrative Services)**Contact:** Bobby Brow**Date Prepared:** March 8, 2018**Budget Services Liaison:** Michael Sun**Document Tracking Number:** IFR-19-21**A. Working Title:** Phoenix HR Payroll Deployments

B. Description of Funding Request: According to JC Directive 131, Phoenix HR Payroll is an optional service to individual Trial Courts, subject to available resources. The Phoenix Program has been able to deploy HR Payroll services to six courts over the last seven years, and is in the process of deploying services to 2 more this year, without any additional investment in existing resources. However, the Program has reached maximum capacity and requires additional funding to provide support to courts that are currently requesting services. At least 4 Trial Courts are interested in deployment projects over the next 2 years. To provide the services, some consulting backfill and travel funds are required, as well as a total of 7.0 ongoing staff to support the additional work of the Program. This will also position the Phoenix Program to deploy to and support 2 to 3 more deployments over the following several years.

C. Estimated Costs: **One Time \$490,000 in 2019-20** **Ongoing \$385,000 in 2019-20**

Preliminary estimates are \$875,000 in 2019-20, and \$1.39 million in 2020-21. The table below shows these costs (new costs and position counts for each year).

	<i>Additional 19-20</i>	<i>Additional 20-21</i>	<i>2-year Total</i>
<i>One-Time</i>	<i>490,000</i>	<i>490,000</i>	<i>980,000</i>
<i>Ongoing</i>	<i>385,000</i>	<i>515,000</i>	<i>1,285,000</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>875,000</i>	<i>1,390,000</i>	<i>2,265,000</i>
<i>Positions</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>7</i>

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: The Phoenix system is the enterprise financial and procurement system for all 58 Trial Courts, and the payroll system for 13 courts. The Phoenix Program has enjoyed great success and continues to receive positive feedback across the state as a valued partner of the courts and good steward of public resources.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Judicial Council Technology Committee take on the lead advisory role as JCTC must review and approve all technology related requests. The Phoenix Program, although more broadly serves an administrative function, is also a technology provider, as it encompasses the deployment and maintenance of the Phoenix Financial, Procurement, and HR Payroll System.

2019-20 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Information Technology Office

Contact: Robert Oyung/John Yee

Date Prepared: April 11, 2018

Budget Services Liaison: Mary Jo Ejercito

Document Tracking Number: IFR-19-29

SECTION 1 – Initial Funding Request:

A. Working Title: Single Sign-On Solution for the Judicial Branch

B. Description of Funding Request:

The Judicial Council requests a General Fund augmentation of a range of \$2.1 to \$3.2 million in FY 2019-2020 and includes 2.0 positions to deploy a single sign-on solution that will provide a unique username and password to every judicial branch employee and judicial officer, attorneys, members of the public, and justice partners who access judicial branch computer systems and electronic services.

A single sign-on solution is the foundation that allows the judicial branch to uniquely identify an individual who is accessing judicial branch electronic systems. Currently each court has a local authentication and authorization system to secure its systems but those usernames and passwords cannot be used across courts. For attorneys, their bar number is a unique identifier but there is no associated password with that number and so cannot be used for secure access to systems. For the public, there is no way to uniquely identify them today and in fact, at times it is difficult to determine if cases with similar participant names are the same or different person.

Assigning a unique identifier to everyone will enable an entirely new set of electronic services. For example, the ability for a member of the public to login once to a portal and pay for any outstanding fines or fees from any court within the state and view all of their case files across different courts. An attorney could use their unique login to be notified if there are any actions or changes to any case that they have open at any court across the state from the superior courts to the Supreme Court. Judges and court staff could use their unique login to securely access systems without needing to memorize multiple usernames and passwords. Justice partners could securely access court systems to view information that only they are authorized to do so.

Note that changes to existing case management systems and other platforms would be necessary to take advantage of the single sign-on solution. The single sign-on solution is the key component that would enable much of this new functionality.

The increased access to justice would be significant.

C. Estimated Costs: : **One Time \$930,000 – \$1.9million** **Ongoing \$1.2million - \$1.3 million**

At this time, the cost to implement a single sign-on system is estimated. A project has been launched that will assess the technologies and options resulting in the limited purchase of a software as a service solution during the FY17/18 fiscal year with small pilot during that year and an anticipated wide spread implementation in FY18/19.

While the costs are not known at this time, one can expect:

2019-20 FY Initial Funding Request

- License/Usage costs – based on the number of users and the number of authentications
- Design/Deployment costs – costs to architect, test, deploy and maintain a branchwide Single Sign-On System
- CMS Modifications – significant modifications to existing CMSs may be needed to take advantage of the unique identifier for all parties, attorneys and other people associated with the case
- Payment/ACH costs – assuming that credit card payments are outsourced to an Automated Clearing House

Cost Table Summary

Description	Low		High	
	One Time Cost	On Going Costs	One Time Cost	On Going Costs
Full Time Staff		230,167		345,250
Contracted Services	928,800		1,857,600	
Single Sign On Services		988,596		988,596
TOTALS	928,800	1,218,763	1,857,600	1,333,846

Low Estimate Total Cost: \$2,147,563

High Estimate Total Cost: \$3,191,446

Cost Estimation Tables for Reference

	Units	Low		High	
		One Time	On Going	One Time	On Going
Full Time Staff Costs					
Sr. BSA	2	115,083.36	172,625.04		
				230,166.72	345,250.08
Full Time Staff Costs				230,166.72	345,250.08
Contracting Services					
Integration with Case Management Systems	3	309,600.00	619,200.00	928,800.00	1,857,600.00
Contacting Services Total				928,800.00	1,857,600.00
Single Sign On Services					
	Units	Unit Price	Ext Monthly Price		Ext Annual Price
Identity Management					
Number of Stored Accounts (3M)	3000000		2923		35,076.00
Number of Transactions (9M)	90000000		19460		233,520.00
Mutlifactor Authentication (2M)	2000000	0.03	60000		720,000.00
					-
Estimated Total					988,596.00

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests:

“Promoting the Digital Court” and “Optimizing Infrastructure” are two of the goals in *Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan* that a single sign-on system will support. Single sign-on

2019-20 FY Initial Funding Request

will enable an entirely new set of capabilities to improve court operations and dramatically increase access to justice for the public. Single Sign-On has been identified as a key component for the e-filing workstream initiative currently in progress and sponsored by the Information Technology Advisory Committee as one of its major programs in the published Tactical Plan for Technology. Single sign-on will also be a key component for both the Self-Represented Litigants workstream and the Next Generation Hosting Workstream.

This request was submitted as part of the FY 2018-2019 BCP process and JC Information Technology has recently been informed that it is not being approved.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Information Technology Advisory Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee:

Budget Services proposes that the Judicial Council Technology Committee take on the lead advisory role as the JCTC oversees the council's policies concerning technology and is responsible in partnership with the courts for coordinating with the Administrative Director and all internal committees, advisory committees, commissions, working groups, task forces, justice partners and stakeholders on technological issues relating to the branch and the courts.