



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm)  
[jctc@jud.ca.gov](mailto:jctc@jud.ca.gov)

## JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))

THIS MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED BY TELECONFERENCE

THIS MEETING WILL BE RECORDED

---

**Date:** June 11, 2018  
**Time:** 12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m.  
**Public Call-in Number:** 1-877-820-7831 Passcode: 3511860

---

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

---

### **I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))**

---

#### **Call to Order and Roll Call**

#### **Approval of Minutes**

Approve minutes of the May 23, 2018 meeting.

---

### **II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(2))**

---

#### **Written Comment**

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), public comments about any agenda item must be submitted by June 8, 2018, 12:00 noon. Written comments should be e-mailed to [jctc@jud.ca.gov](mailto:jctc@jud.ca.gov) or mailed or delivered to 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, attention: Rica Abesa. Only written comments received by June 8, 2018, 12:00 noon will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

---

### **III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-4)**

---

#### **Item 1**

#### **Chair Report**

Provide update on activities of or news from the Judicial Council, advisory bodies, courts, and/or other justice partners.

Presenter: Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair, Judicial Council Technology Committee

**Item 2**

**Update/Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)**

An update and report on ITAC will be provided; this will include the activities of the workstreams.

Presenter: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair, Information Technology Advisory Committee

**Item 3**

**Extension of V3 Case Management System (CMS) Support (Action Required)**

Consideration of proposal to extend use of the funding approved by the Judicial Council in support of V3 CMS past June 30, 2019. This item was approved by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee on May 31, 2018.

Presenter: Mr. David Yamasaki, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Orange County  
Ms. Kathleen Fink, Manager, Information Technology, Judicial Council

**Item 4**

**Update on the Technology Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) for FY19/20**

An update and report on the outcomes of the May 23, 2018 Judicial Branch Budget Committee, in which it prioritized the BCP concepts submitted across all programs for FY 19/20 funding. Review impacts to technology proposals and provide next steps in the process.

Presenter: Hon. Marsha Slough, Chair, Judicial Council Technology Committee  
Mr. Robert Oyung, Chief Operating Officer and Interim Chief Information Officer, Judicial Council

**A D J O U R N M E N T**

**Adjourn**



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm)  
[jctc@jud.ca.gov](mailto:jctc@jud.ca.gov)

## JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

May 23, 2018

3:00 - 4:05 PM

Sequoia Room, Judicial Council Conference Center  
455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3688

---

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair; Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-Chair; Hon. Ming W. Chin; Hon. Kyle S. Brodie; Hon. Rebecca Wightman; Mr. Jake Chatters; Ms. Rachel W. Hill; Ms. Audra Ibarra; and Ms. Andrea K. Rohmann

---

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** None

**Liaison Members Present:** Hon. Sheila F. Hanson

**Others Present:** Hon. Jackson Lucky; Hon. Samantha Jessner; Mr. Snorri Ogata; Mr. Robert Oyung; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Ms. Heather Pettit; Mr. David Koon; Ms. Kathy Fink; Ms. Jamel Jones; Ms. Camilla Kieliger; Mr. Douglas Denton; Ms. Shelly Curran; and Ms. Martha Wright

---

---

### OPEN MEETING

---

#### Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order, took roll call, and advised no public comments were received.

#### Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the April 16, 2018 action by e-mail and the May 14, 2018 meeting.

---

### DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

---

#### Item 1

##### Chair Report

**Update:** Hon. Marsha Slough, Chair of the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC), welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. Justice Slough reviewed the agenda items for the meeting.

**Item 2**

**Status/Final Report on the Intelligent Forms Workstream of the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)**

**Update:** Hon. Jackson Lucky, Executive Sponsor, and Ms. Camilla Kieliger, Project Manager, provided an update and final report from the ITAC Intelligent Forms Workstream Phase 1 activities. This included review of the workstream charge, review of work completed and final recommendations, and next steps of the workstream. The workstream recommendations covered the following topics: certified forms, data population API, accessibility, governance, prioritization of upgrades, evaluation of dynamic forms and document assembly. The meeting materials contained the full report.

**Action:** The committee discussed the report. The committee voted to approve the report from the workstream.

**Item 3**

**Video Remote Interpreting Workstream Update**

**Update:** Hon. Samantha Jessner, Executive Sponsor, and Mr. Douglas Denton, Supervising Analyst in the Judicial Council Court Operations Services office, provided a status of the ITAC/Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force (LAPITF) Video Remote Interpreting program and workstream, which included recent milestones specific to the pilot project (LAP recommendation 16) and establishing minimum technology requirements for remote interpreting (LAP recommendation 14).

**Action:** The committee received the report.

**Item 4**

**Ability-to-Pay Tool Program Overview**

**Update:** Ms. Shelly Curran, Director of the Judicial Council Criminal Justice Services office, and Ms. Martha Wright, Supervising Analyst of the office, provided an introduction and overview of the Ability-to-Pay tool program, currently in development.

**Action:** The committee received the report.

**A D J O U R N M E N T**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: April 16, 2015

---

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Title   | Agenda Item Type   |
| Technology: V3 Interim Case Management System Funding | Action Required  |
| Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected         | Effective Date   |
| None  | July 1, 2015   |
| Recommended by  | Date of Report   |
| Judicial Council Technology Committee                 | April 7, 2015  |
| Hon. James E. Herman, Chair                           | Contact  |
| Hon. David De Alba, Vice-Chair                        | Jessica Craven, 818-558-3103<br><a href="mailto:jessica.craven@jud.ca.gov">jessica.craven@jud.ca.gov</a> |
|   | Kathleen Fink, 415-865-4094<br><a href="mailto:kathleen.fink@jud.ca.gov">kathleen.fink@jud.ca.gov</a>    |
|   | Renea Stewart, 818-558-4184<br><a href="mailto:renea.stewart@jud.ca.gov">renea.stewart@jud.ca.gov</a>    |

---

### Executive Summary

In April 2014, the Judicial Council directed the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) to make a recommendation on a plan to eliminate funding from the Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) and Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) for the V3 Case Management System (V3). In February 2015, the council adopted the joint recommendation from the JCTC and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) that the JCTC continue to work with the affected courts to align V3 and Sustain Justice Edition case management systems with JCTC strategy. The V3 courts consider taking on maintenance and operations costs for V3, as well as funding a replacement case management system for V3, to be a major challenge due to the judicial branch budget, the need to replace case management systems for other case types, the lack of control the V3 courts have over the cost of V3 operations and maintenance, and the

negative impact of the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) on their budgets. The V3 courts also committed significant resources to the development and deployment of V3 as well as subject matter expertise to the development of the terminated CCMS case management system. The JCTC has collaborated with the V3 courts on a path forward that will allow the courts time to transition to another case management system or assume the costs for V3, previously allocated from the IMF or TCTF.

## **Recommendation**

The Judicial Council Technology Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve the following changes to the V3 interim case management system programs:

1. After a period of four years starting on July 1, 2015 and ending June 30, 2019, branch funding for the V3 case management system will stop; and
2. V3 will be funded the first fiscal year (July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016). A working group comprised of members of the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) and Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) will work together on the source of funding for the remaining three years.

## **Previous Council Action**

In March 2012, the Judicial Council voted to terminate deployment of the California Court Case Management System (CCMS) as a statewide court technology solution. The council directed the CCMS Internal Committee to work in partnership with the trial courts to develop timelines and recommendations to the council for strategies to assist trial courts with existing critical case management system needs, to establish a judicial branch court technology governance structure that would best serve the implementation of technology solutions, and to provide technology solutions in the near term to improve efficiencies in court operations by maximizing the value of document management systems, e-filing capabilities, and e-delivery services for the benefit of litigants, attorneys, justice partners, and the public.

In June 2012, the Judicial Council updated the name and structure of the CCMS Internal Committee to the JCTC to be in alignment with the Judicial Council direction. The new committee charge was to oversee the council's policies concerning technology, with responsibility 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.

In October 2012, the JCTC hosted a Judicial Branch Technology Summit where branch stakeholders assembled for a collaborative discussion on branch technology governance, vision, and planning. The discussions and feedback from the summit reinforced the need for a new governance and funding model and a long-term strategic plan for branch technology.

In February 2013, the Chief Justice authorized the creation of the Technology Planning Task Force (TPTF). The task force was charged with working collaboratively to define judicial branch technology governance in terms of statewide versus local decision-making, to develop a strategic plan for technology across all court levels that provides a vision and direction for technology within the branch, and to develop recommendations for a stable, long-term funding source for supporting branch technology, as well as a delineation of technology funding sources.

In January 2014, the Judicial Council approved the concept of the court technology governance and strategic plan, prepared by the Technology Planning Task Force, based on the information provided in the executive summary for the governance and funding model and plans.

At its April 24, 2014 business meeting, the council tasked the JCTC with developing a plan to eventually eliminate funding from the TCTF and State Trial Court IMF to courts for V3 (civil, small claims, probate, and mental health) case management system and Sustain Justice Edition costs.

In August 2014, the Judicial Council approved the Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan. The chair of the JCTC stated that the plan would return to the council with updates related to language access.

In October 2014, the Judicial Council approved the update to the Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan.

In February 2015, the Judicial Council approved recommendations that included input from court executive officers and court information officers on changes to a number of statewide technology programs to achieve approximately \$1 million in savings in the State Trial Court IMF; forming a working group or tasking an existing council committee to focus on technology-related efficiencies and cost-saving measures for small courts; and directing its Information Technology office to consider replacing its external contractors with employees, as well as adopting the joint recommendation from the JCTC and the TCBAC that the JCTC continue to work with the affected courts to align V3 and Sustain Justice Edition case management systems with JCTC strategy.

### **Rationale for Recommendation**

This recommendation recognizes the investments the V3 courts made in a statewide CMS, as well as their lack of funds to deploy a new civil CMS. It takes into consideration that three of the courts (Orange, Sacramento, and San Diego) are donor courts under the WAFM and recognizes that overall, it is counterproductive to expect the courts to pick up operational and maintenance costs for V3, at the same time as they expend funds to transition to a new CMS. The same three courts also have major projects underway to replace other failing case management systems, projects that have consumed their resources and funds. This recommendation assists the V3 courts in bridging the gap to transition from V3 and the statewide CMS strategy to the new judicial branch technology strategy.

## **Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications**

### **Comments**

The JCTC has thoroughly examined, with the participation and collaboration of the V3 courts, the Judicial Council directive to develop a plan to eventually eliminate the funding from TCTF and IMF to the V3 courts. Following the council's decision to stop CCMS as a statewide CMS in 2012, the Judicial Branch Information Technology Working Group reporting to the JCTC formed the V2 and V3 Workstream so the courts could make recommendations on their CMS. The courts were unable to reach a consensus on a path forward.

In July 2014, the JCTC sent a letter to the V3 courts requesting that they advise of their plans for V3. Representatives from the JCTC met with the V3 courts in August 2014 to get their input and ideas. The JCTC has reviewed possible costing models for the V3 courts. JCTC representatives met with each of the V3 courts in March 2015 to invite further feedback and to best understand their plans. In March, the JCTC also met with the V3 courts in a closed meeting, to allow for sharing of confidential information, and an open meeting to allow public discussion and to vote on a recommendation.

On March 11, 2015, the TCBAC's Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee voted to recommend to the TCBAC that the IMF support for V3 and Sustain Justice Edition (also known as the Intermediate Case Management System or ICMS) be reduced by 20% starting in FY 2015–2016 and the costs be passed on to the trial courts. The subcommittee reconvened on April 2, 2015 to reconsider this recommendation. The subcommittee revised the recommendation to freeze the 2015–2016 IMF allocations for V3 and ICMS to the FY 2014–2015 funding levels. In addition, they voted to reduce the IMF allocations for V3 and ICMS by 10% starting in FY 2015–2016 if the IMF FY 2015–2016 ending fund balance is projected to be below \$300,000. The costs would not be passed on to the V3 courts as previously recommended. Judicial Council staff were asked to identify ways the costs could be absorbed within the Judicial Council Information Technology budget or eliminated through reduction in services.

Judicial Council Information Technology staff are working on the potential impact of these recommendations. As of the time of this report, the analysis has not been completed. Suggested next steps for assisting the V3 courts include exploring potential sources of funding to deploy replacement CMSs and developing a business case for funding replacement CMSs.

### **Impacts and equity issues**

**WAFM “donor” courts.** The funding issues are exacerbated in the case of WAFM “donor” courts (the Superior Courts of Orange, Sacramento, and San Diego Counties in FY 2014–2015), by their reduction in allocations. Reductions are at 15% in FY 2014–2015 and go to 30% in FY 2015–2016.



**Limited staff resources.** From the meetings with the V3 courts, the JCTC learned that each of the courts has had significant reductions in staff. Existing staff is committed to supporting judicial officers and also assisting with the current projects to replace failing case management systems. There are no available staff resources to also support the transition to a new civil CMS.

**1% cap on reserves.** With the 1% cap on reserves, the trial courts no longer have the ability to save for a new case management system.

**Pending Gap analysis.** Tyler has agreed to perform a Gap analysis for the Superior Court of Orange County comparing Tyler Odyssey to V3. This will identify areas that Tyler needs to modify in its case management system, so that the efficiencies and cost savings the court depends on in V3 will not be lost. Examples of these efficiencies are streamlined e-filing processing and the Electronic Legal File (which enables a paperless courtroom). These improvements in Tyler's Odyssey will be available to and will benefit all courts moving to Odyssey and could be used even by courts working with other vendors to potentially identify areas for improvement and efficiency.

**Feedback from courts.** The courts have offered feedback regarding the directive of the Judicial Council in their April 2014 meeting:

Beginning in 2005, seven courts volunteered to assist the branch in developing a new case management system. The new system was intended to serve the entire branch, not just the seven courts, and the costs of developing and maintaining the CMS was assumed to be funded from trial court funding sources before allocation to the trial courts. During the development and testing of the branch-wide CMS these seven courts provided substantial additional resources, both operations and IT resources, to help develop and test the V2, V3, and V4 prototypes. Moreover, the people assisting were highly skilled "subject matter experts" whose efforts were dedicated to developing the best system for all courts, and not available to the volunteer courts to do their daily work. These resources were from each court's base allocations, not from the trial court funding sources.

The courts also point out that in the audit of the CCMS development, the California State Auditor found that:

the seven superior courts that have implemented the criminal [V2] and civil [V3] systems reported to us [CSA] that they spent nearly \$44 million in staffing, equipment, and consulting costs to test, deploy and support the interim systems beyond the roughly \$49 million that they [the V3 courts] paid directly to the development vendor [to assist in the deployment of prototypes]. Even this \$44 million is likely understated because one superior court—the Superior Court of San Diego County (San Diego)—also reported that in fiscal years 2005–06 and 2006–07 between 120 and 130 of its staff worked part-time to full-time on

implementation of the civil system but it was unable to quantify the cost related to their efforts.

California State Auditor, Report No. 2010-102, Administrative Office of the Courts: The Statewide Case Management Project Faces Significant Challenges Due to Poor Project Management (Feb. 2011), pp. 45–46.

According to the V3 courts, although the Judicial Council provided administrative grants to assist the V3 courts with their costs to support CCMS development, it was quite nominal compared to the costs spent by the courts to support CCMS development as noted above. The V3 courts made significant investments in a CMS that was intended to benefit all courts.

### **Alternatives Considered**

Two funding strategy alternatives were evaluated. These were:

1. Sunset of V3 in three to five years, which was refined to four years
2. Incremental transitioning of costs using a cost-sharing formula

Additionally, regardless of the alternative chosen, the V3 courts may seek funding for replacement CMSs with the idea that Judicial Council staff would assist if desired by the V3 courts.

***Alternative 1: Sunset of V3 in four years.*** This alternative included:

- No change to the current source of V3 funding. Funding would continue to come from the TCTF or IMF for a set period, proposed between three and five years and refined to four years.
- At the end of that period, V3 courts will either have deployed a replacement civil CMS, taken on support for V3, or will assume the full costs for V3.

The rationale for this alternative was that it recognizes that the combination of the WAFM changes and an immediate start to a glide path or transition will increase the difficulty for the V3 courts to fund a replacement CMS. This gives the V3 courts time to deploy a replacement civil CMS or take on support for V3.

***Alternative 2: Incremental transitioning of costs using a cost-sharing formula.*** This alternative included:

- The V3 courts will incrementally take on more of the V3 costs, with the funds from IMF or TCTF decreasing as court contributions increase, until 100% of the costs are allocated to the V3 courts.
- The progression, percentages, and length of time, need to be determined. A five-year glide path is consistent with the WAFM and with current models for economic planning.

Four cost-sharing models for this alternative were evaluated. These include:

- Allocation proportional to court budget does not take usage into account, but does take court fiscal realities into account. As the WAFM is implemented, the courts' budgets should become more representative of usage.
- Allocation by filings is an accepted cost model for service providers, but costs fall disproportionately on the smaller courts.
- Allocation by users is an accepted cost model for software vendors, but less so for service providers, and costs fall disproportionately on the smaller courts.
- Equal allocation distributes costs disproportionately to the smaller courts.

The rationale for this alternative was that it spreads out the impact on the V3 courts of absorbing the costs for V3; however, this alternative has an additional impact for three V3 courts (the Superior Courts of Orange, Sacramento, and San Diego Counties), which is the challenge of starting a project to deploy a replacement civil CMS while they have resources committed to completing projects already underway to replace other failing CMSs. This results in courts transitioning from V3 and no longer participating in cost sharing for V3 at significantly different times. Related to this alternative is the issue of how to minimize the fiscal impact to the remaining courts as one or more courts convert to another civil CMS and how those costs will be absorbed by the IMF or TCTF.

**Option for either alternative: Seek funding for replacement case management systems**

This option could be used for either alternative. The V3 courts may develop a business case for V3 CMS replacement using the Superior Court of Fresno County's V2 CMS replacement as a model, or develop another model. The courts may request funds from the Judicial Council (emergency funds or a loan) or from the state via a budget change proposal (BCP) in implementing replacement civil CMSs. When the V3 courts are fully transitioned, in four years or less, funding will no longer be needed from the TCTF or IMF.

**Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts**

The implementation requirements, costs, and operational impacts are detailed in the recommendation section above.

**Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives**

This recommendation will address the strategic plan goals of Access, Fairness, and Diversity (Goal I), Modernization of Management and Administration (Goal III), and Quality of Justice and Service to the Public (Goal IV). The Judicial Council approved the Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan, which includes the strategic and tactical plans for technology.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
BUDGET SERVICES  
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

**(Action Item)**

**Title:**           **Extension of V3 Case Management System (CMS) Support**  
**Date:**           5/23/2018  
**Contact:**       Kathy Fink, Manager, Judicial Council Information Technology  
                      415-865-4094 | [Kathleen.Fink@jud.ca.gov](mailto:Kathleen.Fink@jud.ca.gov)

---

**Issue**

Consideration of the Revenue and Expenditure (R&E) Subcommittee's recommendation to approve extending the sunset of CMS V3 funding from June 30, 2019 to June 30, 2020. This request is not an allocation request from the State Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF); as stated it is an extension of the timeline previously approved by the Judicial Council in April 2015 by one year. No additional funding beyond the projected baseline funding plan is being or will be requested.

**Background**

In April 2015, a recommendation by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) and the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) was approved by the Judicial Council to eliminate funding from the IMF for the V3 CMS used by four superior courts including Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura beginning in July 2019. Even prior to that time, the V3 courts had begun to work with the JCTC on a path to deploy alternate CMSs and retire CMS V3. A budget change proposal was submitted for Civil CMS (V3) Replacement for 2016-17 and was approved in the state budget.

The 2017-18 five-year projected budget for CMS V3 was based on the end date of CMS V3 funding of June 30, 2019. The budget projected a steep ramp down in 2018-19 and zero funding in 2019-20. However, this steep ramp down and decommissioning of V3 has since been determined not to be feasible in the original timeframe.

Despite projects already underway to convert other CMSs that were failing, the V3 courts have been progressing with their projects to replace CMS V3. All of the affected courts have identified replacement solutions and are working expeditiously to complete their projects. However, as many courts have already experienced, CMS deployment times are longer than projected or desired. Consequently, conversion to new CMSs will extend beyond June 2019.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
BUDGET SERVICES  
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

**Justification**

The projected five-year budget has been revised based on the timelines for the CMS V3 replacement projects. Since the April 2015 Judicial Council decision to sunset the support of CMS V3, costs for support have been reduced and additional reductions are planned for the next fiscal year. The Judicial Council Information Technology office is proposing to utilize savings generated in the original funding plan as approved in 2015-16 to fund the extension for CMS V3 through 2019-20.

These savings have been achieved through reductions in contractors and data center equipment as well as not replacing employees who have left the Judicial Council. Support efforts for CMS V3 are limited to remediating defects, programming legislative/statutory updates, and upgrades to software components where necessary. The reduced levels of support have not been ideal given the ongoing migration work that is required, but all the courts using CMS V3 have agreed to this reduced level to gain additional, critical time to migrate to their new CMSs.

The table below shows a baseline funding plan projected from the allocation approved by the Judicial Council for 2015-16, as well as a proposed plan for an extension through 2019-20. A baseline CMS V3 funding provides \$22.6 million from 2015-16 through 2018-19. The actual expenditures and forecasted obligations through 2018-19 total \$15.0 million. There is an estimated savings of \$7.6 million from the baseline plan. The precise request for 2019-20 will depend on how quickly the courts can ramp down use of CMS V3 as well as other factors that are not known this far in advance such as unexpected increases in software maintenance, maintenance of older V3 CMS equipment, and reductions in Schedule C funding. However, the projected need for 2019-20 is \$3.46 million or less. Even extending the period to June 30, 2020, there remains an overall savings of \$4.1 million from the baseline-funding plan.

| # | Description   | 2015-16            | 2016-17              | 2017-18              | 2018-19              | 2019-20             | Total                |
|---|---|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | V3 CMS funding plan as a baseline from 2015-16                            | \$5,658,100        | \$5,658,100          | \$5,658,100          | \$5,658,100          | \$0                 | \$22,632,400         |
| 2 | Expenditures/Obligations<br>(2017-18 and 2018-19 are<br>projected values) | \$4,752,099        | \$3,681,167          | \$3,250,766          | \$3,371,838          | \$0                 | \$15,055,870         |
| 3 | <b>Savings from baseline<br/>plan</b>                                     | <b>(\$906,001)</b> | <b>(\$1,976,933)</b> | <b>(\$2,407,334)</b> | <b>(\$2,286,262)</b> | <b>\$0</b>          | <b>(\$7,576,530)</b> |
| 4 | <b>Expended/Proposed V3<br/>Funding</b>                                   | \$4,752,099        | \$3,681,167          | \$3,250,766          | \$3,371,838          | <b>\$3,463,913*</b> | \$18,519,783         |

*\*Amount will be subject to funds availability at the time of the 2019-20 allocation process.*

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
BUDGET SERVICES  
**Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee**

The requested extension does not constitute an allocation request but a request to extend the timeline for potential use of the funds to 2019-20. The Information Technology office will be required to come back to the R&E Subcommittee and TCBAC next fiscal year to request an IMF allocation in 2019-20 along with other Judicial Council offices. There is currently a negative fund balance projected for 2019-20 using the current revenue projections and expenditure assumptions, and Judicial Council staff continue to work diligently with the Department of Finance to resolve the structural deficit in IMF.

**Recommendation**

The following recommendation is presented to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee for consideration:

1. Approve extending the use of CMS V3 funding through to June 30, 2020, based on reductions achieved each year since the decision to eliminate CMS funding from the IMF. Although the projected need for 2019-20 is currently \$3.46 million, this is not a request for an allocation. The program will return next fiscal year to the R&E Subcommittee in the spring and then to the TCBAC to request an allocation for 2019-20.

## Update on the Technology Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) for FY19/20

The Judicial Branch Budget Committee (JBBC), at its May 23 meeting, approved the following 2019-20 concepts for development into budget change proposals with the proposed priority listed below.

Please note:

- Two requests that have been combined with other concepts (see items in **red** in the table below) and will be developed into one budget change proposal.
- The items **highlighted in yellow** are the technology-related proposals.
- JCIT Staff is moving forward to develop full BCPs for the five items in **bold** (ranked as priority #1, #2, #5, #8, and #14).

This list of BCPs and prioritization will be recommended to the Judicial Council at its July 19-20 meeting.

| Priority # | Tracking #   | Description  |
|------------|--------------|--|
| 1          | 19-14        | <b>Case Management System (CMS) Replacement for Trial Courts – Phase III Request</b>   |
| 2          | 19-20        | <b>Implementation of Phoenix Roadmap – Cloud Migration, Technical Upgrade and Functional Improvements and Phoenix HR Payroll Deployments</b>             |
| 3          | 19-01        | Funding for 10 of the 50 Judgeships Authorized by AB 159 and Appellate Court Judicial Workload (additional 2 Justices)                                   |
| 4          | 19-22        | Trial Court Facility Maintenance and Operations  |
| 5          | 19-15 /19-29 | <b>Using Business Intelligence and Data Analytics (BI/DA) to Transform the Enterprise/Deploy an Identity Management solution for the Judicial Branch</b> |
| 6          | 19-30/19-26  | Civil Adjudication of Minor Traffic Infractions - Futures Commission Recommendation/ Fund Shift of Civil Assessment Revenues                             |
| 7          | 19-23        | Statewide Security Systems and Equipment - Maintenance and Replacement   |
| 8          | 19-10        | <b>Digitizing Documents Phase One for the Superior and Appellate Courts</b>  |
| 9          | 19-24        | Increasing Energy Efficiency in the Judicial Branch  |
| 10         | 19-05        | Judicial Branch Litigation Management Program  |
| 11         | 19-04        | Appellate Court Facility Maintenance Program   |
| 12         | 19-03        | Appellate Court Security   |
| 13         | 19-25        | Trial Court Capital Outlay Plan  |
| 14         | 19-11        | <b>Futures Commission Directives for the Expansion of Technology in the Courts</b>   |
| 15         | 19-06        | Continuing the Implementation of the <i>Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts</i>  |

Please note that the requests shown below were **NOT** recommended by the JBBC to move forward.

| #  | Tracking # | Description  |
|----|------------|--|
| 1  | 19-02      | Appellate Court Appointed Counsel Projects   |
| 2  | 19-07      | Habeas Corpus Resource Center Case Team Staffing   |
| 3  | 19-08      | Collaboration Platform for the Branch IT Community   |
| 4  | 19-09      | Management of Digital Evidence in the Courts - Pilot   |
| 5  | 19-12      | Pilot Next Generation Hosting concepts at one or more courts   |
| 6  | 19-13      | Modernization of Judicial Council Forms Technology/Intelligent Forms   |
| 7  | 19-16      | Disaster Recovery Framework Implementation Pilot   |
| 8  | 19-17      | Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) in Juvenile Dependency Court  |
| 9  | 19-18      | Establishing the Center for Self-Help Resources recommended by the Chief Justice's Commission on the Future of the California Courts |
| 10 | 19-19      | Court Appointed Counsel in Juvenile Dependency Proceedings   |
| 11 | 19-27      | Support for Trial Court Operations   |
| 12 | 19-31      | Placeholder - Pretrial Detention Reform  |
| 13 | 19-32      | Placeholder - Proposition 66 - Death Penalty Reform and Savings Act of 2016  |





## 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         |
| May 23, 2018                                  | Please Review            |
| To  | Deadline                 |
| Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair                  | N/A                      |
| Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-Chair                  |                          |
| Judicial Council Technology Committee         | Contact                  |
|   | Kathleen Fink, Manager   |
| From  | 415-865-4094             |
| Kathleen Fink, Manager,                       | kathleen.fink@jud.ca.gov |
| Judicial Council Information Technology       |                          |
| Subject                                       |                          |
| Civil Case Management System (V3) Replacement |                          |
| Projects: Status April 24 – May 21, 2018      |                          |

---

**Project:** Civil Case Management System (CMS) (V3) Replacement projects for the Superior Courts of Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura Counties

**Status:** The monthly Project Status meeting was held on May 21, 2018.

### **Intra Branch Agreements (IBAs):**

Orange Superior Court's decision to update CMS V3 for supportability and reliability until an adequate vendor product is available has resulted in a significant reduction in the BCP funds needed by the court. The original request over three years was \$10.6 million and has been reduced to \$3.4 million.

- An amendment to the Orange Superior Court FY 2016/17 IBA to disencumber unneeded funds has been fully executed.

### **Disbursements**

- Disbursements to Ventura and Orange Superior Courts were processed and checks received.
- Disbursements to San Diego Superior Court are in progress.

**Ventura Superior Court** (Journal Technologies eCourt):

Ventura has been working with other courts that have implemented eCourts, to learn from and leverage work that has already been done.

- The court visited Riverside Superior Court and gathered information on their “file-less” record unit functions (a major step toward paperless - some documents are still printed out for temporary use, but there is no physical file storage and the court is working on functionality needed for paperless).
- A demo is scheduled on June 7 at Riverside for judges who are interested in how probate cases are managed on eCourt.

Configuration, conversion, and testing are well underway.

- The first test data conversion iterations have been successful.
- The court is making progress on configuring inbound and outbound forms which are extremely complex. An eCourt Forms expert is now scheduled to spend time at the court to provide training and answer questions.

The first case type to be converted is small claims. Go-live is targeted for August 20th.

**San Diego Superior Court** (Tyler Odyssey):

Remediating the gaps in functionality between Odyssey and CMS V3 is advancing.

- The court is finishing up on validation of the initial gap analysis findings and reviewing identified items with Tyler.
- Tyler is turning over design documents and flow charts of the business processes for the changes identified in the gap analysis. Per the updated process, the court and Tyler will sign off the document.

Three days of training are scheduled for Odyssey 2017, which will be the upgrade from Odyssey 2014.

**Sacramento Superior Court** (Thomson Reuters C-Track):

Design of business processes and configuration is proceeding.

- The Participation Agreement for planning and business process analysis has been executed with Thomson Reuters.
- The court is scheduled to work with Thomson Reuters on the analysis for civil case types.

CMS design, develop, build and test activities will begin following the analysis phase.

**Orange Superior Court** (Update CMS V3 for supportability and reliability):

Significant changes for supportability are in progress.

- The court is moving CMS V3 to a more flexible platform. The re-platform phase is progressing quickly, with CISCO Blade hardware and Linux OS. Testing is going well and the court is targeting to go live on July 1st.
- An RFP to replace the Adobe software component is completed. The Intent to Award has been issued for DocPath. Planning for the upgrade phase is in progress.

May 23, 2018

Page 3

Two of three staffing requirements have been completed.

- A manager and senior java developer for V3 have been hired and both are starting on May 25th. The manager has experience in upgrading java frameworks, which will be the court's next task for modernizing V3.
- The court is also in the process of recruiting for a java architect for V3.



## 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**

June 4, 2018

**Action Requested**

Please Review

**To**

Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair  
Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-Chair  
Judicial Council Technology Committee

**Deadline**

N/A

**From**

David Koon, Manager,  
Judicial Council Information Technology

**Contact**

David Koon, Manager  
415-865-4618  
david.koon@jud.ca.gov

**Subject**

Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement  
Projects: Status May 1 - 31, 2018

---

As requested, this communication provides a written update regarding the progress of the nine courts using the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system which collectively received \$4.1 million in funding for FY 17/18 as a result of submitting a BCP to replace the SJE case management system with a modern CMS platform.

**Project:** Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement projects for the Superior Courts of Humboldt, Lake, Madera, Modoc, Plumas, San Benito, Sierra, Trinity, and Tuolumne counties.

**Status:** Judicial Council staff and the SJE courts met on May 16, 2018 for the monthly status meeting. During the meeting, the SJE courts shared that they continued to work on configuration tasks related to the eCourt application and business process review. The courts are also testing the various configuration areas as the work progresses. Additionally, the courts are working with the case management system vendor, Journal Technologies, Inc., on an addendum to the master

June 4, 2018

Page 2

services agreement. Once the addendum is signed, the courts will then continue the process of getting their participation agreements in place with the vendor.

**Next Steps:** The next monthly status meeting with Judicial Council staff and the SJE courts is on June 20, 2018. The courts will also continue to work with the Journal Technologies, Inc vendor on the addendum and participation agreements.