



## Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

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: March 27, 2012

---

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Title  | Agenda Item Type   |
| California Court Case Management System:<br>Maintenance and Operations Costs for<br>Courts with V2 and V3 Interim Case<br>Management Systems | Action Required  |
|  | Effective Date   |
|  | March 27, 2012   |
| Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected  | Date of Report   |
| None   | March 18, 2012   |
| Recommended by   | Contact  |
| CCMS Internal Committee  | Mark W. Dusman, 415-865-4999   |
| Hon. James E. Herman, Chair  | <a href="mailto:mark.dusman@jud.ca.gov">mark.dusman@jud.ca.gov</a>                       |
|  | Virginia Sanders-Hinds, 415-865-4617   |
|  | <a href="mailto:virginia.sanders-hinds@jud.ca.gov">virginia.sanders-hinds@jud.ca.gov</a> |

---

### Executive Summary

Maintenance and operations support for the Interim Criminal and Traffic Case Management System (V2) deployed in the Superior Court of Fresno County in 2006 is provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). The Civil, Small Claims, and Probate and Mental Health Interim Case Management System (V3), deployed in six superior courts between 2006 and 2008—Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Joaquin, and Ventura—is also supported by the AOC. Both case management systems were supported by software development vendors before maintenance and support operations transitioned to the AOC to achieve cost savings and establish a foundation for ongoing support. The delay in deploying the California Court Case Management System requires the existing support model for the V2 and V3 programs be reexamined. Funding is required on an annual basis to maintain and support V2 and V3.

## Recommendation

The chair of the California Court Case Management System (CCMS) Internal Committee recommends that the Judicial Council consider the following options for maintaining and operating CCMS V2 and V3:

- Option 1—Approve the projected FY 2012–2013 maintenance and support budget for the CCMS interim case management systems: \$4,139,117 for the V2 case management system, and \$11,967,764 for the V3 case management system, both from the Trial Court Trust Fund.
- Option 2—Approve the projected budget for the CCMS interim case management systems that includes an additional \$1,081,280 for court-requested enhancements to V3. This brings the total budget to: \$4,139,117 for the V2 and \$ 13,049,044 for V3, both from the Trial Court Trust Fund.

## Previous Council Action

Judicial Council actions related to case management systems include:

1998: Adoption of the Court Technology Advisory Committee’s Strategic Plan, providing the foundation for a technology policy in the judicial branch.

2000: Adoption of the *Tactical Plan for Court Technology*, with an objective of leveraging statewide technology resources.

2002: Directive to build a modern technology infrastructure that meets the needs of the courts.

2003: Policy directive to affirm development and implementation of statewide administrative infrastructure initiatives in the areas of finance, human resources, information technology, and legal services.

2010: Approval by the Executive and Planning Committee of the current CCMS governance model, developed to broaden participation within the judicial branch and include the State Bar of California and justice system partners.

2011: Appointment by the Chief Justice of a new internal Judicial Council committee charged with overseeing the council’s policies on CCMS.

July 2011: Vote by the Judicial Council to redirect \$56.4 million from CCMS to trial court operations. The projected budgets for V2 (\$6,902,184) and V3 (\$12,562,497) were not changed by this action.

## **Rationale for Recommendation**

V2 and V3 have been considered “interim” case management systems pending the development of CCMS (V4). In this interim period the courts utilizing V2 and V3 have worked with the AOC Information Services Division (ISD) to develop and maintain mature and stable systems.

ISD assists the courts on a daily basis, providing various levels of support. The courts rely on the skills and expertise of the maintenance and support unit to remediate defects, implement legislative updates, configure and install software and hardware upgrades, and address other minor and critical issues. Ongoing CCMS maintenance is required to support the daily operations of V2 and V3 courts.

The courts recognize that V2 and V3 are interim technology solutions and therefore system enhancement requests are limited to those critical needs with a direct impact on performance and case processing. A continued delay in deployment of CCMS (V4) may necessitate a change in the approach for maintenance and support of V2 and V3. A number of enhancements to V3 have been deferred pending the deployment of CCMS. Examples of pending enhancements include the following:

- Redesign of the Judicial Officer Assignment Balance function;
- Ability to open multiple Minute Order Capture System (MOCS) sessions simultaneously;
- Ability to electronically transmit appeals to the Appellate Court Case Management System;
- Improved integration between the application and document editing tools;
- Alerts for batch jobs to signal problems and enable administrators to restart the process;
- Ability to add multiple documents with same name across case numbers in “add filing”
- Ability to add multiple documents with different names to same case in “add filing.”

Maintenance and support is vital to the daily operations of the courts. The projected level of funding will enable continued support for the current V2 and V3 courts.

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

### **Background on V2 and V3**

Maintenance and operations support for the Interim Criminal and Traffic Case Management System (V2) deployed in the Superior Court of Fresno County in 2006 is provided by the Information Services Division (ISD) of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). This support includes legislative updates, defect remediation, software and hardware upgrades, interface testing with judicial partners such as the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and the Fresno Sheriff’s Office, and routine support with forms, notices, and reports.

The Civil, Small Claims, and Probate and Mental Health Interim Case Management System (V3), deployed in six superior courts between 2006 and 2008—Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Joaquin, and Ventura—is also supported by ISD and the CCMS Program Management Office (PMO). Both case management systems were previously supported

by software development vendors, and then maintenance and operations transitioned to the AOC to achieve cost savings and establish a foundation for ongoing support. Funding is required on an annual basis to support the V2 and V3 maintenance, support, and projects.

In 2002, the AOC embarked on the development of a single comprehensive case management system that would meet the requirements of the California courts and be configurable for courts of any size in the state, and that would include interim systems that would be supported to ensure smooth court operations until the new case management system would be deployed. Key milestones include:

- In 2002, an RFP was issued for a civil, small claims, and probate case management system.
- Deloitte Consulting was selected as the vendor for a product to be called CCMS V3.
- In 2003, the Southern California Oversight Committee (SCOC) decided to develop an application for criminal and traffic that could be shared by the courts. V2 would be based on the Vision product developed by KPMG (now BearingPoint).
- Over the next three years CCMS V2 and CCMS V3 proceeded on parallel development and deployment tracks.
- In November 2005, CCMS V3 product acceptance testing was completed. At the request of the Superior Court of Alameda County's court executive officer, Alameda was selected by the SCOC as the pilot court for V2. Alameda later determined they were unable to participate and withdrew in 2005.
- In 2005, the Superior Court of Fresno County communicated their need to replace their failing criminal and traffic case management system, COFACS. They joined the V2 program.
- In July 2006, V2 was deployed in Fresno County.
- In the fourth quarter of 2006, the AOC, in consultation with the CCMS Executive Steering Committee, decided to consolidate all case management system functionality onto the CCMS V3 architecture.
- In December 2006, V2 support transitioned from BearingPoint to Deloitte. This action was taken to enable Deloitte to become more familiar with the architectural foundations of V2 and prepare them for the functionality that would need to become part of CCMS.
- In the first calendar quarter of 2007, the decision was made to cancel deployment plans at the remaining V2 candidate courts and use the savings to accelerate the development and deployment of CCMS V4.

**Following is a high-level overview of V2 and V3 progress to date:**

### **V2 in Review**

The following is a history of the V2 development, deployment, and performance in Fresno.

- In July 2006, V2 was deployed in Fresno County.
- In 2007, subsequent to deployment, V2 experienced ongoing system performance and stability problems, negatively impacting daily court operations. In response, the AOC created

a task force, comprised of Deloitte staff and AOC architects, developers, network engineers, and functional specialists to address the system performance and instability issues.

- Over the course of the year, software and hardware remediation measures were developed. The number of servers gradually increased to 26 (production and staging) to ensure system stability and eliminate the need for weekly server restarts, which were disruptive to daily operations.
- In 2007, Deloitte continued to work with the Fresno court and the AOC to fine-tune the V2 application. Stability issues were resolved by the end of the year.
- In 2008, the AOC identified an opportunity for substantial cost savings, based on the transition of V2 maintenance and support from the Deloitte team to an AOC in-house team.
- In 2009, the V2 maintenance and support transition was complete, after nine months of knowledge transfer, on-site training, and cutover. It was a successful collaboration.
- Today, the Fresno court is satisfied with the system performance and is supportive of the maintenance and support team.

### **V2 staffing transition**

- In 2008, the Deloitte team, including enhancements and maintenance support, had a full-time staff of 29, at a blended rate of \$202 per hour.
- In 2009, the AOC team, including enhancements and maintenance and support, had a full-time staff of 19, at a blended rate of \$99 per hour.
- In June 2010 the AOC achieved the cost break-even point, where savings achieved by bringing support in-house paid for knowledge transfer and transition costs.

### **V2 present-day staffing**

- Today, the AOC maintenance and support team is comprised of 11 consultants and 2 FTE staff.
- Staffing was reduced in December 2011 to achieve greater cost efficiencies.
- The consultant staff includes two developers, two testers, one applications architect, one operations architect, two database administrators, one service delivery manager, one network /security analyst, and one application support analyst.
- Full-time staff includes a manager and one team lead developer.
- FY 2012–2013 consultant costs: \$2,355,207
- Target savings, based on difference between Deloitte and in-house consultant rate, between 2009 and 2012: \$3.4 million

### **V2 major milestones**

The following major milestones were achieved for V2 between September 2010 and November 2011:

- All known Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) defects were resolved.
- Interface to the Fresno Sheriff's Office for automated warrants was upgraded.
- A randomly occurring 100 percent CPU problem that existed before the AOC assumed maintenance and support was resolved.

- Official Payments interface was upgraded for better continuity of service.
- Production application servers were reduced from 26 to 12, to save on infrastructure costs.
- The V2 Maintenance Release 8.2 resolved critical defects in fiscal processing, calendaring, and warrant recalls, new Failure to Appear and Failure to Pay business processes for collections, and DMV holds.

### **V2 future needs**

The following updates and enhancements are planned for V2:

- Cleanup of legacy users in the V2 database to reduce disaster recovery time and increase security;
- Implement legislative updates;
- Implement new inquiry court codes required by the Department of Motor Vehicles for security;
- Software Stack upgrades to support client upgrades to Internet Explorer, Adobe, and Windows;
- The V2 Maintenance Release 9.1, which resolves critical defects in payment processing, disposition codes, DMV processing, docket codes, and warrant searches; and
- Additional reductions in development and test environments to further reduce costs.

### **V3 in Review**

The following is a summary of V3 development, deployment, and performance.

- The V3 product was developed by Deloitte Consulting in 2004, with rollout to courts beginning in 2006.
- V3 processes approximately 25 percent of all civil cases statewide and supports superior courts in San Diego, Orange, Ventura, San Joaquin, Sacramento, and Los Angeles (Alhambra only).
- V3 was deployed locally in the San Diego, Orange, and Los Angeles courts.
- A single instance of V3 was deployed at the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) to host the Ventura, Sacramento, and San Joaquin courts.
- In April 2010, following the successful migration of the V2 maintenance and support, the AOC identified an opportunity for substantial cost savings by transitioning support for V3 from Deloitte to the AOC.
- In September 2010 Deloitte began the design of knowledge transfer for V3.
- Due to AOC hiring constraints, the original plan calling for 10 consultants and 10 FTEs was adjusted to build the team staffed by consultants.
- The AOC was able to attract Deloitte subcontractors as well as Deloitte ex-employees into the newly formed team, which comprised 11 total staff. One application architect and one database administrator from the V2 team were cross-trained with V3 as a budget-saving step.
- By February 2011, the team was hired and training began.
- Before development by the newly formed team began, all courts were stable on Release 10.

- Environments were created in the CCTC Omaha facility to replace Deloitte facilities in Spring Valley, Pennsylvania.
- In July 2011, the transition training was complete.

### **V3 staffing transition**

- In 2010, the Deloitte team, including enhancements and maintenance support, had a full-time staff of 27, at a blended rate of \$180 per hour.
- In 2011, the AOC team, including enhancements and maintenance support, had a full-time staff of 21 consultants as well as 5 FTEs, at a blended rate of \$93 per hour.

### **V3 present-day staffing**

- The AOC maintenance and support team is comprised of 7 developers, 4 testers, 1 applications architect, 1 infrastructure architect, 2 release managers, 3 support analysts, and 3 business analysts.
- AOC staff includes 2 managers, 1 database administrator, and 2 senior business analysts.
- FY 2012–2013 consultant costs: \$4,727,295
- Target savings based on the difference between Deloitte and in-house consultant rate between 2011 and 2014: \$4.8 million

### **V3 major milestones in FY 2011–2012**

- Deployed Release 11.0. This was the first release managed solely by the AOC team and included 45 items, including e-filing and remediation of high priority defects.
- Deployed Release 11.01 legislative updates, including a small claims limit increase to \$10,000 and Expedited Jury Trial.

### **V3 future needs**

The following updates and enhancements are planned for V3:

- Release 11.02 is planned for May 2012 and includes 42 items, including E-Filing Editable Orders, Attorney Alerts, and remediation of high priority defects.
- Updating of the various software components that make up CCMS V2 to ensure compatibility and compliance with vendor support guidelines.
- Infrastructure upgrades to achieve further cost savings.
- Ongoing system enhancements. Currently the six V3 courts have 232 enhancement requests outstanding, spanning all case types and functional areas, including improving work queues, reports, judicial officer functionality, and adding additional functionality. These enhancements have not been prioritized by the courts, and specific enhancements have been deferred in anticipation of the CCMS V4 deployment.

### **Alternatives**

Following are two alternatives for ongoing maintenance and support for V2 and V3.

### **Alternative 1**

Fund ongoing maintenance and support for V2 and V3, in FY 2012–2013 at this level:

V2     \$ 4,139,117  
V3     \$ 11,967,764

With Alternative 1, support would be maintained at the current level with no increase in staff or contractors and would include daily help desk support, legislative updates, and software and hardware maintenance. The funding would not exceed the FY 2012–2013 budget presented to the Judicial Council. Enhancements, under this alternative, will have a lower priority as defect remediation and legislative updates are a priority for the maintenance and support team.

### **Alternative 2**

Increase the current V3 budget for FY 2012–2013 by \$1,081,280, to accelerate completion of pending enhancements. The increased budget would add 10,000 hours to the current level of maintenance and support. Funding would be allocated for additional contractors or FTEs, including 3 developers, 2 quality assurance analysts, and 1 business analyst.

Budget for V3 FY 2012–2013 would increase from \$11,967,764 to \$13,049,044.

Alternative 2 would provide resources to focus on V3 software enhancements that had been deferred pending deployment of CCMS. This alternative would demonstrate to the courts a commitment to invest in and sustain the CCMS V2 and CCMS V3 programs.

Potential enhancements include the Judicial Officer (JO) module. There is an opportunity to improve usability by providing a screen with all case documents, available for review based upon different sorting criteria (e.g., event, filings, and party).

Another opportunity for enhancements is the Minute Order Capture System (MOCS) where the ability to open multiple MOCS screens at the same time, with different cases, and the ability to work between these MOCS instances provides greater ease of use and productivity.

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

### **Maintenance and Operations Budget**

The maintenance and operations budget for FY 2012–2013 is projected to be \$4,139,117 for V2 and \$11,967,764 for V3. The projected budget includes providing ongoing support in the form of legislative updates, defect remediation, and software and hardware upgrades. The existing budget does not include support to complete all outstanding enhancements. The courts will work with the AOC team to prioritize enhancements and develop a plan based on the available budget.

### **Budget Detail for V2 and V3**

**Table 1: Projected operational budgets for V2 for fiscal years 2012–2013 to 2016–2017**



| <b>V2 Proposed Budget</b> | FY 2012-13         | FY 2013-14         | FY 2014-15         | FY 2015-16         | FY 2016-17         | <b>Total</b>        |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| CCTC Hosting              | 1,231,720          | 1,350,394          | 1,504,985          | 1,603,784          | 1,707,525          | \$7,398,408         |
| Consultants PMO           | -                  | -                  | -                  | -                  | -                  | \$ 0                |
| Consultants ISD           | 2,355,207          | 2,425,863          | 2,498,639          | 2,573,598          | 2,650,806          | \$12,504,113        |
| Staff PMO                 | -                  | -                  | -                  | -                  | -                  | \$ 0                |
| Staff ISD                 | 552,190            | 570,194            | 605,058            | 624,837            | 645,269            | \$2,997,548         |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>\$4,139,117</b> | <b>\$4,346,451</b> | <b>\$4,608,682</b> | <b>\$4,802,219</b> | <b>\$5,003,600</b> | <b>\$22,900,069</b> |

**Table 2: Comparison of current V2 projections and budget presented to the Judicial Council in July 2011**

| <b>V2 Budget Comparison</b> | FY 2012-13         | FY 2013-14         |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Projected JC Budget         | 6,902,184          | 7,229,492          |
| Current Projections         | 4,139,117          | 4,346,451          |
| <b>Variance</b>             | <b>\$2,763,067</b> | <b>\$2,883,041</b> |

**Table 3: Explanation for the variance (reduction) to the budget presented to the Judicial Council in July 2011**

| <b>V2 Budget Variance</b>                | FY 2012-13          | FY 2013-14          |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Reduction in infrastructure costs</i> | (1,964,096)         | (2,163,885)         |
| <i>Reduction in contractor staff</i>     | (1,052,280)         | (981,624)           |
| <i>Salary &amp; Benefit Adjustments</i>  | 253,311             | 262,468             |
| <b>Total Variance</b>                    | <b>\$-2,763,065</b> | <b>\$-2,883,041</b> |

**Table 4: Projected operational budgets for V3 for fiscal years 2012–2013 to 2016–2017**

| <b>V3 Proposed Budget</b> | FY 2012-13          | FY 2013-14          | FY 2014-15          | FY 2015-16          | FY 2016-17          | <b>Total</b>        |
|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| CCTC Hosting              | 6,045,490           | 5,483,127           | 5,580,991           | 6,163,012           | 6,347,902           | \$29,620,522        |
| Consultants PMO           | 455,664             | 501,230             | 501,230             | 501,230             | 551,353             | \$2,510,707         |
| Consultants ISD           | 4,271,631           | 4,437,872           | 4,554,775           | 4,675,235           | 4,818,152           | \$22,757,665        |
| Staff PMO                 | 196,683             | 203,282             | 217,332             | 224,636             | 232,187             | \$1,074,120         |
| Staff ISD                 | 998,296             | 1,029,938           | 1,098,139           | 1,133,190           | 1,169,423           | \$5,428,986         |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>\$11,967,764</b> | <b>\$11,655,449</b> | <b>\$11,952,467</b> | <b>\$12,697,303</b> | <b>\$13,119,017</b> | <b>\$61,392,000</b> |

**Table 5: Comparison of current V3 projections and budget presented to the Judicial Council in July 2011**

| <b>V3 Budget Comparison</b> | <b>FY 2012-13</b> | <b>FY 2013-14</b>  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Projected JC Budget         | 12,562,497        | 12,871,863         |
| Current Projections         | 11,967,764        | 11,655,449         |
| <b>Variance</b>             | <b>\$594,733</b>  | <b>\$1,216,414</b> |

**Table 6: Explanation for the variance (reduction) to the budget presented to the Judicial Council in July 2011**

| <b>V3 Budget Variance</b>                   | <b>FY 2012-13</b> | <b>FY 2013-14</b>   |
|---|-------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Reduction in infrastructure costs</i>    | (862,549)         | (1,543,425)         |
| <i>Adjustment to PMO contractor staff</i>   | 239,112           | 284,678             |
| <i>PMO Salary &amp; Benefit Adjustments</i> | (131,994)         | (125,596)           |
| <i>ISD Salary &amp; Benefit Adjustments</i> | 160,698           | 167,929             |
| <b>Total Variance</b>                       | <b>\$-594,733</b> | <b>\$-1,216,414</b> |