

## 2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request and Budget Change Proposal Concept

**Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Information Technology Office**

**Contact: Robert Oyung, JCIT**

**Date Prepared: March 9, 2017**

**Budget Services Liaison: Mary Jo Ejercito**

**Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-27**

### **SECTION 1 – Initial Funding Request:**

**A. Working Title:** *The working title should convey who the request is for and what the funding will address.*

Deploy a Single Sign-On Solution for the Judicial Branch

**B. Description of Funding Request:** *Provide a summary of the request identifying the problem, measures taken to date to address the problem, and why the problem cannot be addressed within existing resources.*

The Judicial Council requests a General Fund augmentation 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:** *If known, provide estimated costs, fund sources, and position information.*

## 2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request and Budget Change Proposal Concept

At this time, the cost to implement a single sign-on system are unknown. 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:

- 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

**D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests:** *Provide a brief statement as to how this request fits into the overall funding needs of the Judicial Branch, including previous action taken on similar requests, if any.*

“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 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.

**E. Required Review/Approvals:** *If known, please list all subcommittees, advisory committees, or unique approvers needed to review/approve the funding request prior to submission to the Judicial Council.*

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

**F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee:** *Provide a proposed lead advisory committee including an explanation as to why this committee should be designated as lead.*

Judicial Council Technology Committee. The JCTC oversees the council’s policies concerning technology and is responsible in partnership with the courts for coordinating with the Administrative

## **2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request and Budget Change Proposal Concept**

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.

**2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request and Budget Change Proposal Concept**

**SECTION 2 – Budget Change Proposal Concept:** *Once the Initial Funding Request has been given approval to continue, complete Section 2 to provide additional details about the request.*

**Proposal Title:** Deploy an Single Sign-On Solution for the Judicial Branch

**Fiscal Summary:**

Fund Source	Proposed JCC Positions	Total Personal Services	Operating Expenses & Equipment	Proposed Total 2018-19	Proposed Total 2019-20	Proposed Total 2020-21
General Fund			\$3,300,000	\$3,300,000		
General Fund			\$800,000		\$800,000	
General Fund			\$800,000			\$800,000

**Detailed Funding By Fiscal Year:**

	Proposed Total 2018-19	Proposed Total 2019-20	Proposed Total 2020-21
Ongoing	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000
One-Time	\$2,500,000	0	0
Total	\$3,300,000	\$800,000	\$800,000

**Proposal Summary:** *Provide succinct summary of request – six to eight sentences.*

The Judicial Council proposes an ongoing General Fund request to acquire, design, and deploy an enterprise single sign-on system for the branch. This \$800,000 recurring cost will pay for software licenses for judicial branch employees. This system will assign a unique identifier to members of the judicial branch, attorneys, members of the public and justice partners who access judicial branch computer systems and electronic services.

The Judicial Council is also proposing a one-time General Fund request of \$2,500,000 to modify case management systems from the three major case management software vendors in order to take advantage of the unique identifier assigned by the single sign-on solution.

It is envisioned that this system will be deployed using the software as a service model, so there are no direct costs such as hardware, in-house support and operational costs.

**Background Information:** *Provide background details about the program including resources currently dedicated/expended to support existing workload (i.e. dollars and positions); purpose of program, what clientele is being served? Who benefits (i.e. public, courts, other governmental entities).*

## 2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request and Budget Change Proposal Concept

This proposal is for infrastructure that will enable new, improved services that have the following benefits: business hours can be extended, customers can expect more accurate data, customer satisfaction should improve and security is improved. It has the potential to improve customer service for all customers – attorneys; the public, in general; self-represented litigants; parties to cases; and members of the branch.

**Justification:** *Explain how this proposal will address or solve the problem. What are the adverse impacts if this proposal is not approved? Why does this have to be done now?*

Implementing and promoting the Digital Court will provide better customer service (longer hours, access to records and services without having to appear at the courthouse, the ability for customers to conduct business on their own time), all without adding additional permanent staff. Depending upon the implementation, this may offer greater security and better data quality, in addition to the improved customer service. This is especially applicable to customers such as attorneys, who conduct business in multiple jurisdictions within the State.

If this proposal is not approved, customers may be required to create multiple IDs, multiple passwords and use multiple authentication systems, especially if they do business in multiple jurisdictions. Changing public expectations are making online transactions the norm, precisely because they improve customer service, and extend business hours without adding additional staff. The sooner we implement this, the sooner the public will be able to take advantage of the increased access.

**Fiscal Impact:** *Provide a brief recap of costs, methodology, assumptions and future-year costs for this proposal. Where applicable, briefly summarize information regarding proposed fund source and viability of using resources from the proposed fund (can fund support request, potential negative fund balance in future, etc). What actions, approvals or resource requirements from other governmental entities (or courts) are required to implement this proposal?*

**Outcomes and Accountability:** *How will improvements or changes be measured? How will the requested resources be accounted for and monitored?*

Performance measures include:

- The number of unique identifiers entered into the single sign-on system
- The number of people utilizing the court services that take advantage of the unique identifier
- The number of times court services utilizing the unique identifier were utilized
- Customer satisfaction surveys

## 2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request and Budget Change Proposal Concept

### Projected Outcomes:

Workload Measure	2015-16 Past Year	2016-17 Past Year	2017-18 Current Year	2018-19 Budget Year

**Other Alternatives Considered:** *Include a minimum of three alternatives, provide cost estimates and briefly describe why the alternative is not the recommended option.*

1. **Do nothing.** It will not be possible to distinguish between parties with the same names. If you wish to restrict access to certain services only to those involved in a case, you would need positively identify an individual or risk providing court information to the wrong party. Members of the public would continue to receive generic service without information tailored to their situation. Members of the public and attorneys who file in multiple counties would need multiple ID’s for individual court directories rather than a single ID. There is no dollar cost associated with this alternative, but the service is less than we could provide. Members of the judicial branch will have to juggle multiple id’s and most likely, multiple passwords in order to use multiple judicial branch systems.
2. **Create a single sign-on system for the branch.** Major software firms already have created robust systems for this purpose, and they amortize their development cost across multiple clients. In addition to the tool, we would need staff to administer and maintain the system. The proposal to deploy Single Sign-On as a service eliminates the staffing costs and allows us to take advantage of a commercial software tool where the development cost is spread out over many customers. We could not develop a word processor from scratch and be competitive for what we can buy Microsoft Word, for example. It would be different if we required custom capabilities not found in commercial off-the-shelf software. We will not require custom capabilities for a single sign-on system.
3. **Host our own directory service.** Similar to 2, above, we could use an on-premise directory to store user information for both our the branch and our customers. We would need to acquire redundant hardware staff for 24/7 operations, develop and test disaster/recovery plans and periodically refresh both hardware and software. By outsourcing the operation of a directory service into the cloud, these aspects are taken care of by the vendor. Again, because multiple clients are using the service, operational costs are distributed among multiple clients, offering a competitive advantage over hosting our own system.

## 2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

**Requesting Entity:** Judicial Council Information Technology Office

**Contact:** Virginia Sanders-Hinds

**Date Prepared:** 3/9/2017

**Budget Services Liaison:** MaryJo Ejercito

**Document Tracking Number:** IFR-18-26

**A. Working Title:** Self Represented Litigants Statewide E-Services Solution

**B. Description of Funding Request:** A General Fund augmentation (amount \$TBD) to support implementation of a statewide Self-Represented Litigants (SRLs) e-Services website that will enhance the breadth and depth of e-services aimed at helping the increasing number of Californians who attempt to resolve their legal issues without legal representation. Leveraging both existing resources and envisioning new platforms, such as website personalization, artificial intelligence, and online chat, this initiative will result in a best-in-class online clearinghouse of educational and informational resources for self-represented litigants.

Today, there are a myriad of solutions and approaches to providing SRL e-services throughout the state; but they remain somewhat fragmented and usually cluster around large counties that have the resources to develop online services. This leaves medium-sized and rural communities at a distinct disadvantage. The SRL E-Services Workstream, a collaborative judicial branch initiative, has been tasked with developing a comprehensive set of business and functional requirements that will shape the future of court-sponsored online self-help e-services available to all Californians, via the Web. The Self-Represented Litigants Statewide E-Services Solution/Portal will provide more robust information and instruction for SRLs, in addition to numerous service enhancements such as instructional videos, online chat, user/site registration, and integration with document assembly and e-filing.

SRLs are an increasingly large segment of the population that our courts serve, particularly in case types such as family law. Self-represented parties often have extreme difficulty in identifying the pleading forms they require, completing them accurately and legibly, and filing them in a timely manner. Self-help resources vary widely from jurisdiction to jurisdiction and have suffered from recent budget cuts. Restrictions on the filing hours in many courts have placed significant additional burdens on both court personnel and on litigants.

The SRL E-Services initiative will envision and define a digital services strategy for SRLs that will take advantage of both existing and available branch resources to provide more convenience to the public, and provide tangible benefits and cost efficiencies to the courts. The initiative will develop a comprehensive set of business and technical requirements intended to deliver increased online assistance, greater integration of self-help resources, and greater self-reliance for those hoping to resolve legal problems without representation.

A central access point for SRLs (and for community organizations that assist them) will provide consistent information resources and can utilize already developed question-and-answer interview processes, “smart” Judicial Council forms, and document assembly tools to create complete, accurate, and legible form sets. Those forms can then be electronically filed with those courts that have the ability to accept the filings, or electronically delivered to those courts without e-filing capacity, using current branch infrastructure.

## 2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

**C. Estimated Costs:** At this time, the cost to develop and implement a statewide e-services litigant portal/website solution is unknown. To achieve a cost estimate the Workstream team will be validating litigant and court requirements; identifying existing technology and infrastructure solutions that can be leveraged or shared; and drafting a Request for Information (RFI) by Summer, 2017 to learn more about vendor capabilities and associated costs.

It should be noted that a staffing augmentation will most likely accompany the final BCP application for two additional FTE (Business Analysts) to provide ongoing support and maintenance for the SRL portal solution. If as a result of the BCP a Self-Help Call Center is established, the FTE count will rise to eight positions in total.

**D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests:** Contributing to the “Promoting the Digital Court” by implementing an integrated, statewide e-services solution was approved as a key priority in the *Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan* and further detailed as an approved initiative to pursue in the *Tactical Plan for Technology (2014-2016* and remains in the proposed *2017-2018* update to the plan). No other similar requests are known, at this time.

**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 Self-Represented Litigants E-Services Workstream is specifically tasked with developing the requirements for a statewide SRL e-services solution; and those requirements are on track for completion in December 2017.

## 2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

**SECTION 2 – Budget Change Proposal Concept:** *Once the Initial Funding Request has been given approval to continue, complete Section 2 to provide additional details about the request.*

### **G. Proposal Title: Self Represented Litigants Statewide E-Services Portal Solution**

#### **Fiscal Summary:**

At this time, the cost to develop and implement a statewide e-services litigant portal/website solution is unknown. The workgroup charged with envisioning, designing, and implementing this solution intends to post a Request for Information (RFI) to better understand anticipated one-time and ongoing costs. The anticipated release of the RFI is August, 2017.

#### **Proposal Summary:** *Provide succinct summary of request – six to eight sentences.*

The Judicial Council proposes a one-time General Fund augmentation to envision, design, and deploy a statewide Self-Represented Litigants e-services portal. While several counties across the state offer some degree of virtual or online assistance, a statewide e-services portal would serve all Californians and deliver state-of-the-art interactive educational content, online diagnostic tools, real-time chat and call centers to help Californians successfully resolve legal issues without an attorney.

As envisioned, the SRL e-services portal would establish a framework for integrating numerous new and existing e-services, including: account creation and personalization; intelligent ‘triage’ to provide automated intake; instructional content, document assembly to correctly complete the right forms; and online chat, supported by call center assistance.

The e-services portal would integrate with trial courts across the state and provide seamless hand-offs to enable site visitors to conduct document assembly and e-filing, where available. Californians will be able to establish user accounts and save and retrieve documents at any time. And, when unsure about a next step, a real-time chat engine would attempt to answer questions and prompt next steps. A staffed call center would provide escalation support to any issues that online chat was unable to resolve.

Funding would support acquisition of a new judicial branch web content management platform; development of interactive instructional tools and resources for various civil case types, as well as traffic and non-traffic misdemeanors; and deployment of a statewide online chat problem resolution platform. Funding would also support integration with existing document assembly programs, identity management solutions, and e-filing systems at local trial courts throughout the state.

**Background Information:** *Provide background details about the program including resources currently dedicated/expended to support existing workload (i.e. dollars and positions); purpose of program, what clientele is being served? Who benefits (i.e. public, courts, other governmental entities).*

The proposal will transform the depth and breadth of online e-services dedicated to support SRLs. Numerous surveys point to the increasing number of Californians each year who attempt to resolve their legal issues without an attorney. In many cases, the main driver for self-represented litigants is cost and affordability. If you cannot afford an attorney, then your access to justice is severely curtailed.

## 2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

This proposal aims to deliver a coordinated, modern, and interactive collection of legal resources, including instructional video, intelligent ‘triage’ engines, online chat, and integration with 58 court websites across the state to facilitate document assembly and e-filing, where available.

A robust online web portal that can provide an end-to-end ‘customer journey’ would level the playing field for the self-represented as well as provide benefits to courts as they continue to operate under severe financial and staffing constraints.

While much “self-help” information exists today on websites and in libraries, most resources fail to deliver linear end-to-end solutions to navigating the entire legal process.

As envisioned, the SRL e-services portal would establish a framework for integrating numerous new and existing e-services including interactive educational components; account creation and personalization; intelligent ‘triage’ to provide automated intake; document assembly to correctly complete the right forms; and online chat, supported by call center assistance.

**Justification:** *Explain how this proposal will address or solve the problem. What are the adverse impacts if this proposal is not approved? Why does this have to be done now?*

The proposed project will address the current patchwork of services for self-represented litigants and introduce a comprehensive, one-stop online portal of instruction, information, and assistance to radically transform and increase the breadth and depth of e-services available to the self-represented.

There is a huge unmet need in the Self-Represented Litigant world. While there are vast amounts of information about resolving various case types on one’s own, there is no statewide SRL solution that provides meaningful online assistance from start to finish. This proposal will dramatically change the landscape for those hoping to resolve legal issues without an attorney.

The proposed SRL e-Services portal solution will increase the percentage of litigants who can successfully navigate through the legal system and successfully file cases on their own. The portal will reduce litigant time and cost. The proposed project will also ensure that the valuable human resources that are staffed at the court will focus on helping resolve substantive SRL issues, and not be wasted on more trivial requests that would be better resolved online or via real-time chat. It will also provide standardization of self-help information and ensure information remains current and consistent with legislative changes.

**Fiscal Impact:** *Provide a brief recap of costs, methodology, assumptions and future-year costs for this proposal. Where applicable, briefly summarize information regarding proposed fund source and viability of using resources from the proposed fund (can fund support request, potential negative fund balance in future, etc). What actions, approvals or resource requirements from other governmental entities (or courts) are required to implement this proposal?*

## 2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

At this time, the cost to design build and implement the SRL e-Services portal solution is unknown. An RFI will be posted in the summer of 2017 to help gain insight into vendor capabilities and associated costs.

**Outcomes and Accountability:** *How will improvements or changes be measured? How will the requested resources be accounted for and monitored?*

Performance metrics will include number of monthly and annual users; greater customer satisfaction; less unnecessary foot traffic to courthouses; reduction in both costs and time for litigants; percentage of successful hand-offs to trial courts; completed cases. Most of these measurements can be obtained through Web analytics programs, as well as annual surveys to courts and to litigants themselves.

**Other Alternatives Considered:** *Include a minimum of three alternatives, provide cost estimates and briefly describe why the alternative is not the recommended option.*

- 1) **Wait for private sector to develop a similar solution:** due to the lack today of a robust, statewide interactive Self-Represented Litigant portal, we are seeing more and more private companies enter the legal space, on a 'pay-as-you-go' basis. In other words, they see potential revenue streams from people trying to resolve legal issues on their own. We do not believe this is an acceptable alternative and certainly is disadvantageous to those on limited incomes.
- 2) **Maintain the status quo:** the needs of self-represented litigants will continue to be unmet if we maintain the status quo. A patchwork of SRL resources will remain in place for those fortunate enough to live in counties where local courts have established virtual self-help centers.