

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

OPEN MEETING AGENDA

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

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date:	December 11, 2014
Time:	11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Location:	Redwood Room, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
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 November 10, 2014 meeting.

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

Public Comment

Members of the public requesting to speak during the public comment portion of the meeting must place the speaker's name, the name of the organization that the speaker represents if any, and the agenda item that the public comment will address, on the public comment sign-up sheet. The sign-up sheet will be available at the meeting location at least 15 minutes prior to the meeting start time. The Chair will establish speaking limits at the beginning of the public comment session. While the advisory body welcomes and encourages public comment, time may not permit all persons requesting to speak to be heard at this meeting.

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to <u>ictc@jud.ca.gov</u> or mailed or delivered to 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3688, attention: Jessica Craven, c/o Conference Support Services Unit. Only written comments received by 11:00 a.m. on Wednesday, December 10, 2014 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. AGENDA ITEMS

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

Item 2

State-level Data Exchanges and Justice Partner Interfaces Workstream (Action Required) Court Technology Advisory Committee proposes addition of a State-level Data Exchanges and Justice Partner Interfaces Workstream to its annual agenda and is seeking JCTC approval.

Presenter: Mr. David Yamasaki, Court Executive Officer, County of Santa Clara

Item 3

Update on Comparison of Hosting Cost Models

Presentation on hosting models including the California Court Technology Center and Cloud Technology.

Presenter: Mr. David Koon, Supervising Analyst, Information Technology

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn





TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

November 10, 2014 4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present:	Hon. James E. Herman, Chair; Hon. David De Alba, Vice-Chair; Hon. Daniel J. Buckley; Hon. Emilie H. Elias; Hon. Gary Nadler; Mr. Mark G. Bobino; and Mr. Richard D. Feldstein
Liaison Members Present:	Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers
Others Present:	Mr. Curt Soderlund; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Diana Earl; Ms. Virginia Sanders- Hinds; Ms. Jessica Craven; Ms. Kathy Fink; and Mr. David Koon

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed and made a motion to approve the minutes of the October 27, 2014 Judicial Council Technology Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-5)

Items 1

Chair Report (No Action Required)

Update: Hon. James E. Herman, Chair of the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC), welcomed and thanked everyone for attending.

Item 2

Update on Court Technology Advisory Committee (No Action Required)

Update:Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair of the Court Technology Advisory Committee
(CTAC), provided an update on the current and upcoming work of the committee
including the new membership, the impact of the newly approved Court Technology
Governance and Strategic Plan on CTAC, the CTAC to Information Technology
Advisory Committee (ITAC) transition, and the State-level Data Exchanges and Justice
Partner Interfaces workstream.

Update on Information Technology Budget (No Action Required)

Discussion: Mr. Mark W. Dusman, Chief Information Officer and Director of JCC Information Technology provided an update on the Information Technology budget. The update included a breakdown by fund, review of five year historical allocations, how the FY14-15 budget reductions were achieved, the Information Technology budget development process, and issues facing the Information Technology Budget. These issues include the fact there is no sustainable and stable funding source for judicial branch technology needs, the cyclical program budgets vary year to year (equipment replacement, deployment, contract renewals, etc.), five years of numerous budget cuts, as well as others.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Judicial Council Technology Committee Meeting

December 11, 2014

1926

Call to Order and Roll Call

Welcome
Open Meeting Script
Approve minutes of previous meeting

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



Chair Report

Hon. James E. Herman



Action: State-level Data Exchanges and Justice Partner Interfaces Workstream

Mr. David Yamasaki, Court Executive Officer, County of Santa Clara



Update: Comparison of Hosting Cost Models

Mr. David Koon, Supervising Analyst, Information Technology



CMS Hosting Model Options

Background

- The Sustain courts have been tasked with identifying a path forward for their next generation case management system(s).
- Discussions on how to eliminate state wide branch funding for case management systems are underway.
- Cost benefits based on economies of scale may be available to courts working as a consortium and using their joint purchasing power.
- Tyler has 20+ CMS deployments underway in California Software as a Service and locally hosted systems.
- JCC staff conducted this analysis to provide additional information to assist these courts in finding a path forward.

Hosting Models

- The eight SJE Courts hosted at CCTC will provide the basis for the cost models - Humboldt, Imperial, Lake, Madera, Modoc, Plumas, San Benito and Trinity.
- Four different hosting alternatives are being reviewed
 - Tyler's Software as a Service (SaaS) Tyler is responsible for the procurement and support of the hardware and software needed to host the Odyssey application.
 - CCTC Virtualized Servers This model enables the Odyssey application and multiple instances of operating system to run on the same machine reducing the number of servers and cost required to run the Odyssey application.
 - Amazon Web Services GovCloud hosted through CCTC A monthly fee is paid for use of Amazon's virtual machines which eliminates the need to purchase servers and operating systems.
 - Local court hosting Each court is responsible for purchasing the hardware and software needed to host the Odyssey application locally.

Option 1: Tyler SaaS Hosting

- The Odyssey application is hosted at Tyler's data center.
- Tyler is responsible for the procurement and support of the hardware and software required needed to host the Odyssey application.
 - Tyler charges a monthly fee per user rather than a license fee
 - The Court provides resources for configuration, testing and client side support.
 - Limited number of users.
 - Limited information on disaster recovery.



Option 2: Virtualized Servers at CCTC

- Provides an opportunity to leverage economies of scale at a centralized hosting location.
- Utilizes the existing CCTC datacenters.
- Requires the purchase of an Odyssey enterprise license.
 - Includes a virtualized server option with a "dormant" disaster recovery environment and one without a disaster recovery environment.
 - The Court provides resources for configuration, testing and client side support.



Option 3: CCTC Cloud Hosting – Amazon

- Production environment split across two different Amazon data centers to take advantage of the "active" cloud DR capabilities.
 - Requires the purchase of an Odyssey enterprise license.
 - Court provides resources for configuration, testing and client side support.
 - Resources would be required to apply patches and upgrade the Odyssey application.
 - Discussions will be needed with DMV and DOJ to determine if these state agencies would allow connections to their systems from a the Amazon GovCloud.



Option 4: Locally Hosted Court

- Requires the purchase of an Odyssey enterprise license.
- May require building out of a computer room facility by some courts.
 - The Court provides resource for upgrading the Odyssey application/operating systems, maintaining the configuration, testing, client side and server side support.
 - Discussions will be needed with DMV and DOJ to determine if these state agencies will allow connections to their systems from each of these individual courts.



Next Steps

 Complete cost analysis and present results to the SJE courts?

 Build a hosting cost model for other case management systems such as eCourt and Justice Systems Inc.?

Any other analysis or research needed?





