

California Court Case Management System (CCMS)  
Executive Update – October 7, 2009  
Supplemental Questions



The following questions were taken verbatim from emails received by the CCMS Regional Program Office:

1. [What is the remaining budget for V4 development or, in other words, how much more do you anticipate will be spent on the completion of the V4 product, currently scheduled for fall 2010?](#)

The balance on the CCMS-V4 development contract is \$18 million.

2. [What is the cost of the above planned work for the next 12 months?](#)

*(This question refers to information in the CCMS Questions and Answers document distributed on August 13, 2009 that described plans for the next 12 months).*

The judicial branch has identified \$90 million in funding for the 2009/10 fiscal year to support all of the CCMS activities including:

- Maintenance, support and mandated changes for CCMS-V2;
- Maintenance, support and mandated changes for CCMS-V3;
- Development of CCMS-V4;
- Technology environments for development, testing, and production of each product;
- Development and support of data exchanges; and
- Deployment activities.

3. [Does the \\$394 million spent to date, include the court contributions in terms of the cost associated with providing SME's?](#)

The \$394 million includes some money provided to courts to help defray the costs of providing court subject matter experts (SMEs) participating in the design and testing efforts of CCMS; this includes the Superior Courts of Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, and Ventura.

4. [It appears that you anticipate deployment will be delayed by several years. You estimate the additional cost attributable to the delay at \\$240 million/year. Is it correct to assume that the total cost of the project will increase to at least \\$1.44 billion?](#)

The current economic situation and changes to the budget and deployment schedule will determine the final cost.

California Court Case Management System (CCMS)  
Executive Update – October 7, 2009  
Supplemental Questions



5. As Ron Overholt noted the other day, two years ago the AOC created a funding strategy, which relied on about \$400 million from the state general fund and \$250 million from the trial courts. Based on my review of the fund balances the AOC submitted to the legislature in January 2009, there was less than \$100 million in trial court designated for statewide technology initiatives. Is my analysis correct? Given the current statewide budget situation, do you believe general fund money will be available within the next 3 to 5 budget cycles?

*(Mr. Overholt's remarks were made at the TCPJAC meeting on Wednesday, August 26, 2009.)*

Per the AOC Finance Division, as of FY 2007/08 courts had a reserve of approximately \$76.2 million for statewide and local infrastructure, much, but not all of which relates to case management system activities. With regard to the outlook for additional General Fund, our understanding is that this year and next will be challenging, but we remain optimistic that state economics will stabilize, and that we will obtain funding for court deployments.

*A single answer for the following two related questions follows.*

6. What are the anticipated savings from CCMS once fully deployed? Will these savings be passed on to the trial courts? How will these savings be determined and distributed? Will trial court budgets be reduced by these "savings"?
7. If the CCMS system does not result in savings, is AOC prepared to cover losses or increased costs generative by CCMS?

As stated in the previous CCMS Executive Update on August 13, 2009, when CCMS is fully deployed, all California courts will share a single court case management application for all case categories. This will eliminate significant cost redundancies associated with supporting and maintaining multiple case management systems across the state. Based on a 2007 analysis conducted by Gartner Consulting, when all courts are deployed the savings to the branch will be \$157 million per year. This includes savings from electronic filing, electronic storage of documents, electronic calendars, self-service payments, and self service case inquiries. Actual savings per year, until CCMS is fully deployed, will depend on the number and mix of courts deployed during that time period.

A Judicial Council policy set in February 2003 states that "AOC staff shall make recommendations to the council to redirect funds no longer needed for delivery of an administrative service when a statewide approach is implemented; recommendations should provide options that support statewide services and permits reallocation of the savings to other unfunded mandates in the local court, or if none, to other trial courts."

Budgets will be adjusted according to policy as the budget situation improves and CCMS is deployed. Each court will analyze how their costs will change. For example, the costs and resources to support document management and electronic filing may increase but there will be a corresponding decrease in the cost to store, retrieve, and archive case files. As the CCMS project moves forward, the AOC Finance Division will work with the trial courts to ensure funding and budget adjustments are made appropriately.

California Court Case Management System (CCMS)  
Executive Update – October 7, 2009  
Supplemental Questions



8. [The total cost of CCMS seems reasonable relative to other large IT projects undertaken by the state. Has any comparison been made as to what other states typically spend on statewide court case management systems?](#)

Early in the CCMS project, a team from the courts and the AOC evaluated a number of systems. The evaluation process included visits to Utah, Texas and Illinois. In Texas the Tyler Technologies case management system was evaluated. In Illinois, a custom solution developed by IBM was evaluated. A delegation from the Court Technology Task Force visited Utah to learn how they were managing a statewide approach to court technology. In addition to these site visits, as part of an RFP process, the CCMS lead courts evaluated several systems used by courts in different states. The systems evaluated included Affiliated Computer Services, Inc, Maximus, Sustain, and a KPMG/Sybase partnership. Each of the visits and evaluations confirmed that the California courts needed to develop a custom solution to deal with the complexities in our state.

*A single answer for the following four related questions follows.*

9. [Why would trial courts be charged anything for a system that AOC has used public funds to develop?](#)
10. [If the Judicial Branch owns the system, why are individual trial courts being charged for deployment and use?](#)
11. [Why can't AOC simply directly pay all costs of development and deployment of the system? Why should the trial courts share? Isn't it all the same money?](#)
12. [Why will trial courts not be provided supplemental funding for the increased costs associated with the deployment of this system?](#)

Legislation for state trial court funding established a system of statewide policies and decentralized management of the courts. The budgeting process is complex resulting in challenges in creating and supporting an enterprise model for services. The AOC Finance Division, along with the courts, the Executive and Planning Committee, and the Trial Court Budget Working Group, are working within these parameters to make certain the trial courts and statewide infrastructure initiatives receive adequate funding.

The AOC has paid the majority of costs to develop the existing CCMS products (V2, V3 and V4); trial courts will not be required to share these costs. All enterprise applications have ongoing costs including user support, third party software licenses (e.g. Adobe, Oracle), hardware, technology centers, defect correction, enhancements, and legislative updates. A model will be established for courts to contribute towards these costs. Sharing these costs is not unlike what is currently in place where courts pay vendors or local county IT shops to keep their systems running and maintained.

As per AOC Finance Division, given the current budget situation, it is unlikely funds will be available to supplement court budgets in 2009/10 or 2010/11. As the budget process for the

California Court Case Management System (CCMS)  
Executive Update – October 7, 2009  
Supplemental Questions



judicial branch continues to evolve, funds might be identified to meet the operational needs and strategic objectives of the judicial branch.

13. Will trial courts be mandated by AOC to implement the CCMS system without supplemental funding to cover the cost? If a trial court declines to implement CCMS without supplemental funding, how does AOC intend to respond to that situation?

The Judicial Council meeting minutes for February 2003 directed the AOC to work with the courts on the development and implementation of statewide administrative services. The minutes also state, “Trial courts interested in pursuing an alternative to a statewide approach shall obtain the review and approval of the Administrative Director of the Courts before proceeding,” and “requests for new funding will not be approved when a statewide approach for delivering the service is available.”

14. Does the functionality of CCMS require courts to have document imaging capability? If so, how many courts in the state have this capability? I assume that if a court does not have document imaging system it will be required to purchase and implement this technology from its own funds. On a related issue, does the estimated \$157 million in costs savings after deployment assume all courts are currently able to image documents?

The Information Services Division has a project underway to identify the requirements for a document management solution (DMS) for the trial courts, the appellate courts, and the AOC. In compiling the data for the project we are leveraging information from prior research addressing branch document management needs. As part of this project, we will be surveying the courts as to their current document management and imaging requirements and solutions. The results of this survey will provide us with a more accurate count of the courts using imaging and DMS solutions. We will be able to provide you with the most current information by the end of the year.

Courts that do not have document management systems (DMS) will be able to utilize CCMS. The \$157 million estimated by the Gartner study assumed all 58 courts are using CCMS for all case categories and they have converted to electronic business processes.

15. To follow-up on the question I asked at the meeting on Wednesday, as it appears the funding necessary to deploy CCMS is not available (at least not in the near term), do you plan to analyze the viability of any project alternatives?

*(This question refers to a question asked at TCPJAC on Wednesday, August 26, 2009.)*

As stated before, CCMS development is meeting all of its milestones, and the project is not stopping. The CCMS Regional Program office has analyzed other deployment alternatives given that funding is not available to proceed with full deployment at this time. We found that the most viable option is to deploy a minimum of two early adopter courts. This will allow for productive use of the product, enable us to identify any major issues, as well as take advantage of the vendor’s warranty period. The product will be completed and can be deployed to additional courts as funding is identified or to courts that have urgent case management system needs.