

IMF IT Work Group

January 2015

IMF Fund Condition Statement Summary

(Excerpt)

Line No.		Estimate as of 10/9/2014			
		FY 2013-14 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2014-15	2015-16	Difference (Column D-C)
		B	C	D	
3	Adjusted Beginning Balance	49,237,913	29,333,045	3,631,046	(25,701,999)
15	Net Revenue/Transfers	47,428,770	43,150,350	62,106,425	18,956,075
16	Total Resources	96,666,683	72,483,395	65,737,471	(6,745,924)
18	Program and Project Allocations	69,878,695	71,466,600	71,732,095	265,495

IMF IT Allocation Summary

		FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Project and Program		Approved Allocation	Approved Allocation	Estimated Allocation
		A	B	C
1	Telecommunications Support	15,608,480	11,705,000	10,649,166
2	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	9,465,100	10,487,200	10,583,037
3	Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)	5,122,800	5,268,500	5,220,302
4	Data Integration	3,906,900	3,903,600	3,850,213
5	Interim Case Management Systems	1,650,600	1,246,800	1,996,034
6	CCPOR (ROM)	675,800	585,600	1,047,954
7	Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	582,500	624,300	619,699
8	Jury Management System	600,000	-	600,000
9	CLETS Services/Integration	515,200	433,400	513,620
10	Justice Partner Outreach / e-Services	572,000	200,700	442,957
11	Uniform Civil Fees	385,000	343,000	366,544
12	Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension	129,800	133,700	141,000
Total, Information Technology		39,214,180	34,931,800	36,030,526



Items reviewed September 19



Items reviewed October 15



Items reviewed December 3

Objectives

- Reduce IT costs which are funded from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF).
- The goal is to identify the needs and priorities of the trial courts and determine whether and how costs for existing programs/services could be reduced.
- Open for discussion is:
 - whether a program should be modified or eliminated (and how that would occur),
 - whether the trial courts could provide any of the programs/services to all 58 counties themselves
 - whether there are any costs that could (or should) be absorbed by the trial courts rather than paid from the IMF.

Proposed Actions

Program	Short Description	Proposed Action
Telecommunications Support	LAN/WAN network refresh	Fund program as proposed.
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	SAIC Data Center Hosting	Initiate Next Generation Hosting Tactical Plan workstream to identify cost reduction opportunities.
Enterprise Policy/Planning	Oracle Enterprise License	Determine need for re-negotiation.
Data Integration	Tibco Integration Services Backbone, hosted CLETS access	Initiate Next Generation Hosting Tactical Plan workstream to identify cost reduction opportunities.
Interim Case Management Systems	V2, V3, Sustain Justice Edition Case Management Systems	Postpone non-critical Sustain projects. Sunset CMS per JCTC.
CCPOR	California Courts Protective Order Registry	Continue deployment if grant funds are available. Do not fund deployment from IMF.
Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	Testing tools for V3	Sunset per Judicial Council Technology Committee strategy.
Jury Management System	Jury Improvement Grant	Postpone spending funds.

Action Roadmap

Program	Impact	Cost Savings
Short-Term Actions (within 12 months)		
Interim Case Management Systems	Delays non-critical Sustain projects.	\$100K
CCPOR	Delay deployment to 4-6 courts if grant funds not available.	\$332K
Jury Management System	Delay non-critical jury improvements.	\$600K
Medium-Term Actions (12-24 months)		
Enterprise Policy/Planning	None in short term. Potential savings in future.	To be identified.
Long-Term Actions (24-36 months)		
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	Complex analysis and transition requires work to start as soon as possible.	To be identified.
Data Integration	Complex analysis and transition requires work to start as soon as possible.	To be identified.
Interim Case Management Systems	To be identified.	To be identified.
Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	None.	To be identified.

Recommendations

1. Judicial Council recommend that the Judicial Council Technology Committee oversee the implementation of the proposed actions.
2. Judicial Council IT should consider reducing as many external contractors as possible.
3. Judicial Council recommend that the Judicial Council Technology Committee consider creating a working group to focus on IT efficiencies and cost saving measures for smaller courts.