

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Budget Change Proposal - Cover Sheet
 DF-46 (REV 08/16)

Fiscal Year 2017 – 18	Business Unit 0250	Department Judicial Branch	Priority No. 01
Budget Request Name 0250-301-BCP-2017-A1		Program 0140-Judicial Council	Subprogram 0140010-Judicial Council

Budget Request Description

Implement and Administer a Statewide Electronic Filing Program

Budget Request Summary

The Judicial Council requests a General Fund loan of \$671,000 in 2017-18 and \$491,000 in 2018-19 to the Trial Court Trust Fund to support 3.0 positions to develop and maintain a standards-based statewide e-filing environment that will promote, enable, and assist full court participation in e-filing.

Requires Legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Code Section(s) to be Added/Amended/Repealed	
Does this BCP contain information technology (IT) components? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, departmental Chief Information Officer must sign.</i>	Department CIO Robert Oyung, Director, Information Technology	Date 3/22/17

For IT requests, specify the project number, the most recent project approval document (FSR, SPR, S1BA, S2AA, S3SD, S4PRA), and the approval date.

Project No. Project Approval Document: Approval Date:

If proposal affects another department, does other department concur with proposal? Yes No
Attach comments of affected department, signed and dated by the department director or designee.

Prepared By Jamel Jones Chief Administrative Officer	Date 3/22/17	Reviewed By Madelynn McClain Administrative Director	Date 3/22/17
-------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------

Department of Finance Use Only

Additional Review: Capital Outlay ITCU FSCU OSAE CALSTARS Dept. of Technology

BCP Type: Policy Workload Budget per Government Code 13308.05

PPBA	ORIGINAL SIGNED BY: MARK TOLLEFSON	Date submitted to the Legislature 3-30-17
------	---------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------

A. Budget Request Summary

The Judicial Council requests a General Fund loan of \$671,000 in 2017-18 and \$491,000 in 2018-19 to the Trial Court Trust Fund to support 3.0 positions to develop and maintain a standards-based statewide e-filing environment that will promote, enable, and assist full court participation in e-filing. The loan will be repaid no later than June 30, 2021.

The positions will support the following key areas:

- (1) Integration with an Identity and Access Management system.
- (2) Integration with the preferred financial gateway where the Judicial Council has secured favorable rates.
- (3) Establishment and initial (2 year) operations of standards management, certification, and support services for statewide e-filing managers (EFMs) and e-filing service providers (EFSPs).
- (4) Support for superior court e-filing implementations leveraging the established e-filing environment.

B. Background/History

California law authorizes both direct e-filing and e-filing through an EFSP (See Code Civ. Proc., § 1010.6(d)(1)(B); Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.253(a).) In most instances, parties or their attorneys file through an EFSP. A party or attorney sends the documents through a user interface to the EFSP for filing. The EFSP handles the actual filing, including compliance with any technical requirements. After filing, the EFSPs also provide feedback to the parties about the case; and can offer additional services, such as the service of documents on all parties in the case. Under current law, a court can institute mandatory e-filing only if it has more than one EFSP or direct e-filing. This requirement fosters competition and provides the public with a choice.

California has a variety of innovative EFSPs based or operating in the state. While some of the courts in California have realized a degree of success and innovation in e-filing, progress has been limited. This partial adoption of e-filing has been influenced by the actions of e-filing vendors who have created a difficult economic environment by:

- Focusing on high volume courts almost to the exclusion of the smaller courts.
- Creating monopolies through the use of proprietary designs.
- Creating barriers to entry and operation for innovative EFSPs.
- Extracting higher fees for filing and payment processing.

Currently, courts that have implemented e-filing have an EFM provided by the same vendor as their CMS and are deploying e-filing as a local county event. While this model satisfies many of the needs of the individual court, it creates challenges for attorneys that file in multiple counties and creates uneven services from county to county.

Further, the majority of courts do not have any e-filing capability. Those courts that do have e-filing rely on either a single EFSP or EFM to provide identity management and financial gateway integration. The EFSP is analogous to the attorney service firm or couriers in a paper world; it provides the interface to the court filer, collects filing data, fees and may provide educational and other value-added services (e.g., process serving, billing assistance). The EFM is analogous to the counter clerk; it interacts with the EFSP by electronically accepting the filing, settling the payment, and presents the filing for clerical review and, upon approval, helps electronically move the data into the court's case and document management systems.

The disadvantage inherent in allowing EFMs and EFSPs to manage the identities of filers is that this approach does not allow the judicial branch to create a holistic view of the customer across services and courts.

Analysis of Problem

Moreover, it allows the EFSPs to limit movement of customers from one provider to another. Lastly, allowing the EFSPs to select their preferred financial gateway enables the vendor to charge above market fees for payment processing, thus increasing costs for the court customer.

Judicial Council Adoption of a Statewide E-filing Approach

Enhancing electronic access to justice and promoting more efficient business practices through information technology aligns with the core values of our judicial branch and with the proposed technology vision. Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye's vision for restoring full and meaningful access to our courts, Access 3D, and includes remote access as one of its principles. In order to achieve the vision for remote access, in 2014, the Judicial Council adopted a Court Technology Governance, Strategic and Tactical Plans for the California judiciary. The "digital court" with the capability of 21st century data exchange will not only allow us to do more with less but also significantly broaden meaningful access to the courts for litigants, lawyers, justice partners, and the public.

The adopted Tactical Plan includes two e-filing initiatives: (1) E-Filing Service Provider (EFSP) selection/certification and (2) E-Filing deployment, which both directly support the highest priority strategic goal, to "promote the digital court."

In May 2015, a working group of the Judicial Council Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) comprised of court members representing various court sizes and demographics (and named the ITAC E-Filing Workstream) kicked-off with a branch E-Filing Summit in San Francisco. At this meeting, interested trial courts and Judicial Council staff were invited to hear the e-filing experiences of three different court systems and approaches:

- The State of Texas using a vendor-driven statewide e-filing model;
- The State of Colorado using a court-developed statewide e-filing model; and
- Orange County, California using a local trial court implemented solution.

After several months of branch deliberations, input gathering, strategizing, and reviews¹, the Judicial Council approved an e-filing approach for the California judicial branch that employs a refined version of the vendor-driven model, with five (5) primary differences. The California model shall include:

- Statewide selection of more than one EFM.
- A requirement that all EFSPs work with all statewide EFMs.
- A requirement that all EFMs and EFSPs integrate with the Identity Management provider.
- A requirement that all EFSPs must be prepared to provide e-filing services to participating trial courts/counties adopting one of the two statewide EFMs.
- Differences in how monies are managed (e.g., court fees, EFM fees, EFSP fees, Merchant Bank fees, and optional court cost-recovery fees).

Under this approach, each EFM must accomplish the following:

- Support e-filing statewide for all litigation types.
- Integrate with "core" Case Management Systems (CMSs) – the three CMS vendor products with Master Services Agreements and Journal Technology's eCourt.

¹ Among the groups commenting were trial court presiding judges, court executive officers, court information officers, and related Judicial Council advisory bodies.

Analysis of Problem

- Integrate with SunGard ONESolution CMS certified with Electronic Court Filing standards.
- Integrate with Judicial Council-approved financial gateway vendors.
- Support electronic payment types beyond credit card.
- Provide a zero-cost e-filing option for indigent and government filers.

This approach is engineered to breakdown monopolistic practices that commonly develop in e-filing implementations. These include creating vendor lock-in, charging above market payment processing fees, and eliminating EFSP competition or discouraging market entry of other EFSPs through vertical integration and predatory pricing.

C. State Level Considerations

Presently e-filing is managed on a county-by-county basis. While this approach has been successful for some courts, it has created inconsistencies across the state in terms of access (most trial courts do not offer e-filing), pricing and availability of EFSPs, to name a few. This initiative seeks to encourage nearly pervasive e-filing throughout California while promoting efficiency and increasing access to justice.

D. Justification

On June 24, 2016, the Judicial Council directed ITAC to develop and implement a statewide electronic filing solution. Through a series of approved high-level requirements, the expectation is that the solution will improve access to litigants in a cost-effective manner. To ensure a competitive landscape the approach in part relies on multiple EFMs (required to provide e-filing for four core CMSs and e-delivery or another solution to courts without e-filing capability) and a requirement that all EFSPs work with all EFMs to ensure that even the smallest of counties enjoys a full array of choice.

Fundamental to the multiple EFM-EFSP model is a statewide identity management capability. The filer ultimately has their relationship with the court in which their case is heard, but may want to interact with the court (or multiple courts) through different EFSPs on the same or different cases. To ensure seamless access to their case, the branch should manage filer identities across courts, EFMs and EFSPs. To improve access and ensure the filer has choices, we are seeking funds to implement a statewide identity management capability that will be used by all EFMs, EFSPs and courts in support of e-filing.

Another key capability of e-filing is the management, handling, and payment of court fees. Traditionally additional processing costs for collecting and managing court fees are determined by the vendors (EFSP and/or EFM) and are passed on to the filer. It is not uncommon for these vendors to add 2 to 3 percent to the cost of court fees, which can be substantial. Financial institutions determine the credit card merchant fees based on revenue volume, credit-worthiness, likelihood of chargebacks, and refunds. In part from the sheer volume of monies collected by the court (via credit card processing), the fact that as a government agency payment is more certain, the judicial branch, can and has already, negotiated more favorable terms than the vendors can achieve.

As the state begins to implement a statewide e-filing solution, identity management and financial gateway integration will be required. Allowing the EFSP to control identities will limit movement of customers from one provider to another, and will not allow the branch to create a holistic view of the customer across services and courts. Allowing the EFM to control identities will create additional work for EFSPs and courts as they seek to leverage a common identity for their customers. Likewise, an EFSP or EFM controlled financial gateway will lead to greater costs to the filer as they lack the volume to obtain the greatest discounts. By putting identity management and payment processing services under the management control of the branch, the courts can provide better service to filers. In addition, this ensures filers access to the

Analysis of Problem

lowest cost payment processing services available to the courts. Filers will ultimately have greater choice and lower overall costs.

Lastly, establishing an EFM-EFSP certification process, providing ombudsman support, and facilitating issue resolution are necessary to ensure the statewide model is operational. Thus, to adequately support adoption of standards-based, statewide e-filing, the Judicial Council will need responsibilities in relation to EFMs, payment processors, identity management authority, and a certification authority. The plan anticipates cost recovery for EFSP certification to be funded via fees to vendors; and following the initial two year period, support for any ongoing positions will be funded via court e-filing/digital court cost recovery fees that will increase as more courts adopt the statewide e-filing model.

Benefits to attorneys/filers across state

The key benefits of e-filing to all filers include:

- *Convenience* – The Internet is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. With ubiquitous access to the Internet, many court transactions can be conducted virtually from anywhere in the world. The convenience of e-filing also has the potential to balance access to justice for all filers.
- *Immediacy* – By reducing or eliminating the processing time involved in clerk review, filers receive confirmation more quickly that their documents have either been accepted into the court record or rejected. If the files are rejected, filers can quickly address the errors and resubmit without delay.
- *Accuracy* – From the perspective of the filer, accuracy is improved. The filer is in greater control of how information is recorded in the court as duplicative data entry is removed. Instead of data entry, the clerk focuses on the accuracy and completeness of the filed document(s).
- *Lower Fees and Cost* – E-filing eliminates fees for delivery of the filing to courier and service to other parties in an existing case. Even if the e-filing system charges fees for e-filing and e-service, these fees are typically less than the fees of legal courier services and service personally.
- *Single Sign-on* – This initiative will provide for Identity and Access Management to allow filers to connect to multiple inter-related technology systems using a single sign-on and password. Inter-related systems include: EFSPs, Court Portal.
- *Consistency* – From the perspective of attorneys, this initiative will provide a consistent process for electronically submitting filings to any superior court that implements e-filing in accordance with the statewide standards and rules.

Benefits to government agencies and disadvantaged filers

This initiative enables particular benefits to government and disadvantaged filers

- *Common Benefits* – The benefits of *Convenience*, *Immediacy*, *Accuracy*, *Consistency* and *Single Sign-On* (previously noted) are available to government and disadvantaged filers.
- *Free e-Filing* – It provides for free e-filing services to government agencies and indigent filers who are filing under a fee waiver.
- *Self-Represented Litigants Portal* – Similar statewide e-filing initiatives have proved to be key enablers for the creation of effective self-representative litigant portals that provide greater access to justice to disadvantaged filers.

Benefits to the courts

In the courthouse, the key benefits of e-filing include significant potential for cost savings through automation. If e-filing simply emulates today's paper based business processes, real savings are possible in a variety of areas, such as:

- Faster processing and lower filing workloads, including:

Analysis of Problem

- *Faster Intake* – Receiving filings.
- *Less Data Entry* – Recording filing information in the court CMS.
- *Automated Scheduling* – Arranging for the filing to be reviewed or heard by a judge.
- *Less Scanning* – Imaging paper documents into a court document management system (DMS) to create an electronic record.
- *Less File Management* – Storing, retrieving, and potentially losing paper files.
- **Simpler records management, including:**
 - *Simpler File Sharing* – Making copies for multiple people to access concurrently.
 - *Simpler Document Destruction* – Destroying records based on a retention schedule.
 - *Less Physical File Storage* – Maintaining a physical warehouse of documents.
- **Potential for additional revenues, including:**
 - *Higher Volume of Fees for Public Access* – Providing access to or copies of documents for a fee.
 - *Revenue sharing with selected EFM and EFSP vendors.*
- **Statistics collection, including:**
 - *Statewide filing counts* – Such as for initial and subsequent filings.
 - *Number of documents filed.*
- **Process Improvement, including:**
 - *Automation;*
 - *Ease of communication (eService, eNotice, eMail); and*
 - *Optimization of workflows and processes.*

Cost Detail

Detailed information by position is included in the attached staffing workload analysis. In 2017-18, \$520,000 is budgeted for staff and OE&E cost and \$151,000 for software customization for the payment gateway (\$100,000) and data center services for identity management (\$51,000). The \$100,000 is the estimate for a contractor (1,000 hours x \$100/hour) to develop the payment gateways. The \$51,000 is the estimate to purchase Microsoft Identity Management calculated at the vendor's cost of \$0.01033 per stored identity and \$0.00280 per authentication for an approximate 335,000 filers, which is estimated to be needed in the first year assuming the Superior Court of Los Angeles County is responsible for testing the implementation of the Statewide Electronic Filing Program and each e-filer accesses e-filing services 50 times a year (filing, checking filing status, etc.).

These cost approximations are necessary to begin implementation of the project. Once operational, courts will assess an e-filing cost recovery fee, estimated to be approximately \$0.15 per filing, in outlying years to recoup ongoing transaction costs. The cost recovery must support the ongoing \$491,000 for the positions administering the Statewide Electronic Filing Program as well as the loan repayment in the first two years. This request includes a loan from the General Fund to implement and administer the Statewide Electronic Filing Program: \$671,000 in 2017-18 and \$491,000 in 2018-19. In order to pay back the \$1,162,000 loan no later than June 30, 2021, the Judicial Council estimates that the cost recovery fee will increase by approximately \$0.15 per filing. Approximately 4 million transactions annually at \$0.30 per transaction (from the approximately 335,000 filers in Los Angeles) will generate approximately \$1.2 million annually beginning July 1, 2019. The table below identifies the anticipated loan repayment terms. The cost recovery fee will be adjusted as needed, depending on the number of filers, to ensure that only the fee necessary to repay the General Fund loan and cover the costs to support the Electronic Filing Program will be assessed. Once the General Fund loan is repaid, the cost recovery fee will be reduced to support only the costs associated with the positions necessary to administer the program.

Analysis of Problem

Loan repayment schedule/summary of cost recovery fee revenue:

	2019-20	2020-21
Loan Balance	\$1,162,000	\$453,000
Costs to Support the Electronic Filing Program	\$491,000	\$491,000
Total costs to implement and administer the Statewide Electronic Filing Program	\$1,653,000	\$944,000
Cost Recovery Fee Revenue:		
4 million transactions @ \$0.30/ per transaction	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000
Loan Balance	\$453,000	-\$256,000 (available for 2021-22 support costs)

With the addition of approximately \$0.15 to the cost recovery fee necessary to support the repayment of the General Fund loan, the e-filing ecosystem will still be more cost effective and provide a more efficient and convenient way to file documents with the court. For example, a Proof of Service filing has \$0 court filing fee and using the Statewide Electronic Filing Program generates user costs of approximately \$13 (\$2 to the EFM, \$10 to the EFSP, \$0.30 to the branch, and \$0.37 to the financial gateway (~3 percent)). For a civil case initial filing, the court filing fee is \$400. The fees identified in the first example would be the same except that the financial gateway charge would increase as it's approximately 3 percent on the \$400 court filing fee - total charge is approximately \$25. Today, a filer can either: (1) pay an attorney service to file this document at court (including an expedite fee of \$50 if needed); (2) drive to the courthouse, wait in line, pay for parking, and pay the filing fees, or (3) e-file with a court that has already implemented e-filing and pay associated e-filing fees in addition to the standard filing fees.

In 2018-19, \$491,000 is budgeted for staff and OE&E.

The positions will support the following key areas:

- (1) Integration with an Identity and Access Management system.
- (2) Integration with the preferred financial gateway where the Judicial Council has secured favorable rates.
- (3) Establishment and initial (2 year) operations of standards management, certification, and support services for statewide e-filing managers (EFMs) and e-filing service providers (EFSPs).
- (4) Support for superior court e-filing implementations leveraging the established e-filing environment.

The classification/responsibilities are as follows:

- **Program Manager**- responsible for architecture and standards management, EFSP certification authority implementation and maintenance, EFM service management.
- **Application Developer**- responsible for the development and maintenance of technical architecture, establishment and maintenance of ancillary services for identity management and payment processing integration, and technical assistance to support the EFM and EFSP transition.
- **Business Analyst**- responsible for administering the e-filing program, ancillary services, operational certification ombudsman, and EFM and EFSP transition.

Software customization will result in full integration between the statewide e-filing solution and the JCC preferred financial gateway vendor(s). It is anticipated that data center services would be hosted by an identity management provider who's services would include an identity management software, storage of filer identities, and management of signons.

Analysis of Problem

E. Outcomes and Accountability

Upon implementation of a statewide e-filing solution, courts and court users will experience lower/more transparent e-filing costs and streamlined e-filing services. The Judicial Council positions will promote, enable, and assist full court participation in e-filing.

F. Analysis of All Feasible Alternatives

In a multiple EFM-EFSP environment each EFM and EFSP will have to be independently certified to validate adherence to the required standards and rules. The selected EFM vendors will likely also provide EFSP services leading to a concern that the certification process for EFSPs be open and independent. Resources will be required for development of services to provide the connectivity to the Judicial Council preferred financial gateway and implementation of a statewide identity management solution. Lastly, resources will be necessary for the initial court implementation, to provide subject matter expertise for subsequent court implementations, and to promote and manage a consistent statewide, standards-based e-filing environment.

Alternative #1: Provide \$671,000 General Fund in 2017-18 and 3.0 positions and \$491,000 General Fund in 2018-19 to develop and maintain a standards-based statewide e-filing environment that will promote, enable, and assist full court participation in e-filing. In addition, the funds will allow for implementation of statewide identity management and a payment gateway.

PROS:

1. Allows better choice of e-filing service providers to the customer.
2. Allows more choices of EFSPs for smaller courts.
3. Minimizes processing costs.
4. Allows the judicial branch to create a holistic view of the customer across services and courts.
5. Promotes a standards-based, e-filing adoption statewide.
6. Improves the ease of use for customers who need to transact with multiple courts.
7. Provides prompt responses to requests from superior courts, EFMs, EFSPs and filers.
8. Allows statewide leverage to address issues with vendors.
9. Allows for branch wide tracking of e-filing transactions, statistics, and metrics.

CON: Requires additional General Fund resources.

Alternative # 2 Status Quo (each court on their own). No statewide management, each court operates on their own. There are no managed identities and/or financial gateways. Currently each superior court in the State is solely responsible for implementing e-filing in their jurisdiction. It is currently evident that some courts have the financial and labor resources along with the filing volume to implement e-filing. However other courts in the State may not have the financial resources or the required skilled staff or the filing volume to implement. To continue with the status quo will lead to disparate e-filing solutions for some superior courts and no e-filing in others.

PRO:

No additional General Fund costs.

CONS:

1. Higher overall cost to the branch with each superior court initiating their own solution.
2. No statewide Identity Management, thus filers have separate credentials for each court.

Analysis of Problem

3. Smaller courts may never be able to offer e-filing.
4. More customizations, less standardization.
5. Lack of EFSP willingness to participate in e-filing at smaller courts due to a low return on investment (ROI).
6. Lack of EFSP choices in smaller courts.
7. Large courts with an existing e-filing solution in place may not switch to the statewide EFMs.
8. Fails to address the needs of filers who transact with multiple courts.
9. Risks low (no) adoption of the statewide e-filing program as courts lack the required resources.

Alternative # 3 Provide \$151,000 General Fund in 2017-18 to support EFMs with Assistance from Court Staff to manage the environment on behalf of all participating courts. The cost estimate includes \$100,000 for one-time Contract Services for software customization and \$51,000 for Data Center Services to begin implementation of identity management and payment gateways.

Description: EFMs, EFSPs, and individual courts will manage the environment. The EFMs would be responsible to develop and maintain the standards-based statewide e-filing environment that will promote, enable, and assist full court participation in e-filing. This option would require the EFMs to be responsible for all ongoing operational tasks and issues. With each implementation, the local court staff would be required to assist with their specific implementation and ongoing operational issues.

PROS:

1. Lower General Fund costs.
2. Initial e-filing solution will be local but could serve as the starting point or “demonstration” for a statewide solution.
3. Initial identity management solution will be local but could serve as the starting point or “demonstration” for a statewide solution.

CONS:

1. Selected court(s) will be required to resolve differing agendas of EFM, EFSP, local court and statewide interests.
2. Selected court(s) set the statewide standards based on their local needs and are under no burden to make solutions reusable across courts.
3. Large courts may adopt the program and coordinate efforts with their CMS vendors.
4. Adopting courts will use cost-recovery mechanisms to offset local implementation costs.
5. Statewide e-filing program adoption will be slow as smaller courts lack the resources to implement.
6. EFM’s and EFSP’s will not be aggressive to implement at small courts. EFM primary business objectives do not necessarily align with the objectives of the judicial branch.
7. EFMs would have a conflict of interest in many situations.
8. Potentially higher EFM/EFSP convenience fees charged by the EFM to cover their operational costs.
9. Lack of cohesion between implementations.
10. More problematic with regard to governance and does not fully realize a statewide e-filing solution.

This model was opposed by a coalition of EFSPs and Process Servers named the Coalition for Improving Court Access (CICA). CICA companies claim an EFM controlled environment leads to an unfair market if the EFM is also an EFSP.

G. Implementation Plan

Analysis of Problem

Implementing e-filing is highly disruptive to individual trial courts, thus the ultimate solution must leave participation authority with the local court. Before implementing e-filing, a court must have a modern case management system, a document management capability, financial resources to navigate through the transition to a digital court record, and staff available to train and operate the new environment. In the long run, e-filing is proven to increase operational efficiencies. The timing of the transition, however, must be a local court decision.

The Statewide Electronic Filing Program will be implemented in three courts that are willing to join the implementation, which will be quickly followed by other courts to maximize the benefits to the courts and public.

H. Supplemental Information

Staffing workload analysis

I. Recommendation

The Judicial Council recommends a General Fund loan of \$671,000 in 2017-18 and \$491,000 General Fund in 2018-19 to the Trial Court Trust Fund to support 3.0 positions to develop and maintain a standards-based statewide e-filing environment that will promote, enable, and assist full court participation in e-filing. The loan will be repaid no later than June 30, 2021. This approach supports the Judicial Council's approved statewide e-filing model, the Chief Justice's 3D Access vision, the *Judicial Branch Strategic Plan*, and *Tactical Plan for Technology*.

**WORKLOAD ANALYSIS WORKSHEET - NEW POSITIONS
BUDGET CHANGE PROPOSAL
FISCAL YEAR 2016-2017**

Office/Court:	Information Technology				
Unit					
BCP Number/Title:	E-Filing				
Class Code/Title	Program Manager	Task Quantity	Number of Hrs. for each Task (or % of Hour)	Per Year/Month/Week/Day	Annual Hours
					Percent of Total
Activity N: Governance Facilitation					
Task Description:(list below)					
1	Maintain rosters, facilitating the process for filling positions in all committees	1	4.00	Month	48
2	Schedule and facilitate meetings	1	16.00	Month	192
3	Maintain collaboration resources	1	2.00	Month	24
4	Maintain schedules, agendas, logistics, minutes, assignments, and status reports	1	8.00	Month	96
Total Annual Hours:					264
					15%
Activity N: Architecture and Standards Management					
Task Description:(list below)					
1	Develop / maintain work plan and schedule	1	4.00	Month	48
2	Manage tasks and resources	1	4.00	Month	48
3	Manage risks	1	2.00	Month	24
4	Manage issues	1	2.00	Month	24
5	Manage budget	1	4.00	Month	48
6	Report Status	1	4.00	Month	48
Total Annual Hours:					240
					13%
Activity N: Certification Authority Implementation & Maintenance					
Task Description:(list below)					
1	Establish Contract	1	80.00	Year	80
2	Develop / maintain work plan and schedule	1	4.00	Month	48
3	Manage tasks and resources	1	4.00	Month	48
4	Manage risks	1	2.00	Month	24
5	Manage issues	1	2.00	Month	24
6	Manage budget	1	4.00	Month	48
7	Report Status	1	4.00	Month	48
8	Management contract and service level agreement	1	4.00	Month	48
Total Annual Hours:					368
					21%
Activity N: EFM Service Implementation & Management					
Task Description:(list below)					
1	Develop / maintain work plan and schedule	1	8.00	Month	96
2	Manage tasks and resources	1	8.00	Month	96
3	Manage risks	1	2.00	Month	24
4	Manage issues	1	2.00	Month	24
5	Manage budget	1	4.00	Month	48
6	Report Status	1	4.00	Month	48
7	Management contract and service level agreement	1	4.00	Month	48
Total Annual Hours:					384
					22%
Activity N: General Program Management					
Task Description:(list below)					
1	Manage IAM Service Contract	1	8.00	Month	96
2	Manage Payment Processor service to EFSPs	1	8.00	Month	96
3	Provide e-filing ombudsman services to EFPS, EFMs, Filers, Courts, and contracted service providers.	1	8.00	Month	96
4	Manage program staff	1	8.00	Month	96
5	Manage program budget	1	4.00	Month	48
6	Conduct community outreach	1	4.00	Month	48
7	Prepare and prepare reports as needed	1	4.00	Month	48
Total Annual Hours:					528
					30%
Grand Total Annual Hours :*					1,784
					100%
Full Time Equivalents Required to Complete:					1.0
Currently Authorized Positions:					0.0
Additional Positions Needed:					1.0
Number of Positions Being Requested					1.0

* Note: One full-time position = 1,778 hours - Percentage must equal 100% for positions.

**WORKLOAD ANALYSIS WORKSHEET - NEW POSITIONS
BUDGET CHANGE PROPOSAL
FISCAL YEAR 2016-2017**

Office/Court:		Information Technology					
Unit							
BCP Number/Title:	E-Filing	Task Quantity	Number of Hrs. for each Task (or % of Hour)	Per Year/Month/Week/Da y	Annual Hours	Percent of Total	
Class Code/Title	Technical Analyst						
Activity N Develop and Maintain Technical Architecture							
Task Description:(list below)							
1	Develop architecture management process	1	40.00	Year	40		
2	Design e-Filing Transactions	1	80.00	Year	80		
3	Design IAM Processing	1	20.00	Year	20		
4	Design Payment Processing	1	20.00	Year	20		
5	Identify JCC / Court Provided IP	1	40.00	Year	40		
6	Manage SME participation	1	8.00	Month	96		
7	Conduct Design Sessions	1	8.00	Month			
8	Document and Maintain Standards	1	16.00	Month			
9	Facilitate architecture change management	1	16.00	Month	192		
Total Annual Hours:					296	12%	
Activity N Establish and Maintain Ancillary Services							
Task Description:(list below)							
1	Maintain and manage IAM minimum configuration required for e-	4	2.00	Month	96		
2	Configure IAM Service for e-Filing Courts	2	12.00	Month	288		
3	Assist payment processing integration	2	8.00	Month	192		
4			0.00	Month	0		
5		0	0.00	Month	0		
6		0	0.00	Month	0		
Total Annual Hours:					576	24%	
Activity N Technical Certification Ombudsman							
Task Description:(list below)							
1	Define technical certification protocols	1	80.00	Year	80		
2	Facilitate construction and configuration of certification	1	80.00	Year	80		
3	Facilitate certification process, resolving errors and technical	2	16.00	Month	384		
4	Conduct technical research and troubleshooting to resolve disputes and error conditions in certification and e-filing	2	4.00	Month	96		
5		0	0.00	Month	0		
6		0	0.00	Month	0		
7		0	0.00	Month	0		
8		0	0.00	Month	0		
Total Annual Hours:					640	26%	
Activity N EFM and EFSP Transition Assistance							
Task Description:(list below)							
1	Provide technical subject matter expertise to support EFM implementation with courts.	2	80.00	Year	160		
2	Provide technical subject matter expertise to support EFSP implementation with EFM's.	2	16.00	Month	384		
3	Conduct technical research to support EFM and EFSP implementation and exit.	2	4.00	Month	96		
4	Provide technical subject matter expertise to support exit by EFSP, EFM, or court.	1	24.00	Year	24		
5		0	0.00	Month	0		
6		0	0.00	Month	0		
7		0	0.00	Month	0		
Total Annual Hours:					664	27%	
Activity N Technical Contract Monitoring							
Task Description:(list below)							
1	Monitor system performance against service level agreements for all e-filing and CMS applications	1	8.00	Month	96		
2	Work with service providers to identify and resolve compliance issues and ensure SLAs are being met.	4	16.00	Year	64		
3	Monitor and audit security of service provider operations on a regular basis.	1	8.00	Month	96		
4				Month	0		
5				Month	0		
6				Month	0		
7				Month	0		
Total Annual Hours:					256	11%	
Grand Total Annual Hours :*					2,432	100%	
Full Time Equivalents Required to Complete:					1.4		
Currently Authorized Positions:					0.0		
Additional Positions Needed:					1.4		
Number of Positions Being Requested					1.0		

* Note: One full-time position = 1,778 hours - Percentage must equal 100% for positions.

**WORKLOAD ANALYSIS WORKSHEET - NEW POSITIONS
BUDGET CHANGE PROPOSAL
FISCAL YEAR 2016-2017**

Office/Court:	Information Technology					
Unit						
BCP Number/Title:	E-Filing	Task Quantity	Number of Hrs. for each Task (or % of Hour)	Per Year/Mon th/ Week/Da y	Annual Hours	Percent of Total
Class Code/Title	Business Analyst					
Activity N: Administer e-Filing Program						
Task Description: (list below)						
Develop program policies and procedures for contracting, on-boarding, exiting, certification, accounting, training, grievance and issue resolution, and communication.						
1		1	120.00	Year	120	
2		1	8.00	Month	96	
3		1	8.00	Month	96	
4		2	4.00	Month	96	
5		4	2.00	Month	96	
6		1	8.00	Month	96	
7		2	2.00	Month	48	
8		1	8.00	Month	96	
9		1	0.50	Day	130	
Total Annual Hours:					744	38%
Activity N: Administer Ancillary Services						
Task Description: (list below)						
1		1	2.00	Month	24	
2		4	2.00	Month	96	
3		1	4.00	Month	48	
4		1	4.00	Month	48	
5				Month	0	
6				Month	0	
Total Annual Hours:					216	11%
Activity N: Operational Certification Ombudsman						
Task Description: (list below)						
1		1	60.00	Year	60	
2		2	4.00	Month	96	
3		1	2.00	Week	104	
4		2	4.00	Month	96	
5		2	4.00	Month	96	
6		0	0.00	Month	0	
7		0	0.00	Month	0	
8		0	0.00	Month	0	
Total Annual Hours:					452	23%
Activity N: EFM and EFSP Transition Assistance						
Task Description: (list below)						
1		2	40.00	Year	80	
2		2	8.00	Month	192	
3		2	8.00	Month	192	
4		1	16.00	Year	16	
5		0	0.00	Month	0	
6		0	0.00	Month	0	
7		0	0.00	Month	0	
Total Annual Hours:					480	24%
Activity N: Operational Contract Monitoring						
Task Description: (list below)						
1		1	4.00	Month	48	
2		4	8.00	Year	32	
3				Month	0	
4				Month	0	
5				Month	0	
6				Month	0	
7				Month	0	
Total Annual Hours:					80	4%
Grand Total Annual Hours :*					1,972	100%
Full Time Equivalents Required to Complete:					1.1	
Currently Authorized Positions:					0.0	
Additional Positions Needed:					1.1	
Number of Positions Being Requested					1.0	

* Note: One full-time position = 1,778 hours - Percentage must equal 100% for positions.

BCP Fiscal Detail Sheet

BCP Title: Statewide Electronic Filing Implementation and Operational Support

BR Name: 0250-301-BCP-2017-A1

Budget Request Summary

	FY17					
	CY	BY	BY+1	BY+2	BY+3	BY+4
Personal Services						
Positions - Permanent	0.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Total Positions	0.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Salaries and Wages						
Earnings - Permanent	0	270	270	270	270	270
Total Salaries and Wages	\$0	\$270	\$270	\$270	\$270	\$270
Total Staff Benefits	0	148	148	148	148	148
Total Personal Services	\$0	\$418	\$418	\$418	\$418	\$418
Operating Expenses and Equipment						
5340 - Consulting and Professional Services - External	0	151	0	0	0	0
539X - Other	0	102	73	73	73	73
Total Operating Expenses and Equipment	\$0	\$253	\$73	\$73	\$73	\$73
Total Budget Request	\$0	\$671	\$491	\$491	\$491	\$491
Fund Summary						
Fund Source - State Operations						
0932 - Trial Court Trust Fund	0	671	491	491	491	491
Total State Operations Expenditures	\$0	\$671	\$491	\$491	\$491	\$491
Total All Funds	\$0	\$671	\$491	\$491	\$491	\$491
Program Summary						
Program Funding						
0140010 - Judicial Council	0	671	491	491	491	491
Total All Programs	\$0	\$671	\$491	\$491	\$491	\$491

