

Administrative Office of the Courts

The Statewide Case Management Project Faces Significant Challenges Due to Poor Project Management

REPORT NUMBER 2010-102, ISSUED FEBRUARY 2011

This report concludes that the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) has not adequately planned the statewide case management project since 2003 when the Judicial Council of California (Judicial Council) directed the AOC to continue its development. The statewide case management project includes two interim systems and the most recent version, the California Court Case Management System (CCMS). Further, the AOC has not analyzed whether the project would be a cost-beneficial solution to the superior courts' technology needs and it is unclear on what information the AOC made critical decisions during the project's planning and development. In addition, the AOC did not structure its contract with the development vendor to adequately control contract costs. As a result, over the course of seven years, the AOC entered into 102 amendments and the contract has grown from \$33 million to \$310 million. Further, although the AOC fulfilled its reporting requirements to the Legislature, the four annual reports it submitted between 2005 and 2009 did not include comprehensive cost estimates for the project, and the AOC's 2010 report failed to present the project's cost in an aggregate manner. Moreover, the AOC has consistently failed to develop accurate cost estimates for the statewide case management project, which is now at risk of failure due to a lack of funding.

As of June 2010 the AOC and several superior courts had spent \$407 million on the project. The AOC's records show that as of fiscal year 2015–16—the year it expects that CCMS will be deployed statewide—the full cost of the project will be \$1.9 billion. However, this amount does not include \$44 million that the seven superior courts reported to us they spent to implement the interim systems or the unknown but likely significant costs the superior courts will incur to implement CCMS.

In addition, our survey of the seven superior courts using interim versions of the statewide case management project found they experienced challenges and difficulties in implementation, and some are reluctant to implement the CCMS. Many of the remaining 51 superior courts not using an interim version expressed uncertainty about various aspects of the project. Although the Judicial Council has the authority to compel the superior courts to implement CCMS, our survey results indicate that its successful implementation will require the AOC to more effectively foster court support. Although state-level justice partners indicated to us they look forward to CCMS, the extent to which local justice partners will integrate their systems with CCMS is unclear due to cost considerations.

Finally, the AOC has not contracted for adequate independent oversight of the statewide case management project. Our information technology expert believes that as a result of the AOC's failure to address significant independent oversight concerns and quality problems experienced, CCMS may be at risk of future quality problems. In light of these issues, we believe that prior to proceeding with the AOC's plan to deploy CCMS at three courts that will be early adopters of the system, there would be value in conducting an independent review to determine the extent of any quality issues and problems.

In the report, the California State Auditor (state auditor) made the following recommendations to the AOC. The state auditor's determination regarding the current status of recommendations is based on the AOC's one-year response to the state auditor as of February 2012 and subsequent responses to provide additional context received through November 2012.

Recommendation 1.1—See pages 24—26 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To understand whether CCMS is a cost-beneficial solution to the superior courts' case management needs, the AOC should continue with its planned cost-benefit study and ensure it completes this study before spending additional significant resources on the project. The AOC should ensure that this study includes a thorough analysis of the cost and benefits of the statewide case management project,

including a consideration of costs and benefits it believes cannot be reasonably quantified. The AOC should carefully evaluate the results of the study and present a recommendation to the Judicial Council regarding the course of action that should be taken with CCMS. Further, the AOC should fully share the results of the study as well as its recommendation to all interested parties, such as the superior courts, justice partners, the Legislature, and the California Technology Agency (Technology Agency). The AOC should update this cost-benefit analysis periodically and as significant assumptions change.

AOC's Action:

In March 2012 the Judicial Council voted to halt deployment of CCMS; thus, this recommendation is no longer relevant.

Recommendation 1.2—See pages 26—29 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To ensure the statewide case management project is transparent, the AOC should make sure all key decisions for future activities on CCMS are documented and retained.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

The AOC stated all key decisions will be documented and all documentation provided to or produced by the CCMS governance committees and the CCMS Project Management Office will be retained throughout the life of the CCMS project. It also stated all available documentation predating this new governance model will also be retained throughout the life of the CCMS project. The AOC stated that CCMS documentation will be available to the public in a manner consistent with rule 10.500 of the California Rules of Court, which strives for transparency of judicial administrative records and to ensure the public's right of access to such records.

Recommendation 1.3—See pages 32—34 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To ensure its contract with the development vendor protects the financial interests of the State and the judicial branch, the AOC should consider restructuring its current contract to ensure the warranty for CCMS is adequate and covers a time period necessary to ensure that deployment of CCMS has occurred at the three early-adopter courts and they are able to operate the system in a live operational environment.

AOC's Action:

In March 2012 the Judicial Council voted to halt deployment of CCMS; thus, this recommendation is no longer relevant.

Recommendation 1.4.a—See pages 34 and 35 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

If the Judicial Council determines that CCMS is in the best interest of the judicial branch and it directs the AOC to deploy the system statewide, assuming funding is available, the AOC should ensure that any contract it enters into with a deployment vendor includes cost estimates that are based on courts' existing information technology (IT) environments and available resources to assist with deployment activities.

AOC's Action:

In March 2012 the Judicial Council voted to halt deployment of CCMS; thus, this recommendation is no longer relevant.

Recommendation 1.4.b—See pages 35 and 36 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

If the Judicial Council determines that CCMS is in the best interest of the judicial branch and it directs the AOC to deploy the system statewide, assuming funding is available, the AOC should ensure that any contract it enters into with a deployment vendor includes well-defined deliverables.

AOC's Action:

In March 2012 the Judicial Council voted to halt deployment of CCMS; thus, this recommendation is no longer relevant.

Recommendation 1.4.c—See pages 34 and 35 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

If the Judicial Council determines that CCMS is in the best interest of the judicial branch and it directs the AOC to deploy the system statewide, assuming funding is available, the AOC should ensure that any contract it enters into with a deployment vendor includes that adequate responsibility be placed on the vendor for conducting key steps in the deployment of the system.

AOC's Action:

In March 2012 the Judicial Council voted to halt deployment of CCMS; thus, this recommendation is no longer relevant.

Recommendation 1.5—See pages 29—32 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

The Judicial Council should make certain that the governance model for CCMS ensures that approval of contracts and contract amendments that are significant in terms of cost, time extension, and/or change in scope occur at the highest and most appropriate levels, and that when contracts or contract amendments above these thresholds are approved, that the decision makers are fully informed regarding both the costs and benefits.

AOC's Action:

In March 2012 the Judicial Council voted to halt deployment of CCMS; thus, this recommendation is no longer relevant.

Recommendation 1.6.a—See pages 24—26 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To ensure that any future IT projects are in the best interest of the judicial branch and the State, the AOC should complete a thorough analysis of the project's cost and benefits before investing any significant resources and time into its development, and update this analysis periodically and as significant assumptions change.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

The AOC stated it has been working diligently with the Technology Agency since its review of CCMS. The AOC further stated it has taken steps to integrate the Technology Agency's recommendations into its existing technology project management process. The AOC reported this includes working with the Technology Agency on project concept documents and the project charters for future IT projects and using project planning documents more similar to those typically used for executive branch IT projects.

Recommendation 1.6.b—See pages 26—29 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To ensure that any future IT projects are in the best interest of the judicial branch and the State, the AOC should document and retain all key decisions that impact the project in general, including the goals of the project.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

The AOC indicates incorporating the Technology Agency's recommendations into its existing processes, and using and retaining project concept documents, project charters, and other project planning documents more similar to those typically used for executive branch IT projects.

Recommendation 1.6.c—See pages 29—36 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To ensure that any future IT projects are in the best interest of the judicial branch and the State, the AOC should better structure contracts with development and deployment vendors to protect the financial interests of the judicial branch and ensure the contracts provide for adequate warranty periods.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

The AOC stated it will continue to work with the best qualified legal counsel to ensure that its development and deployment contracts protect the financial interests of the judicial branch and the State. The AOC also stated it will include appropriate warranty periods in IT projects and will ensure that any future development and deployment contracts address the length and timing of a warranty period to ensure necessary protection.

Recommendation 2.1.a—See pages 40—47 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To ensure that the financial implications of the statewide case management project are fully understood, the AOC should report to the Judicial Council, the Legislature, and stakeholders a complete accounting of the costs for the interim systems and CCMS. This figure should be clear about the uncertainty surrounding some costs, such as those that the AOC and superior courts will incur for deployment of CCMS.

AOC's Action:

In March 2012 the Judicial Council voted to halt deployment of CCMS; thus, this recommendation is no longer relevant.

Recommendation 2.1.b—See pages 44—47 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

The AOC should require superior courts to identify their past and future costs related to the project, particularly the likely significant costs that superior courts will incur during CCMS deployment, and include these costs in the total cost.

AOC's Action:

In March 2012 the Judicial Council voted to halt deployment of CCMS; thus, this recommendation is no longer relevant.

Recommendation 2.1.c—See pages 44—47 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

Further, the AOC should be clear about the nature of the costs that other entities, such as justice partners, will incur to integrate with CCMS that are not included in its total cost.

AOC's Action:

In March 2012 the Judicial Council voted to halt deployment of CCMS; thus, this recommendation is no longer relevant.

Recommendation 2.1.d—See pages 40—47 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

The AOC should update its cost estimate for CCMS on a regular basis as well as when significant assumptions change.

AOC's Action:

In March 2012 the Judicial Council voted to halt deployment of CCMS; thus, this recommendation is no longer relevant.

Recommendation 2.2—See pages 47—49 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To address the funding uncertainty facing CCMS, the AOC should work with the Judicial Council, the Legislature, and the governor to develop an overall strategy that is realistic given the current fiscal crisis facing the State.

AOC's Action:

In March 2012 the Judicial Council voted to halt deployment of CCMS; thus, this recommendation is no longer relevant.

Recommendation 2.3.a—See pages 40—44 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To better manage costs of future IT projects, the AOC should estimate costs at the inception of projects.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

The AOC has two artifacts for budgeting, tracking, managing, and estimating costs—the business case and the project assessment form—both developed as part of the Enterprise Methodology and Process program (enterprise program). A key component of the enterprise program is development and implementation of a standard Solution Development Life Cycle (development life cycle) that describes a phase-by-phase methodology for medium or large projects including standards, processes, and artifacts. The AOC explained that while no new medium or large projects are currently envisioned in the current budget climate, it will require that upcoming applicable maintenance and operations efforts and future projects adhere to the development life cycle.

The AOC explained that the primary purpose of development of a business case is to provide a financial justification for undertaking a project, including cost analyses for a recommended solution and for alternatives that were explored as well. According to the AOC, costs are broken out into several categories (such as hardware or software), as well as project versus ongoing costs. In addition to completing the business case, the development life cycle calls for revisiting the business case after project inception to facilitate cost management and tracking as well as to validate the accuracy of initial estimates. The development life cycle also requires a post-project review, one part of which includes an analysis of the accuracy of cost estimates and the identification of any lessons learned to improve cost management on future efforts.

The purpose of the project assessment form is to gather high-level information about the project to categorize it as small, medium, or large, based on estimated level of effort, duration, and cost. Costs are broken out into several categories (such as hardware or software), application versus infrastructure, and project versus ongoing. The project assessment form also includes costs likely to be incurred by entities external to the AOC, such as the superior courts, justice partners, and law enforcement agencies.

The AOC also explained that another key tool used for budgeting, tracking, managing, and estimating costs is its Information and Technology Services Office's (IT services office) zero-based budgeting process. The purpose of this process, according to the AOC, is to identify key needs for each project going forward while providing sufficient funding for baseline activities. The other purpose the AOC cited is to provide a budget monitoring tool for project managers throughout the fiscal year. The AOC explained that the budget projections produced through this process are also used to inform the Judicial Council, related working groups, and advisory committees. To develop, track, and monitor their budgets, the AOC indicated that each program uses information provided by its financial system, which captures all AOC allocations, encumbrances, and expenditures for IT services programs.

Additionally, the AOC stated that it uses a project portfolio management tool for weekly project reporting, one element of which includes a budget health indicator, ensuring that significant variances from initial cost estimates are identified and addressed. Formal criteria for the budget health indicator are as follows: green, the project is tracking to the approved budget; yellow, a budgetary risk has been identified for which a mitigation strategy is in place; and red, a budgetary risk has been identified for which there is no mitigation strategy in place. The AOC stated that an explanation of any yellow or red budget indicators must be provided in writing, and a justification for any indicators that were previously yellow or red but have been reset to green must also be noted.

Recommendation 2.3.b—See pages 43 and 44 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To better manage costs of future IT projects, the AOC should employ appropriate budget and cost management tools to allow it to appropriately budget, track, manage, and estimate costs.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

The AOC has two artifacts for budgeting, tracking, managing, and estimating costs—the business case and the project assessment form—both developed as part of the Enterprise Methodology and Process program (enterprise program). A key component of the enterprise program is development and implementation of a standard Solution Development Life Cycle (development life cycle) that describes a phase-by-phase methodology for medium or large projects including standards, processes, and artifacts. The AOC explained that while no new medium or large projects are currently envisioned in the current budget climate, it will require that upcoming applicable maintenance and operations efforts and future projects adhere to the development life cycle.

The AOC explained that the primary purpose of development of a business case is to provide a financial justification for undertaking a project, including cost analyses for a recommended solution and for alternatives that were explored as well. According to the AOC, costs are broken out into several categories (such as hardware or software), as well as project versus ongoing costs. In addition to completing the business case, the development life cycle calls for revisiting the business case after project inception to facilitate cost management and tracking as well as to validate the accuracy of initial estimates. The development life cycle also requires a post-project review, one part of which includes an analysis of the accuracy of cost estimates and the identification of any lessons learned to improve cost management on future efforts.

The purpose of the project assessment form is to gather high-level information about the project to categorize it as small, medium, or large, based on estimated level of effort, duration, and cost. Costs are broken out into several categories (such as hardware or software), application versus infrastructure, and project versus ongoing. The project assessment form also includes costs likely to be incurred by entities external to the AOC, such as the superior courts, justice partners, and law enforcement agencies.

The AOC also explained that another key tool used for budgeting, tracking, managing, and estimating costs is its Information and Technology Services Office's (IT services office) zero-based budgeting process. The purpose of this process, according to the AOC, is to identify key needs for each project going forward while providing sufficient funding for baseline activities. The other purpose the AOC cited is to provide a budget monitoring tool for project managers throughout the fiscal year. The AOC explained that the budget projections produced through this process are also used to inform the Judicial Council, related working groups, and advisory committees. To develop, track, and monitor their budgets, the AOC indicated that each program uses information provided by its financial system, which captures all AOC allocations, encumbrances, and expenditures for IT services programs.

Additionally, the AOC stated that it uses a project portfolio management tool for weekly project reporting, one element of which includes a budget health indicator, ensuring that significant variances from initial cost estimates are identified and addressed. Formal criteria for the budget health indicator are as follows: green, the project is tracking to the approved budget; yellow, a budgetary risk has been identified for which a mitigation strategy is in place; and red, a budgetary risk has been identified for which there is no mitigation strategy in place. The AOC stated that an explanation of any yellow or red budget indicators must be provided in writing, and a justification for any indicators that were previously yellow or red but have been reset to green must also be noted.

Recommendation 2.3.c—See pages 44—47 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To better manage costs of future IT projects, the AOC should ensure that cost estimates are accurate and include all relevant costs, including costs that superior courts will incur.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

The AOC has two artifacts for budgeting, tracking, managing, and estimating costs—the business case and the project assessment form—both developed as part of the Enterprise Methodology and Process program (enterprise program). A key component of the enterprise program is development and implementation of a standard Solution Development Life Cycle (development life cycle) that describes a phase-by-phase methodology for medium or large projects including standards, processes, and artifacts. The AOC explained that while no new medium or large projects are currently envisioned in the current budget climate, it will require that upcoming applicable maintenance and operations efforts and future projects adhere to the development life cycle.

The AOC explained that the primary purpose of development of a business case is to provide a financial justification for undertaking a project, including cost analyses for a recommended solution and for alternatives that were explored as well. According to the AOC, costs are broken out into several categories (such as hardware or software), as well as project versus ongoing costs. In addition to completing the business case, the development life cycle calls for revisiting the business case after project inception to facilitate cost management and tracking as well as to validate the accuracy of initial estimates. The development life cycle also requires a post-project review, one part of which includes an analysis of the accuracy of cost estimates and the identification of any lessons learned to improve cost management on future efforts.

The purpose of the project assessment form is to gather high-level information about the project to categorize it as small, medium, or large, based on estimated level of effort, duration, and cost. Costs are broken out into several categories (such as hardware or software), application versus infrastructure, and project versus ongoing. The project assessment form also includes costs likely to be incurred by entities external to the AOC, such as the superior courts, justice partners, and law enforcement agencies.

The AOC also explained that another key tool used for budgeting, tracking, managing, and estimating costs is its Information and Technology Services Office's (IT services office) zero-based budgeting process. The purpose of this process, according to the AOC, is to identify key needs for each project going forward while providing sufficient funding for baseline activities. The other purpose the AOC cited is to provide a budget monitoring tool for project managers throughout the fiscal year. The AOC explained that the budget projections produced through this process are also used to inform the Judicial Council, related working groups, and advisory committees. To develop, track, and monitor their budgets, the AOC indicated that each program uses information provided by its financial system, which captures all AOC allocations, encumbrances, and expenditures for IT services programs.

Additionally, the AOC stated that it uses a project portfolio management tool for weekly project reporting, one element of which includes a budget health indicator, ensuring that significant variances from initial cost estimates are identified and addressed. Formal criteria for the budget health indicator are as follows: green, the project is tracking to the approved budget; yellow, a budgetary risk has been identified for which a mitigation strategy is in place; and red, a budgetary risk has been identified for which there is no mitigation strategy in place. The AOC stated that an explanation of any yellow or red budget indicators must be provided in writing, and a justification for any indicators that were previously yellow or red but have been reset to green must also be noted.

Recommendation 2.3.d—See page 46 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To better manage costs of future IT projects, the AOC should disclose costs that other entities will likely incur to the extent it can reasonably do so.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

The AOC has two artifacts for budgeting, tracking, managing, and estimating costs—the business case and the project assessment form—both developed as part of the Enterprise Methodology and Process program (enterprise program). A key component of the enterprise program is development and implementation of a standard Solution Development Life Cycle (development life cycle) that describes a phase-by-phase methodology for medium or large projects including standards, processes, and artifacts. The AOC explained that while no new medium or large projects are currently envisioned in the current budget climate, it will require that upcoming applicable maintenance and operations efforts and future projects adhere to the development life cycle.

The AOC explained that the primary purpose of development of a business case is to provide a financial justification for undertaking a project, including cost analyses for a recommended solution and for alternatives that were explored as well. According to the AOC, costs are broken out into several categories (such as hardware or software), as well as project versus ongoing costs. In addition to completing the business case, the development life cycle calls for revisiting the business case after project inception to facilitate cost management and tracking as well as to validate the accuracy of initial estimates. The development life cycle also requires a post-project review, one part of which includes an analysis of the accuracy of cost estimates and the identification of any lessons learned to improve cost management on future efforts.

The purpose of the project assessment form is to gather high-level information about the project to categorize it as small, medium, or large, based on estimated level of effort, duration, and cost. Costs are broken out into several categories (such as hardware or software), application versus infrastructure, and project versus ongoing. The project assessment form also includes costs likely to be incurred by entities external to the AOC, such as the superior courts, justice partners, and law enforcement agencies.

The AOC also explained that another key tool used for budgeting, tracking, managing, and estimating costs is its Information and Technology Services Office's (IT services office) zero-based budgeting process. The purpose of this process, according to the AOC, is to identify key needs for each project going forward while providing sufficient funding for baseline activities. The other purpose the AOC cited is to provide a budget monitoring tool for project managers throughout the fiscal year. The AOC explained that the budget projections produced through this process are also used to inform the Judicial Council, related working groups, and advisory committees. To develop, track, and monitor their budgets, the AOC indicated that each program uses information provided by its financial system, which captures all AOC allocations, encumbrances, and expenditures for IT services programs.

Additionally, the AOC stated that it uses a project portfolio management tool for weekly project reporting, one element of which includes a budget health indicator, ensuring that significant variances from initial cost estimates are identified and addressed. Formal criteria for the budget health indicator are as follows: green, the project is tracking to the approved budget; yellow, a budgetary risk has been identified for which a mitigation strategy is in place; and red, a budgetary risk has been identified for which there is no mitigation strategy in place. The AOC stated that an explanation of any yellow or red budget indicators must be provided in writing, and a justification for any indicators that were previously yellow or red but have been reset to green must also be noted.

Recommendation 2.3.e—See pages 40—44 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To better manage costs of future IT projects, the AOC should update cost estimates on a regular basis and when significant assumptions change.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

The AOC has two artifacts for budgeting, tracking, managing, and estimating costs—the business case and the project assessment form—both developed as part of the Enterprise Methodology and Process program (enterprise program). A key component of the enterprise program is development and implementation of a standard Solution Development Life Cycle (development life cycle) that describes a phase-by-phase methodology for medium or large projects including standards, processes, and artifacts. The AOC explained that while no new medium or large projects are currently envisioned in the current budget climate, it will require that upcoming applicable maintenance and operations efforts and future projects adhere to the development life cycle.

The AOC explained that the primary purpose of development of a business case is to provide a financial justification for undertaking a project, including cost analyses for a recommended solution and for alternatives that were explored as well. According to the AOC, costs are broken out into several categories (such as hardware or software), as well as project versus ongoing costs. In addition to completing the business case, the development life cycle calls for revisiting the business case after project inception to facilitate cost management and tracking as well as to validate the accuracy of initial estimates. The development life cycle also requires a post-project review, one part of which includes an analysis of the accuracy of cost estimates and the identification of any lessons learned to improve cost management on future efforts.

The purpose of the project assessment form is to gather high-level information about the project to categorize it as small, medium, or large, based on estimated level of effort, duration, and cost. Costs are broken out into several categories (such as hardware or software), application versus infrastructure, and project versus ongoing. The project assessment form also includes costs likely to be incurred by entities external to the AOC, such as the superior courts, justice partners, and law enforcement agencies.

The AOC also explained that another key tool used for budgeting, tracking, managing, and estimating costs is its Information and Technology Services Office's (IT services office) zero-based budgeting process. The purpose of this process, according to the AOC, is to identify key needs for each project going forward while providing sufficient funding for baseline activities. The other purpose the AOC cited is to provide a budget monitoring tool for project managers throughout the fiscal year. The AOC explained that the budget projections produced through this process are also used to inform the Judicial Council, related working groups, and advisory committees. To develop, track, and monitor their budgets, the AOC indicated that each program uses information provided by its financial system, which captures all AOC allocations, encumbrances, and expenditures for IT services programs.

Additionally, the AOC stated that it uses a project portfolio management tool for weekly project reporting, one element of which includes a budget health indicator, ensuring that significant variances from initial cost estimates are identified and addressed. Formal criteria for the budget health indicator are as follows: green, the project is tracking to the approved budget; yellow, a budgetary risk has been identified for which a mitigation strategy is in place; and red, a budgetary risk has been identified for which there is no mitigation strategy in place. The AOC stated that an explanation of any yellow or red budget indicators must be provided in writing, and a justification for any indicators that were previously yellow or red but have been reset to green must also be noted.

Recommendation 2.3.f—See pages 40—47 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To better manage costs of future IT projects, the AOC should disclose full and accurate cost estimates to the Judicial Council, the Legislature, and stakeholders from the beginning of projects.

AOC's Action: Partially implemented.

The AOC explained that the Judicial Branch Technology Committee, in collaboration with working groups and advisory committees, is establishing a branch governance structure that will enable communication to the Judicial Council, the Legislature, and stakeholders. With the March 27, 2012, Judicial Council decision to halt deployment of CCMS, the AOC stated that the Judicial Council tasked the Technology Committee with overseeing the council's policies concerning technology. The AOC indicated that the Technology Committee is responsible, in partnership with the courts, to coordinate with the Administrative Director of the Courts 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. The committee is responsible for ensuring compliance with IT policies and that specific projects are on schedule, and within scope and budget.

Further, the AOC explained that the Technology Committee will develop a governance structure for technology programs that will provide the oversight, monitoring, transparency, and accountability recommended by both the state auditor and the Judicial Council. The AOC stated that future projects will be subject to the approval of the Technology Committee.

In addition to the project oversight that the governance structure will provide after it is implemented, the AOC explained that the superior courts, the appellate courts, and the AOC are all subject to the approval from the California Technology Agency for projects with an estimated cost of more than \$5 million.

Recommendation 2.3.g—See pages 47—49 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To better manage costs of future IT projects, the AOC should ensure that it has a long-term funding strategy in place before investing significant resources in a project.

AOC's Action: Partially implemented.

The AOC explained that the Judicial Branch Technology Committee, in collaboration with working groups and advisory committees, is establishing a branch governance structure that will enable communication to the Judicial Council, the Legislature, and stakeholders. With the March 27, 2012, Judicial Council decision to halt deployment of CCMS, the AOC stated that the Judicial Council tasked the Technology Committee with overseeing the council's policies concerning technology. The AOC indicated that the Technology Committee is responsible, in partnership with the courts, to coordinate with the Administrative Director of the Courts 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. The committee is responsible for ensuring compliance with IT policies and that specific projects are on schedule, and within scope and budget.

Further, the AOC explained that the Technology Committee will develop a governance structure for technology programs that will provide the oversight, monitoring, transparency, and accountability recommended by both the state auditor and the Judicial Council. The AOC stated that future projects will be subject to the approval of the Technology Committee.

In addition to the project oversight that the governance structure will provide after it is implemented, the AOC explained that the superior courts, the appellate courts, and the AOC are all subject to the approval from the California Technology Agency for projects with an estimated cost of more than \$5 million.

Recommendation 3.1.a—See pages 52—64 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

Although the Judicial Council has the legal authority to compel the courts to adopt CCMS, to better foster superior court receptiveness to deploying CCMS, the AOC should use the results from its consultant's survey of the superior courts to identify and better understand the courts' input and concerns regarding CCMS, including the manner in which the project has been managed by the AOC. To the extent the survey results indicate courts have significant concerns regarding CCMS or that they believe their case management systems will serve them for the foreseeable future, the AOC should take steps to address these concerns and overcome any negative perceptions and modify its deployment plan for CCMS accordingly.

AOC's Action:

In March 2012 the Judicial Council voted to halt deployment of CCMS; thus, this recommendation is no longer relevant.

Recommendation 3.1.b—See pages 52—57 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

Although the Judicial Council has the legal authority to compel the courts to adopt CCMS, to better foster superior court receptiveness to deploying CCMS, the AOC should continue to work with the superior courts that have deployed the civil system to ensure it is addressing their concerns in a timely and appropriate manner.

¹ According to the director of the AOC's IT services office, the one courthouse within Los Angeles County that used the civil system at the time of our review, no longer uses the system. Thus, as of the AOC's October 2012 response, the five counties that use the civil system are Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Joaquin, and Ventura. Fresno is the sole county that continues to use the criminal system.

AOC's Action: Partially implemented.

According to the AOC, currently the IT services office conducts weekly meetings by conference call with five superior courts that have deployed the interim civil system.² The AOC stated that the civil system support project manager facilitates these weekly meetings, which are attended by court project managers, technical analysts, and operational staff. During these meetings, the AOC explained that court representatives discuss operational issues and prioritize items for the next software release. Following established processes, any enhancements and defects exceeding a pre-defined level of effort are escalated to the governance committee for approval. In addition to these weekly meetings, the AOC indicated that it holds weekly meetings with each individual court, providing an opportunity to discuss issues specific to their court.

To further support the courts, the AOC cited metrics that are maintained to track compliance to service level agreements, as well as application performance and reliability. Over the past 12 months, the AOC asserted that there has been only one severity 1 (critical) issue recorded. The AOC stated that the interim civil system application has been extremely stable.

Regarding the future, the AOC explained that the Judicial Council Technology Committee created the Judicial Branch Technology Initiatives Working Group to address various technology issues facing the branch and to determine how the six courts that are currently using an interim system will be supported. In addition, these six courts are preparing a proposal regarding the future of the interim systems, which will address maintenance and support, governance, funding, addition of courts, hosting, and life expectancy of the case management systems.

Recommendation 3.1.c—See pages 52 and 57—59 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

Although the Judicial Council has the legal authority to compel the courts to adopt CCMS, to better foster superior court receptiveness to deploying CCMS, the AOC should work with superior courts to address concerns about hosting data at the California Court Technology Center (Technology Center). Further, the AOC should take steps to ensure that superior courts do not lose productivity or efficiencies by hosting data at the Technology Center.

AOC's Action: Partially implemented.

To address the needs of the courts, the AOC indicated that it works directly with the courts to address day-to-day issues and concerns with hosting data at the Technology Center, as well as extended challenges. Weekly, it meets with Technology Center staff on behalf of the courts to address any service issues.

Regarding the future, the AOC indicates that the Judicial Branch Technology Initiatives Working Group will address the question of hosting data at a court's local facilities versus central hosting at the Technology Center and make recommendations to the Judicial Council.

Recommendation 3.2—See pages 64—65 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

The AOC should continue working with local and state justice partners to assist them in their future efforts to integrate with CCMS, and in particular provide local justice partners the information needed to estimate the costs involved.

AOC's Action:

In March 2012 the Judicial Council voted to halt deployment of CCMS; thus, this recommendation is no longer relevant.

Recommendation 3.3.a—See pages 52—64 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

Before embarking on future statewide IT initiatives and to ensure it secures appropriate support from users of the systems being proposed, the AOC should determine the extent to which the need for the IT initiative exists, including the necessary information to clearly demonstrate the extent of the problem the IT initiative will address.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

The AOC stated it has both formal and informal processes and procedures in place to identify and assess the need for statewide technology improvements for the judicial branch in partnership with the courts. The AOC also stated it is committed to these processes and will continue to leverage these opportunities. As technology project needs are identified through these many communication channels, the AOC stated project concept documents are drafted that include statements of the problem, anticipated costs and benefits of the IT solution, impacts on courts and court operations, and known risks.

Recommendation 3.3.b—See pages 52—64 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

Before embarking on future statewide IT initiatives and to ensure it secures appropriate support from users of the systems being proposed, the AOC should take steps to ensure that superior courts support the solution the AOC is proposing to address the need, which could include conducting a survey of courts to determine their level of support.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

The AOC stated regional meetings provide a solid foundation for the AOC and the courts to share information to learn about, better understand, and evaluate statewide technology needs. The AOC also stated the Judicial Council's Court Technology advisory committee, trial court presiding judges advisory committee, and court executives advisory committee provide additional avenues of communication that enhance the exchange of information between and among the AOC and the courts to influence the direction and strategies for future statewide technology improvements. The AOC indicated that statewide meetings of presiding judges and court executive officers build on those committee meetings to ensure that superior court feedback is received.

Recommendation 3.3.c—See pages 64 and 65 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

Before embarking on future statewide IT initiatives and to ensure it secures appropriate support from users of the systems being proposed, the AOC should if necessary, determine whether other stakeholders, including local and state justice partners, support the IT initiative.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

The AOC stated its Project Review Board is to ensure that all branch-wide technology projects follow a structured analysis protocol that will produce the information required to adequately assess the need for and value of the project proposal. The AOC further stated court and stakeholder surveys will be included in this structured analysis protocol.

Recommendation 4.1—See pages 68—78 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To provide for an appropriate level of independent oversight on CCMS, the AOC should expand and clarify the scope of oversight services and require that oversight consultants perform oversight that is consistent with best practices and industry standards.

AOC's Action:

In March 2012 the Judicial Council voted to halt deployment of CCMS; thus, this recommendation is no longer relevant.

Recommendation 4.2—See pages 69—72 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To ensure that no gaps in oversight occur between CCMS development and deployment, the AOC should ensure that it has IV&V and IPO services in place for the deployment phase of CCMS. Further, to allow for independent oversight of the IV&V consultant, the AOC should use separate consultants to provide IV&V and IPO services.

AOC's Action:

In March 2012 the Judicial Council voted to halt deployment of CCMS; thus, this recommendation is no longer relevant.

Recommendation 4.3—See pages 80—86 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To ensure no significant quality issues or problems exist within CCMS, the AOC should retain an independent consultant to review the system before deploying it to the three early-adopter courts. This review should analyze a representative sample of the requirements, code, designs, test cases, system documentation, requirements traceability, and test results to determine the extent of any quality issues or variances from industry standard practices that would negatively affect the cost and effort required of the AOC to operate and maintain CCMS. If any quality issues and problems identified by this review can be adequately addressed, and system development can be completed without significant investment beyond the funds currently committed, the AOC should deploy it at the early-adopter courts during the vendor's warranty period.

AOC's Action:

In March 2012 the Judicial Council voted to halt deployment of CCMS; thus, this recommendation is no longer relevant.

Recommendation 4.4.a—See pages 68—72 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To ensure that future major IT projects receive appropriate independent oversight over technical aspects and project management, the AOC should obtain IV&V and IPO services at the beginning of the projects and ensure this independent oversight is in place throughout and follows best practices and industry standards appropriate for the size and complexity of the project.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

The AOC stated that it uses established guidelines and a framework for graduated project oversight. The AOC explained that the oversight level will be according to the evaluation of criticality and the risk level of the project and that this will be initiated during the concept stage of the project. The AOC stated that it will also continue to operate under industry guidelines and standards of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) for verification and validation (V&V) activities as established in Standard 1012-2012. Independent V&V activities will be performed in accordance with the established standard's guidelines. For example, if a vendor is performing project oversight work, a separate vendor will perform the independent V&V activities. The AOC indicates that it will use independent oversight services within the review and according to the recommendations of the California Technology Agency, as required by California Government Code, Section 68511.9. Subsequent to receiving the AOC's response and for purposes of clarification, we confirmed with the AOC that it intends to implement our recommendation on any future, major IT project.

Recommendation 4.4.b—See pages 69—72 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To ensure that future major IT projects receive appropriate independent oversight over technical aspects and project management, the AOC should employ separate firms for IV&V and IPO services to allow for the IPO consultant to provide independent oversight on the IV&V consultant as well as the project team's response to IV&V findings.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

The AOC stated it will work closely with the Technology Agency on all future IT projects that will have a cost in excess of \$5 million, and will carefully consider its recommendations for such projects, including those relating to oversight and risk mitigation.

Recommendation 4.4.c—See pages 68—78 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To ensure that future major IT projects receive appropriate independent oversight over technical aspects and project management, the AOC should ensure that the staff performing IV&V and IPO services have experience and expertise that is commensurate with the size, scope, and complexity of the project they are to oversee.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

See the AOC's response under recommendation 4.4.b.

Recommendation 4.4.d—See pages 78—80 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To ensure that future major IT projects receive appropriate independent oversight over technical aspects and project management, the AOC should ensure that independent oversight is not restricted in any manner and that all parties—the IV&V and IPO consultants, senior management, the project management team, and the development vendor—understand that the IV&V and IPO consultants are to have complete access to all project materials.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

See the AOC's response under recommendation 4.4.b.

Recommendation 4.4.e—See pages 80—86 of the audit report for information on the related finding.

To ensure that future major IT projects receive appropriate independent oversight over technical aspects and project management, the AOC should address promptly and appropriately the concerns that independent oversight consultants raise.

AOC's Action: Fully implemented.

The AOC stated it concurs with the importance of the identification of concerns raised by IV&V and IPO consultants and that their concerns be reported and monitored to ensure they are appropriately addressed. The AOC also stated concerns raised by IV&V and IPO consultants will be taken off watch status only after careful consideration and discussion of all risks and mitigation efforts that must occur to ensure that system function is unaffected.

