

Exhibit 3: Estimated Expenditures for Court Technology Projects Under Development

| | Fiscal Year | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Project | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 | 2004-05 | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | Total |
| NCAWARE | | | | | | | | | |
| State Funds | \$ 72,328 | \$ 339,651 | \$ 653,589 | \$ 873,398 | \$1,386,013 | \$1,873,518 | \$2,382,926 | \$ 1,271,831 | \$ 8,853,254 |
| Grant Funds | 541,800 | 266,667 | 935,232 | 1,433,724 | 972,218 | | | | 4,149,641 |
| Subtotal | 614,128 | 606,318 | 1,588,821 | 2,307,122 | 2,358,231 | 1,873,518 | 2,382,926 | 1,271,831 | 13,002,895 |
| CCIS-Clerk | | | | | 72,A77 | 308,477 | 926,496 | 1,270,818 | 2,578,268 |
| CCIS-DA | | | | | | | 312,223 | 499,228 | 811,451 |
| Discovery Automation | | | | | | | 155,550 | 1,454,213 | 1,609,763 |
| eFiling | | | | | | | 184,740 | 361,124 | 545,864 |
| ePayment | | | | | | | | 134,960 | 134,960 |
| Total | \$614,128 | \$606,318 | \$1,588,821 | \$2,307,122 | \$2,430,708 | \$2,181, 99 5 | \$3,961,935 | \$4,992,174 | \$18,683,201 |
| Note: AOC estimated expenditures by estimating personnel costs based on salary midpoints, hourly salary costs, and/or contracted hourly rates. | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Program Evaluation Division based on AOC documents.

Exhibit 4: Comparison of Model Court Technology Functions—North Carolina and Unified State Systems in Colorado, Alabama, Kentucky, and Iowa

| | Ν | Iorth Carolina | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------------|--------|
| Court Technology Function | As of October 2008 | Projected by 2010 | Business Court | Colorado ⁱ | Alabamaï | Kentucky ⁱⁱⁱ | lowaiv |
| Electronic Filing | 0 | | | | | 0 | 0 |
| Electronic Payment | 0 | | 0 | | | ۲ | |
| Automated Case Management | 98% | • | | • | | • | • |
| Statewide Warrant Repository | ¶ vi | • | n/a | • | 0 | • | |
| Electronic Document Management | 0 | • | • | • | • | • | 0 |
| Integrated Justice System | 0 | € vii | n/a | • | 0 | 0 | ٢ |
| Online Public Case Information | € viii | • | 0 | ● | • | • | • |

Notes: $O = \text{does not exist}; \bullet = \text{full functionality}; \bullet = \text{Partial functionality}; \bullet = \text{in implementation}; n/a = \text{not applicable to the setting.}$

ⁱColorado web page; http://www.courts.state.co.us.

"Alabama web page; http://www.alacourt.gov.

"Kentucky web page; http://www.kycourts.net.

^{iv} lowa web page; http://www.iowacourts.gov.

^v Currently payment can be made via telephone by credit or debit cards; web-based system will be operational within a year.

vi 97 counties are on a centralized warrant repository; 2 additional counties transfer data; Wake county is not automated.

vii Scheduled to be piloted as part of the multi-agency Criminal Justice Data Integration project in Wake county in 2009.

viii North Carolina court information can be accessed in all courthouses and through a fee-based vendor service.

Source: Program Evaluation Division based on AOC documents and information from other states.