JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel 415-865-4200
TDD 415-865-4272
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

HON. MARSHA G. SLOUGH
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. DAVID M. RUBIN
Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Chair, Litigation Management Committee

HON. MARLA O. ANDERSON
Chair, Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee

HON. HARRY E. HULL, JR.
Chair, Rules and Projects Committee

HON. KYLE S. BRODIE
Chair, Technology Committee

Hon. Richard Bloom
Hon. C. Todd Bottke
Hon. Stacy Boulware Eurie
Hon. Ming W. Chin
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin
Hon. Samuel K. Feng
Hon. Brad R. Hill
Ms. Rachel W. Hill
Hon. Harold W. Hopp
Hon. Hannah-Beth Jackson
Mr. Patrick M. Kelly
Hon. Dalila Corral Lyons
Ms. Gretchen Nelson
Mr. Maxwell V. Pritt

ADVISORY MEMBERS
Ms. Nancy CS Eberhardt
Hon. Carin T. Fujisaki
Mr. Kevin Harrigan
Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs
Hon. Ann C. Moorman
Mr. Michael M. Roddy
Hon. Tam Nomoto Schumann
Hon. Eric C. Taylor
Ms. Andrea K. Wallin-Rohmann
Hon. Rebecca L. Wightman

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO
Administrative Director, Judicial Council

December 31, 2019

Hon. Holly Mitchell
Chair, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee
State Capitol, Room 5019
Sacramento, CA 95814

Hon. Hannah-Beth Jackson
Chair, Senate Judiciary Committee
State Capitol, Room 2187
Sacramento, CA 95814

Hon. Philip Ting
Chair, Assembly Budget Committee
State Capitol, Room 6026
Sacramento, CA 95814

Hon. Mark Stone
Chair, Assembly Judiciary Committee
1020 N Street, Room 104
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: *Report on State Trial Court Electronic Filing and Document Service Accessibility Compliance* as required under Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6(g)

Dear Senator Mitchell, Senator Jackson, Assembly Member Ting, and Assembly Member Stone:

Attached is the Judicial Council report required under Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6(g) regarding trial court electronic filing and document service accessibility compliance.

Assembly Bill 103, the public safety bill approved by the Governor on June 27, 2017, amended Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6(g), which requires that any system for the electronic filing and service of documents used by a California trial court shall be accessible to individuals with disabilities, as provided.

The amendment also requires the Judicial Council to submit four reports between 2018 and 2023 to the appropriate committees of the Legislature relating to the trial courts that have implemented a system of electronic filing and service of documents. This December 2019 report is the second of the submissions.

The report (Attachment A) provides an overview of efforts to date to determine the level of compliance. It identifies all the courts that have implemented a system of electronic filing and service of documents, the name of the entity or entities providing the system, and whether the system complies with the requirements of Assembly Bill 103.

Attachments B1–B4 are response letters from some of the vendors that provide electronic filing and service of documents, verifying whether their system complies with subdivision (g). If their system is not fully compliant, the vendors then describe the actions they are taking to make the system compliant.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Kathleen Fink, Manager, Judicial Council Information Technology at 415-865-4094 or kathleen.fink@jud.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Martin Hoshino
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

MH/CC
Attachments:
1. Attachment A: Report of State Trial Court Electronic Filing and Document Service Accessibility Compliance
2. Attachment B-1: Vendor Response Letter–ABC Legal Services
3. Attachment B-2: Vendor Response Letter–File & Serve Xpress
4. Attachment B-3: Vendor Response Letter–TurboCourt
5. Attachment B-4: Vendor Response Letter–US Legal Pro

cc: Diane F. Boyer-Vine, Legislative Counsel
Erika Contreras, Secretary of the Senate
Sue Parker, Assistant Chief Clerk of the Assembly
Eric Dang, Policy Consultant, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Toni G. Atkins
Alf Brandt, Senior Counsel, Office of Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon
Gabrielle Zeps, Policy Consultant, Office of Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon
Amy Alley, Policy Advisor, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Toni G. Atkins
Anita Lee, Principal Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
Tina McGee, Executive Secretary, Legislative Analyst's Office
Jesse Romine, Budget Analyst, Department of Finance
Margie Estrada, Chief Counsel, Senate Judiciary Committee
Mary Kennedy, Chief Counsel, Senate Public Safety Committee
Eric Csizmar, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office
Morgan Branch, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office
Alison Merrilees, Chief Counsel, Assembly Judiciary Committee
Gregory Pagan, Chief Counsel, Assembly Public Safety Committee
Jennifer Kim, Consultant, Assembly Budget Committee
Lyndsay Mitchell, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Gary Olson, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Daryl Thomas, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Amy Leach, Minute Clerk, Office of Assembly Chief Clerk
Cory T. Jasperson, Director, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council
Yvette Casillas-Sarcos, Administrative Coordinator, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel 415-865-4200
TDD 415-865-4272
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

HON. MARSHA G. SLOUGH
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. DAVID M. RUBIN
Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Chair, Litigation Management Committee

HON. MARLA O. ANDERSON
Chair, Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee

HON. HARRY E. HULL, JR.
Chair, Rules and Projects Committee

HON. KYLE S. BRODIE
Chair, Technology Committee

Hon. Richard Bloom
Hon. C. Todd Bottke
Hon. Stacy Boulware Eurie
Hon. Ming W. Chin
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin
Hon. Samuel K. Feng
Hon. Brad R. Hill
Ms. Rachel W. Hill
Hon. Harold W. Hopp
Hon. Hannah-Beth Jackson
Mr. Patrick M. Kelly
Hon. Dalila Corral Lyons
Ms. Gretchen Nelson
Mr. Maxwell V. Pritt

ADVISORY MEMBERS
Ms. Nancy CS Eberhardt
Hon. Carin T. Fujisaki
Mr. Kevin Harrigan
Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs
Hon. Ann C. Moorman
Mr. Michael M. Roddy
Hon. Tam Nomoto Schumann
Hon. Eric C. Taylor
Ms. Andrea K. Wallin-Rohmann
Hon. Rebecca L. Wightman

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO
Administrative Director, Judicial Council

Report title: *Report on State Trial Court Electronic Filing and Document Service Accessibility Compliance*

Statutory citation: Assembly Bill 103 (Stats. 2017, ch. 17)

Code section: Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6(g)

Date of report: December 31, 2019

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature in accordance with Assembly Bill 103 (Stats. 2017, ch. 17).

The following summary of the report is provided under the requirements of Government Code section 9795.

Assembly Bill 103, the public safety bill approved by the Governor on June 27, 2017, amended Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6(g), which requires that any system for the electronic filing and service of documents used by a California trial court shall be accessible to individuals with disabilities as provided.

This report provides an overview of efforts to date to determine the trial courts' level of compliance with AB 103. It identifies all the courts that have implemented a system of electronic filing and service of documents, the name of the entity or entities providing the system, and whether the system complies with the specified requirements.

In March 2018, the Judicial Council Information Technology Office conducted a survey of the 58 trial courts to determine compliance with AB 103, and during 2019 the courts were contacted to update the information. Based on the information received, currently 29 of the 58 trial courts provide electronic filing and electronic document service. Feedback regarding vendor compliance from the courts and vendors indicates approximately 90 percent compliance, with some noncompliant vendors anticipating full remediation by the end of December 2020.

The full report can be accessed at *www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm*. A printed copy of the report may be obtained by calling 415-865-4600.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

Hon. Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye
Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council

Martin Hoshino
Administrative Director,
Judicial Council

OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION
Robert Oyung
Chief Operating Officer

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
Heather Pettit
Director

Kathleen Fink
Manager and
Primary Author of Report

Report on State Trial Court Electronic Filing and Document Service Accessibility Compliance

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE
DECEMBER 2019

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Report to the Legislature

California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1010.6(g)

Assembly Bill 103 amended Code of Civil Procedure section1010.6(g), which requires that any system for the electronic filing and service of documents—including any information technology applications, internet websites, and web-based applications—used by an electronic service provider or any other vendor or contractor that provides an electronic filing and service system to a trial court, regardless of the case management system used by the trial court, shall satisfy both of the following requirements:

> (A) The system shall be accessible to individuals with disabilities, including parties and attorneys with disabilities, in accordance with Section 508 of the federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. Sec. 794d), as amended, the regulations implementing that act set forth in Part 1194 of Title 36 of the Code of Federal Regulations and Appendices A, C, and D of that part, and the federal Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12101 et seq.).
>
> (B) The system shall comply with the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0 at a Level AA success criteria.

Further, the amendment requires the Judicial Council to submit four reports between June 2018 and December 2023 to the appropriate committees of the Legislature, relating to the trial courts that have implemented a system of electronic filing and service of documents.

These reports shall include the following information:

1. The name of each court that has implemented a system of electronic filing and service of documents;
2. A description of the system of electronic filing and service;
3. The name of the entity or entities providing the system; and
4. A statement as to whether the system complies with subdivision (g) and, if the system is not fully compliant, a description of the actions that have been taken to make the system compliant.

The first report is due by June 30, 2018; the second report is due by December 31, 2019; the third report is due by December 31, 2021; and the fourth report is due by December 31, 2023.

Report on Trial Court Electronic Filings and Service of Documents

In March 2018, the Judicial Council Information Technology Office conducted a survey of the 58 trial courts, seeking information on electronic filing and electronic service of documents. Based on survey results, 24 of the 58 trial courts provided electronic filing and electronic document service, either directly through vendor services or a combination of vendor and in-house services. Information gathered from the court survey included (1) the extent of deployment of electronic filing and document services, (2) whether the services were in-house or outsourced, and (3) the vendors providing those services. This information was reported to the Legislature in the report dated June 2018. The number of trial courts providing electronic filing and electronic document service to the public has increased since the last report, with 29 of the 58 trial courts now providing some form of electronic filing and electronic document service.

The Judicial Council Information Technology Office has continued to follow up with the 58 trial courts, and the vendors providing electronic filing and electronic document service, to monitor any changes in the information

given previously. We also looked at the individual Electronic Filing Service Providers (EFSPs) listed on both the Tyler Odyssey eFilingCA page and on the trial court e-filing pages to ascertain compliance with the requirements of AB 103. Letters were sent to EFSPs that had not certified their compliance with AB 103, or that had identified deficiencies prior to June 30, 2019, requesting feedback on the status of their level of compliance as required under AB 103.

Courts that Provide Electronic Filing, Electronic Service of Documents, and the Entity Providing Services

Table A below provides a summary of the survey results and follow-up based on data gathered from the trial courts, the Case Management System (CMS) vendors, and the EFSPs providing the electronic filing and electronic document service. The results from the survey indicate various stages of development and deployment of electronic services. The results indicate:

- 50 percent of courts do not provide Public Electronic Services.
- 50 percent of courts do provide Public Electronic Services. Of those courts:
    - 83 percent are compliant with AB 103; and
    - 17 percent are not yet compliant with AB 103.

Table A

Superior Court County	Entity or Entities Providing Electronic Services	Service Description	Compliant with Section 508 and Web Content Accessibility Guidelines	Data Source
Alameda	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Alpine	No Public Electronic Services			
Amador	No Public Electronic Services			
Butte	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Calaveras	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Colusa	No Public Electronic Services			
Contra Costa	No Public Electronic Services			
Del Norte	No Public Electronic Services			
El Dorado	No Public Electronic Services			

Superior Court County	Entity or Entities Providing Electronic Services	Service Description	Compliant with Section 508 and Web Content Accessibility Guidelines	Data Source
Fresno	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Glenn	No Public Electronic Services			
Humboldt	No Public Electronic Services			
Imperial	Journal Technologies	eDelivery portal for electronic submission of files	No	Vendor
Inyo	No Public Electronic Services			
Kern	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Kings	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Lake	No Public Electronic Services			
Lassen	No Public Electronic Services			
Los Angeles	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
	Journal Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Madera	No Public Electronic Services			
Marin	No Public Electronic Services			
Mariposa	No Public Electronic Services			
Mendocino	No Public Electronic Services			
Merced	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Modoc	No Public Electronic Services			
Mono	No Public Electronic Services			

Superior Court County	Entity or Entities Providing Electronic Services	Service Description	Compliant with Section 508 and Web Content Accessibility Guidelines	Data Source
Monterey	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Napa	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Nevada	No Public Electronic Services			
Orange	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
	Court-Managed System	Locally developed e-service application with e-filing provided through multiple EFSPs	Yes	Court
Placer	No Public Electronic Services			
Plumas	No Public Electronic Services			
Riverside	In-house System	eSubmit is electronic submission intended to replace faxing. Filers upload documents and pay fees directly to the court via an online portal.	No	Court
Sacramento	In-house System	Small Claims and Unlawful Detainer electronic filing. Utilizes fillable Adobe forms that can be submitted directly to the court via embedded controls.	No	Court
San Benito	No Public Electronic Services			
San Bernardino	TurboCourt	Electronic Forms and Filing	No	Vendor
San Diego	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service for family cases	Yes	Vendor
	One Legal	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor

Superior Court County	Entity or Entities Providing Electronic Services	Service Description	Compliant with Section 508 and Web Content Accessibility Guidelines	Data Source
San Francisco	Court Managed	Fourteen (14) court-approved Electronic Filing Service Providers available for the public to use. Four (4) additional concierge filing services listed.	Yes	Court
San Joaquin	No Public Electronic Services			
San Luis Obispo	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
San Mateo	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Santa Barbara	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Santa Clara	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Santa Cruz	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Shasta	No Public Electronic Services			
Sierra	No Public Electronic Services			
Siskiyou	No Public Electronic Services			
Solano	No Public Electronic Services			
Sonoma	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Stanislaus	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Sutter	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Tehama	No Public Electronic Services			
Trinity	No Public Electronic Services			

Superior Court County	Entity or Entities Providing Electronic Services	Service Description	Compliant with Section 508 and Web Content Accessibility Guidelines	Data Source
Tulare	Journal Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor
Tuolumne	No Public Electronic Services			
Ventura	Journal Technologies	eDelivery portal for electronic submission of files	No	Vendor
Yolo	No Public Electronic Services			
Yuba	Tyler Technologies	Electronic Filing and Electronic Service	Yes	Vendor

Electronic Filing Service Provider (EFSP) Compliance with AB 103

Table B below provides a summary of the survey results and follow-up based on data gathered from the trial courts, the CMS vendors, and the EFSPs providing the electronic filing and electronic document service. We found a current total of 106 EFSPs offering e-filing services to California courts. Of these:

- 13 do not offer direct e-filing for the public (they are "Concierge" or courier services that have staff do e-filing and/or paper filing at the courthouse);
- 8 need compliance verification or are not fully compliant yet; and
- 85 are currently compliant.

The table below shows the status of each EFSP.

Table B

Concierge or Courier Services	AB 103 Compliance verification needed or not fully compliant
Attorney's Messenger Service	1 eFile
Cutting Edge Legal Services, LLC	E-Filings of America/American Legal Support Services, Inc. (ALSSI)
Freewheelin' Attorney Service	Exclusive Attorney Service Inc.
LawHelp Interactive	FileTime
Legal Lawgic	InfoTrack
Legal Photocopy Service	Intresys/TurboCourt
NorCal Courier and Legal Services	Tristar Software
On Call Legal	US Legal Pro
ProVest	
Prime Solutions 4 U	
S&R Services	
United Process Servers	
Wheels of Justice	

AB 103 Compliant	
123 E-File	Express Network
2 Filing California	File and ServeXpress
A&A Legal Service, Inc.	First Legal
A&M Attorney Services	Flat Rate Process Service
AAA E-Filing	Golden State Attorney Service
ABC Legal	Green Filing
ACE Attorney Services, Inc.	Janney & Janney
Advanced Attorney Services	Journal Technologies
Aggressive Legal Services	Judy's Roadrunners
ALL-N-ONE Legal Support, Inc.	Kern Legal Services, Inc.
Allstar Attorney Service	L&L Legal Assistance
American Legal Net	Legal Connect/Rapid Legal Inc.
AmStar Express	Legal Document Server
Angeles Legal Services	Legal Document Specialist

AB 103 Compliant	
Apex Legal Services	Legal e-File
ASAP Legal Solution	LegalConnect
Attorney Related Services Inc.	Legend Legal Services
Attorney Services	LSS Legal Services
Attorney's Certified Services	Nationwide Legal
Benders Legal Service	Odyssey eFileCA
Beyond e-Discovery	One Hour Delivery
BFRM Legal Support Services	One Legal
Bosco Legal Services, Inc.	Online Legal Courier
By the Book	Pacific Coast Legal Services
Calwest Attorney Service	PacTrack Legal
CaseAnywhere	ProLegal
Commercial Process Serving, Inc.	Rapid Legal
Continuing Education of the Bar	Rezac-Meyer Attorney Service
Countrywide Process, LLC	Run With It
County Legal Attorney & Notary Service	Sables Servco Service of Process
County Process Service, Inc.	Saddleback Attorney Service
Court Connection	Santoni Investigations and Backgrounds
Court Filing California	Sayler Legal Service
Court Link	Signal Attorney Service
Creekside e-filing	Sterling Madison Company
D&T Legal Services	Swift Attorney Services
Dauntless Legal Services	Temecula Attorney Services
DDS Legal	USA Legal Network Inc.
Direct Legal Support	USAExpress
Downtown Documents LTD	WIN-WIN ALSSI Inc.
Eddings Attorney Services	W-W-OneTouch Inc.
Efficient Efiling/Paszko Attorney Services	Zachs Legal Services
e-Legal Services, Inc.	

Attachment B includes samples of vendor responses to the inquiry regarding the status of compliance to the requirements under AB 103.

From: Nina Oseeva
To: Chappell, Carol
Subject: WCAG 2.00 at Level AA Response
Date: Thursday, October 31, 2019 9:16:18 PM
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png
image003.png

Hello Ms. Carol Chappell,

First of all, I would like to introduce myself, my name is Nina and I am a project manager for ABC Legal Services. ABC Legal Services is a tech enabled legal logistics company and we are working with portals such as Tyler Host, Green Filing, Legal Connect, and Rapid Legal to file documents for law firms. We primarily focused on filing collections work in Superior Courts in the state of California. ABC Legal product team and software developers have implemented changes to the ABC Legal website and performed human and machine testing available to comply with Level AA compliance. As of now, ABC Legal website should be fully compliant with the WCAG 2.0 at Level AA.

You can see our website below…
https://www.abclegal.com/

Warm regards,

abclegal
Nina Oseeva | **Project Manager**
206-521-9000 | Seattle, WA

I welcome your feedback, click here

From: Keith Foote
To: Chappell, Carol
Subject: Electronic Filing and Service of Documents Mandatory Reporting
Date: Tuesday, October 29, 2019 8:41:07 AM
Attachments: Compliance Summary

Greetings Ms. Chappell. This is our response to Heather Pettit's September 24, 2019 letter requesting information confirming our compliance with Assembly Bill 103's amendments to the Civil Code regarding electronic filing.

In California, the File & ServeXpress eFiling application is currently integrated with court systems in San Francisco County Superior Court and Contra Costa County Superior Court. We also provide non-integrated eService through our application in all California Superior Courts.

The attached document provides a summary of our compliance with WCAG 2.0, steps taken towards compliance, and a remaining requirement to be addressed.

Please let me know if I can provide any additional information.

File & Serve Xpress
Fast. Secure. eXact.

Keith Foote
Court Accounts Manager • File & ServeXpress

Office: 972-893-6665
Client Support 24/7: 888-529-7587
Email: kfoote@fileandserve.com
500 E. John Carpenter Fwy, Suite 250
Irving, TX 75062

www.FileandServeXpress.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

File & ServeXpress Accessibility Guideline Compliance Statement

Compliance Summary

On June 15, 2018, File & ServeXpress (FSX) assessed its compliance with each of the 38 WCAG 2.0 A and AA criteria. FSX identified 11 WCAG 2.0 requirements the File & ServeXpress application did not fully conform to. As of July 13, 2019, FSX remediated 10 of the 11 requirements. The application does not yet conform to one remaining requirement (Multiple Ways, i.e. a site map or other similar navigation alternative).

FSX has remediated following 10 WCAG 2.0 criteria that were previously non-compliant:

1.3.1 Info and Relationships — Level A

FSX fails to convey page structure via Accessible Rich Internet Applications (ARIA) HTML attributes to indicate page sections or elements on pages.

Remediation: FSX has added ARIA attributes to page sections and elements so that assertive technologies can identify these elements.

1.4.3 Contrast (Minimum) — Level AA

FSX fails to present all text with a color contrast ratio of 4.50:1. The blue “MailBox” text on the main dashboard has a contrast ratio of 4.37:1 against its grey background.

Remediation: FSX has Increased the contrast ratio between all text elements to at least 4.37:1 compared to the text background.

2.1.1 Keyboard — Level A

Not all FSX page element may be accessed using only keyboard strokes, including “Filing & Service” and “Search” menus which both contain submenu items.

Remediation: FSX has resolved page layouts so that all menu and submenu items are accessible using only Tab keystrokes.

2.4.1 Bypass Blocks — Level A

FSX has no mechanism for skipping content blocks such as navigation bars that appear across multiple pages.

Remediation: FSX has added “main” tags to HTML bodies so users with screen readers may skip to the main page content quickly.

2.4.6 Headings and Labels — Level AA

FSX uses meaningful descriptions for headings and labels for most sections of content, though some temporary elements such as notification blocks use empty label tags.

Remediation: FSX has added headings and labels to sections of content missing them. For transient elements such as error dialogs, FSX has added ARIA live tags to allow assertive technologies to alert the user to the error.

3.1.1 Language of Page — Level A

The default language (English) of FSX pages cannot be programmatically determined by use of lang attributes.

Remediation: FSX has added lang attributes to all pages and frames.

3.3.1 Error Identification — Level A

Some FSX pages include error container made with the WAI-ARIA aria-live="assertive" attribute, FSX does not include additional aria-atomic="true" attributes for these containers to ensure assistive technologies can read errors after multiple invalid submissions.

Remediation: FSX has added ARIA input IDs to all error containers so that the atomic error ID is passed to the ARIA describedby list.

3.3.2 Labels or Instructions — Level A

Not all FSX input fields have descriptions or instructions, including fields within the Quick Start section.

Remediation: FSX has added descriptive labels to all fields. For page elements intended to be hidden from all users, FSX has added aria-hidden attributes.

4.1.1 Parsing — Level A

Some FSX pages include non-unique element IDs such as the #Container and #Mailbox IDs on the main dashboard.

Remediation: FSX has removed all duplicate IDs so that all on-page HTML elements have unique IDs.

4.1.2 Name, Role, Value — Level A

Not all FSX input fields are made to be programmatically parsed with HTML labels or WAI-ARIA attributes.

Remediation: FSX has added ARIA labels and ARIA roles to all input fields.

FSX is has not yet remediated the following WCAG 2.0 criteria:

2.4.5 Multiple Ways — Level AA

FSX does not provide multiple ways to reach pages such as a navigation bar in combination with a sitemap containing links to all pages.

Remediation: FSX has not yet resolved this issue. To remediated, FSX will create a site map page that may be reached from the dashboard page.

FSX remains compliant with the WCAG 2.0 standard for the 27 criteria below:

1.1.1 Non-text Content — Level A

FSX uses alt text to label images descriptively.

1.2.1 Audio-only and Video-only (Prerecorded) — Level A

FSX has no audio or video.

1.2.2 Captions (Prerecorded) — Level A

FSX has no audio or synchronized media.

1.2.3 Audio Description or Media Alternative (Prerecorded) — Level A

FSX has no time-based media or video.

1.2.4 Captions (Live) Level AA

FSX has no live audio.

1.2.5 Audio Description (Prerecorded) Level AA

FSX has no audio or video.

1.3.2 Meaningful Sequence Level A

The meaning of content on pages in FSX is not affected by the layout order.

1.3.3 Sensory Characteristics Level A

FSX does not use sensory queues other than text to convey meaning.

1.4.1 Use of Color Level A

FSX does not use color to convey meaning.

1.4.2 Audio Control Level A

FSX has no audio.

1.4.4 Resize text Level AA

All text in FSX can be resized.

1.4.5 Images of Text Level AA

FSX does not have any images containing text except for its Logotypes, which are considered essential under WCAG 2.0 guidelines.

2.1.2 No Keyboard Trap Level A

All FSX page elements that may be navigated to using only a keyboard interface may be navigated away from using only a keyboard interface.

2.2.1 Timing Adjustable Level A

No FSX pages are constrained by time limits.

2.2.2 Pause, Stop, Hide Level A

No FSX content moves, blinks, scrolls, or auto-updates.

2.3.1 Three Flashes or Below Threshold Level A

FSX has no content that flashes or blinks.

2.4.2 Page Titled Level A

FSX uses meaningful page titles.

2.4.3 Focus Order Level A

The sequence of navigation elements in FSX do not affect the meaning of content or the operation of the website, and the order of tab indexes is logical.

2.4.4 Link Purpose (In Context) Level A

Each FSX link contains text describing the purpose of the link.

2.4.7 Focus Visible — Level AA

FSX page elements indicate that they are the focused item navigated to using only a keyboard.

3.1.2 Language of Parts — Level AA

The language of each block of content in FSX can be programmatically determined.

3.2.1 On Focus — Level A

FSX does not initiate page actions such as form submission or navigation context changes when any page element becomes focused.

3.2.2 On Input — Level A

FSX does not change the context of a page or add elements to a page in response to user form or control input that occurs prior to form submission.

3.2.3 Consistent Navigation — Level AA

There is no change to the order of repeated navigational elements in FSX's navigation link bar across different pages that use the bar.

3.2.4 Consistent Identification — Level AA

FSX identifies the purpose of page components consistently when the same components are used across different pages.

3.3.3 Error Suggestion — Level AA

FSX indicates error correction suggestions with text when likely remedies for errors are known. For example, the default FSX error page indicates that the user should close their browser, navigate back to the website, and repeat the last action.

3.3.4 Error Prevention (Legal, Financial, Data) — Level AA

FSX allows users to review transactions for errors before they are submitted. All changes made by a user to user-controllable data are reversible.

TURBOCOURT
Relax. We're in Your Court.

TurboCourt/Intresys

1. The name of each court that has implemented your application/system.

   54 Courts

2. Is your electronic filing services website currently compliant with WCAG 2.0 at a Level AA?

   No

3. What steps have been taken towards compliance with WCAG 2.0 at Level AA?

   efforts underway to resolve issues identified for compliance

4. When do you anticipate you will be in full compliance with WCAG 2.0 at Level AA?

   2020

Regards and Thank you,

Alex Zilberfayn
1301 Shoreway Road, Suite 190 Belmont CA 94002
650.208.1881 | mobile
650.372.1790, 201 | direct
alexz@intresys.com | email

Award-winning.secure. hosted. SAAS
Courts Intelligent Platform
TURBOCOURT
Relax. We're in Your Court.

US Legal Pro/1 eFile

1. The name of each court that has implemented your application/system.

Alameda Superior Court
Butte Superior Court
Calaveras Superior Court
Fresno Superior Court
Kern Superior Court
Kings Superior Court
Los Angeles Superior Court
Merced Superior Court
Monterey Superior Court
Napa Superior Court
Orange Superior Court
San Luis Obispo Superior Court
San Mateo Superior Court
Santa Barbara Superior Court
Santa Clara Superior Court
Santa Cruz Superior Court
Sonoma Superior Court
Stanislaus Superior Court
Sutter Superior Court
Yuba Superior Court

2. Is your electronic filing services website currently compliant with WCAG 2.0 at a Level AA?

No it is not

3. What steps have been taken towards compliance with WCAG 2.0 at Level AA?

We have done a lot of enhancements to our site to achieve compliance with the help of a few Evaluation tools but we recognize that, still, there is much left to be done and we will keep updating the site till we become fully compliant.

4. When do you anticipate you will be in full compliance with WCAG 2.0 at Level AA?

We anticipate that by 31st December 2020, we will be fully compliant. However if the state requires us to be fully compliant before the end of 2020, we will reallocate our resources to make it happen sooner. We understand and fully appreciate that it is important to be compliant so we will be trying to achieve compliance as soon as possible.

Thank you

Sudeep Bhattarai
sudeep@uslegalpro.com
https://uslegalpro.com
847-220-7008