CALIFORNIA JUDICIAL BRANCH

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Case Management System Data Exchange Workstream

Final Report & Governance Plan

11/29/2016

(Submitted for the December 2016 ITAC Meeting)

Table of Contents

Table of Contents 1
Business Context 4
Existing Condition 4
Project Approach 5
Workstream Principles 5
Proposed Future State - Governance 6
Near-term future state: 6
Long-term future state: 6
Governance Committee Plan 7
Background 7
Governance Committee Structure 7
Governance Assumptions & Guidelines 9
Proposed Future State – By Justice Partner 11
Department Of Justice 11
Exchange description: 11
Near-term future state: 11
Long-term future state: 11
California Highway Patrol 11
Exchange description: 11
Near-term future state: 12
Long-term future state: 12
Department of Child Support Services 12
Exchange description: 12
Near-term future state: 12
Long-term future state: 12
California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation 13
Exchange description: 13
Near-term future state: 13
Long-term future state: 13
Department of Motor Vehicles 13
Exchange descriptions: 13
Near-term future state: 13
Long-term future state: 14

California Department of Social Services 14
Exchange description: 14
Near-term future state: 14
Long-term future state: 14
Additional Tasks Completed 14
Additional Tasks to be undertaken through the Governance Committee 15
Appendix A: Data Exchange Workstream Membership 16
Appendix B: Proposed Long-Term Data Exchange Standards 17
Appendix C: Description of Potential Benefits 18

INTRODUCTION

On December 5, 2014, the Court Technology Advisory Committee (now, Information Technology Advisory Committee or "ITAC") established the Data Exchange Workstream under the Executive Sponsorship of David Yamasaki.

This document presents the judicial branch blueprint for the development of data exchanges with its partner agencies. This effort comes at a pivotal time, as the branch implements new case management systems in the majority of trial courts. This opportunity to achieve the benefits of significantly improved efficiency and consistency of information sharing has never before occurred in California and may be decades before it recurs.

The implementation of standard data exchanges provide many benefits:

- They are efficient and cost effective to implement and support;
- The exchanges promote error reduction, responsiveness, and correction turnaround;
- Accuracy and currency of the information shared is increased; and
- Provides a foundation for future mandates and improvements.

As described in the judicial branch *Court Technology Strategic Plan*, implementation of new technology is critical to address a devastating reduction in judicial branch funding. This effort establishes a roadmap for the adoption of data exchange solutions that further the administration of justice and meet the needs of the people of California.

This document provides the results from the Data Exchange Workstream, which included justice partner agencies, case management system vendors, judicial officers, court executive officers, and court information technology officers.

The proposed next steps recognize that many local trial courts have entered into contracts with case management system vendors for the delivery of systems along specified timelines with existing deliverables to be achieved. The efforts of this workstream balance the need to assist in achieving those contract milestones with the broader, long-term need to standardize data exchange approaches state-wide across systems. By the very nature of these objectives, the workstream recommendations are divided into short-term and longer-term action steps.

The ultimate success of this workstream depends on working as an information technology (IT) community that can form consortia to leverage and optimize resources to achieve its goals and overall branch objectives. The result will be a judicial branch where the courts act as innovation centers for the benefit of the legal community and public, increasing the efficiency and timeliness of data access across the entire justice community.

Business Context

The California court system is the largest in the nation, with 1,937 judges and justices, 1,825 of which are authorized for the trial courts. There are approximately 19,000 court employees throughout the State; 16,600 of which are employed by the trial courts. In 2013 there were 7,868 cases filed in Supreme Court; 20,661 in the Courts of Appeal, and 6,832,710 cases filed in the Trial Courts. The court system serves over 38 million people. The state Constitution vests the judicial power of California in the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and the Superior Courts. The Constitution also provides for the formation and functions of the Judicial Council, the policymaking body for the state courts and other agencies.

The judicial branch has diversity in geography, court size, and case types. The smallest superior court has two judicial officers serving a population of just over 10,000 people while the largest has 587 judicial officers serving a population of almost 10 million people. Courts have varying fiscal health and capabilities, and budget cuts have drastically affected their ability to invest in technology.

The judicial branch interacts with and depends on data flows with several state agencies. These agencies underwent similar budget reductions in the recent recession and are similarly seeking increased efficiencies through standardized data exchanges. There is demand for integrated justice and a need to adapt to constant change in the environment. However, existing processes and exchanges may still be paper-based, or were written to address a singular transfer based upon an existing technology rather than a more advanced integrated, digital, environment.

Pre-Existing Condition

At the formation of the Data Exchange Workstream, there was a plethora of data exchange mechanisms, standards, formats and approaches. Data exchange between the judicial branch and each justice partner was accomplished in a different manner. Often there were multiple data exchange approaches with the same justice partner implemented with different superior courts at different points in time. As a result, case management vendors were struggling to understand and implement the various ‘flavors’ of each exchange to meet the requirements of their customers and the justice partner. The development and support of multiple ‘standards’ for the same exchange would be expensive and inefficient for the vendors, justice partners and the judicial branch; and inconsistent with the vision for the future.

Project Approach

The data exchange workstream began with a series of face-to-face meetings in Sacramento and San Francisco. These meetings served to introduce the participants from across the courts, justice partners and case management system vendors and confirm that a common interest existed for the creation of data exchange standards. These initial meetings also led to the creation of a set of workstream principles; and, in combination with a survey of participants, the determination that there was significant consensus on the technical specifications to be used in future data exchanges.

The face-to-face meetings recognized that there were many possible data exchanges to examine. These include exchanges with local agencies such as: District Attorney; Public Defender; Probation; local law enforcement agencies; collection agencies; etc. There are also many internal exchanges between courts, and with the Judicial Council: case transfers; appeals filings; Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS); etc. The workstream determined it would focus initial efforts on data exchanges between the courts and five agencies that are accessed by all courts: Department of Justice (DOJ); California Highway Patrol (CHP); Department of Child Support Services (DCSS); California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR); Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). Prior to the conclusion of the workstream, the Department of Social Services (DSS) was added a sixth agency for focusing efforts.

Following the face-to-face meetings, a series of webinars, each focused on one of the key justice partner exchanges, was held to drive out detail on that exchange and determine a short and long term plan for that justice partner.

Workstream Principles

Guiding principles establish a set of considerations for technology project decision-makers. The February 2, 2015 workstream meeting established the following principles:

- Limit exchange approaches
- Use standards-based solutions
- Exchange solutions will be prospective
- Leverage and reuse solutions where possible
- Safeguard integrity and privacy of data

Proposed Future State - Governance

The proposed future state is split into near-term and long-term goals. Many near-term state goals have been accomplished by the workstream, whereas the long-term future state goals are to be achieved as part of ongoing operations under the oversight of a proposed standing Data Exchange Governance Committee.

Near-term future state:

In the near-term the Data Exchange Workstream can assist to:

1. Identify a single data exchange standard between each justice partner and the judicial branch to use as a development target for case management system vendors;
2. Provide a lead court to act as a point of contact for all case management system vendors and justice partners for each justice partner exchange;
3. Collect the required documentation to support exchange development;
4. Document the current implementation status of each exchange by each vendor;
5. Establish a brokerage for modifications to the standard exchanges;
6. Finalize the 'goal state' for the long-term data exchange standards.

Long-term future state:

In the longer-term, the Data Exchange Governance Committee can:

1. Identify the technical standards to be used for the implementation of all data exchanges between the judicial branch and justice partners;
2. Establish and execute a formal governance process for exchange updates and modifications;
3. Maintain a repository of required materials that support development of standardized exchanges;
4. Promote the technical standards as the default standards for local data exchanges.

Governance Committee Plan

Background

The Judicial Council Information Technology Advisory Committee Data Exchange Workstream was established upon approval on December 5, 2014 in an effort to align the requirements of justice partners regarding the exchange of information between courts and their case management system vendors. This effort was deemed critical in light of the extensive Case Management System (CMS) implementations that were underway as courts anxiously moved forward acquiring the systems to avoid the loss of fund balances created by statutory prohibition of maintaining reserves in excess of 1% of their budgets.

As this effort was voluntary, between multiple, disparate agencies, the role and responsibility for the workstream required some agreement between all parties based upon two concepts or a combination thereof: 1. the structure and function was one of advice and guidance, with the methodology of encouragement and inclusion for the purpose of arriving at consensus; and 2. the structure and function was to manage and encourage common solutions and adherence to the policies and technical standards.

Governance Committee Structure

It became clear during the workstream activities that an organized, on-going effort would be required to nurture and maintain the voluntary collaboration and cooperation among the justice partners, vendors, courts and Judicial Council. The need to operationalize support for establishing and maintaining standardized exchanges was largely the case due to the varying technological solutions that each of the vendors were developing in conjunction with the needs of local trial courts and the varying requirements expressed by justice partners with their existing or emerging information system solutions. Absent a solution, there existed the risk of developing 58 different data exchange solutions for each of the trial courts to communicate with a single justice partner. This approach would have been costly to maintain and would have slowed the development process between vendors and justice partners.

Subject to the approval of ITAC and the Judicial Council Technology Committee (providing oversight to ITAC), the development of a standing Data Exchange Governance Committee is seen as the means of achieving on-going oversight. While there is no overriding mandate to participate, voluntary effort between multiple agencies with agreement between the parties to preserve and extend the benefits achieved by the Data Exchange Workstream is in the best interest of all participants. The Committee will provide continued oversight of the structure and function of data exchanges, and facilitate

the adoption of common solutions, policies and standards that best serve the implementation of existing and future technology and processes.

Governance Assumptions & Guidelines

Data Exchange Governance Committee assumptions and guidelines cover four broad areas: 1. stakeholder engagement, 2. communications, 3. technology compliance, and 4. change control management.

1) STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT:
   The Committee will:
   a. Create applicable management strategies to effectively maintain ongoing stakeholder involvement and engage new stakeholders (i.e. vendors, courts, state justice partners) throughout the committee life cycle, based on the analysis of their needs, interests, and potential impact on data exchange success;
   b. Consider organizational culture, structure, and political climate as important in determining the best options to support processes for managing stakeholder involvement;
   c. Seek stakeholder judgement and expertise from individuals with insight into the relationships within each organization involved in the data exchanges;
   d. Address and manage issues as they occur, and foster appropriate stakeholder engagement in committee activities;
   e. Execute stakeholder expectations through negotiation and communication to ensure data exchange goals are accomplished;
   f. Identify and address potential stakeholder concerns that have not become issues and future problems that may be raised, discuss as quickly as possible to assess associated data exchange risks;
   g. Clarify and resolve identified issues/risks;
   h. Monitor overall stakeholder relationships and adjust the strategies and plans for engaging stakeholders.

2) COMMUNICATIONS:
   The Committee will:
   a. Create a communications plan which will coordinate and maintain communications between the Judicial Council, trial and appellate courts, Justice Partners and case management system vendors in regards to automated data exchange;
   b. Maintain a secured document repository – currently in HyperOffice, hosted by the Judicial Council – of relevant materials to update all parties involved in standards, data exchange implementations, technical improvements, and relationships;

c. Coordinate electronic communications management: e.g. e-mail, teleconference, video and web conferences, web publishing (e.g. to the Judicial Resources Network "JRN" web site), as appropriate to facilitate standardized data exchanges
d. Meet in-person at least annually in synchronization with the Judicial Council Annual Agenda timeline (travel and lodging expenses are covered by individual members, if applicable);
e. Provide performance information to ITAC which includes ongoing status and progress information on the data exchange development, implementation and coordination among the participants on the committee;
f. Maintain a list of justice partners and vendor contacts.

3) TECHNOLOGY COMPLIANCE:
The Committee will ensure:
a. There will be a single standardized data exchange between all courts and each identified justice partner;
b. The use of National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) and Electronic Court Filing (ECF) will be promoted as new data exchanges are developed;
c. Implementation of current security models will be promoted as new data exchanges are developed;
d. The integrity and privacy of data, data exchanges, and repository information, remain core to the development and on-going operation of data exchanges;
e. Error handling will be specified as a part of developing each new data exchange;
f. Secure connectivity will be defined as part of developing each new data exchange.

4) CHANGE CONTROL MANAGEMENT:
The Committee will:
a. Develop and manage a change control process for existing and new data exchanges between its members;
b. Develop and manage a change control process for its assumptions and guidelines;
c. Develop and manage a change control process for its data exchange documentation repository;
d. Define how to enforce/encourage the partner's obligation to follow the governance structure.

Proposed Future State – By Justice Partner

Department of Justice

Exchange description:

The initial Department of Justice (DOJ) exchange involves the transfer of data from the courts to the DOJ on charged offenses and dispositions. This information is part of a broad data capture effort at the DOJ. Defendant, offense and conviction information is sent to DOJ. Error messages are returned to the courts, as necessary.

Near-term future state:

The DOJ has worked to develop two subsequent exchanges, however they have indicated that their older, Automated Transaction Disposition Reporting (ATDR) version of the exchange will be used for new implementations during the next two years; while they analyze their needs for the next data exchange mechanism. This is quite an old exchange, incorporating none of the technical specifications expected for the long-term, and does not fully support the DOJ's business processes. DOJ anticipates 12- 24 months of analysis before initiating an arrest and disposition reporting modernization project in 2017.

Long-term future state:

Work with DOJ to implement a new exchange based on the adopted long term technical specification. There has been recent legislative interest in improvements to DOJ reporting.

California Highway Patrol

Exchange description:

The initial California Highway Patrol (CHP) exchange involves the filing of new cases from the CHP into the courts. This exchange is part of the state-wide implementation of electronic citation devices. Defendant, offense and vehicle information is sent to the courts. The courts respond with a success/error message on each citation to the CHP.

Near-term future state:

The CHP has worked with the Superior Court in Sacramento to complete the development of a new data exchange for citations. The new exchange is based upon many of the proposed technical specifications and is now implemented. This will be the exchange available during the next two years.

Long-term future state:

Work with CHP to implement the remaining technical specifications in a future version of the exchange.

Department of Child Support Services

Exchange description:

The initial Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) exchange involves the electronic filing of case information, from the DCSS into the courts. This exchange is part of the state-wide implementation of electronic case filing. New filing, subsequent filing, proposed orders, proof of service, etc. can all be electronically sent to the courts. The courts respond with a success/error message on each filing and stamped forms can also be returned, when appropriate. Nine courts are currently implemented on this exchange.

Near-term future state:

The Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) is actively seeking to expand implementations. This will be the exchange available during the next two years.

Long-term future state:

Work with DCSS to implement the remaining technical specifications in a future version of the exchange.

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation

Exchange description:

There is no current California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) exchange with the courts. However, there is significant interest by all parties in automating the 'prison commitment packet'.

Near-term future state:

The CDCR has been working internally to develop a fully defined, NIEM-compliant, data warehouse. This offers an excellent opportunity to partner with the CDCR to implement a standards compliant data exchange in the short term.

Long-term future state:

Deploy new, standards compliant data exchange across all courts.

Department of Motor Vehicles

Exchange descriptions:

There are currently two Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) exchanges with the courts:

Driver's license and vehicle registration, and
Traffic School Completion.

The Driver's license and vehicle registration exchange is critical to the processing of traffic cases in courts and is accessed throughout the day. The traffic school completion exchange provides the courts proof of traffic school completion, directly from the traffic schools.

Near-term future state:

The DMV supports a very large network of data consumers for Driver's license and vehicle registration exchange; including many governmental agencies, and private sector service providers. The current data exchange mechanisms are quite old and meet none of the proposed technical standards. The existing LU 6.2 and screen-scrape exchanges will be the only exchanges available during the next two years. The state data center provides hosting and technical support for both DMV exchanges.

The Traffic School Completion exchange is used by the courts and the private sector traffic school providers. It is much newer and employs more current technology, incorporating most of the proposed technical standards, other than NIEM compliance.

Long-term future state:

Work with DMV to implement updated exchanges incorporating the technical specifications.

California Department of Social Services

Exchange description:

There is no current California Department of Social Services (DSS) exchange with the courts. However, there has been significant work performed by DSS to develop a Request for Proposals (RFP) for their new Child Welfare System which is intended to include court data exchange.

Near-term future state:

The DSS has invited the courts to participate in the RFP process.

Long-term future state:

Deploy new, standards compliant data exchange across all courts.

Additional Tasks Completed

Following the initial issuance of this report in July 2015, a number of tasks were completed to facilitate the goals of the data exchange workstream:

a. An additional Justice Partner was added to the set of participants, Department of Social Services (DSS);
b. Selection of a court to act as the technical lead for each of the six primary justice partner exchanges: DMV, DOJ, CHP, DCSS, DSS and CDCR;
    1. DMV- Los Angeles County Superior Court
    2. DOJ – San Bernardino County Superior Court
    3. CDCR – Santa Clara County Superior Court
    4. CHP – Sacramento County Superior Court
    5. DSS – Marin Superior Court

6. DCSS – Orange County Superior Court

c. Justice Partner/Vendor meetings were held to discuss status and resolve any issues. All vendors and justice partners were invited to interact on the status of implementation of the short-term data exchanges; DMV met with Tyler then next vendor etc. The lead court set up the meeting times for all interested participants.
d. A repository was established containing the documentation on the short-term data exchange standard for each justice partner.

Additional Tasks to be undertaken through the Governance Committee

A small set of workstream tasks remain to be addressed by the Governance Committee as part of their on-going efforts to facilitate data exchanges:

a. Develop the business case for data exchange standards. This may include consultation with federal government agencies, the National Center for State Courts, the Integrated Justice Information Systems (IJIS) Institute, etc.;
b. Continue to promote the implementation within the Judicial Branch of the short-term data exchange standards for each justice partner;
c. Initiate a data exchange implementation project with CDCR using the long-term data exchange technical specification.
d. Initiate a data exchange implementation project with DSS using the long-term data exchange technical specification.

CONCLUSION

The establishment of standardized data exchange models will facilitate the exchange of information between all of the entities that have been identified as partners for this endeavor. Until this time, courts, vendors and justice partner agencies have relied upon independent communications to develop methods to share information that were sensitive to local needs and local resources. While these considerations are of value, the entire trial court and justice partner community can ensure that respective needs for information can continue and at the same time work closely with the vendor community to incorporate advanced standards for the exchange of information efficiently and securely.

The workstream's timeline to complete this process was set at approximately 18 months. The opportunity to share information collectively regarding ongoing developments provided early benefits and resulted in positive results, well in advance of this schedule. We are hopeful that formalizing the process for future communications will continue to provide

future gains as deployments continue and the implementation of standards becomes more common.

Appendix A: Data Exchange Workstream Membership

Lead Project Staff

Mr. David H. Yamasaki
Chief Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

Hon. Robert B. Freedman
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

Mr. Alan Crouse
Deputy Chief Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of San Bernardino

Trial Court Workstream Participants

Mr. Adam Creiglow, Superior Court of Marin County
Mr. Paras Gupta, Superior Court of Monterey County
Hon. Shelia Hanson, Superior Court of Orange County
Mr. Greg Harding, Superior Court of Placer County
Mr. Brett Howard, Superior Court of Orange County
Hon. Gary Nadler, Superior Court of Sonoma County
Mr. Snorri Ogata, Superior Court of Los Angeles County
Ms. Heather Pettit, Superior Court of Contra Costa County
Mr. Chris Stewart, Superior Court of Sacramento County
Ms. Jeanette Vannoy, Superior Court of Napa County
Mr. Deon Whitfield, Superior Court of Tulare County

Workstream Staff

Mr. Robert Oyung
Chief Information Officer
Information Technology Office, Judicial Council of California

Ms. Nicole Rosa
Information Technology Office, Judicial Council of California

California Justice Partner Participants

California District Attorney Association
California Highway Patrol
California Police Chiefs Association
Department of Child Support Services
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
Department of Justice
Department of Social Services
Department of Motor Vehicles
Office of Systems Integration
Probation Information Technology Association

Case Management System Vendors Participants

Journal Technologies
Justice Systems
Thompson Reuters
Tyler Technologies

Appendix B: Proposed Long-Term Data Exchange Standards

To facilitate the standardized exchange of data between the judicial branch and its justice partners, the following framework of technical standards shall be adopted for the development of new data exchanges:

1. Exchanges shall use the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM)/Electronic Court Filing (ECF) as a standard way of defining the contents of messages being exchanged;
2. Exchanges shall be implemented using a web services architecture for data exchange;
3. Exchanges shall use SSL/TLS (Secure Sockets Layer/Transport Layer Security) at the current commercially implemented release for communications security.

Appendix C: Description of Potential Benefits

Premise / Basis for Achieving Benefits:

- The data packet for an exchange is based upon standards that define the methods and the data rules.
- The data packet is transported (delivered, received, retrieved) utilizing a method that provides immediate notification pertaining to success or failure.
- The integration and/or application services provide timely validation and error notification.
- A single set of nationally based, non-proprietary data, transport, and security standards are utilized.

These benefits are achieved through:

- **Cost reduction.**
  - Resource reduction compared to manual or semi-manual processes.
  - Standardization and modern methods require less initial development and support later upgrade efforts.
  - Data rules built into the exchange payload mean less development and support effort and automated validation by the providers and consumers of the data.
  - Modern communication services / techniques provide more immediate success and error responses and efficient resolution.

- **Timeliness, completeness, and accuracy.**
  - Efficient and standardized processes provide timely, accurate, and complete updates of databases, as well as more complete and accurate data retrieved by the courts and their justice partners.
  - When errors are encountered, the tools provide mechanisms for quick response and correction.

- **Modern, consistent, transparent, and predictable.**
  - The standardized tools provide a consistent and predictable development and upgrade path for mandated changes or beneficial enhancements, relating to both data exchanges and applications by vendors, courts, and justice partners.
  - Isolates the data exchange partner from the specific technology of the other partner's application.
  - Provides an opportunity for consistent improvement in order to avoid obsolescence and increasing support costs.

- **Provide the foundation to support future generations of toolsets.**
  - The standardized tools provide the opportunity to implement versioning in order for each court to move to new standards when funding, resources, and prioritization allows.