JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/itac.htm
itac@jud.ca.gov

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

December 2, 2016

10:00 A.M.

Judicial Council of California Conference Center Boardroom, San Francisco

Advisory Body Members Present:	Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair; Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Vice Chair; Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers; Mr. Brian Cotta; Hon. Julie R. Culver; Hon. Robert B. Freedman; Ms. Alexandra Grimwade; Hon. Michael S. Groch; Hon. Jackson Lucky; Mr. Terry McNally; Hon. Kimberly Menninger; Ms. Allison Merrilees in for Hon. Mark Stone; Hon. James Mize; Mr. Snorri Ogata; Mr. Hon. Alan G. Perkins; Hon. Peter J. Siggins; Mr. Don Willenburg; Mr. David H. Yamasaki
Advisory Body Members Absent:	Hon. Samantha P. Jessner; Mr. Darrel Parker; Hon. Joseph Wiseman
Others Present:	Mr. Robert Oyung; Mr. Jake Chatters; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Ms. Kathy Fink; Ms. Jamel Jones: Mr. Patrick O'Donnell; Ms. Andrea Jaramillo; Ms. Fati Farmanfarmaian; Ms. Jackie Woods; Mr. Mark Gelade; Mr. Brett Howard

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM, and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the October 14, 2016 Information Technology Advisory Committee meeting.

Public Comment

There was no written public comments received nor any requests to comment in person visitors for this meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–9)

Item 1

Chair Opening Remarks

Presenter: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair

Update: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson welcomed members to the annual in-person meeting. She
                extended a welcome to the two newer members who are joining in-person for the first

time, Judge Kimberly Menninger, Orange County and Ms. Alexandra Grimwade, CIO, Twentieth Century Fox Television. The agenda for today's meeting is full with the focus on closing out the current year of activities and developing the annual agenda for the coming year. Because of the full agenda, there will be no subcommittee or workstream reports today. Written update reports have been included in your materials. Additionally, there are two action items for consideration on behalf of the data exchange and tactical plan workstreams.

Updates since the last ITAC meeting include appointing Judge Michael Groch as the ITAC liaison to the Traffic Advisory Committee, Judge Menninger to the Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) workstream, and Judge Alan G. Perkins to Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee (JATS). Judge Hanson is seeking volunteers to join the privacy policy-working group and there may be a need for executive sponsors for new workstreams identified by ITAC on the 2017 annual agenda. Members not currently participating are welcome to volunteer in areas of interest to help distribute workload evenly.

Item 2

Judicial Council Chief Information Officer (CIO) Introduction
Presenter: Robert Oyung, CIO/Director, Information Technology

Update: Judge Hanson welcomed Mr. Rob Oyung to update and discuss his new CIO role at the Judicial Council. Mr. Oyung has been in his new position for four weeks. He is currently working on his 60-day plan to gain customer insight via outreach with the Trial and Appellate Courts, Supreme Court, as well as internal JC offices. He sees feedback on what works and where there could be improvement at JCIT. He feels there should be stronger ties between committees as well. The timing is right for JCIT to help take work from committees into a production phase.

Mr. Oyung believes updating the ITAC Annual Agenda and Tactical Plan at the same time will help reduce the amount of staff time, overlap and redundancy. Justice Terence L. Bruiniers agrees there is overlap and wonders how to rationalize and prioritize resource allocation issues in the court and with JC staff. Mr. Snorri Ogata feels this is an opportunity to plan coordinating projects, to avoid feeling disjointed. Justice Louis R. Mauro noted there is a lot of paperwork, suggesting reviewing and reducing paperwork. If the paperwork advances the project, keep and if not trim down. Judge Hanson would like members to consider how ITAC can streamline planning opportunities regarding these various issue.

Item 3

ITAC Organization Discussion

Presenters: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson,

                 Chair Robert Oyung, CIO/Director, Information Technology

Update: Judge Hanson welcomed Mr. Oyung to discuss overall organization around ITAC work. It became apparent this year there is a need for alignment of planning processes. Noting there is overlap, redundancy and confusion while developing both the Tactical Plan and Annual Agenda. In the coming months the chairs and staff will review ways to streamline planning activities and improve effectiveness of reporting.

                 Mr. Oyung opened a dialogue regarding the role of the Projects Subcommittee. As Judge Robert B. Freedman has mentioned before, since the advent of workstreams, the Project Subcommittee has less projects. One reason the workstream model has been successful is that it unites key stakeholders within the branch, allowing the branch to actively participate and drive initiatives forward. While the Projects Subcommittee members are a standing body assigned topics as they arise and members may not have expertise in the assigned subjects. Therefore, there is more of a challenge moving things forward. The ITAC members discussed whether it is appropriate to sunset the Projects Subcommittee at the end of the year. There have been immense and successful changes over the last four years in the branch (workstreams, new CMS systems, etc.) and this subcommittee may be very useful in the future, if there are less workstreams. Members see value in keeping this subcommittee available as needed. Mr. Oyung indicated from the JCIT perspective, there are some resource issues with staffing so many subcommittees and workstreams. He is looking to identify a more effective way for securing resources. One suggestion is an ad hoc group instead of the Projects Subcommittee that would allow more flexibility in staffing. Judge Hanson asked members to send her or Mr. Oyung any additional thoughts or comments. No final decision at this time.

                 Due to Mr. Oyung transitioning from ITAC to the Judicial Council Information Office, there is now a CIO vacancy on the committee. Ms. Jamel Jones will coordinate the recruitment for that position this month, and if successful, the new member will begin in February.

Item 4

CMS Data Exchange Workstream Update – Final Report and Governance Plan (Action Required)

Review the Data Exchange Workstream Final Report & Governance Plan proposal prepared by the workstream and justice partner stakeholders. Decide whether to accept this deliverable and provide appropriate direction on next steps, as needed.

Presenters: Mr. David Yamasaki, Workstream Executive Sponsor

                 Hon. Robert B. Freedman, Governance Lead

Action: Judge Hanson welcomed Mr. David Yamasaki to provide a status report on the Data Exchange Workstream. Since the last ITAC meeting the workstream there have been

Meeting Minutes | December 2, 2016

several completed activities. These include adding an additional justice partner (DSS) to the participants; primary data exchange and interface requirements identified and tested by justice partners; identified complete for technical solution; created a central repository for sharing and created a Governance Committee Plan for managing use, support, modifications and relationships. As a deliverable, they established five workstream principles: 1) Limit the types of exchange approaches; 2) Use of standards-based solutions; 3) Establish prospective solutions; 4) Leverage and reuse solutions where possible; and 5) Safeguard integrity and privacy of data.

Next steps will be to implement the Governance Committee Plan; promote the single data exchange standard; provide continued support of lead court; continue collections of required documentation to support exchange development; and to track current implementation status of each exchange by each vendor.

Mr. Oyung suggests there is a need for a bridge between the completed and ongoing action items and Governance Plan and having a single point of contact with justice partners. While JCIT is in transition, he does not want there to be any loss of continuity. Focus is on a quality, not a rushed Governance Plan. Judge Menninger suggests finishing the first workstream then adding a timeline for the Governance Plan workstream. Justice Bruiniers added that the Judicial Council will need to approve the Governance Plan at some point, but JCTC and ITAC will review first.

Mr. Yamasaki is asking ITAC to accept the workstream's final report and conclude it upon the implementation of the Governance Plan. Additionally, that ITAC recommend that JCIT (Mr. Oyung) develop a plan on how to resource and meet the objectives of the Governance Plan and report back to ITAC.

Modified Motion to accept the workstream's final report and for JCIT to take on the governance part with Mr. Rob Oyung as contact. Approved.

Item 5

Tactical Plan Workstream Update – Progress Report and Approval to Circulate Draft for Public Comment (Action Required)

A report on progress toward the updated Tactical Plan (2017-2018), which incorporates the comments received from judicial branch stakeholders. Meeting materials include a red-line of the edits and a comment matrix. Decide whether to recommend that the draft be posted for public comment.

Presenters: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Workstream Executive Sponsor
                         Kathleen Fink, IT Manager and Workstream Project Manager

Action: Judge Hanson welcomed Justice Bruiniers and Ms. Kathy Fink to provide a status report on the Tactical Plan Workstream. Ms. Kathy Fink and JCIT staff have included comment

suggestions from the branch into the Tactical Plan. Some substantive comments included deferment and branch wide purchasing agreements concerns. The workstream is continuing to move plan forward for public comment.

Motion to Approve distribution of the updated Tactical Plan for Public comment, subject to JCTC approval.

Approved.

Items 6 & 7

Annual Agenda Planning Session: Part I & II – Review & Discuss
Review of the proposals will resume at 1 p.m. (when the committee reconvenes) and continue through 2:30 p.m.

Action: Judge Hanson welcomed Ms. Jamel Jones to review the ITAC Annual Agenda. Slides were handed out to members and are included it the materials. ITAC's goal is to align their annual agenda to the Tactical Plan going forward. There are currently 17 initiatives for review, 3 new and 14 carryover. Ms. Jones reviewed and took feedback on each one. These are on the worksheet given to members at meeting. Below includes feedback from members.

1. Modernize Rules of Court for the Trial Courts – No comments.

2. Standards, Rules and/or Legislation for E-Signatures – Will work with JATS & Appellate Courts. E-Signature requirement for bench warrants; special penal code efficiencies; enabling rules for external parties. Will work with JATS as these apply to all courts.

3. Rules for Remote Access to Records for Justice Partners – Omitting welfare section at this time. In development by Juvenile & Family Law Advisory Committee, currently only criminal law.

4. Standards for Electronic Court Records as Data – Note to remove collaboration area from the data exchange and change to term that is more generic.

5. Rules for E-Filing– No comments.

6. Privacy Policy – No comments.

7. Modernize Rules of Court for the Appellate Courts – No comments.

8. Consult on Appellate Court Technological Issues – No comments.

9. E-Filing Strategy – More than cost recovery, potential mod fund replacement. There is a 2017 completion date. Council needs to adopt NIEM as standard. Add as major task to implement with timeframe.

10. Next Generation Hosting Strategy – Target June ITAC/end of 2nd quarter. Changes to tasks and deliverables (keep A, B, C, E, delete D, F). Mr. Oyung feels this should be a P1.

Meeting Minutes │ December 2, 2016

11. Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) – Pilot ends 2017. Outside evaluation being done by San Diego University. Workstream kickoff will be mid December with selected courts to go live 2nd quarter 2017. This is a 6-month program with deliverables due in 2018.

12. SRL E-Services – Education phase ends Jan. 2017; requirements phase ends Dec. 2017; and then will develop the RFP.

13. Disaster Recovery (DR) Framework – Mr. Cotta suggests priority change to P1 from P2. June 2017 is the new date.

14. Tactical Plan for Technology – Plan to Judicial Council for approval no later than April 2017.

15. New Item: Forms Technology Modernization (Rename?) – Investigation to identify most important courts and prioritize them. Timeframe 6-9 months for deliverables. Amend to 9-month scope. Judge Lucky will continue to sponsor. Renaming should express these aspects: new validating single source, data entry consistent on forms, data e-signature, data centric, and smart data collection of Judicial Council forms. There should be consistency in the forms that current forms do not have. Intelligent Forms Phase 1: Scoping was the selected name.

16. New Item: Next Generation Infrastructure & Support Strategy – Define and develop team of network experts and what that looks like. Will it be resources across court or new hire and train? The team would support network infrastructure. Should this be in-house staff or will there be outsourcing? Looking at modernization or changing current infrastructure? It is not ITAC's place to make a recommendation. This should be CIOs and CITMF to discuss with courts and community. The share Governance structure across courts. Not ITAC project work.

    Motion to Defer and not include in the ITAC annual agenda.
    Approved

17. New Item: CMS Data Exchanges Phase II: Operation & Maintenance – Mr. Oyung will assume ownership of this item, no longer needs to be and action item on ITAC's annual agenda. He will review the workstream's Governance Plan draft and report to ITAC with next steps at the March 2017 meeting.

    Motion to remove CMS Data Exchanges Phase II from ITAC Annual Agenda and for JCIT to take the lead.
    Approved

Motion to Approve contents of the Annual Agenda as restructured at the December 2, 2016 ITAC meeting.

Approved.

Meeting Minutes │ December 2, 2016

Ms. Jones will update and circulate to members via e-mail in one week for final review. She will then send to JCTC for their review and approval at their January 2017 meeting.

Item 8

Update on the Judicial Council's (internal) Technology Committee (JCTC)
Provide report on activities and news coming from the JCTC.

Presenter: Mr. Jake Chatters, Member, JCTC

Update: Judge Hanson welcomed Mr. Jake Chatters, member of JCTC to provide a JCTC update. Justice Marsha Slough, Chair of JCTC sends her regrets as she is unable to attend today's ITAC meeting and that she is very appreciative of the partnership between committees. Since the October 14 meeting, JCTC held an orientation meeting and two committee meetings. JCTC has reviewed the update on the Tactical Plan draft and approves going for public comment in December. Work continues on modernizing the trial court CMS systems and there is a BCP for the V3 courts funding. There will be a new batch of courts currently on legacy systems for funding and the hosted courts moving from the Judicial Council CCTC. Placer court will host six courts who are receiving one-time funding from the Judicial Council. Humboldt and Madera are working on their own projects and sending a funding request this month to Trial Court Budget Committee. Project is on schedule to move several other smaller courts by end of 2017. Of note is that DOF funding successes the past 3 years are largely due to having a branch governance in place. This shows DOF that the branch has long-term plans and goals. Other government branches are appreciative of our efforts.

Item 9

New Business and Closing Remarks

Action: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson welcomed

Judge Hanson asked members if there was any new business for ITAC members to consider. Justice Bruiniers contributed a potential new workstream on electronic or digital evidence. He believes this is urgent enough to be in the ITAC Annual Agenda and he is asking if this committee will consider this project. Mr. Oyung suggested reaching out to the courts to see if they are able to support as well. After approving the Tactical Plan, ITAC will still needs to delay this a short time to identify resources. Judge Menninger volunteered to be the executive sponsor as her court is currently working electronic evidence; she also noted that Los Angeles could provide resources. Judge Hanson is assigning this to the Projects Subcommittee to continue the momentum. Deferring this project until after approval of the Tactical Plan.

A DJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:45 PM.

Upcoming 2017 ITAC meetings are March 17, June 9, October TBD and December TBD.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

Data Exchange JC IT Staffing Recommendations

Note: This matrix represents JC IT responsibilities only; it does not reflect the totality of the governing body's responsibilities.

#	Governance Group Task	JC IT Responsibility	JC IT Specific Tasks	Role (Min. Class)	Timeline	Duration	Obstacles/ Concerns	Recommendations
	Governance Plan Guidelines							
1.	Develop Governance Cohesive Plan (Guidelines)	Plan Stakeholder Management, Communications, & Change Control Management	a) Schedule 2-3 meetings to discuss how partners wish to interact and document findings. b) Prepare, coordinate 3 of 4 guidelines and integrate them into a comprehensive plan. c) Gain governance group approval of the plan. d) Gain ITAC committee approval of plan.	JC IT Senior Business Systems Analyst	One time activity; 1-4 months.	120 hours (30 hours per month)	Without governance group input, JC IT staff runs the risk of misinterpreting stakeholder needs.	JC IT staff and the governance group should complete this task together.
	Operations							
2.	Maintain & Update Governance Cohesive Plan	Support the governance group in maintaining the plan and guidelines.	a) Schedule meetings (once per year), for stakeholders to discuss developments to plan/and make updates to guideline content.	JC IT Business Systems Analyst	Annual activity.	1-5 hours		Assign JC IT staff to complete the task.
3.	Deliver Recommendations On Multiple Data Exchanges	Subject Matter Expert to support group data exchange decision.	a) Provide expert information on data exchange efforts and approaches. b) Support group at data exchange meetings with Justice Partners.	JC IT Senior Business Systems Analyst	Annual activity (or as needed).	1-5 hours		Assign JC IT staff to complete the task. JC IT staff will serve as a representative of the group to only provide expert judgement upon request.

#	Governance Group Task	JC IT Responsibility	JC IT Specific Tasks	Role (Min. Class)	Timeline	Duration	Obstacles/ Concerns	Recommendations
4.	Monitor Stakeholder Relationships	Facilitate issue resolution.	a) Respond to ad hoc requests and questions. b) Address issues as they occur, clarify and resolve, foster appropriate engagement in committee activities. c) Create issues log. d) Address potential concerns that have not become issues and future problems that may be raised.	JC IT Business Systems Analyst	Monthly activity.	0-5 hours		Assign JC IT staff to complete the task.
5.	Maintain Data Exchange Repository	Monitor the repository intake and manage user accounts.	a) Submit request for new user repository accounts to systems administrator. b) Solicit document updates and manage folder access restrictions. c) Update all parties involved on standards, data exchange implementations, technical improvements, and relationships.	JC IT Business Systems Analyst	Quarterly activity.	1-5 hours	Hyper Office repository may not be the best tool. However, documents will remain in the repository until a decision is made to migrate.	JC IT staff to work with the JC IT PMO, JC IT Principal Managers, and service owners to determine the appropriate solution.
	Web Publishing (formally "facilitate communication outlets")	Provide publishing of web artifacts.	d) Implement Web publishing (i.e. JRN) as appropriate to facilitate standardized data exchanges.		Annual activity.	20 hours		
6.	Maintain Official Membership Roster	Maintain updates on group contact information.	a) Amends the official membership roster, and contact lists of justice partners and vendors.	JC IT Business Systems Analyst	Annual activity or as needed.	0-5 hours		Assign JC IT staff to complete the task.

#	Governance Group Task	JC IT Responsibility	JC IT Specific Tasks	Role (Min. Class)	Timeline	Duration	Obstacles/ Concerns	Recommendations
	Communications							
7.	Status Reporting (formerly, Monitor Committee Performance)	Facilitate reporting on status and progress.	a) Provide performance reports to governance group and ITAC on data exchanges.	JC IT Business Systems Analyst	Quarterly activity.	0-5 hours		Assign JC IT staff to complete the task.
8.	Coordinate Meetings	Support governance group efforts to meet and discuss problem solving and decision making.	a) Plan/schedule annual teleconference or in-person meetings in synchronization with JC Annual Agenda timeline. b) Prepare meeting materials. c) Create agenda. d) Schedule teleconference and WebEx sessions.	JC IT Business Systems Analyst	Annual activity.	20 hours	Annual in-person meeting will require funding, unless travel paid by participants.	Assign JC IT staff to complete the task.

Next GEN-Hosting Workstream

ITAC Update

March 17, 2017

Purpose of Workstream

- Outline industry best practices for hosting in an educational manner.

- Produce a roadmap tool for use by courts in evaluating options.

- Consider educational summit on hosting options, and hold summit if appropriate.

- Identify requirements for centralized hosting.

- Recommend a branch-level hosting strategy.

Participant Requirements

Two Levels of Participants:

- Oversight Participation- Selected Workstream Members

- Technical Participation- Experts in the IT Field of Network/Infrastructure

Workstream Plan

Phase 1:

Develop Educational Information and Hold Summit

1. Define top four to five solutions in the industry.

2. Define the pros and cons of each solution

3. Provide examples of court applications that could use each solution

4. Provide example cost information by solution.

5. Include road-mapping tool to assist courts in evaluating local needs and identifying hosting solutions for themselves.

6. Produce Next Generation Hosting Information Tool (contains a-e)

7. Determine if a summit on the topic is necessary, and if so, hold the summit.

Workstream Tasks

1. Define Industry Best Practices for Hosting

2. Develop Matrix of Solutions with Pros, Cons, and Example Applications Hosted and Costs

3. Produce educational document with tool for use by courts in individual evaluation,

4. Hold a one-day summit on hosting (if deemed necessary and appropriate).

5. Determine interest and support for possible solutions at branch level.

6. Develop recommendation for branch-level hosting model.

Framework Overview

WORKSTREAM ASSUMPTIONS

- All courts utilizing or moving to modern CMS within five years

- Facilities meet requirements

- Adequate internet bandwidth

- Funding is not an issue

- Resources will be determined based on solution

- Outputs for Disaster Recovery Workstream will be utilized

Framework Overview

DATA CENTER OPTIONS

- Based upon review of the Hosting and Disaster Recovery Assessments, as well as court ideas and strategies, the following solutions are to be investigated:

- Branch Data Center (Centrally Hosted) - CCTC Model, Judicial Council Managed, Court Managed

- Court Hosted Data Center - Court Managed, Limited size
  - Discussion of Regional Data Centers
  - Regional Applications

- Infrastructure as a Service (CLOUD)

- Software as a Service (CLOUD)

- Individual Courts – Hosting their own needs

Framework Overview

DATA CENTER OPTIONS PROS/CONS SAMPLE

Branch Data Center: Vendor Hosted (Current CCTC Model)

PROS	CONS
Full Service - Including desktop solutions	Cost Allocation - How?
Removes court pressure	Licenses are not included
Vendor does updates/anti-virus	Lack of control from the Court
Vendor controls Active Directory	Generally more costly
Vendor manages servers locally and at CCTC	No input in technology solutions being deployed at Data Center
Able to negotiate work with vendor for updates, hardware refresh, etc. - Madera, Lake and Modec	Connectivity Costs
Hardware choices remain with Court	
No need for in-depth technical knowledge within the court	

Framework Overview

BRANCH WIDE RECOMMENDED HOURS OF OPERATION AND SERVICE LEVEL DEFINITIONS

Next Generation Hosting services should be 24/7 hours of operation.

- <u>Critical</u>: damage or disruption to a service that would stop court operations, public access or timely delivery of justice, with no viable work-around.
- <u>High</u>: damage or disruption to a service that would hinder court operations, public access or timely delivery of justice. A work-around is available, but may not be viable.
- <u>Medium</u>: damage or disruption to a specific service that would impact a group of users, but has a viable work-around.
- <u>Systems Support</u>: damage or disruption to a specific service that would not impact court operations, public access or timely delivery of justice and a viable work-around is available.

Framework Overview

BRANCH WIDE RECOMMENDED SERVICE LEVELS

SLA Type	SLA Criteria	Local Data Center	Cloud
Critical	Max Time Recovery	4 hours	1 hours
Critical	Max Data Loss	1 hour	5 minutes
High	Max Time Recovery	6 hours	2 hours
High	Max Data Loss	1 hour	30 minutes
Moderate	Max Time Recovery	24 hours	24 hours
Moderate	Max Data Loss	1 Business day	1 Business day
Low	Max Time Recovery	48 hours	48 hours
Low	Max Data Loss	N/A	N/A

Framework Overview

BRANCH WIDE INVENTORY ASSETS SAMPLE

Requirement	Recommended Service Level
Systems	
Case Management	Critical
Jury Management	Critical
Website - Public Service Portal	Critical
E-filing	High
Communications/VoIP/Analog/Faxes	High
CCPOR/CLETS	High
DMV- Justice Partners Branch and local (Lan/Wan- Connect)	High
IVR/Call Routing	High
Electronic/Video Recording and Playback (FTR)	Moderate
Facilities Requirements- Assisted Listening (ADA)	Moderate
Building Access Controls	Moderate
E-Warrants_PC Dec/Ipad/Magistrate phone	Moderate
Court Call/Telephonic/Video appearance	Moderate
VRI - Video Remote Interpreting	Moderate
Physical Security- Video Surv.	Moderate
Video/Meeting/Conference Systems	Low

Framework Overview

BRANCH WIDE RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS SAMPLE

Requirement	Applicable Solution		
	Local	Private Data Center	Cloud
Systems			
Case Management	✓	✓	✓
Jury Management	✓		✓
Website - Public Service Portal			✓
E-filing			✓
Communications/VoIP/Analog/Faxes	✓		
CCPOR/CLETS			✓
DMV- Justice Partners Branch and local (Lan/Wan-Connect)	✓		
IVR/Call Routing	✓		✓
Video/Meeting/Conference Systems			✓
Electronic/Video Recording and Playback (FTR)	✓		✓
Facilities Requirements- Assisted Listening (ADA)	✓		
Building Access Controls	✓		
E-Warrants_PC Dec/Ipad/Magistrate phone			✓
Court Call/Telephonic/Video appearance			✓
VRI - Video Remote Interpreting			✓
Physical Security- Video Surv.	✓		✓

Framework Overview

NEW FRAMEWORK TOOLS

1. RECOMMENDED SERVICE LEVELS, INVENTORY ASSETS AND SOLUTIONS

2. USE INVENTORY CHECKLIST TEMPLATE AND BUDGET PLANNER

3. USE TECHNOLOGY ROADMAP TEMPLATE

Framework Overview

NEW FRAMEWORK TOOLS SAMPLE INVENTORY CHECKLIST

Requirement	Recommend Service Level	Court Service Level	Applicable Solution		Estimated Amount $$ from Road Map			
			Local	Cloud	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Systems								
Case Management	Critical							
Jury Management	Critical							
Website - Public Service Portal	Critical							
E-filing	High							
Communications/VoIP/Analog/Faxes	High							
CCPOR/CLETS	High							
DMV- Justice Partners Branch and local (Lan/Wan- Connect)	High							
IVR/Call Routing	High							
Video/Meeting/Conference Systems	Low							
Electronic/Video Recording and Playback (FTR)	Moderate							
Facilities Requirements- Assisted Listening (ADA)	Moderate							
Building Access Controls	Moderate							
E-Warrants_PC Dec/Ipad/Magistrate phone	Moderate							
Court Call/Telephonic/Video appearance	Moderate							
VRI - Video Remote Interpreting	Moderate							
Physical Security- Video Surv.	Moderate							
					$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
					ESTIMATED STRATEGIC BUDGET			**$0.00**

Framework Overview

NEW FRAMEWORK TOOLS SAMPLE ROADMAP

Requirement	Service Level	Cloud				
Systems						
Case Management	Critical	✓	$$$			
Jury Management	Critical	✓	$$			
Website - Public Service Portal	Critical	✓	$			
E-filing	High	✓	$$			
Communications/VoIP/Analog/Faxes	High					
CCPOR/CLETS	High	✓				
DMV- Justice Partners Branch and local (Lan/Wan- Connect)	High					
IVR/Call Routing	High	✓				
Video/Meeting/Conference Systems	Low	✓				
Electronic/Video Recording and Playback (FTR)	Moderate	✓				
Facilities Requirements- Assisted Listening (ADA)	Moderate					
Building Access Controls	Moderate					
E-Warrants_PC Dec/Ipad/Magistrate phone	Moderate	✓				
Court Call/Telephonic/Video appearance	Moderate	✓				
VRI - Video Remote Interpreting	Moderate	✓				
Physical Security- Video Surv.	Moderate	✓				

Extra Large/Branch	$$$	$xxxxxx.xx-$xxxxx	**Medium Court:**	$$$	$xxxxxx.xx-$xxxxx
	$$	$xxxxxx.xx-$xxxxx		$$	$xxxxxx.xx-$xxxxx
	$	$xxxxxx.xx-$xxxxx		$	$xxxxxx.xx-$xxxxx
Large Court:	$$$	$xxxxxx.xx-$xxxxx	**Small Court:**	$$$	$xxxxxx.xx-$xxxxx
	$$	$xxxxxx.xx-$xxxxx		$$	$xxxxxx.xx-$xxxxx
	$	$xxxxxx.xx-$xxxxx		$	$xxxxxx.xx-$xxxxx

Note: The technical team is still gathering the initial sample cost data.

Framework Overview

BRANCH WIDE RECOMMENDATIONS

- If the courts have the ability, opportunity and the cost is less than a local solution they should to move to a cloud solution;

- Adopt the recommended branch services levels and hours of operation for all data center solutions;

- Recommendation to remove VMWare vendor to future Master Service Agreement (MSA) or branch-wide agreement;

- Create new support model for defining branch impacting technology initiatives, such as next generation hosting;

- Microsoft is the office and email standard across the branch, whether using Exchange or Office 365; and

- Approve **phase two** of next generation hosting Workstream; *including Webinar, cloud service agreements for real framework pricing and Pilot;*

Current Status and Next Steps

- Technical Workstream members are finalizing "sample estimate" values for framework to be completed by March 10, 2017.

- Workstream members will be reviewing and making recommendations for final draft March 21-April 21, 2017

- Final draft framework will be completed May 12, 2017

- Framework is expected to be delivered to ITAC for the June 9, 2017 meeting for vetting and approval