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

June 9, 2017
10:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m.
Ronald M. George State Office Complex
William C. Vickrey Judicial Council Conference Center, 3rd Floor
Malcolm M. Lucas Board Room
455 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Advisory Body Members Present:	Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair; Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Vice Chair; Mr. Brian Cotta; Hon. Julie R. Culver; Ms. Alexandra Grimwade; Hon. Michael S. Groch; Hon. Samantha P. Jessner; Hon. Jackson Lucky; Mr. Terry McNally; Hon. Kimberly Menninger; Hon. James Mize; Mr. Snorri Ogata; Hon. Alan G. Perkins; Mr. Don Willenburg; Mr. David H. Yamasaki
Advisory Body Members Absent:	Mr. Darrel Parker; Hon. Mark Stone: Hon. Joseph Wiseman
Others Present:	Hon. Daniel J. Buckley; Mr. Robert Oyung; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Ms. Kathy Fink; Ms. Jamel Jones: Mr. Patrick O'Donnell; Ms. Andrea Jaramillo; Ms. Fati Farmanfamaian; Ms. Nicole Rosa; Ms. Jackie Woods

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call
The chair called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m., and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes
The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the May 5, 2017, Information Technology Advisory Committee meeting with changes, and the May 19, 2017 Information Technology Advisory Committee action by email.

There were no public comments submitted or in person.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–14)

Item 1

Chair Opening Remarks
Presenter: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, ITAC Chair

Update: Hon. Shelia Hanson welcomed members to the bi-annual in person ITAC meeting.

She provided an update on the committee nominations. There were numerous candidates for the 8 open ITAC positions. They have been reviewed, deliberated with staff, and recommendations have been submitted to the Executive & Planning Committee for consideration by the Chief Justice. Judge Hanson thanked those who personally reached out to colleagues or submitted nominations. The Chief Justice will make her final decision in September, new members will begin their terms on September 15.

Judge Hanson asked for a volunteer to replace Judge Freedman who recently retired, as liaison to the Civil & Small Claims Advisory Committee. Judge Samantha Jessner volunteered and Judge Hanson confirmed her appointment.

Additionally, Judge Jessner has been appointed as the Video Remote Interpreting Workstream (VRI) executive sponsor. Judge Jessner will continue to work closely with Justice Terence Bruiniers as the chair of the Technological Solutions Subcommittee of the Language Access Task Force who is leading the VRI project.

Judge Hanson provided an update on JCTC decisions since the May ITAC meeting. They include: approval of the final deliverables from the Data Exchange Workstream; the Rules & Policy Subcommittee were authorized to form an ad hoc joint working group led by ITAC and consisting of 8 other subject matter advisory bodies to streamline the development of the new rules for remote access to records for parties, their attorneys, and justice partners; the final item is an amendment to ITAC's annual agenda permitting ITAC to initiate a digital evidence workstream with Judge Kimberley Menninger as the executive sponsor, this will be considered at the JCTC meeting next Monday, June 12.

The Chair briefly reported on the Small Court Technology Summit, noting there will be a full report later. Both ITAC chairs attended the event. There were over 30 courts with 80 participants. The event was extremely engaging and interactive as well as eye-opening. One instance where courts were asked to identify top challenges, one court responded "having reliable internet" as their issue. It became clear that some challenges are shared by all courts while others are unique to smaller and medium sized courts.

Final update from Judge Hanson was on the Futures Commission directives. Mr. Michael Planet will join the meeting to provide an overview on these directives. The chair noted the Chief Justice has assigned four immediate directives to be prioritized and addressed. One of those is specifically assigned to ITAC to be discussed further after Mr. Planet's report. This concluded the chair report.

Item 2

Disaster Recovery Framework Workstream—Preview of Deliverables

Present for discussion the draft deliverables of the Disaster Recovery Workstream including a DR Framework document and model DR Plan (adaptable by individual courts). Provide input prior to branch circulation for comment.

Presenters: Hon. Alan Perkins, Workstream Executive Co-Sponsor

Mr. Brian Cotta, Workstream Executive Co-Sponsor and Project Manager

	Mr. Michael Derr, Principal Manager and Workstream Staff/SME, Judicial Council Information Technology
Update:	Judge Alan Perkins thanked the workstream and staff and thought this effort would be especially very helpful to small and medium sized courts. Mr. Brian Cotta provided a detailed review of the project deliverables via his slide presentation, located in your materials. Of note are the Output documents that include: Output 1." How to Use: Guide, Output 2. Disaster Recovery Recommendations and Reference Guide, Output 3. Disaster Recovery Adaptable Template, and Output 4. Recommendation to ITAC to pursue a budget change proposal (BCP). He asked ITAC to review the materials and provide comments to him by June 23 and to support circulation of the documents to all CEO's, Clerk/Administrators, and CTO's. He noted the approval/acceptance of all deliverables and recommendations as well as project closure of the workstream, will be requested at the August ITAC meeting.

Item 3

Next Generation Hosting Strategy Workstream—Preview of Deliverables

Present for discussion the draft deliverables of the Next Generation Hosting Strategy Workstream including a Next Generation Hosting Framework document and recommendations. Provide input/feedback.

Presenters:	Hon. Jackson Lucky, Workstream Executive Co-Sponsor
	Mr. Brian Cotta, Workstream Executive Co-Sponsor
	Ms. Heather Pettit, Workstream Project Manager/Court Lead
Update:	Ms. Pettit shared the framework document that outlines an inventory of technology assets, their criticality, and a recommended hosting solution for each. Options include: local data center, or cloud hosting. The team developed road mapping tools that courts may adapt for their own planning purposes. Final deliverables from this workstream are due in August. Please see meeting materials for handouts and slide presentation.

Item 4

ITAC Structure: Projects Subcommittee Discussion (Action Requested)

Discuss the path forward for the Projects Subcommittee and decide whether to sunset this group or to take another action.

Presenters:	Hon. Sheila Hanson, ITAC Chair
	Mr. Robert Oyung, CIO/Director, Judicial Council Information Technology
Action:	Judge Hanson asked members if ITAC should continue with the Projects Subcommittee or could it be sunset. Mr. Oyung believes it has outlived its usefulness and that ad hoc working groups and/or workstreams are move beneficial. It was deiced to use the current workstream methods to invite for working groups.

Request a Motion to Sunset the Projects Subcommittee.

Approved.

Item 5

Brainstorming Session: Expanding Collaboration within the Branch IT Community

Discussion session to gather feedback and input on priorities from ITAC on the newly added Tactical Plan for Technology initiative: Expanding Collaboration within the Branch IT Community. This initiative is intended to identify opportunities for sharing technical resources, advancing technology leadership, and expanding collaboration throughout the judicial branch.

Facilitators: Ms. Jeannette Vannoy, ITAC Member

Ms. Kathleen Fink, Manager, Judicial Council Information Technology

Discussion: Ms. Vannoy held an initial discussion on expanding collaboration within the branch IT community. She asked ITAC to review and rank priorities on slide 41 in the materials. Along with ITAC, she is gathering input from the Court Information Technology Management Forum and two IT summits to inform how ITAC may support this initiative through a workstream as part of the ITAC 2018 Annual Agenda. Additional information is in her presentation slides included with meeting materials.

Item 6

Comments and Questions Regarding Written Workstream and Committee Reports
E-Filing Strategy Workstream

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Executive Sponsor

Mr. Snorri Ogata, Project Manager

Comments: E-filing strategy BCP has received positive feedback. The BCP may conclude with trailer bill language attached.

Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) E-Services Workstream

Hon. James M. Mize, Executive Sponsor

Comments: Next steps are to develop the RIF, then the RFP.

Video Remote Interpreting Workstream

Hon. Samantha Jessner, Executive Sponsor

Comments: Judge Samantha Jessner will be the new executive sponsor and, upon the retirement of Justice Terence Bruiniers, assuming the role as chair of the Technological Solutions Subcommittee of the Language Access Task Force who is leading the VRI project.

Intelligent Forms Workstream

Hon. Jackson Lucky, Executive Sponsor

Comments: The workstream concluded their first meeting and will continue bi-weekly meetings.

ITAC Rules & Policy Subcommittee

Hon. Peter Siggins, Chair, ITAC Rules & Policy Subcommittee Member

Comments: A new ad hoc working group is being formed, Rules for Remote Access. Mr. Snorri Ogata volunteered to be the IT resource. Membership is assembled from other committees. There will be a roster posted.

Court Executive Advisory Committee (CEAC) will be the lead on electronic court records.

Modernization rules with the Legislature regarding CCP 13b and 10.6 and Senate 8976 to require an opt in via the Judicial Council form. The focus has been on opting out on the form.

Privacy Policy resource guide is similar to the court resource manual. Obligated to provide information accordingly or protect public and private information. There is a need for subject matter experts, let the chair know if you are interested.

Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee

Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Chair, Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee

Comments: No additional comments.

Item 7

Technology Innovation Grants Update

Review the grants awarded for technological innovations by the Judicial Council, and provide an update on the coordination with related initiatives and branch IT governance.

Presenters: Ms. Maureen Dumas, Principal Manager, Judicial Council Special Projects
Mr. Robert Oyung, CIO/Director, Judicial Council Information Technology

Update: Mr. Oyung provided an update on the awarded grants and next steps in managing grants with court collaboration. Included in the meeting materials is the list of courts and dollar amounts awarded.

Ms. Dumas noted there were 28 trial courts and one appellate court awarded innovation grants and an Inter Branch Agreement (IBA) is in place. There were four courts funded in June and the remaining will be funded in July. Innovation grant courts will be funded in full every July through 2020. Mr. Oyung drafted a proposal that was shared at the last CIO meeting that outlines the JCC staff will help facilitate discussions between courts, the host repository, and manage mailing lists.

Item 8

Branch Budget Update

Update on the status of the branch budget, along with any technology-related discussions with the Department of Finance and/or with Legislators.

Presenter: Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Judicial Council Budget Services

Update: Mr. Theodorovic provided a branch budget update to ITAC. The budget committee concluded work which will be sent to the floor next week in Sacramento. There will be a vote on Proposition 54 on June 15, comment period is 72 hours. There is limited new funding in the new budget. Nine small courts were approved to move their CMS. DMS funding was also approved. There is a general fund loan included in the Governor's May Revise to assist in developing and maintaining a statewide trial court e-filing environment. This loan would be paid back from user fees. Disability group raised the issue with existing ADA as well as new programs, and draft trailer bill language has been added to address comments related to ensuring access to those with disabilities. Funding was also requested to migrate courts to the state financial system. Finally, work is underway on next year's BCPs which are due to the Judicial Council this summer.

Item 9

Judicial Council Technology Committee Update

Update on activities and news coming from this internal oversight committee.

Presenter: Hon. Marsha Slough, Chair, JCTC

Update: Justice Slough provided an update on JCTC activities since the last ITAC meeting. She also expressed her appreciation for the work and partnership of ITAC. JCTC held and educational session, two open meetings and, co-hosted a Small Court Technology Summit with the California Trial Court Consortium. At the March JC meeting the 2017-2018 Tactical Plan was approved.

There will be a statewide technology summit held August 23 & 24 in Sacramento in conjunction with the statewide TCPJAC and CEAC. The summit is open to CIOs, Appellate Presiding Justices, Appellate Court Administrators, administration, and others. Content feedback has been gathered from ITAC, CIO Management Forum, CEAC, Appellate Court Clerks, and other. ITAC members are welcome to attend. The information gathered from this summit will help to update the Technology Strategic Plan.

The Futures Commission report has been released and there are technology recommendations that ITAC will address. Further discussion today by Mr. Planet.

The technology BCPs for FY 18/19 BCPs have been ranked in a discussion lead by Judge Daniel Buckley. The ranking is: 1. CMS replacements; 2. Deploy and maintain California Court Protective Order Registry (CCPOR); 3. Phoenix system required updates; 4. Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) Statewide E-Services Solution; 5. Digitizing Paper and Filmed case files for trial and appellate courts; and 6. Single Source Sign-On

Meeting Minutes | June 9, 2017

for Judicial Branch. These are consistent with the approved Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan.

Item 10

Futures Commission Update

Update on the status of the Commission on the Future of California's Court System and its final Report to the Chief Justice. On April 26, 2017, a news release announced the completion of the final report.

Presenter: Mr. Michael Planet, Technology Working Group, Futures Commission; Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Ventura

Update: Mr. Planet advised ITAC that the final report has gone to the Judicial Council and the commission is complete. Of the 65-page report, the Chief Justice selected three top priorities for ITAC. 1. Remote Video Appearances: Developing a pilot project to allow remote appearances by parties, counsel, and witnesses for most noncriminal court proceedings; 2. Video Arraignments: Authorizing video arraignments in all cases, without the defendant's stipulation, if certain minimum technology standards are met; 3. Intelligent Chat Technology: Developing a pilot project using intelligent chat technology to provide information and self-help services. He noted there is a fourth unofficial project to continue with the Tactical Plan.

Judge Hanson noted that the Chief Justice has issued those directives to ITAC. Justice Mauro has attended a meeting with internal committee chairs and staff to discuss ITAC's approach to this assignment. ITAC plans to reach out to the CIO community for volunteers to assist with this special assignment. Next, ITAC will hold a one-day brainstorming session with CIOs and staff on the three areas of focus to identify all the factors and elements to consider as part of the analysis; as well as identify all stakeholders for input. Then, assigned CIO will develop an overall workplan for the project, which is due in August.

Item 11

Small Court Technology Summit Report

Report on the May 25 Small Court Technology Summit held at the Judicial Council Sacramento Office.

Presenters: Ms. Linda Romero Soles, Chair, California Trial Court Consortium; Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Merced

Mr. Richard Feldstein, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Napa

Update: Ms. Romero Soles provided an update on behalf of Mr. Feldstein, who was unable to attend today's ITAC meeting. There were more than 80 attendees representing 30 courts and the meeting was well received. Each court identified their CMS, disaster recovery, and e-filing current and future needs. Breakout session tracks included CMS planning, sharing court resources, IT security for CEOs and CIOs, and resource planning. Courts

also identified their strengths and gaps. Materials and output from the meeting are located on the Judicial Resources Network (JRN) Small Court Technology Summit. The information gathered at this meeting will be shared at the August 2017 Technology Summit in Sacramento ensuring that the small and medium courts' needs are included in overall branch technology.

Item 12

Liaison Reports

Reports from members appointed as liaisons to/from other advisory bodies.

Presenters: Mr. David Yamasaki, ITAC Member, Liaison to Court Executive Advisory Committee (CEAC)

Update: CEAC and the Presiding Judges Advisory Committee met jointly, but then split off to discuss court executives focused issues and heard a presentation from Mr. Brian Cotta and Ms. Charlene Ynson about the benefits of electronically filling in the court of appeals. Many courts focus on fiscal as well as technology challenges such as Mr. Yamasaki did while with the Santa Clara court. At his current court in Orange County, he has seen a great benefit to having digital copies and electronically filing. It has reduced onsite paper storage and the time it takes to process a request for copies. This technology could help reduce staffing levels and increase efficiencies. Digitizing documents would be helpful for the entire branch.

Mr. Oyung noted that this is the third time at today's ITAC meeting it's been mentioned about the importance of digitizing documents in the courts. This is an important item for a new BCP.

Presenters: Hon. Louis R. Mauro, ITAC Vice-Chair, Liaison to Appellate Advisory Committee (AAC)

Update: Justice Mauro reported the Supreme Court is going live with e-filing in July. The only appellate district not on e-filing is the 2nd District who is awaiting the new Document Management System (DMS) that the 3rd and 5th Districts are rolling out over the summer. The AAC is making progress to amend CCP 271 that say court reporter transcripts must be in paper. There is an AB 1450 draft that says that originals will be electronic, but allows court reports, or courts that cannot do electronic can opt out. There are many court reporters ready to offer this service now, but there is only one vendor and they worry that it forces a monopoly. Justice Mauro feels that efforts are close to reaching an agreement with the court reporters and the judicial branch.

Presenters: Hon. James Mize, ITAC Member, Access & Fairness Advisory Committee (AFAC)

Update: Judge Mize noted that at a recent meeting he attended he was impressed with a presentation *Using Animation to Simplify Legal Stuff,* and by using visuals to explain items instead of just words, more people would benefit in the courts.

There were no other liaison reports given.

Item 13

Review Legislative Proposal to Amend Civil Code Section 1719 and Code of Civil Procedure Sections 405.22, 405.23, 594, 659, 660, and 663a (Action Required)

Review public comments and decide whether to recommend proposed amendments to the Civil Code and Code of Civil Procedure. The purpose of the legislative amendments is to provide clarity about and foster the use of electronic service. The proposed amendments authorize electronic service for certain demands and notices. The proposal also clarifies that the broader term "service" is applicable rather than "mailing" in certain code sections.

Presenters: Hon. Peter Siggins, Chair, Rules and Policy Subcommittee

Mr. Patrick O'Donnell, Principal Managing Attorney, Legal Services

Ms. Andrea Jaramillo, Attorney, Legal Services

Action: Mr. O'Donnell advised the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee (CCAC) voted to move these changes forward and he is seeking an action from ITAC to move them forward as well. The meeting materials contain the detailed suggested rules changes.

Motion to Approve the recommendation that the Judicial Council sponsor legislation amending the Civil Code Section 1719 and Code of Civil Procedure Sections 405.22, 405.23, 594, 659, 660, and 663a.

Motion Approved.

Item 14

New Business and Closing Remarks

Update: Judge Hanson advised members that ITAC has been authorized for two in person meetings annually due to the important work of this committee. Members are welcome to share their feedback with her or Justice Mauro.

Mr. Cotta alerted members that the 5th District Court of Appeal (COA) has an e-signing solution that can be used by all COAs and Supreme Court. Mr. Oyung is working on an Inter Branch Agreement (IBA) to allow the trial courts to use this as well.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:11 PM.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

Workplan 1: Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings

Draft workplan developed by:
- Mr. Brian Cotta, CIO, Fifth District Court of Appeals and ITAC Member
- Ms. Jeannette Vannoy, CIO, Superior Court of California, County of Napa and ITAC Member

> **Approach** – Reference existing proven remote video appearance deployments and conduct a proof of concept (POC) for any additional functionality that may not be included in existing solutions. It is believed that one or more solutions that are in place today at trial court(s) likely meet both technical and business requirements/readiness.

I. Proof of Concept - Short Term (3-6 months)

Goal: Conduct a mock remote video hearing using a web conferencing system for a specific hearing type (e.g., Civil - Small Claims) as a POC in a court.* The initial scope of the POC would be to conduct one or more mock hearings of the selected hearing type.**

* If the court conducting the POC were interested in expanding the POC to include additional hearing types or to conduct real (non-mock) hearings, then additional tasks required for local rule changes and agreement with the parties to participate would need to be addressed and time would need to be added to the schedule as appropriate. The intent would be to ensure the relevant rules of court are not limiting so that courts could choose to use the solution/technology for all fitting case types as business needs dictate.

** Input from the branch Technology Summit (Aug 2017) will help identify potential use case(s).

1. Reach out to courts, to identify which court will conduct the POC (including those awarded an Innovation Grant focused on video hearings). – **Week 1**

2. Reach out to the court community to identify an evaluation team – **Week 2**

3. Identify common web conferencing solutions and select one or two to be used for the POC – **Week 2**

4. Determine operational impacts and document considerations – **Week 3-4**
   a. Calendaring/scheduling
   b. Conducting the hearing (formalities, procedures, etc.)
   c. Training staff and judicial officers
   d. Determine the need for and accommodation of interpreting (standard and ASL)
   e. Ongoing quality control(s) for latency, ease of use and accessibility

5. Conduct POC – **Week 4-8* (see note above if POC is more extensive than conducting mock hearings of a specific type, then additional tasks/time would be required)**
   a. Setup environment
   b. Use the Judicial Branch's electronic signature solution to accommodate remote signing if/when applicable

  c. Use the web conferencing solution and/or other standard cloud solutions to accommodate remote viewing and sharing of evidence and/or other related documents

  d. Use the web conferencing solution's recording capability to capture "the record"

  e. Use a survey tool to collect feedback from POC participants (e.g. outside parties as applicable)

6. Establish regular communication and review with evaluation team (regularly scheduled call, monitor progress, capture lessons learned, report feedback). – **Weekly**

7. Wrap up findings from POC and propose next steps. – **Week 8-10**

II. Pilot and Productizing Plan - Long Term

Goal: Use learnings from the pilot and propose how to implement more broadly

1. Existing activities - purpose is to understand what may be leverage/linkages – **Week 1-4**

 1.1. Workstreams

  1.1.1. Reach out to Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Workstream

 1.2. Active projects in courts (including Innovation Grants)

  1.2.1. Determine collaboration opportunities with Innovation Grants awardees (Note: The #'s below reflect the official grant #, for informational/relational purposes only)

   1.2.1.1. Video hearings - Placer (8, 24), Humboldt (41), Merced (44), Sacramento (50), San Bernardino (51);

   1.2.1.2. Video conferencing- Butte (18), San Bernardino (29), Ventura (36)

  1.2.2. Survey courts for additional related projects

  1.2.3. Communicate with courts already conducting remote video appearances to evaluate lessons learned and what solutions were or were not successful.

2. Determine technology maturity and categorize – **N/A**

 2.1. Categorize

  2.1.1. Monitor

  2.1.2. Ready for pilot

  2.1.3. Ready for production

 2.2. Report recommendations

3. Identify plan/next steps – **Week 4-45** *(timelines to be adjusted once the scope is determined)*

 3.1. **Identify and select use cases**

  3.1.1. Identify business problems being solved

  3.1.2. Identify measures of success, value add, success criteria

  3.1.3. Identify fit within existing portfolio of services

  3.1.4. Brainstorm at Technology Summit

 3.2. Identify challenges and mitigations

  3.2.1. Brainstorm at Technology Summit

3.2.1.1.   Barriers, mitigations, measures of success

3.2.1.2.   Practical limitations

3.3. Research

3.3.1. General market research including available tools/various vendors

3.3.1.1.   Identify alternative solutions/approaches to the same business problem(s) and attempt to standardize on a limited number (2?) of solutions that can coexist and work seamlessly together.

3.3.1.2.   Determine level(s) of integration/compatibility with existing technology being used with VRI project(s).

3.3.2. Vendor visits/demos

3.3.2.1.   TBD – based on research & only if determined necessary

3.3.3. California court demos/data gathering

3.3.3.1.   Dependent upon results of survey

3.3.4. Find out what other state courts are doing

3.3.4.1.   Court IT Officers Consortium (CITOC) query

3.3.4.2.   National Center for State Courts (NCSC) query

3.3.4.3.   National Conference of Appellate Court Clerks (NCACC) query

3.3.5. Explore build versus buy versus hybrid

3.3.5.1.   Analyze pros/cons, cost/benefit analysis

3.4. Financial considerations

3.4.1. Identify cost for possible technologies/solutions

3.4.2. Identify funding source (e.g., BCP, cost recovery, etc.)

3.4.2.1.   For pilot

3.4.2.2.   For production/implementation

3.4.2.3.   For ongoing support and maintenance

3.5. Survey and identify existing rules and policy constraints, impacts, and changes necessary

3.6. Pilot – TBD based on findings above (current category is ready for production)

3.6.1. Scope the pilot

3.6.2. Create project timeline

3.6.3. Identify pilot participants and methodology

3.6.4. Launch/implement

3.6.5. Evaluate pilot

3.7. Recommendations for a production implementation – TBD based on findings above (current category is ready for production)

3.7.1. Scope the service

3.7.2. Create proposed timeline

3.7.3. Recommendations re: directives and alternative approaches

3.7.4. Align with strategic plan

3.7.5. Determine priorities and resources

3.7.6. Incorporate into a workstream

3.7.7. Determine appropriate operational processes and procedures

3.7.8. Ongoing support considerations and planning

3.7.9.Training and Marketing

##

Comments from conference calls conducted 7/17/17 and 7/17/19 to discuss this topic at high-level

Comment #1: How is step #3 related to #1; should #1 inform #3; opportunities to coordinate/connect.

Comment #2: Consider relationship to VRI project; only region (3) has met and conferred with union; capitalize on other work going forward.

Comment #3: Judicial officer shared experience of video conferencing with the prisoner, stipulated, trial entirely conducted via video conference; he was not sure of how any evidence was handled or displayed and suggested to contact CIO for information.

Comment #4: Judicial officer shared two experiences using video: 1) with court trial in which plaintiff— long-term inmate; was a civil case with most difficult issue being transportation of the inmate to the video room; and 2) conducted mental health assessment trials with patients in mental health facilities, all trials done remotely.

Workplan 2: Voice-to-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom

Draft workplan developed by:

- Mr. Rick Walery, Superior Court of California, County of San Mateo
- Ms. Heather Pettit, Superior Court of California, County of Contra Costa

---

Approach – Given the immaturity of real-time voice-to-text translation and transcription services, we recommend assessing and validating the maturity of this technology in a controlled lab environment prior to potentially piloting in a local court. Part of the assessment within the lab will be to gauge the alignment of the technical tool(s) to deliver an accurate, useful translation within a complex environment such as the legal environment. The lab assessment will consider tools from personal device translation tools to enterprise-scale translation API toolkits.

I. Proof of Concept (POC) - Short Term (3-6 months)

Goal – Setup a technical lab environment at the Judicial Council or a local court to test the technical recommendations of the Futures Commission for this initiative. Piloting various voice-to-text language services in a lab environment will allow for exposure to more technologies and shorter learning cycles than if a specific technology is deployed at a court for piloting. The goal of the lab pilot will be to determine next steps with this technology. Potential next step outcomes may be to continue to research the technology within a lab environment while it matures, to pilot at one court for a specific use case, or to pilot at multiple courts for multiple use cases.

---

1. Reach out to courts to identify steering committee and lab participants – **Week 1 - Week 2**

2. Setup governance structure to facilitate exposure to various technologies and quick learning cycles – **Week 3**

3. Establish regular communication and discussion with project team (regularly scheduled call, monitor progress, capture lessons learned, report feedback) – **Bi-weekly**

4. Determine high-level use cases within a court environment outside the courtroom. One forum for determining use cases will be at the August Technology Summit. – **Week 3**

5. Determine the various technologies and services models for delivering real-time voice-to-text translation and transcription services – **Week 4**

6. Setup demos with vendors – **Week 5 - Week 7**

7. Produce a white paper on the lessons learned within the pilot and a recommendation for next steps – **Week 8 – Week 10**

II. Pilot and Productizing Plan- Long Term

> **Goal –** Based on the learnings from the Proof of Concept phase, devise a strategy for piloting the technology in a local court to continue to learn lessons for a broader, long-term deployment.

1. Existing activities- purpose is to understand what may be leverage/linkages
   1.1. Workstreams
      1.1.1. Reach out to VRI workstream to determine if any lessons learned in VRI apply to the voice-to-text initiative
   1.2. Active projects in courts (including Innovation Grants)
      1.2.1. Survey courts for additional projects that may align with this initiative
2. Determine technology maturity and categorize
   2.1. Categorize
      2.1.1. Monitor
      2.1.2. Ready for pilot
      2.1.3. Ready for production
   2.2. Report recommendations
3. Identify plan/next steps
   3.1. **Identify and select use cases**
      3.1.1. Identify business problems being solved
      3.1.2. Identify measures of success, value add, success criteria
      3.1.3. Identify fit within existing portfolio of services
      3.1.4. Brainstorm at Technology Summit
   3.2. Identify challenges and mitigations
      3.2.1. Brainstorm at Technology Summit
         3.2.1.1.   Barriers, mitigations, measures of success
         3.2.1.2.   Practical limitations
   3.3. Research
      3.3.1. General market research including available tools/various vendors
         3.3.1.1.   Conduct analyst briefing(s)
         3.3.1.2.   Identify alternative solutions/approaches to the same business problem(s)
            3.3.1.2.1.   Research commercially available speech interfaces
            3.3.1.2.2.   Research commercially available translation interfaces
      3.3.2. Vendor visits/demos
         3.3.2.1.   Learn about products:
            3.3.2.1.1.   Identify commercially available API toolkits and services
            3.3.2.1.2.   Research options using personal devices (i.e. smartphones, tablets)
      3.3.3. California court demos/data gathering
         3.3.3.1.   Dependent upon results of survey
      3.3.4. Find out what other state courts are doing

          3.3.4.1.   Court Information Technology Officers Consortium query

          3.3.4.2.   National Center for State Courts query

      3.3.5. Explore build versus buy versus hybrid

          3.3.5.1.   Analyze pros/cons, cost/benefit analysis

3.4. Financial considerations – TBD based on proof of concept lab findings above

      3.4.1. Identify cost for possible technologies/solutions

      3.4.2. Identify funding source (e.g., BCP, cost recovery, etc.)

          3.4.2.1.   For pilot

          3.4.2.2.   For production/implementation

          3.4.2.3.   For ongoing support and maintenance

3.5. Survey and identify existing rules and policy constraints, impacts, and changes necessary

3.6. Pilot – TBD based on proof of concept lab findings above

      3.6.1. Scope the pilot

      3.6.2. Create project timeline

      3.6.3. Identify pilot participants and methodology

      3.6.4. Launch/implement

      3.6.5. Evaluate pilot

3.7. Recommendations for a production implementation – TBD based on lab findings above

      3.7.1. Scope the service

      3.7.2. Create proposed timeline

      3.7.3. Recommendations re: directives and alternative approaches

      3.7.4. Align with strategic plan

      3.7.5. Determine priorities and resources

      3.7.6. Incorporate into a workstream

      3.7.7. Determine appropriate operational processes and procedures

      3.7.8. Ongoing support considerations and planning

      3.7.9. Training and marketing

##

Comments from conference calls conducted 7/17/17 and 7/17/19 to discuss this topic at high-level

Comment #1: mainstream language may work but there is a lot of nuance in spoken language, idioms, and dialects that could lead to misinterpretation. The workstream my want to consider potentially including language academics/experts given the complexity of spoken language

Comment #2: similar questions are asked in the two use cases (filing counter and self-help), so perhaps real-time, spoken translation may work for common questions. Some questions that are similar and could lend themselves to macros/repetition/simplicity to overcome complexity of language difficulty. True real-time translation may be more challenging with a true, interactive conversation.

Workplan 3: Intelligent Chat Technology *(Virtual Customer Assistant)*

Draft workplan developed by:
- Mr. Snorri Ogata, CIO, Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles and ITAC Member
- Mr. Paras Gupta, CIO, Superior Court of California, County of Monterey

---

Approach – Gain insights from related capabilities already deployed (e.g., FAQ in Orange County, Avatar in Los Angeles) and conduct a series of proofs of concept (POCs) to identify target areas for high-value implementation. It is believed that this technology is readily available and the primary opportunity is to gain insight on specific technology alternatives and specific use cases.

I. Proof of Concept (POC) - Short Term (3-6 months)

Goal – Conduct a series of proofs of concepts (POCs) to assess technology readiness for various use cases (e.g., Court of Appeal, E-Filing, Self-Help). Identify key performance indicators and benchmark before/after success and capture learnings.

---

1. Define the overall POC goals (e.g., quick implementations, for multiple use cases, with the intent of gaining insights on what works and doesn't work). – 1 week
2. Define broad categories of desired data that need to be captured from each POC (before and after). – 1 week
3. Solicit input from interested courts to identify business usage scenarios for ChatBot that meet the POC criteria. – 1 weeks
4. Identify readily available technology solutions that support program objectives. – 1 week
5. Find pilot courts (preliminary list includes: COA, LA and Monterey) – 1 week

For each POC…

6. Work with POC courts to define / refine / publish success measures (e.g., # uses, % of questions answered correctly, …) tailored to the measures to their specific usage scenario. – 1 week

7. Provide direction/assistance to POC courts: - 2 weeks
   a. Formalize performance metrics to collect
   b. Formalize features to evaluate (e.g., ease of authoring, ease of integration, usability of the Q&A engine)
   c. Identify reporting and minimum duration/sampling size to draw meaning conclusion

8. Conduct POCs – 8 weeks
   a. Build and deploy pilot implementation
   b. Measure pilot implementations
   c. Pilot court quarterly results meeting and repeat steps 6-8 for next "sprint"

9. Wrap up findings from POC and propose next steps. – 2 weeks
   a. Assessment of Use Cases
   b. Assessment of Technologies
   c. Recommendation of solution sets (e.g., use cases with technology)

II. Pilot and Productizing Plan- Long Term

Goal – Learnings from the pilot and how to more broadly implement

1. Existing activities- purpose is to understand what may be leverage/linkages – 4 weeks
    1.1. Workstreams
        1.1.1. Explore alignment opportunities with SRL workstream
    1.2. Active projects in courts (including Innovation Grants)
        1.2.1. Innovation Grants- Determine if virtual customer assistant is scoped within grant project for:
            1.2.1.1. Avatar – LA, Riverside and Yolo (project #'s: 21, 27, 38)
            1.2.1.2. Self-help Portal – 5DCA, Contra Costa, Orange, Riverside, San Diego, San Mateo (project #'s 17, 19, 23, 26, 30, 31)
        1.2.2. Survey courts for additional projects
2. Determine technology maturity and categorize – 2-4 weeks
    2.1. Categorize
        2.1.1. Monitor
        2.1.2. Ready for pilot
        2.1.3. Ready for production
    2.2. Report recommendations
3. Identify plan/next steps – 6-12 months
    3.1. **Identify and select use cases**
        3.1.1. Identify business problems being solved
        3.1.2. Identify measures of success, value add, success criteria
        3.1.3. Identify fit within existing portfolio of services
        3.1.4. Brainstorm at Technology Summit
    3.2. **Identify challenges and mitigations**
        3.2.1. Brainstorm at Technology Summit
            3.2.1.1. Barriers, mitigations, measures of success
            3.2.1.2. Practical limitations
    3.3. **Research**
        3.3.1. General market research including available tools/various vendors
            3.3.1.1. Conduct IT Advisory Service Analyst briefings
            3.3.1.2. Review additional products identified through additional research
        3.3.2. Vendor visits/demos
            3.3.2.1. Learn about specific products
        3.3.3. California court demos/data gathering
            3.3.3.1. Los Angeles
            3.3.3.2. Orange
        3.3.4. Find out what other state courts are doing

3.3.4.1.   CITOC query

3.3.4.2.   NCSC query

3.3.5. Explore build versus buy versus hybrid

3.3.5.1.   Analyze pros/cons, cost/benefit analysis

3.4. Financial considerations – BCP PROCESS

3.4.1. Identify cost for possible technologies/solutions

3.4.2. Identify funding source (e.g., BCP, cost recovery, etc.)

3.4.2.1.   For pilot

3.4.2.2.   For production/implementation

3.4.2.3.   For ongoing support and maintenance

3.5. Survey and identify existing rules and policy constraints, impacts, and changes necessary

3.6. Pilot

3.6.1. Scope the pilot

3.6.2. Create project timeline

3.6.3. Identify pilot participants and methodology

3.6.4. Launch/implement

3.6.5. Evaluate pilot

3.7. Recommendations for a production implementation

3.7.1. Scope the service

3.7.2. Create proposed timeline

3.7.3. Recommendations re: directives and alternative approaches

3.7.4. Align with strategic plan

3.7.5. Determine priorities and resources

3.7.6. Incorporate into a workstream

3.7.7. Determine appropriate operational processes and procedures

3.7.8. Ongoing support considerations and planning

3.7.9. Training and marketing