



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/itac.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/itac.htm)  
[itac@jud.ca.gov](mailto:itac@jud.ca.gov)

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

April 15, 2019

10:00 AM to 3:00 PM

Ronald M. George State Office Complex

William C. Vickrey Judicial Council Conference Center, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor

Malcom M. Lucas Board Room

455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102-3688

---

<b>Advisory Body Members Present:</b>	Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair; Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Vice Chair; Mr. Jake Chatters; Mr. Brian Cotta; Mr. Adam Creiglow; Hon. Julie R. Culver; Hon. Tara Desautels; Hon. Michael S. Groch; Mr. Paras Gupta; Hon. Samantha P. Jessner; Hon. Kimberly Menninger; Mr. Snorri Ogata; Mr. Darrel Parker; Hon. Alan G. Perkins; Hon. Donald Segerstrom; Hon. Peter Siggins; Hon. Bruce Smith; Ms. Jeannette Vannoy; Mr. Don Willenburg; Mr. David H. Yamasaki
<b>Advisory Body Members Absent:</b>	Assembly member Marc Berman; Ms. Alexandra Grimwade; Hon. James Mize; Hon. Joseph Wiseman
<b>Others Present:</b>	Hon. Marsha Slough; Ms. Heather Pettit; Ms. Jamel Jones; Mr. Richard Blalock; Ms. Camilla Kieliger; Ms. Fati Farmanfarmaian; Mr. John Yee; Ms. Andrea Jaramillo; Ms. Nicole Rosa; Ms. Jessica Craven; Ms. Jackie Woods; and other JCC staff present

---

#### OPEN MEETING

---

##### Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:01 AM and took roll call.

##### Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the February 8, March 4, and April 2, 2019 teleconference meetings of the Information Technology Advisory Committee.

There were no public or in-person comments for this meeting.

#### DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-11)

---

##### Item 1

##### Chair's Report

Presenter: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair

**Update:** Judge Hanson welcomed members and staff to the first 2019 in-person meeting. At two recent special meetings, ITAC approved 3 rules proposals by Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee (JATS) to circulate for public comment. They are out for comment along with the legislative proposals from the Rules & Policy Subcommittee. The comment period will close in June.

The Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) workstream completed their objectives and the Judicial Council voted to approve their report at their March meeting. The Chair thanked Judge Jessner for being the executive sponsor, as well as the members and staff who contributed.

Judge Hanson advised that Mr. Don Willenburg has been reappointed to ITAC by the State Bar of California. He has served as an ITAC member for nearly 10 years and continues to provide his legal expertise to both Rules & Policy Subcommittee, and the JATS. The Chair also expressed her gratefulness for his continued contributions to ITAC. Additionally, the California Senate Rules Committee has appointed Senator Robert Hertzberg to serve on ITAC. Senator Hertzberg represents the 18<sup>th</sup> Senate District, in the San Fernando Valley, and was elected in 2014. He has also served as State Assemblymember from 1996–2002 and was selected as Assembly Speaker from 2000–2002.

## Item 2

### Judicial Council Technology Committee Update (JCTC)

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

Presenter: Hon. Marsha Slough, Chair, JCTC

**Update:** Justice Slough provided a JCTC update to ITAC members. Since the February ITAC meeting, the JCTC has held 5 open meetings and an education session. Judge Gary Nadler provided an update on March 15 to the Judicial Council on both ITAC and JCTC activities.

At the February 11 JCTC meeting, Judge Hanson provided an update on ITAC subcommittees and workstreams. There were 5 action items from ITAC and all were approved. They included 4 trial court rules for public comment and the VRI pilot for the March Judicial Council meeting.

During the February 26 meeting, the JCTC prioritized the technology-related Initial Funding Requests (IFRs) that would be developed into Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) for fiscal year 2020–2021. They were submitted to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (JBBC) for their review and ranking.

At the March 14 meeting, the committee reviewed and approved the proposed funding of court projects for the jury management grant. JCTC also reviewed and approved a funding request for the hosting of the Sustain Justice Edition case management system application at the technology center next fiscal year with this year's Improvement and Modernization Funds (IMF).

During the most recent meeting on April 8, JCTC received an ITAC update and overview of the pilot project relating to e-delivery of court documents between the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), a prison, and the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District. There were two action items: first was to review results from the Digital Evidence workstream, signaling the close of phase 1 and initiation of phase 2; and second was to review and consider whether to recommend acceptance of the Tactical Plan for Technology 2019–2020, and approve submission to the Judicial Council. Both items were approved. Justice Slough thanked Judge Hanson for her leadership of the update of the Tactical Plan, as well as members of the workstream and staff for putting together an excellent document that will guide the branch through the next two years. Justice Slough closed by thanking ITAC for their continued collaboration and excellent work to improve the judicial branch technology infrastructure.

### Item 3

#### **FY 2020/2021 Technology Initial Funding Requests (IFRs)**

Review of the technology Initial Funding Requests for Fiscal Year 2020/2021.

Presenter: Ms. Heather Pettit, Chief Information Officer

**Update:** Ms. Pettit provided an update on the 6 JCTC submitted technology IFRs. for intelligent forms, productization of innovation grants, disaster recovery consulting services for courts, next generation hosting for courts, digitization documents phase 2 & 3, and Digital Evidence. The JBBC reviewed the requests and selected 1. Intelligent forms, 2. Productizing Innovation Grants, digitizing documents, and digital evidence. JCTC reviewed and decided on 5 of the 6 projects, as well as prioritizing for submission to Judicial Branch Budget Committee (JBBC). They selected 5 projects: intelligent forms, productization of innovation grants, disaster recovery consulting services, digitization of documents phase 2 & 3, and next generation hosting. Digital evidence will be considered in the next cycle of IFRs. After reviewing, the JBBC has requested 4 concept documents, they are combing 2 IFRs. The concept documents are being drafted and may request an additional ITAC meeting to approve before JBBC submission and prioritization. The group may not get all IFRs requested as they do manage the number of BCPs submitted to legislature.

### Item 4

#### **Privacy Resource Guide – Annual Agenda Amendment**

Consider amending the description of the Privacy Resource Guide (PRG) project contained in ITAC's 2019 annual agenda (1) to correct the language so that it matches the language submitted for review at ITAC's December 3, 2018 meeting, and (2) to add an objective that the PRG be published on the Judicial Resources Network (JRN) in 2019.

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

Ms. Debora Morrison, Attorney, Legal Services

**Action:** Justice Siggins explained this amendment is a follow up from the December 2018 ITAC meeting where ITAC agreed to publish the PRG on the JRN for 2019. Ultimately, Judicial Council staff will be the owner, but until then ITAC will continue to monitor until it officially transitions.

**Motion to Approve the Annual Agenda amendment to the Privacy Resource Guide. Approved.**

## Item 5

### Privacy Resource Guide – Publication

Update on status and report on the presentation of the (draft) Privacy Resource Guide to the Trial Court Presiding Judges (TCPJs) and Court Executives Advisory Committees (CEAC) during their February 2019 meetings. Consider whether to approve publication of the Privacy Resource Guide on the Judicial Resources Network (JRN).

Presenters: Hon. Julie Culver, Privacy Resource Guide Lead  
Ms. Debora Morrison, Attorney, Legal Services

**Action:** Judge Culver presented the PRG to both TCPJs and CEAC, letting both committees know this resource is available publicly and on the JRN. The message to CEAC was they should share with their judges this information and resource. TCPJs received a message telling them about the ITAC projects and the resource guide. Debora Morrison has replaced Kristi Morioka as the staff attorney.

**Motion to Approve the publication of the Privacy Resource Guide on the Judicial Resources Network.**

**Approved.**

## Item 6

### Digital Evidence Phase 2 – Annual Agenda Amendment

Discuss the request to update the ITAC Annual Agenda for the Digital Evidence Phase 2 Workstream, adding a key objective to include piloting technologies.

Presenter: Hon. Kimberly Menninger, Executive Sponsor

**Action:** Judge Menninger is asking ITAC to approve amending the Annual Agenda for digital evidence phase 2 to add a pilot program. Placer County is doing a similar pilot and this workstream would like to coordinate efforts. Lastly, they would like to run a pilot out of Orange County as well and follow any other pilots before the workstream starts assessing products.

**Motion to Approve the Annual Agenda amendment to the Digital Evidence Phase 2 Workstream.**

**Approved.**

**Item 7****Spotlight: Futures Commission Directive – Intelligent Chat**

Report on the Intelligent Chat Workstream’s recent progress.

**Presenters:** Hon. Michael Groch, Executive Sponsor  
Mr. John Yee, Enterprise Architect, Information Technology and Workstream Business Lead  
Ms. Fati Farmanfarmaian, Senior Business Systems Analyst, Information Technology and Workstream Project Manager

**Update:** Judge Groch stated the goal is to use technology to get public online instead of inline and turned over the presentation to Ms. Farmanfarmaian. She provided an update of the project given to ITAC from the Chief Justice’s Futures Commission. Phase one results will be complete and presented to ITAC in August 2019. Phase 2 consists securing additional funding, selecting pilot courts, and a Request for Proposal (RFP) to begin in January 2020.

Mr. Yee shared their initial findings on the various Chatbots available, see material slides for examples. Findings include: most of the effort is in developing and creating knowledge bases; subject matter experts (SMEs) are crucial to help develop appropriate chatbot interactions; live chat transcripts are excellent sources for building content and training chatbots; adding machine learning and artificial intelligence needs more time to research and develop best practices. Some challenges are the availability of SMEs and using knowledge bases by chatbots to access statewide and local courts’ knowledge.

**Item 8****Spotlight: Futures Commission Directive – Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings**

Report on the Remote Video Appearance Workstream’s recent progress and draft findings.

**Presenters:** Hon. Samantha Jessner, Executive Sponsor  
Mr. Jake Chatters, Workstream Business Lead

**Update:** Judge Jessner and Mr. Jake Chatters presented Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings. The materials include their slide presentation. The workstream reviewed various literature and then developed a list of topics and questions divided into 4 groups: procedure, evidence, rules, and technology. They discussed each area in detail and held mock hearings on February 15 at the San Bernardino Superior Court, as well as Superior Courts remote sites in Los Angeles, Placer, Humboldt, Sacramento, and the Judicial Councils offices in San Francisco. They were civil harassment and small claims hearings with scripts based on actual hearings. Evidence was shared via SharePoint. There was a positive response from participants with nearly 77% very satisfied. Some concerns were: monitor placement in courtroom, clear identification of the party’s reason for “going dark”, and ensuring all participants test equipment prior to event. The workstream submitted 9 recommendations as outlined in the slides included with the

materials. Next steps are to finalize report to ITAC and get their approval at the June ITAC meeting.

**Item 9****Comments and Questions Regarding Written Workstream and Subcommittee Reports****Futures Commission Directive: Voice-to-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom**

Hon. James Mize, Executive Sponsor

**Tactical Plan for Technology Update Workstream**

Hon. Sheila Hanson, Executive Sponsor

**Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Workstream**

Hon. Samantha Jessner, Executive Sponsor

**Identity and Access Management Strategy Workstream**

Mr. Snorri Ogata, Executive Sponsor

**Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) E-Services Workstream**

Hon. James M. Mize and Hon. Michael Groch, Executive Sponsors

**Digital Evidence: Assessment – Phase 1 Workstream**

Hon. Kimberly Menninger, Executive Sponsor

**Data Analytics: Assess and Report – Phase 1 Workstream**

Hon. Tara Desautels and Mr. David Yamasaki, Executive Sponsors

**Disaster Recovery (DR) – Phase 2 Workstream**

Mr. Paras Gupta, Executive Sponsor

**Online Dispute Resolution (ODR): Assessment**

Hon. Julie Culver, Executive Sponsor

**Branchwide Information Security Roadmap**

Hon. James Mize, Executive Sponsor

**Rules & Policy Subcommittee**

Hon. Peter Siggins, Chair

**Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee**

Hon. Louis Mauro, Chair

**Comments:** No additional comments on any of the above items.**Item 10****Spotlight: IT Community Development Workstream**

Report on the IT Community Development Workstream's recent progress and draft findings.

**Presenters:** Hon. Alan Perkins, Executive Co-Sponsor  
Ms. Jeannette Vannoy, Executive Co-Sponsor**Update:** Judge Perkins updated that this workstream is on time and will be ready to present its findings report at the August ITAC meeting. The workstream is comprised of court executive and information officers as well as judges. They looked at three tracks on resources, education, and tools to see how to maximize collaboration. Ms. Vannoy elaborated on the resources track findings and recommendations as noted in their slides in the materials. They include CIOs focus groups to define opportunities and methods for resource sharing, to establish priority areas and report back to CEOs. Additionally, follow up with CEOs who indicated peer consulting as their top resource. Judge Perkins explained the education track findings that included continuing the CIO development program based on the identified prioritized needs of CIO community and improve the nature of the workstream assessment to define and deliver appropriate IT skills training for Judicial Officers, CEOs and Operations staff. The tools track recommendations are to expand hosted branch collaboration platforms (MS SharePoint/Teams) to pilot and to participate in on-going Granicus effort to expand to other committee meetings.**Item 11****Next Generation Data Center Hosting Product Showing**

Receive a status report on the recent progress of operationalizing the Next Generation Data Center Hosting Workstream by the Judicial Council.

**Presenter:** Ms. Heather Pettit, Chief Information Officer**Update:** Ms. Pettit provided an update on operationalizing next generation hosting. Is this a consulting service for the courts? Through a proof of concept used in San Barbara Superior Court, JCIT found it was a problem of delivery of service. The recommendations included IT governance, potential solution options and budget based on business defined requirements, and finally next steps for court. Next steps are to offer consulting to interested courts (Alpine, San Luis Obispo, and Inyo); apply framework to courts in need of the service and refine business process; lastly a BCP has been submitted for FY 2020–2021 for funding for next generation hosting and disaster recovery consulting services.

---

**A D J O U R N M E N T**

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 PM.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.