



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

October 4, 2019

10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present:	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; Ms. Alexandra Grimwade; Hon. Michael S. Groch; Mr. Paras Gupta; Hon. Kimberly Menninger; Hon. James Miz; Mr. Snorri Ogata; Mr. Darrel Parker; Hon. Peter Siggins; Hon. Bruce Smith; Ms. Jeannette Vannoy; Mr. Don Willenburg; Mr. David H. Yamasaki
Advisory Body Members Absent:	Assemblymember Marc Berman; Senator Robert Hertzberg; Hon. Samantha P. Jessner; Hon. Donald Segerstrom; Hon. Joseph Wiseman;
Others Present:	Hon. Kyle Brodie; Ms. Heather Pettit; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Jamel Jones; Mr. Alex Barnett (Sen. Hertzberg); Mr. Richard Blalock; Ms. Camilla Kieliger; 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 and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the August 19, 2019, Information Technology Advisory Committee meeting. Justice Peter Siggins and Mr. Paras Gupta abstained.

No public comments received for this meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1 – 5)

Item 1

Chair's Report

Presenter: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair

Update: Judge Hanson welcomed members to the meeting. She noted members re-appointed for another 3-year term: Justice Louis Mauro, Judge Tara Desautels, Judge Kimberly Menninger, Mr. Brian Cotta, Mr. David Yamasaki, Ms. Jeannette Vannoy, and Ms. Alexandra Grimwade. There are two new members appointed to ITAC. She welcomed

back to ITAC Assistant Presiding Judge Theodore Zayner from Superior Court of Santa Clara County, who served in 2014 and Mr. Alan Crouse, Deputy Court Executive Officer from Superior Court of San Bernardino, who also previously served this committee from 2004 – 2007. Judge Hanson thanked all ITAC members for their dedication and hard work.

Item 2

Judicial Council Technology Committee Update (JCTC) (Report)

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

Presenter: Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair, JCTC

Update: Judge Brodie introduced himself as the new JCTC chair and provided an update on activities since the August ITAC meeting. At the September 9 JCTC meeting Justice Mauro provided an ITAC update. JCTC reviewed and approved the dispersal of funds for the language access signage and technology grant program. They received an update on V3 courts' case management replacement projects as well.

JCTC also met on September 24 for an open meeting where they reviewed and approved the selection of 8 courts to participate in the initial phase of the Digitizing Records pilot program for the Appellate and Superior Courts. Funding was received through the Budget Change Proposal (BCP) process and supports the Strategic Plan goals of Promoting the Digital Court and Advancing IT Security and Infrastructure. The pilot courts were selected according to the objectives of the program and established criteria.

Judge Bodie also reported on both JCTC and ITAC activities to the Judicial Council at their September meeting.

Item 3

Joint Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Remote Video Rules (Action Required)

Review a proposal to amend the 2019 annual agenda to form a joint ad hoc subcommittee to address the remote video recommendations.

Presenter: Hon. Peter Siggins, Chair, Rules and Policy Subcommittee
Ms. Andrea Jaramillo, Attorney II, Legal Services

Action: Justice Siggins is seeking approval to add a joint ad hoc subcommittee to the Annual Agenda for the Rules & Policy subcommittee to have all necessary parties impacted to update rules.

Motion to approve amending the 2019 Annual Agenda to form the join ad hoc subcommittee.

Approved.

Item 4**E-Filing Workstream – Status and Final Report (Action Required)**

Final presentation, review and discussion of deliverables from the E-Filing Workstream’s efforts. Consider whether to sunset this workstream.

Presenter: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Workstream Executive Sponsor
Mr. Snorri Ogata, Workstream Court Lead

Action: Mr. Ogata gave the final status report for the e-filing workstream. Tyler pulled out of being a statewide e-filing vendor leaving Journal Technologies and ImageSoft as statewide vendors. There is a Judicial Council unit that will manage the project going forward.

Motion to sunset the E-Filing workstream.

Approved.

Item 5**2020 Annual Agenda Planning (Discussion Item)**

Facilitated session to initiate planning of the ITAC 2020 Annual Agenda, including a review of the process and discussion of project topics (in progress and emerging) for consideration.

Presenters: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair

Ms. Camilla Kieliger, Senior Business Systems Analyst, Information Technology
Mr. Richard Blalock, Senior Business Systems Analyst, Information Technology

Discussion: JCIT staff solicited suggestions for the 2020 ITAC Annual Agenda. These include: a legislative discussion with Senator Hertzberg. Mr. Ogata suggested an innovative workstream on how the branch can help employees work more efficiently using a “digital workspace”, also how working remotely might impact courts. It was unclear if this topic should be a workstream. Justice Mauro considers it an important topic especially around how the branch can use technology to help its workforce. Mr. Yamasaki suggested that this conversation needs to be discussed throughout the branch due to labor issues. Ms. Vannoy thought perhaps this could be included a future Tactical Plan update. Mr. Creiglow supports and would interested in working on this topic. Judge Menninger sees a lot of overlap with remote projects and wonders if there needs to be a combined project meeting outside of ITAC. Mr. Crouse suggested there is a statewide HR group that could be a resource.

Ms. Pettit will put together an education session for ITAC on the facilities working group project.

Next steps include updating objectives, redlines for Executive Sponsors and Chair presentation at the December 2 ITAC meeting. After, reach out to CIO community to gather input and feedback for ITAC’s consideration and distribute agenda at the December 2 meeting.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:20 AM.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

14.1. Rules Modernization: Uniform Formatting Rules for Electronic Documents



Highlight: The proposed uniform formatting rules were approved by the Judicial Council to be effective January 1, 2020.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Develop uniform formatting rules for electronic documents filed or otherwise submitted to the appellate courts.	Completed	The proposal was approved by the Judicial Council on September 24, 2019, and will go into effect on January 1, 2020.

14.2. Modernize Appellate Court Rules



Highlight: The proposed uniform formatting rules were approved by the Judicial Council to be effective January 1, 2020.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Numbering of materials in requests for judicial notice. Consider amending rule 8.252, which requires that materials to be judicially noticed be numbered consecutively, starting with page number one. The problem is that such materials are attached to a motion and declaration(s) and are electronically filed as one document, making pagination and reference to those materials in the briefs confusing for litigants and the courts. This project may be addressed by the uniform format rules project.	Completed	This project was included in the uniform formatting rules proposal.
(b) Method of notice to the court reporter. Consider whether to amend rule 8.405, which governs the filing of an appeal in juvenile cases, to remove or modify the requirement in subdivision (b)(1)(B) that the clerk notify the court reporter “by telephone and in writing” to prepare a transcript. This language may be outdated or inconsistent with other rules requiring notification by the clerk.	Transferred to facilitate staffing	Work on this project will transfer to the Appellate Advisory Committee; any rule amendment to be effective 1/1/2021.
(c) Clarify the filing date of an e-filed document. Amend rule 8.77 to clarify that an e-filed document received by the court before midnight that meets the filing requirements is deemed to have been filed that day. This project addresses an ambiguity in the rule that has resulted in inconsistent treatment of e-filed documents that are received after business hours.	Transferred to facilitate staffing	Work on this project will transfer to the Appellate Advisory Committee; any rule amendment to be effective 1/1/2021.

14.2. Modernize Appellate Court Rules (Cont'd)



Highlight: The proposal to amend rule 8.500 was approved by the Judicial Council to be effective January 1, 2020.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(d) Court of Appeal service copy of a petition for review. Amend rule 8.500(f)(1) to remove the requirement of a separate service copy of a petition for review. Once the Supreme Court accepts a petition for review for filing, the Court of Appeal automatically receives a filed/endorsed copy of the petition. The filing of the petition satisfies the service requirements for the Court of Appeal. This project is intended to eliminate an inefficiency.	Completed	The proposal was approved by the Judicial Council on September 24, 2019, and will go into effect January 2020.
(e) Amend rule 8.70 to clarify content. Consider amending rule 8.70 to clarify the subdivision (c)(2)(B) definition of a document and make subdivision (c)(2)(D) parallel with the rest of (c)(2).	Transferred to facilitate staffing	Work on this project will transfer to the Appellate Advisory Committee; any rule amendment to be effective 1/1/2022.

14.3. E-Filing and E-Readers for Incarcerated Individuals



Highlight: A pilot program is being developed in the Third Appellate District.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Research and explore options with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) regarding the use of e-readers by incarcerated individuals.	Transferred to the court	The possible use of e-readers will be explored after the e-delivery program described below is implemented.
(b) Potentially recommend to the Judicial Council the development of a pilot program with one prison and one court to test promising options.	Transferred to the court	The Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District is working with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to implement an e-delivery pilot program for specified inmate documents. ITAC's Appellate Liaison will provide updates on the project.

14.4. Appellate Document Management System



Highlight: Program implemented in the Third and Fifth Appellate Districts.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) Receive status updates and provide feedback to Judicial Council Information Technology (JCIT) staff on implementation of a new document management system in the appellate courts. The Third Appellate District and the Fifth Appellate District are piloting the initial implementation.</p>	<p>Transferred to facilitate staffing</p>	<p>Phase I of the DMS program went live in the Third and Fifth Appellate Districts on September 9, 2019. Deployment of the program to the Second and Fourth Appellate Districts are scheduled for January 6 and 20, 2020, respectively. Finally, training for the Supreme Court and the First and Sixth Appellate Districts are scheduled for February 24, 2020, with a tentative go-live in March/April 2020.</p> <p>This is a JCIT-managed program. ITAC's Appellate Liaison will provide updates on the project going forward.</p>

13.1. Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions



Highlight: Amendments to Code of Civil Procedure sec. 1010.6, Penal Code sec. 1203.01, and rules 2.251, 2.255, 2.257, and 2.540 of the California Rules of Court were circulated for public comment and approved by ITAC.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Proposals to amend statutes to support e-business. First, amend Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 to allow courts to recover actual costs of permissive electronic filing as they can with mandatory electronic filing, and clarify a provision for signatures made not under penalty of perjury. Second, amend Penal Code section 1203.01 to provide an alternative to mailing certain statements and reports.	In Progress	<p>Amendments to Code of Civil Procedure sec. 1010.6 and Penal Code sec. 1203.01 were circulated for public comment. Following the comment period, they were approved by ITAC and forwarded for consideration by the Judicial Council.</p> <p>The Judicial Council will vote on whether to sponsor the proposed legislation at its November meeting.</p>
(b) Proposals to amend the electronic filing and service rules to provide greater clarity and remove paper dependencies. First, amend rule 2.251 to clarify how notice of electronic service is to be given and provide standardized language for consent. Second, amend rule 2.257 to revise language on signatures of opposing parties, and make minor revisions consistent with Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6.	Completed	<p>Amendments to rules 2.251, 2.255, and 2.257 of the California Rules of Court were circulated for public comment. Following the comment period, they were approved by ITAC and forwarded for consideration by the Judicial Council.</p> <p>The Judicial Council approved the amendments at its September meeting.</p>
(c) Proposals to amend rules on remote access to electronic records. Make minor amendments to rule 2.540 to add more clarity and additional local government entities.	Completed	<p>Amendments to rule 2.540 of the California Rules of Court were submitted for public comment. Following the comment period, they were approved by ITAC and forwarded for consideration by the Judicial Council.</p> <p>The Judicial Council approved the amendments at its September meeting.</p>

13.2 Standards for Electronic Court Records as Data



Highlight: The CEAC Records Management Subcommittee has determined standards are not needed at this time.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) CEAC Records Management Subcommittee – in collaboration with the Data Exchange Workstream governance body – to develop standards if needed to allow trial courts to maintain electronic court records as data in their case management systems to be included in the Trial Court Records Manual with input from the Court Information Technology Managers Forum (CITMF). Rules & Policy Subcommittee to review.</p>	Completed	<p>The CEAC Records Management Subcommittee planned to add a section to the <i>Trial Court Records Manual</i> (TCRM), “if needed,” to provide standards for trial court records as data. The subcommittee has tentatively concluded such standards may not be necessary. The subcommittee will instead consider expanding and updating the general standards for electronic court records in the TCRM. The contemplated revisions, among other things, would acknowledge that electronic court records may include records in the form of data (for example, data submitted on fillable forms). This approach may be simpler, clearer, and less repetitive.</p>
<p>(b) Determine what statutory and rule changes may be required to authorize and implement the maintenance of records in the form of data; develop proposals to satisfy these changes.</p>	Completed	Not needed at this time.

13.3. Privacy Resource Guide



Highlight: The Privacy Resource Guide (PRG) has been published, ownership to be discussed at December ITAC meeting.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Continue development of a comprehensive statewide privacy resource guide addressing, among other things, electronic access to court records and data, to align with both state and federal requirements.	Completed	Completed 2018
Continue development of court privacy resource guide, outlining the key requirements, contents, and provisions for courts to address within its specific privacy policy.	Completed	Completed 2018
(a) Finalize and seek ITAC and JCTC approval of the guide to be published on the Judicial Resource Network (JRN).	Completed	The PRG was published to JRN in Q1 2019.
(b) Revise and update the Privacy Resource Guide with new privacy related laws, rules, forms, standards and best practices on an annual basis with a projected publication date after January 1, 2020 to allow for inclusion of published rules and law effective as of January 1, 2020.	Not Started	This task will be deferred to 2020.
(c) Monitor and analyze how the Privacy Resource Guide is being used for the calendar year 2019, and make recommendations for which Judicial Council entity will be responsible for maintaining and updating the Privacy Resource Guide beyond 2019.	In Progress	ITAC will meet in December to discuss ownership and ongoing maintenance of the guide.

Ongoing Project	
Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions	<i>Priority 2¹</i>
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Revise the California Rules of Court for the trial courts to support e-business. In collaboration with other advisory committees, as needed, review rules and statutes in a systematic manner and develop recommendations for amendments to align with modern business practices (e.g., eliminating paper dependencies).</p> <p><i>Proposals within the scope of this item include:</i></p> <p>(a) Amend the California Rules of Court to indicate that an electronic filing service provider must allow the party to proceed with an electronic filing even if the party does not consent to receive electronic service.</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-2020. Public comments. Standing item on the agenda.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Rules & Policy Subcommittee, Chair, Hon. Peter Siggins • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology, Office of Governmental Affairs, <p><i>Collaborations:</i> ITAC Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee; Appellate, Civil & Small Claims, Criminal Law, Traffic, Family and Juvenile Law, and Probate and Mental Health advisory committees; TCPJAC, CEAC and their Joint Technology, Rules, and Legislative Subcommittees</p>	

¹ For rules and forms proposals, the following priority levels apply: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives

1.1. Futures Commission Directive: Intelligent Chat (Phase 1)



Highlight: Draft Findings and Recommendations report completed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The core team has been formed. It includes: Executive Sponsor, Judge Michael Groch (San Diego); Technical Lead, John Yee, Judicial Council Information Technology (JCIT); Project Manager, Fati Farmanfarmaian, JCIT, along with JCIT technical resources.</p> <p>The full workstream team/membership has been formed. Executive Sponsor, Judge Groch, distributed a branch memorandum inviting nominations for workstream membership. The request called for those individuals with an interest and experience in intelligent chat and the technology to deliver court services. The request also set membership expectations and defined next steps. A final membership list was approved by the ITAC and JCTC Chairs.</p> <p>A workstream kickoff meeting was held on August 28 and included a full team orientation and educational demos of the intelligent chat technology.</p> <p>Ongoing meetings with the core team and full workstream are occurring 3-4 times per month and the workstream model is proving quite effective. The SharePoint site is robust and well populated with tools and data. An example is the collaborative user story sheet which forms the basis of the POC project selected by the team.</p> <p>Additionally, staff has prepared and the Judicial Council approved the submission of a budget change proposal requesting FY19-20 funding to support more formalized piloting.</p>
<p>(a) Identify and monitor a series of court proofs of concepts (POCs) to assess technology readiness for various cases (e.g., Court of Appeal, E-Filing, Self-Help).</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The group has completed its research and conversations into the innovation grant projects related to Intelligent Chat. The workstream will leverage the Innovation Grant Courts as POCs to inform the Findings and Recommendation report.</p>

1.1. Futures Commission Directive: Intelligent Chat (Phase 1)



Highlight: Draft Findings and Recommendations report completed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(b) Identify key performance indicators and benchmark before/after success.	Completed	The group has completed identifying key performance indicators and benchmarks. The workstream will include this deliverable in the Findings and Recommendation report.
(c) Capture learnings and report findings.	Completed	Completed the draft Findings and Recommendation report.
(d) Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results.	In Progress	<p>The workstream recommended and asked ITAC at its August 19 meeting to sunset the workstream and in lieu of a phase 2, to transition the effort to JCIT. ITAC approved that request on August 19.</p> <p>The workstream will recommend and ask JCTC the same thing at its December meeting.</p>
(e) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; annual agenda accordingly.	In Progress	<p>The workstream sought approval from ITAC to conclude phase 1 at their August 19 meeting, and to sunset the workstream. In lieu of a phase 2, the group will recommend a full transition to JCIT. ITAC approved that request on August 19.</p> <p>The workstream will recommend and ask JCTC the same thing at its December meeting.</p>

1.3. Futures Commission Directive: Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings (Phase 1)



Highlight: Findings and Recommendations report completed and approved.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Completed	<p>The core team has been formed. It includes: Executive Sponsor, Judge Samantha Jessner (Los Angeles); Court Lead, Jake Chatters (CEO, Placer); Project Manager, Alan Crouse (Deputy CEO, San Bernardino), along with support from the Judicial Council Information Technology Office (JCIT), Language Access Plan and VRI programs.</p> <p>The full initiative team/membership has been formed and approved. Eight courts, representing a diversity of size; participants from the VRI Workstream and remote video innovation grant, are a part of the team for this directive—specifically, the Superior Courts of Fresno, Los Angeles, Merced, Mono, Orange, Placer, Sacramento, and San Bernardino.</p> <p>The workstream held its kickoff and meets monthly. It has formed 4 subgroups/subcommittees and assigned a Chair/lead to each - Procedures, Evidence, Rules, and Technology. The subcommittees will develop initial recommendations on topics including but not limited to user technical requirements, evidence exchange, and presentation rules.</p> <p>Additionally, staff has prepared and the Judicial Council approved the submission of a budget change proposal requesting FY19-20 funding to support pilot deployments to the courts.</p>
Identify and conduct a mock remote video hearing using a web conferencing system for a specific hearing type (e.g., Civil – Small Claims) as a Proof of Concept (POC) in a court. Include one or more mock hearings of the selected hearing type.	Completed	The Core Team identified a number of recent studies by the Center for Legal and Court Technology, the National Association for Presiding Judges and Court Executive Officers, the State Justice Institute, and the Self-Represented Litigation Network. Thus, an initial set of challenges were explored and developed for further refinement and investigation by the team. (continued on next page)

1.3. Futures Commission Directive: Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings (Phase 1)



Highlight: Findings and Recommendations report completed and approved.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Identify and conduct a mock remote video hearing using a web conferencing system for a specific hearing type (e.g., Civil – Small Claims) as a Proof of Concept (POC) in a court. Include one or more mock hearings of the selected hearing type.	Completed	<p>The team progressed through an issue and topic log created from the results of the studies and crafted initial recommendations. These recommendations were used during mock proceedings.</p> <p>The team prepared scripts for the mock hearing proceedings and finalized the location and dates for the mock run.</p> <p>Mock hearings were held at the San Bernardino Superior Court February 15, 2019 via Web Cam – Blue Jeans Video Conference platform. Several participants attended in-person and participated remotely. Case types tested were Small Claims and Civil Harassment. Evidence sharing was tested via a SharePoint application.</p>
(a) Capture learnings and report findings.	Completed	The team completed their draft Findings and Recommendations report.
(b) Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results.	Completed	The team is recommending not initiating a phase 2 at this time. Instead, the group recommends that the rule and legislative proposal amendments outlined in the Findings and Recommendations report complete, as well as the innovation grant recipient courts who received grants in this area to finish their efforts, so that their efforts can be leveraged going forward.
(c) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; annual agenda accordingly.	Completed	The core team members presented their final report and recommendations to ITAC on August 19. The first five recommendations were approved. The report has been edited accordingly and was approved by JCTC in November. Any further workstream activity will not begin until those recommendations are completed.

December 2019 Progress Report

1.2. Futures Commission Directive: Voice-To-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom (Phase 1)



Highlight: Evaluation site nearly complete, testing to occur in December.

	Status	Description
Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Completed	<p>The core team has been formed. It includes: Executive Sponsor, Judge James Mize, (Sacramento); Business Lead, Heather Pettit, Judicial Council Information Technology (JCIT); and Project Manager, Rick Walery, (IT Director, San Mateo).</p> <p>In late August, a memorandum was distributed to the branch (appellate and trial court presiding judges, CEOs, and CIOs) seeking nominations for members, and including expectations and next steps. Final membership was approved in September, after which a kickoff meeting was held in October.</p> <p>The project team has been formed. The team includes members from a diverse set of courts and the Judicial Council. Expertise on the team ranges from multiple members with IT-related experience, a member who previously was a translator, and multiple members with first-hand knowledge or working with LEP customers at a court.</p> <p>Additionally, the budget change proposal for FY19-20 was approved to support a formal pilot to further test the technology.</p>
Define the standard of success and how to measure it as well as define the difference between translation and interpretation.	Completed	<p>The project team has been divided into 2 tracks – a Metrics track, and a Vendor track.</p> <p>The Metrics track has chosen a 1-5 scale, with definitions for each number, for both voice recognition/transcription, and text translation. These scores will be used when testing the solutions using prewritten scripts provided by workstream members.</p>
Determine how, or if, the work for this initiative aligns with existing work of the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force (LAPITF) and the work of The Legal Design Lab at the Stanford University Law School.	Completed	<p>The project leads attended presentations prepared by students in the Legal Design Lab at the Stanford University Law School. One of the presentations demonstrated text-based translation services, which leveraged Google’s translation API.</p> <p>The project team will continue to collaborate with both LAPITF and the Legal Design Lab at Stanford for further collaborative opportunities.</p>

December 2019 Progress Report

1.2. Futures Commission Directive: Voice-To-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom (Phase 1) (cont'd)



Highlight: Evaluation site nearly complete, testing to occur in December.

	Status	Description
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.	Completed	The workgroup received presentations from 4 vendors, demonstrating their offerings in this space. The group determined that there was not a current solution offered that fully met their needs, and opted to develop a demo site to test the APIs for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voice to text transcription • Text to text translation • Text to speech output
Pilot 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.	In Progress	The workgroup engaged with the Judicial Council to develop an evaluation site to test the APIs offered by 4 vendors. This site is live for testing, with improvements continuing to be developed. The workstream has assigned members to evaluate the vendor APIs using pre-developed scripts; testing to occur throughout December.
Capture learnings and draft a white paper report on the lessons learned, findings, and recommendations for next steps.	In Progress	Initial findings have been discussed by the group, with a full white paper to be drafted following the results of the tests in December.
Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results.	Not Started	
Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; amend the Annual Agenda accordingly.	Not Started	

Existing Project (Ending 2020)**1.2 Futures Commission Directive:
Voice-to-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom (Phase 1)*****Priority 1******Scope categories:
Possibilities, Prototypes***

Project Summary: The committee was directed by the Chief Justice to explore available technologies and make recommendations to the Judicial Council on the potential for a pilot project using voice-to-text language interpretation services at court filing and service counters and in self-help centers. 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, parallel with a pilot at one court for a specific use case, or to pilot at multiple courts for multiple use cases.

Key Objectives:

Included in Phase 1 of this project:

- (a) Pilot various voice-to-text language services in a lab environment, which will allow for exposure to more technologies and shorter learning cycles than if a specific technology is deployed at a court for piloting.
- (b) Capture learnings and draft a white paper report on the lessons learned, findings, and recommendations for next steps.
- (c) Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results.
- (d) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; amend the annual agenda accordingly.

Objectives met or resolved:

- *Define the standard of success and how to measure it as well as define the difference between translation and interpretation.*
- *Determine how, or if, the work for this initiative aligns with existing work of the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force (LAPITF) and the work of The Legal Design Lab at the Stanford University Law School.*
- *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.*

Origin of Project: Chief Justice directive from the Futures Commission recommendations report; assigned to ITAC in May 2017.

Status/Timeline: April 2020

Resources:

- *ITAC:* Sponsor: Hon. James Mize
- *Judicial Council Staffing:* Information Technology
- *Collaborations:* Court CIOs, pilot courts, Court Innovation Grant awardees

Existing Project (Ending 2021)	
Futures Commission Directive: Voice-to-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom (Phase 2)	<i>Priority 1</i>
	<i>Scope Category: Pilot</i>
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> The committee was directed by the Chief Justice to explore available technologies and make recommendations to the Judicial Council on the potential for a pilot project using voice-to-text language interpretation services at court filing and service counters and in self-help centers. Following the accepted results as outlined in the findings and recommendations report, a pilot program shall be developed to test the technology in one or more courts.</p> <p><i>Key Objectives:</i> Included in the Phase 2 of this project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Develop and issue a request for proposal (RFP) or other solicitation, as needed, to pilot real-time voice-to-text language interpretation mservices (b) Support implementation of the voice-to-text pilot program (including kickoff, court preparations, site visits, and deployment). (c) Review pilot findings; develop technical standards and guidelines to support utilization of the technology. (d) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 2. <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Chief Justice directive from the Futures Commission recommendations report.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> June 2021</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Sponsors: Hon. James Mize • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> Court CIOs, pilot courts, Innovation Grant awardees 	

4. E-Filing Strategy



Highlight: Workstream sunset on October 4, 2019 and program transferred to JCIT.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Finalize master agreements with the three (3) E-Filing Managers (EFMs) selected to provide services.	Completed	We have an executed master agreement with 2 of the 3 selected EFM Vendors, JTI and ImageSoft. Tyler Technologies declined to participate in the program. We continue to evaluate alternative solutions for the Trial Courts using Tyler so they may receive benefits similar to those being provided by the other 2 EFM vendors.
(b) Develop the E-Filing Service Provider (EFSP) selection/certification process.	Transferred	We will be scheduling meetings with the 2 EFMs vendors (ImageSoft & JTI) and the EFSP community to define the certification process.
(c) Monitor the progress of EFSP accessibility compliance.	Transferred	Recently JCIT reached out again to the 58 trial courts to determine compliance with AB 103. Currently 25 of the 58 trial courts provide electronic filing and electronic document service either directly, through vendor services, or a combination of vendor and in-house services. JCIT identified over 100 EFSPs active in the state of which all but 9 are compliant with the accessibility guidelines from AB 103.
(d) Develop the roadmap for an e-filing deployment strategy, approach, and branch solutions/alternatives.	Transferred	The E-Filing program continues to provide updates and guidance to CIOs and most recently at the small court summit. The roadmap needs to be adjusted due to Tyler's opting out of the statewide program and will need to be completed in partnership with selected EFM vendors.
(e) Report on the plan for implementation of the approved NIEM/ECF standards, including effective date, per direction of the Judicial Council at its June 24, 2016 meeting.	Transferred	The Los Angeles Superior Courts recently implemented a JTI E-Filing solution for Civil and Small Claims cases. This solution was developed based on the requirements and standards for the statewide program. This solution will effectively become the baseline California E-Filing Standard. The standard will evolve as additional courts and case-types are included in the program.
(f) Consult and report on the implementation of the court cost recovery fee that will support the statewide e-filing program.	Transferred	We have approval for collection of the fee and the JCC Finance department has reviewed the plan and can account for the funds we will be receiving.
(g) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support of the ongoing e-filing program being funded through the court cost-recovery fee.	Transferred	Two of the three JCIT staff positions for the program have been filled. We are currently recruiting the 3 rd position and hope to fill by end of the year.
(h) At the completion of these objectives and with the approval of the JCTC, formally sunset the workstream.	Completed	ITAC sunset the workstream at its October 4, 2019, meeting.

December 2019 Progress Report

5. Identity and Access Management Strategy



Highlight: Policy track recommendations reviewed at ITAC and CITMF.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Develop and issue an RFP for a statewide identity management service/provider; identify and select.	Completed	Microsoft Azure AD Identity Service acquired under a Leveraged Procurement Agreement (LPA), County of Riverside RFQ #PUARC-1518, Microsoft Master Agreement Number 01E73970.
(a) Develop the roadmap for a branch identity management strategy and approach.	In Progress	Roadmap recommendations are being drafted. Los Angeles will be the first court to deploy applications (Attorney Portal and Remote Hearings Portal) using the Branchwide Identity Management service.
(b) Determine policies and processes for identity management (including proofing and access management).	In Progress	Policy track recommendations presented at ITAC and at CITMF for feedback. Scheduled for presentation at CEAC/TCPJAC at the January business meeting.
(c) Ensure linkage and alignment with other branchwide initiatives such as E-Filing, SRL Portal, Next Generation Hosting, CMS Migration and Development.	In Progress	Sponsors or project managers for the aligned initiatives are members of the workstream.
(d) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	In Progress	JCIT staff are participating in the pilot at Los Angeles Superior Court and are on the workstream.
(e) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.	In Progress	Feedback requested from ITAC on draft Policy track recommendations.

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
5. Identity and Access Management Strategy (Phase 2)	Priority 1 Scope category(ies): Possibilities, Prototypes, Piloting, Policies/ Procurement
<p>Project Summary: Develop a branch identity management strategy.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Develop the roadmap for a branch identity management strategy and approach. (b) Determine policies and processes for identity management (including proofing and access management). (c) Ensure linkage and alignment with other branchwide initiatives such as E-Filing, SRL Portal, Next Generation Hosting, CMS Migration and Deployment. (d) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate. (e) Recommend changes to Rules of Court as needed and work with the Rules and Policies Subcommittee to draft them. (f) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream. <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Phase 1: Develop and issue an RFP for a statewide identity management service/provider; identify and select (completed 2018).</i> <p>Origin of Project: Previously, this was a sub-task of the e-filing initiative. The item was promoted to its own annual agenda initiative given its many touchpoints with other workstreams (including Self-Represented Litigants E-Services, Next-Generation Hosting, E-filing Strategy, etc.). Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-2018 and 2019-2020 (pending).</p> <p>Status/Timeline: June 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream: Sponsor: Mr. Snorri Ogata • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services, Branch Accounting and Procurement • <i>Collaborations:</i> CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee 	

December 2019 Progress Report

7. IT Community Development



Highlight: Final Recommendations are being documented.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Initiate new workstream: Identify sponsor and leads; form workstream membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Completed	Orientation and introduction meeting held on July 30, 2018 for members and workstream track leads to review the three workstream tracks (Resources, Education, Tools) and related key objectives. Next steps are for each track to solicit additional workstream participants as needed based on the area of focus and kick off the individual tracks.
(a) Survey the courts to identify (i) their interest in exploring opportunities to share key technical resources and (ii) IT leadership and resource development needs and priorities; report findings.	Completed	(i) CEO survey complete (ii) IT leadership assessment complete, 3 courses delivered based on identified priorities
(b) Assess court CEO/CIO interest in an IT peer consulting program and develop recommendations.	Completed	CEO survey complete with CIO input.
(c) Assess needs and make recommendations for expanded opportunities for technology-related education for judicial officers, CEOs, CIOs, and court staff. Consult with CJER for educational planning considerations.	In Progress	Judicial focus group/assessment complete CEO and Operations focus groups in progress. Documenting recommendations in progress.
(d) Identify, prioritize, and report on collaboration needs and tools for use within the branch.	In Progress	Needs assessment conducted. Documenting recommendations in progress.
(e) Evaluate and prioritized possible technologies to improve advisory body and workstream meeting administration; pilot recommended solutions with the committee.	Completed	Research conducted.
(f) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, as appropriate.	Completed	Reviewed workstream recommendation summary with JCIT leadership and staff.

December 2019 Progress Report

7. IT Community Development



Highlight: Final Recommendations are being documented.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(g) Provide recommendations for Phase 2 based on findings and including updated Tactical Plan for Technology.	In Progress	Future phasing considerations and next steps be considered by ITAC.
(h) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; amend the annual agenda accordingly.	Not Started	Future phasing considerations and next steps be considered by ITAC.

New Workstream (Ending 2019)	
7. IT Community Development	<i>Priority 1</i>
	<i>Scope category(ies): Possibilities</i>
<p>Project Summary: Expand collaboration and professional development within the branch IT community.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, as appropriate. (b) Provide recommendations for next steps based on findings. (c) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1. <p>Objectives Met or Resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Survey the courts to identify (i) their interest in exploring opportunities to share key technical resources and (ii) IT leadership and resource development needs and priorities; report findings.</i> • <i>Assess court CEO/CIO interest in an IT peer consulting program and develop recommendations.</i> • <i>Assess needs and make recommendations for expanded opportunities for technology-related education for judicial officers, CEOs, CIOs, and court staff. Consult with CJER for educational planning considerations.</i> • <i>Identify, prioritize, and report on collaboration needs and tools for use within the branch.</i> • <i>Evaluate and prioritize possible technologies to improve advisory body and workstream meeting administration; pilot recommended solutions with the committee.</i> <p>Origin of Project: Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-2018 and 2019-2020.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: April 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC: Workstream, Sponsor: Ms. Jeannette Vannoy</i> • <i>Judicial Council Staffing: Information Technology</i> • <i>Collaborations: CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee</i> 	

8.2. Digital Evidence: Assessment (Phase 2)



Highlight: Team Leads identified, orientation held. Kickoff being scheduled for Dec/Jan.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Investigate and draft proposed best practices, policies, and standards for transmitting, accepting, storing, and protecting digital evidence, and circulate recommendations to the branch for input and feedback.	Not Started	Workstream orientation, knowledge transfer, and kickoff in planning
(b) Research and recommend existing technology and services that would support transmission, acceptance, storage, and protection of digital evidence.	In progress	Potential vendors/technologies identified. Partners for potential pilots are in agreement.
(c) Develop and propose changes to evidence-based rules of court and statutes in collaboration with the Rules and Policy Subcommittee	Not Started	
(d) Review the Trial Court Records Manual for any needed updates to reflect revisions of rules and statutes, and any proposed best practices, policies and standards	Not Started	
(e) Evaluate potential pilots for receiving, storing, and presenting digital evidence. Execute such pilots as they are feasible.	In progress	Pilot in Superior Court of Orange County is in progress.
(f) Report findings to ITAC and JCTC, providing recommendations on next steps, and formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
8.2. Digital Evidence: Management (Phase 2)	Priority 1¹
Scope category(ies): Policies; Pilot	
<p>Project Summary: Investigate and draft technology best practices, standards, and policies, and propose changes to evidence-based rules and statutes.</p> <p>Key Objectives: Based on findings from Phase 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Investigate and draft proposed best practices, policies, and standards for transmitting, accepting, storing, and protecting digital evidence, and circulate recommendations to the branch for input and feedback. (b) Research and recommend existing technology and services that would support transmission, acceptance, storage, and protection of digital evidence. (c) Develop and propose changes to evidence-based rules of court and statutes in collaboration with the Rules and Policy Subcommittee. (d) Review the Trial Court Records Manual for any needed updates to reflect revisions of rules and statutes, and any proposed best practices, policies and standards. (e) Evaluate potential pilots for receiving, storing, and presenting digital evidence. Execute such pilots as they are feasible. (f) At the completion of these objectives, present findings to and seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream. <p>Origin of Project: Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-18 and 2019-2020.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: Hon. Kimberly Menninger • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services • <i>Collaborations:</i> CEAC, TCPJAC, ITAC Rules and Policy Subcommittee, and other advisory bodies as needed 	

¹ For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done).

9. Data Analytics : Assess and Report (Phase 1)



Highlight: Contracted with Gartner to build a branch data governance framework; launch pilot projects with 19-20 BCP funding; seek 20-21 BCP funding for permanent resources for data analytics

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Identify, evaluate and prioritize possible policies, processes, and technologies to help the branch utilize data analytics to improve business effectiveness.	In Progress	Gartner work to build data governance framework kicked off August 29, 2019.
(b) Develop appropriate governance recommendations at the local court and branch level.	In Progress	Gartner work to build data governance framework kicked off August 29, 2019.
(c) Assess and report priorities for data collection.	In Progress	This has been initiated as part of the Gartner work as well as the pilot programs.
(d) Identify and evaluate possible data analytical tools and templates.	In Progress	The branch has procured a cloud data warehouse solution and is in the process of procuring an ETL (Extract, Load, Transform) tool. Two different types of data visualization tools are being tested.
(e) Identify whether new or amended proposed rules of court and/or statutes are needed and advise the Rules and Policy Subcommittee for follow up.	In Progress	This will be more fully fleshed out once other objectives are complete.
(f) Based on findings and recommendations, scope and initiate Phase 2 of the workstream	Not Started	
(g) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval from ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
9. Data Analytics: Assess and Report	<i>Priority 1</i>
	<i>Scope categories: Possibilities; Pilot; Policies/Procurement</i>
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Scope and recommend a data analytics strategy for the branch.</p> <p><i>Key Objectives:</i></p> <p>Scope and recommend a data analytics strategy for the branch.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Identify, evaluate and prioritize possible policies, processes, and technologies to help the branch utilize data analytics to improve business effectiveness. (b) Develop appropriate governance recommendations at the local court and branch level. (c) Assess and report priorities for data collection. (d) Identify and evaluate possible data analytical tools and templates. (e) Identify whether new or amended rules of court and/or statutes are needed and advise the Rules & Policy Subcommittee for follow up. (f) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream. <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Topic resulted from a brainstorm of ideas conducted with ITAC and the court CIOs in late 2017; Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-2020.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> December 2020</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsors: Hon. Tara Desautels, Mr. David Yamasaki • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Budget Services, Criminal Justice Services, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) Program, Center for Families, Children, and the Courts, Legal Services • <i>Collaborations:</i> CIOs, CEAC, TCPJAC, appellate group representation 	

10 Disaster Recovery (DR) Initial Pilot and Knowledge Sharing (Phase 2)



Highlight: Vendor engagement complete; pilot court in pilot phase.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<i>Leveraging the innovation grant awarded to the Superior Court of Monterey County for a Cloud DR Pilot Program, the workstream will:</i>		
(a) Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Completed	Roster approved on February 28, 2019. Workstream kickoff held on March 29, 2019. Biweekly meetings scheduled.
(b) Recommend a list of critical technology services that make business sense for cloud-based recovery adoption.	In Progress	The Superior Court of Monterey County has engaged with the selected vendor, and is in the process of conducting discovery and assessments.
(c) Establish a cloud DR master agreement with a short list of cloud service providers for judicial branch entities/courts to leverage.	Completed	Agreement completed November 20, 2018, with Infiniti Consulting, Inc.
(d) Publish design solution templates from judicial branch entities (JBEs) that implement technologies and solutions from vendors selected in the cloud DR master agreement.	In Progress	
(e) Host knowledge-sharing sessions for interested JBEs (including tools to estimate cost for deploying recovery solution using a particular cloud service provider; and Monterey solution case study).	In Progress	One session - a proposal conference - held as part of the RFP for the Cloud-Based Disaster Recovery project, on May 31, 2018. Second Session – Discovery and solution recommendations for Monterey - presented on September 20th, 2019. After successful CMS disaster recovery testing additional avenues for knowledge sharing will be made available to the judicial branch technology community.
(f) Evaluate the need for a BCP to fund a pilot group of courts interested in implementing cloud-based DR for critical technology services (see (a))	Not Started	
(g) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	Not Started	
(h) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)**10. Disaster Recovery (DR) Initial Pilot and Knowledge Sharing (Phase 2)***Priority 1**Scope category(ies):**Pilot*

Project Summary: Implement branch disaster recovery (DR) pilot program, master agreement, knowledge-sharing; evaluate need for BCP.

Key Objectives:

Leveraging the innovation grant awarded to the Superior Court of Monterey County for a Cloud DR Pilot Program, the workstream will:

- (a) Recommend a list of critical technology services that make business sense for cloud-based recovery adoption.
- (b) Publish disaster recovery to cloud (DR2C) roadmap for judicial branch entities (JBEs) that includes design solution templates from Monterey and other participant courts. ~~Publish design solution templates from judicial branch entities (JBEs) that implement technologies and solutions from vendors selected in the cloud DR master agreement.~~
- (c) Host knowledge-sharing sessions for interested JBEs (including tools to estimate cost for deploying recovery solution using a particular cloud service provider; and Monterey solution case study).
- (d) Evaluate the need for a BCP to fund a pilot group of courts interested in implementing cloud-based DR for critical technology services (see (a)).
- (e) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.
- (f) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.

Objectives Met or Resolved:

- *Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).*
- *Establish a cloud DR master agreement with a short list of cloud service providers for judicial branch entities/courts to leverage.*

Origin of Project: Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-2018 and 2019-2020 (pending); next phase of project following framework adoption.

Status/Timeline: June 2020

Resources:

- *ITAC:* Workstream, Sponsor: Mr. Paras Gupta
- *Judicial Council Staffing:* Information Technology
- *Collaborations:* Pilot courts; CEAC, CITMF

11 Online Dispute Resolution (ODR): Assessment



Highlight: Solicitation for workstream membership will occur shortly.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	In Progress	Executive Sponsor is Hon. Julie R. Culver; solicitation drafted
(b) Identify and evaluate available ODR technologies.	Not Started	
(c) Review findings from existing court-offered ODR programs.	Not Started	
(d) Evaluate and describe scenarios where ODR might be beneficially deployed in the judicial branch.	Not Started	
(e) <i>[Proposed new objective]</i> Survey and document best practices in evaluating feasibility and program design to maximize access to justice.	Not Started	
(f) Review rules and statutes to identify areas where possible amendments will be needed.	Not Started	
(g) Report findings and recommendations to ITAC.	Not Started	
(h) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
11. Online Dispute Resolution (ODR): Assessment	<i>Priority 2¹</i>
	<i>Scope category(ies): Possibilities</i>
<p>Project Summary: Identify and evaluate available ODR technologies and potential scenarios in which ODR might benefit the judicial branch and its court users.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s). (b) Identify and evaluate available ODR technologies. (c) Review findings from existing court-offered ODR programs. (d) Evaluate and describe scenarios where ODR might be beneficially deployed in the judicial branch. (e) <i>[Proposed new objective]</i> Survey and document best practices in evaluating feasibility and program design to maximize access to justice. (f) Review rules and statutes to identify areas where possible amendments will be needed. (g) Report findings and recommendations to ITAC. (h) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream. <p>Origin of Project: Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-2020</p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream: Sponsor: Hon. Julie Culver • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services • <i>Collaborations:</i> CEAC; TCPJAC; Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee 	

¹ For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done).

12 Branchwide Information Security Roadmap



Highlight: Kickoff held on October 7, 2019; workstream dividing into tracks.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Completed	The membership roster was approved on September 9, 2019, and the kickoff meeting held on October 7, 2019.
(b) Define methods and activities for expanding branch information security capabilities.	In Progress	Members have asked to be included in sub-tracks that support the primary objectives.
(c) Create an overarching strategy for educating courts on information security end user education, risk management, and incident response.	In Progress	Sub-track leads have been identified for End User Education, Risk Management and Incident Response
(d) Identify resources to assist the courts in developing policies and procedures based on the Judicial Branch Information Systems Controls Framework.	In Progress	Resources like the Outreach Program, JRN Information Security web pages have been identified. Development of plans to assist courts with utilizing the Controls Framework with prioritization and adoption.
(e) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream	Not Started	

Continuing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
12. Branchwide Information Security Roadmap	<i>Priority 1</i>
	<i>Scope category(ies): Possibilities, Policies</i>
<p>Project Summary: Develop a defined structure of activities that will collectively enhance the judicial branch information security posture.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Define methods and activities for expanding branch information security capabilities. (b) Create an overarching strategy for educating courts on information security end user education, risk management, and incident response. (c) Identify resources to assist the courts in developing policies and procedures based on the Judicial Branch Information Systems Controls Framework. (d) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream. <p>Objectives Met or Resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).</i> <p>Origin of Project: Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-2020</p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: Brian Cotta • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> CITMF 	

New Workstream (Ending 2020)	
Tactical Plan for Technology Update	<i>Priority 1</i>
	<i>Scope category: Policies</i>
<p>Project Summary: Update <i>Tactical Plan for Technology</i> for effective date 2021-2022.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Initiate workstream, including formation of membership and conduct orientation/kickoff meeting. (b) Review, gather input, and update the <i>Tactical Plan for Technology</i>. (c) Circulate the draft plan for branch and public comment; revise as needed. (d) Finalize, and seek approval by the JCTC and the Judicial Council; thereafter, formally sunset the workstream. <p>Origin of Project: Specific charge of ITAC per Rule 10.53 (b)(8).</p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: Hon. Sheila Hanson • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> Broad input from the branch and the public. 	