



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2020 ITAC Annual Agenda Branch CIO Feedback Report

This year, as an outcome of ITAC's recent workstream improvement discussions, the committee invited branch Court Information Officers (CIOs) to apply their technology project expertise to reviewing and refining items on the proposed 2020 Annual Agenda.

Representatives from 16 courts – including ITAC CIO members – participated in a full-day meeting in Sacramento on December 13, 2019 to review four (4) new and early stage Annual Agenda topics:

1. Digital Evidence (not yet kicked off)
2. Online Dispute Resolution (not yet kicked off)
3. Voice-to-Text Phase 2 (new)
4. Remote Video Appearances in Criminal Proceedings (new)

The following pages includes a summary of the CIO discussion related to each item, followed by a marked-up version of its Annual Agenda entry based on the suggestions and further consultation with the ITAC Chairs. Each item discussion summary includes:

- A brief scope analysis
- A description of the more substantive proposed revisions
- A list of the types of members needed for the effort
- An indication of how soon the assembled courts might engage in the proposed activity locally
- Courts that expressed an interest in some level of participation

Separately, a complete version of the proposed 2020 Annual Agenda is provided, including the four updated topics, with mark-ups removed.

Notes from 12/13 Branch CIOs' review of ITAC 2020 Annual Agenda

Project:	Digital Evidence: Best Practices, Rules and Pilot Evaluation
<p>Summary: By October 2020, develop recommendations and evaluate pilots for the transmission, acceptance, storage, presentation, and protection of digital evidence, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best practices, policies, and standards • Available technology and services • Rules of court, statutes, and Trial Court Records Manual updates 	
Evaluation	
<p>Scope analysis and reasoning: Phase 1 of the workstream conducted a survey of courts and justice partners on the current state of digital evidence handling. Based on the results, the workstream outlined potential areas for development of best practices. However, the CIOs felt that best practices and standards should be based on findings from executed pilots. It may be possible to leverage findings from existing pilots (e.g., Placer Remote Video innovation grant; local pilot in Orange; Texas) and other current practices in the courts. It is also recommended that this Phase 2 workstream include defining the framework for developing, executing and evaluating possible future pilots involving digital evidence.</p> <p>Suggested changes to the agenda item: The substantive suggested edits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revising objective (a) re: best practices to clarify the focus on existing pilots and other current practices in the courts. • Removing objective (d) re: updating the Trial Court Records Manual, pending development of best practices and amendment of any rules and legislation. • Clarify objective (e) re: developing a framework for successful possible future pilots to include use case scenarios and success criteria. Remove pilot execution, as this would not be feasible within the timeframe, nor within currently available funding or staffing levels. <p>Additional non-technical edits are included for clarity. This scope can be concluded within the estimated timeframe for this workstream.</p> <p>Types of participants needed: Judicial officers (experience/policy) Finance (ROI, cost/benefit) Justice partners Legal Services IT</p> <p>How soon might your court be looking at this: 0-3 years: 3 courts 3-5 years: 9 courts Unsure: 5 courts</p> <p>Specific interest: Placer, Santa Clara</p>	

Notes from 12/13 Branch CIOs' review of ITAC 2020 Annual Agenda

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
8.2. Digital Evidence: Management (Phase 2) Rules, Technology and Pilot Evaluation	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approved September 25, 2019	<i>Scope category(ies): Policies; Pilot</i>
<p>Project Summary: Investigate and draft technology best practices, standards, and policies. Consider existing pilots and court practices along with available technology pertaining to use of digital evidence; propose changes to evidence-based rules and statutes related to digital evidence; develop a framework for successful possible future pilots.</p> <p>Key Objectives: Based on findings from Phase 1 and evaluation of existing local pilots and other court practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Investigate and draft proposed report on existing local pilots and court practices, including 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 available 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 related to digital evidence 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. Develop a framework for successful possible future pilots, including use case scenarios, costs and benefits, and success criteria. pilots for receiving, storing, and presenting digital evidence. Execute such pilots as they are feasible. (f) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream. <p>Origin of Project: Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-18 and 2019-20.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITAC: Workstream, Sponsor: Hon. Kimberly Menninger • Judicial Council Staffing: Information Technology, Legal Services • Collaborations: CEAC, TCPJAC, ITAC Rules and Policy Subcommittee, and other advisory bodies as needed 	

Notes from 12/13 Branch CIOs' review of ITAC 2020 Annual Agenda

Project:	Online Dispute Resolution Study
Summary: By October 2020, research existing ODR solutions, describe case type scenarios, identify policy considerations, and document best practices for evaluating program feasibility and program design.	
Evaluation	
<p>Scope analysis and reasoning: This phase of the workstream is appropriately scoped as <i>research</i>. In the current state, whether– and how – to deploy Online Dispute Resolution solutions is a local court decision. The workstream will evaluate available technologies, operating models, rules and legislation, and will define use case scenarios for ODR. This study phase will inform any next steps, including the need for any statewide effort.</p> <p>Suggested changes to the agenda item: There were no substantive changes suggested, simply a technical clarification that “scenarios” are “use case scenarios.”</p> <p>Types of participants needed: Civil & Small Claims ADR Subcommittee Family & Juvenile Law Advisory Committee Judges Operations IT</p> <p>How soon might your court be looking at this: 0-3 years: 7 (several courts have acquired or are in the process of acquiring solution) 3-5 years: 5 courts Unknown: 3 courts</p> <p>Specific interest: Los Angeles, Monterey, San Bernardino, San Luis Obispo</p>	

Notes from 12/13 Branch CIOs' review of ITAC 2020 Annual Agenda

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
11. Online Dispute Resolution (ODR): Research	<i>Priority 2¹</i>
	<i>Scope category(ies):</i> Possibilities
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Identify and evaluate available ODR technologies and potential scenarios in which ODR might benefit the judicial branch and its court users.</p> <p><i>Key Objectives:</i></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 use case scenarios where ODR might be beneficially deployed in the judicial branch. (e) 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, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream. <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-20</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> December 2020</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></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).

Notes from 12/13 Branch CIOs' review of ITAC 2020 Annual Agenda

Project:	Voice-to-Text - Standards and Guidelines
Summary: By April 2021 conduct a pilot to determine the technical standards and usage guidelines for real-time voice-to-text language interpretation at filing counters and self-help centers.	
Evaluation	
<p>Scope analysis and reasoning: Since the current workstream is well underway to complete lab testing of several solutions, and resources may be available soon, it is feasible to amend the workstream's scope to include deployment and evaluation of a pilot, instead of creating a new (Phase 2) workstream:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrow to one or two solutions • Select tools and devices • Define success criteria • Deploy pilot with volunteer courts, possibly in collaboration with Stanford students • Evaluate • Report back <p>Incorporating the pilot into the current phase will take advantage of the availability of staff and pilot program funds awarded in Fiscal Year 2019-2020, as well as leverage the workstream's familiarity with the technology and the test environment set up to evaluate various solutions.</p> <p>Suggested changes to the agenda item: The suggested changes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding two objectives that represent an expansion of the scope to execute a pilot program as described in the 2019-2020 Budget Change Proposal (new item (c)) and a possible collaboration with Stanford Legal Design Lab (new item (b)) to assist with the design, deployment and evaluation of the proposed pilot program; • In objective (d), adding "use cases" and "usage guidelines" as critical areas to include in the white paper; and • Updating the end date to account for the extended scope. <p>Types of participants needed: Workstream is already in flight, no additional members necessary Pilot courts Pilot program administration (possibly existing Futures Commission BCP)</p> <p>How soon might your court be looking at this: 0–3 years: 8 courts 3–5 years: 6 courts Unknown: 1 court</p> <p>Specific interest: Alameda, Mariposa, Modoc, Placer, Sonoma</p>	

Notes from 12/13 Branch CIOs' review of ITAC 2020 Annual Agenda

Existing Project (Ending 2020)	
1.2 Futures Commission Directive: Voice-to-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom (Phase 1)	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approved October 15, 2018	<i>Scope category(ies): Possibilities, Prototypes-Pilot</i>
<p>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.</p> <p>Key Objectives: Included in Phase 1 of this project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Pilot Test 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. Identify and pursue any possible pilot collaborations with the Legal Design Lab at the Stanford University Law School. Support implementation of a voice-to-text pilot program (including kickoff, court preparations, site visits, and deployment). Capture learnings and draft a white paper report on the lessons learned, findings, use cases, usage guidelines, and recommendations for next steps. Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results. At the completion of these directives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from ITAC and the, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council to conclude and formally sunset the workstream. Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; amend the annual agenda accordingly. <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Set up a technical lab environment at the Judicial Council or a local court to test the technical recommendations of the Futures Commission for this initiative. <p>Origin of Project: Chief Justice directive from the Futures Commission recommendations report; assigned to ITAC in May 2017.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: April 2019 December 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ITAC: Sponsor: Hon. James Mize Judicial Council Staffing: Information Technology Collaborations: Court CIOs, pilot courts, Court Innovation Grant awardees 	

Notes from 12/13 Branch CIOs' review of ITAC 2020 Annual Agenda

Project:	Research Rules, Legislation and Technical Considerations for Remote Video Appearances in Criminal Proceedings
<p>Summary: By October 2020, identify rules and legislation that may need drafting or revision, and recommend any policies that would allow and facilitate remote video appearances in criminal proceedings. Review technical recommendations for remote video in non-criminal hearings to determine any variances for criminal proceedings.</p>	
<p>Evaluation</p>	
<p>Background: This is a new annual agenda item based on a directive made by the Judicial Council Technology Committee to study the findings of the Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Proceedings workstream and examine how remote video appearances might apply in criminal proceedings. The work under the initial scope will continue as planned; and a new workstream effort will be initiated to consider the additional case types.</p> <p>Scope analysis and reasoning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define and prioritize use case scenarios: Some may be simple – traffic, DUI, probation – and others highly complex. • Review rules and statutes to determine if any revisions/additions may be needed to facilitate implementation. • Workstream should review output from VRI/Digital Evidence/Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Proceedings workstreams; update technical implementation guidelines if variance is determined. <p>Suggested changes to the proposed agenda item: This is a new item for the agenda; there was no prior version presented previously.</p> <p>Types of participants needed: Attorneys Judges IT Operations/multiple inputs (in court and outside) Advisory Committees</p> <p>How soon might your court be looking at this: 0-3 years: 6 courts 3-5 years: 6 courts Unknown: 3 courts</p> <p>Specific interest: Inyo, Los Angeles, Placer, San Bernardino</p>	

Notes from 12/13 Branch CIOs' review of ITAC 2020 Annual Agenda

New Workstream (End 2020)	
Remote Video Appearances in Criminal Proceedings: Research	Priority 2
	Scope category(ies): Possibilities
<p>Project Summary: Define and prioritize use cases for remote video appearances in criminal proceedings.</p> <p>Key Objectives: Reviewing outcomes of Video Remote Interpreting pilot and Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings workstream:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Validate, refine, and amend, if necessary, the technical standards applicable to criminal proceedings. (b) Identify whether new or amended rules of court and statutes are needed and advise the Rules & Policy Subcommittee for follow up. (c) Define and prioritize use case scenarios and define success criteria for a pilot. (d) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to and seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream. <p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council Technology Committee; <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-20</i></p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: TBD • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Criminal Justice Services • <i>Collaborations:</i> Family & Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Criminal Law Advisory Committee, Traffic Advisory Committee 	

Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

Annual Agenda¹—2020

Approved by Judicial Council Technology Committee: _____

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Superior Court of California, County of Orange
Lead Staff:	Mr. Richard Blalock, Senior Business Systems Analyst, Judicial Council, Information Technology
Committee's Charge/Membership: <p>Rule 10.53. Information Technology Advisory Committee of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Information Technology Advisory Committee. The committee makes recommendations to the council for improving the administration of justice through the use of technology and for fostering cooperative endeavors to resolve common technological issues with other stakeholders in the justice system. The committee promotes, coordinates, and acts as executive sponsor for projects and initiatives that apply technology to the work of the courts.</p> <p>Rule 10.53. Information Technology Advisory Committee sets forth additional duties of the committee.</p> <p>The ITAC currently has 24 members. The ITAC website provides the composition of the committee.</p> Subcommittees²: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rules & Policy Subcommittee<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Trial court rules and statutes revisions○ Standards for electronic court records as data• Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee (JATS) [suspended status for 2020]• Joint Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Remote Video Appearances	

¹ The annual agenda outlines the work a committee will focus on in the coming year and identifies areas of collaboration with other advisory bodies and the Judicial Council staff resources

² California Rules of Court, rule 10.30 (c) allows an advisory body to form subgroups, composed entirely of current members of the advisory body, to carry out the body's duties, subject to available resources, with the approval of its oversight committee

All proposed projects for the year are included on the Annual Agenda, as follows:

Futures Commission Directives

Two directives are in the last stages of the approval process:

- **Intelligent Chat (Phase 1) (continued):** Explore and make recommendations to the Judicial Council on the potential for a pilot project using intelligent chat technology to provide information and self-help services. (Draft report pending committee approvals)
- **Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings (Phase 1) (continued):** Consider, for presentation to the Judicial Council, the feasibility of and resource requirements for developing and implementing a pilot to allow remote appearances by parties, counsel, and witnesses for most noncriminal court proceedings. (Update to Judicial Council pending)

One directive is ongoing:

- **Voice-to-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom (continued):** Explore available technologies and make recommendations to the Judicial Council on the potential for a pilot project using voice-to-text language interpretation at service counters and in self-help centers.

Workstreams

- **Tactical Plan for Technology Update (new):** Update the *Tactical Plan for Technology* for effective date 2021-2022.
- **Identity and Access Management Strategy (continued):** Develop a branch identity management strategy.
- **IT Community Development (continued):** Expand collaboration and professional development within the branch IT community.
- **Digital Evidence: Rules, Technology and Pilot Evaluation (continued):** Investigate and draft technology best practices, standards, and policies, and propose changes to evidence-based rules and statutes.
- **Data Analytics: Assessment and Report (continued):** Scope and recommend a data analytics strategy for the branch.
- **Disaster Recovery Initial Pilot and Knowledge Sharing (continued):** Implement branch disaster recovery pilot program, master agreement, knowledge-sharing; evaluate need for BCP.
- **Online Dispute Resolution (ODR): Research (continued):** Identify and evaluate available ODR technologies and potential scenarios in which ODR might benefit the judicial branch and its court users.
- **Branchwide Information Security Roadmap (continued):** Develop a defined structure of activities that will collectively enhance the judicial branch information security posture.
- **Remote Video Appearances in Criminal Proceedings: Research (new):** Review existing technical standards, rules, and statutes; define and prioritize use cases for remote video appearances in criminal proceedings.

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

Existing Project (Ending 2020)	
<p>1.1 Futures Commission Directive: Intelligent Chat for Self-Help Services</p>	<i>Priority 1</i>
<p>Workstream membership approved July 9, 2018</p>	<i>Scope category(ies): Policy</i>
<p>Project Summary: The committee was directed by the Chief Justice to explore and make recommendations to the Judicial Council on the potential for a pilot project using intelligent chat technology to provide information and self-help services.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <p>(a) Present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from the JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.</p> <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Identify and monitor a series of court proofs of concepts (POCs) to assess technology readiness for various use cases (e.g. Court of Appeal, e-filing, self-help).</i> • <i>Identify key performance indicators and benchmark before/after success.</i> • <i>Capture learnings and report findings.</i> <p>Origin of Project: Chief Justice directive from the Futures Commission recommendations report; assigned to ITAC in May 2017.</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 	

Existing Project (Ending 2020)	
1.2 Futures Commission Directive: Voice-to-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom	<i>Priority 1³</i>
Workstream membership approved October 15, 2018	Scope category(ies): Possibilities, Pilot
<p>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 services at court filing and service counters and in self-help centers. To leverage current BCP funding, a pilot program will be implemented as a part of this workstream.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Test 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) Identify and pursue any possible pilot collaborations with the Legal Design Lab at the Stanford University Law School. (c) Support implementation of a voice-to-text pilot program (including kickoff, court preparations, site visits, and deployment). (d) Capture learnings and draft a white paper report on the lessons learned, findings, use cases, usage guidelines, and recommendations for next steps. (e) At the completion of these directives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Define the standard of success and how to measure it as well as define the difference between translation and interpretation.</i> • <i>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.</i> • <i>Set up a technical lab environment at the Judicial Council or a local court to test the technical recommendations of the Futures Commission for this initiative.</i> <p>Origin of Project: Chief Justice directive from the Futures Commission recommendations report; assigned to ITAC in May 2017.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2020</p>	

³ For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done).

Resources:

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

DRAFT

New Workstream (Ending 2020)	
2. Tactical Plan for Technology Update	<i>Priority 1</i>
	<i>Scope category(ies): Policy</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"> (b) Initiate workstream, including formation of membership and conduct orientation/kickoff meeting. (c) Review, gather input, and prepare an update of the <i>Tactical Plan for Technology</i>. (d) Circulate the draft plan for branch and public comment; revise as needed. (e) Finalize, and seek approval from ITAC, JCTC, and the Judicial Council. 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 	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
3. Identity and Access Management Strategy	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approved September 25, 2018	Scope category(ies): Possibilities, Prototypes, Pilot, Policy/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. (e) Recommend changes to Rules of Court as needed and work with the Rules & Policy Subcommittee to draft them. (f) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. 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.). <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-18 and 2019-20.</i></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 	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
4. IT Community Development	Priority 1
Workstream membership approved May 17, 2018	Scope category(ies): Possibilities
<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 ongoing operational support, as appropriate. (b) Provide recommendations for next steps based on findings. (c) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to formally sunset the workstream. <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 2017-18 and 2019-20.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: April 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: Ms. Jeannette Vannoy (formerly co-sponsored by now retired Judge Alan Perkins) • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee 	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
5. Digital Evidence: Rules, Technology and Pilot Evaluation	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approved September 25, 2019	<i>Scope category(ies): Policies; Pilot</i>
<p>Project Summary: Consider existing pilots and court practices along with available technology pertaining to the use of digital evidence; propose changes to rules and statutes related to digital evidence; develop a framework for successful possible future pilots.</p> <p>Key Objectives: Based on findings from Phase 1 and evaluation of existing local pilots and other court practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Investigate and report on existing local pilots and court practices, including policies and standards, for transmitting, accepting, storing, and protecting digital evidence. (b) Research and recommend available technology and services that would support transmission, acceptance, storage, and protection of digital evidence. (c) Develop and propose changes to Rules of Court and statutes related to digital evidence in collaboration with the Rules and Policy Subcommittee. (d) Develop a framework for successful possible future pilots, including use case scenarios, costs and benefits, and success criteria <p>At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.</p> <p>Origin of Project: <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-18 and 2019-20.</i></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 	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
6. Data Analytics: Assessment and Report	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approved July 23, 2018	<i>Scope category(ies): Possibilities; Policy</i>
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Scope and recommend a data analytics strategy for the branch.</p> <p><i>Key Objectives:</i></p> <ul 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, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. 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; <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-20.</i></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 	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
7. Disaster Recovery (DR) Initial Pilot and Knowledge Sharing	Priority 1
Workstream membership approved February 28, 2019	Scope category(ies): Pilot
<p>Project Summary: Implement branch disaster recovery (DR) pilot program, master agreement, knowledge-sharing; evaluate need for BCP.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <p>Leveraging the innovation grant awarded to the Superior Court of Monterey County for a Cloud DR Pilot Program, the workstream will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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. (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, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, 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> • <i>Establish a cloud DR master agreement with a short list of cloud service providers for judicial branch entities/courts to leverage.</i> <p>Origin of Project: Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-18 and 2019-20; any next phase of project following framework adoption.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: June 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: Mr. Paras Gupta • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> Pilot courts; CEAC, CITMF 	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
8. Online Dispute Resolution (ODR): Research	<i>Priority 2</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 use case scenarios where ODR might be beneficially deployed in the judicial branch. (e) 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) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Origin of Project: <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-20</i></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 	

Continuing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
9. Branchwide Information Security Roadmap	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approved September 6, 2019	<i>Scope category(ies): Possibilities, Policies</i>
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Develop a defined structure of activities and recommendations that will collectively enhance the judicial branch information security posture.</p> <p><i>Key Objectives:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Define methods, activities and/or initiatives for expanding and strengthening 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) Consult with other workstreams on individual security recommendations and ensure alignment with ongoing development of Judicial Branch security standards. (e) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream <p><i>Objectives met or resolved:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).</i> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-20</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. Donald I. Segerstrom, Jr, Mr. Brian Cotta • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology (Matt Nicholls) • <i>Collaborations:</i> CITMF 	

New Workstream (End 2020)	
10. Remote Video Appearances in Criminal Proceedings: Research	<i>Priority 2</i>
	<i>Scope category(ies): Possibilities</i>
<p>Project Summary: Review existing technical standards, rules, and statutes; define and prioritize use cases for remote video appearances in criminal proceedings.</p> <p>Key Objectives: Reviewing outcomes of Video Remote Interpreting pilot and Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings workstream:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Validate, refine, and amend, if necessary, the technical standards applicable to criminal proceedings. (b) Identify whether new or amended Rules of Court and statutes are needed and advise the Rules & Policy Subcommittee for follow up. (c) Define and prioritize use case scenarios and define success criteria for a pilot. (d) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council Technology Committee; <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-20</i></p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: TBD • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Criminal Justice Services • <i>Collaborations:</i> Family & Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Criminal Law Advisory Committee, Traffic Advisory Committee 	

Ongoing Project	
11.1 Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions	<i>Priority 2⁴</i>
	<i>Scope category(ies): Policies</i>
<p>Project Summary: 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>Proposals within the scope of this item include:</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>Origin of Project: <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-20.</i> Public comments. Standing item on the agenda.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Resources:</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, • <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 	

⁴ 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.

One-Time Project (Ending 2021)	
11.2 Remote Video Appearances in Civil Proceedings	<i>Priority 2</i>
	Scope category(ies): Policies
<p>Project Summary: Develop legislative and rule proposals to further the recommendations of the Commission on the Future of California’s Court System (Futures Commission) relating to video remote appearances by parties, counsel, and witnesses for most noncriminal court proceedings (pursuant to directive to ITAC from the Chief Justice).</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Building on the recommendations of the Futures Commission and ITAC Remote Video Appearances Workstream, participate in a joint ad hoc subcommittee with Civil and Small Claims, Family and Juvenile Law, and Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committees to develop legislative and rule proposals to allow video remote appearances in most civil court proceedings. (b) Work cooperatively with the ITAC Digital Evidence Workstream, when needed. <p>Origin of Project: In April 2017, the Futures Commission recommended allowing remote video appearances at trials and evidentiary hearings in civil matters. In May 2017, the Chief Justice directed ITAC to consider feasibility and resource requirements for implementing pilot projects for remote video appearances. ITAC formed the Remote Video Appearances Workstream for this purpose, which issued its final report and recommendations to ITAC, including policy recommendations in August 2019.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2021, effective by January 2022 (Anticipate that legislative proposal would go to the council in November 2020, and to the Legislature in 2021, with rule proposals to be developed concurrently.)</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Joint Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Remote Video Appearances, Co-Chair: Hon. Peter Siggins • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services, Center for Families, Children & the Courts, Governmental Affairs • <i>Collaborations:</i> ITAC Digital Evidence Workstream, Civil and Small Claims, Family and Juvenile Law, and Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committees; Digital Evidence Workstream 	

III. LIST OF 2019 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.1	Futures Commission Directive: Intelligent Chat for Self-Help Services (Phase 1) – The Workstream presented its final report to ITAC on August 19. The recommendations included establishing an intelligent chatbot program to be administered by the Judicial Council, with an advisory board made up of stakeholder representatives from the branch. FY19-20 BCP funding of \$760,336 awarded to implement the pilot phase.
1.3	Futures Commission Directive: Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings (Phase 1) – ITAC accepted the workstream’s final report on August 19; JCTC approved via email action on November 25. The recommendations included rulemaking and legislative changes that would facilitate the implementation of digital or video appearance initiatives by local courts. FY19-20 BCP funding of \$1,276,910 awarded to implement the pilot phase. A report to the Judicial Council is anticipated in the coming year.
2.	Tactical Plan for Technology for 2019-2020 – The updated plan was approved by the Judicial Council on May 17, 2019. The plan includes several continuing and new initiatives, including Data Analytics, Identity Management, and Online Dispute Resolution.
3.	Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Pilot – The Workstream and the Language Action Plan (LAP) Implementation Task Force presented the final report to the Judicial Council on March 15, 2019. The council adopted the recommendations to adopt the LAP guidelines, including recommended minimum technology requirements, and to develop and implement a coordinated VRI program for the branch.
4.	E-Filing Strategy – FY17-18 BCP loan funding of \$1,162,000 . Two of three master agreements for statewide e-filing managers were finalized and a branchwide e-filing program being funded through the court cost recovery fee is being developed.
5.	Identity and Access Management – Selected a statewide identity management service/provider (in 2018). (Project continues.) BCP funding for a Data Analytics/Business Intelligence pilot , supported by Identity and Access Management, awarded for FY19-20.
6.	Self-Represented Litigants E-Services – Awarded BCP funding for FY18-19 (\$3.2 million) and FY19-20 (\$1.3 million) to support development of branchwide SRL e-capabilities that will facilitate interactive FAQ, triage functionality, and document assembly to guide SRLs through the process, and interoperability with the branchwide e-filing solution. The workstream concluded its specific objectives on June 21, 2019; the ongoing program continues through JCIT.
8.1	Digital Evidence Phase 1 - Surveyed courts and justice partners on current use of digital evidence. Survey results were conveyed to ITAC and JCTC, concluding Phase 1; and Phase 2 was approved to go forward.
11.	Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee – Developed uniform formatting rules for electronic documents filed or otherwise submitted to the appellate courts; and removed the requirement of a separate service copy of a petition for review. Proposals were approved by the Judicial Council and became effective January 1, 2020.

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 13. | Rules & Policy Subcommittee – Rule change proposals developed to support and clarify e-filing and service and remote access to court records (including adding additional local government entities). Received council approval for amendments to 2.251, 2.255, 2.257, and 2.540, effective January 1, 2020. Further developed legislative proposals to amend statutes to support and clarify e-business, including allowing courts to recover actual costs of permissive e-filing (similar to mandatory e-filing) and clarifying provisions for signatures not made under penalty of perjury. |
|-----|---|

DRAFT