



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

November 2, 2020
12:00 – 1:00 PM
Videoconference

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; Mr. Paras Gupta; Hon. Kimberly Menninger; Hon. James Mize; Mr. Snorri Ogata; Mr. Darrel Parker; Hon. Donald Segerstrom; Hon. Peter Siggins; Hon. Bruce Smith; Ms. Jeannette Vannoy; Mr. Don Willenburg; Mr. David H. Yamasaki

Advisory Body Members Absent: Assembly member Marc Berman; Ms. Alexandra Grimwade; Hon. Michael S. Groch; Senator Robert Hertzberg; Hon. Samantha P. Jessner; Mr. Kevin Lane; Hon. Joseph Wiseman; Hon. Theodore Zayner

Others Present: Ms. Robin Brandes-Gibbs; Ms. Heather Pettit; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Jamel Jones; Mr. Richard Blalock; Ms. Camilla Kieliger; Ms. Andrea Jaramillo; Ms. Jackie Woods; and other JCC staff present

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:00 PM and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the October 2, 2020, Information Technology Advisory Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-4)

Item 1

Chair's Report

Presenter: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair

Report: Judge Hanson welcomed members to the meeting. She announced that the Judicial Council Technology Committee voted to recommend the acceptance of the report presented by the Voice-to-Text Workstream, the last of the Chief Justice's three Futures Commission directives to ITAC to be completed. The report has been submitted for consideration for the January 2021 Judicial Council meeting.

Item 2

Tactical Plan Workstream Preview

Receive a preview of the initiatives proposed for the 2021-2022 Tactical Plan cycle, as well as an overview of next steps.

Presenters: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair
Mr. Richard Blalock, Senior Business Systems Analyst, Information Technology

Report: As the Executive Sponsor, Judge Hanson noted that the workstream has made considerable progress over the summer. She reminded members that the two-year Tactical Plan is part of the branch technology governance process, along with the four-year *Strategic Plan for Technology* and the branch strategic plan. Judge Hanson outlined the scope of the workstream, along with the principles for the review: that initiatives are at the right level; have branchwide impact; need support financially or strategically; and do not include ongoing or operational IT activities, unless they meet one of the above criteria. Finally, she noted that branch capacity and priorities should also be considered, especially with the COVID-19 pandemic impacting court operations.

Mr. Blalock provided an overview of the proposed initiatives in the Tactical Plan, which included all existing initiatives and introduce “Digital Court Ecosystem” as a new item.

Next steps include finalizing initiatives, drafting remaining sections, circulating for branch and public comment, and review and approval by ITAC, the Technology Committee, and Judicial Council.

Item 3

Annual Agenda Planning

Discuss and review ITAC’s 2021 annual agenda.

Presenters: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair
Ms. Camilla Kieliger, Senior Business Systems Analyst, Information Technology

Discussion: Judge Hanson reminded ITAC that the Judicial Council’s internal committee chairs requested the prioritization of projects that: assist courts, justice partners, and parties with access to justice during and following the COVID-19 pandemic; address otherwise urgent needs; or are mandated by legislation. Projects that do not meet those criteria should be deferred.

Ms. Kieliger provided an overview of completed 2020 accomplishments, including the:

- Rules & Policy Subcommittee objectives
- Futures Directive: Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings workstream
- Joint Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Remote Video Appearances; and
- IT Community Development workstream.

Also, awaiting Judicial Council approval are the Futures Directives: Intelligent Chat and Voice-to-Text Services Outside the Courtroom.

Ms. Kieliger also reviewed the potential 2021 items that include continuing remaining 2020 Annual Agenda items and the Rules & Policy Subcommittee work, and a discussion of any additional critical needs.

Item 4

Digital Evidence Workstream: Rules Track Proposal

Review a proposal from the workstream's Rules Track, which includes a report on identified rules and/or statutes needing to be addressed; and a request to transition this activity to the Rules & Policy Subcommittee for completion.

Presenters: Hon. Kimberly Menninger, Workstream Executive Sponsor
Ms. Robin Brandes-Gibbs, Workstream Lead

Report: Judge Menninger introduced the Digital Evidence: Rules & Statutes Track Proposal, and Ms. Brandes-Gibbs further explained the details. The workstream proposes amendments to allow 3rd party vendors to maintain custody of exhibits on behalf of the court and parties. Rules are needed to address litigant/attorney access; electronic evidence in remote video proceedings; lodged electronic exhibits; and only while in court possession. The proposal includes suggestions to maintain confidentiality of private information, including restrictions on the time, place, and manner of access. Next steps will be to have Rules & Policy Subcommittee consider amendments before the next rules cycle.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:00 PM.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

1.2. Futures Commission Directive: Voice-To-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom



Highlight: Targeting the January 2021 Judicial Council meeting to present final report.

	Status	Description
<p>Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The core team was 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 was 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>
<p>Define the standard of success and how to measure it as well as define the difference between translation and interpretation.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The project team has been divided into 2 tracks – a Metrics track, and a Vendor track. The Metrics track chose a 1-5 scale, with definitions for each number, for both voice recognition/transcription, and text translation. These scores were used when testing the solutions using prewritten scripts provided by workstream members.</p>
<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.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<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>

(Continued next slide)

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



Highlight: Targeting the January 2021 Judicial Council meeting to present final report.

	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
Test 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.	Completed	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.
Identify and pursue any possible pilot collaborations with the Legal Design Lab at the Stanford University Law School.	Deferred	JCIT will collaborate with the Legal Design Lab for possible collaborations.
Support implementation of a voice-to-text pilot program (including kickoff, court preparations, site visits, and deployment).	Completed/ Ongoing	The workstream will provide input to this JCIT-managed effort as the product becomes available. Additionally, some workstream members' home courts also are participating in the pilot.
Capture learnings and draft a white paper report on the lessons learned, findings, use cases, usage guidelines, and recommendations for next steps.	Completed	The workstream has drafted this document, which includes 3 recommendations surrounding moving forward with a pilot, data privacy and security, and continued collaboration and exploration.
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.	In Progress	ITAC and the Technology Committee approved the recommendations. The workstream is targeting the January 2021 Judicial Council meeting to present for review and approval.

Existing Project (Ending 2020)**1. Futures Commission Directive: Voice-to-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom***Priority 1*

Workstream membership approved October 15, 2018

*Scope category(ies):
Possibilities, Pilot*

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.

Key Objectives:

- (a) At the completion of these directives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, the Technology Committee and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream. [Scheduled for January 22, 2021]

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.*
- *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.*
- *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.*

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

Status/Timeline: ~~December 2020~~ January 2021

Resources:

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

2. Tactical Plan for Technology Update



Highlight: Reviews and drafting complete; plan to be circulated for comment.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Initiate workstream, including formation of membership and conduct orientation/kickoff meeting.	Completed	The workstream has held their kickoff meeting.
(b) Review, gather input, and prepare an update of the Tactical Plan for Technology.	Completed	Workstream members have reviewed and drafted updates to the existing initiatives. Additionally, one new initiative is drafted. Staff are finalizing the edits and preparing to assemble the Plan for branch and public comment circulation.
(c) Circulate the draft plan for branch and public comment; revise as needed.	Not Started	Anticipated to circulate in late December/early January.
(d) Finalize, and seek approval from ITAC, JCTC, and the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2021)

2. Tactical Plan for Technology Update

Priority 1

*Scope category(ies):
Policy*

Project Summary: Update *Tactical Plan for Technology* for effective date 2021-2022.

Key Objectives:

- (b) Circulate the draft plan for branch and public comment; revise as needed.
- (c) Finalize, and seek approval from ITAC, the Technology Committee, and the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.

Objectives met or resolved:

- *Initiate workstream, including formation of membership and conduct orientation/kickoff meeting.*
- *Review, gather input, and prepare an update of the Tactical Plan for Technology.*

Origin of Project: Specific charge of ITAC per Rule 10.53 (b)(8).

Status/Timeline: March 2021

Fiscal Impact:

This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.

Resources:

- *ITAC:* Workstream, Sponsor: Hon. Sheila Hanson
- *Judicial Council Staffing:* Information Technology
- *Collaborations:* Broad input from the branch and the public

3. Identity and Access Management Strategy

 **Highlight:** Final report is being drafted.

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 for the final report.
(b) Determine policies and processes for identity management (including proofing and access management).	In Progress	Policy track recommendations are being drafted for the final report
(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.	In Progress	JCIT workstream staff are participating in the pilots at Los Angeles, Orange, and Placer Superior Courts, as well as for the Ability to Pay project.
(e) Recommend changes to Rules of Court as needed and work with the Rules & Policy Subcommittee to draft them.	Completed	No updates or additions to current rules of court are proposed.
(f) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.	In Progress	Request to update estimated completion to March 2021.

Existing Workstream (Ending 2021)	
3. Identity and Access Management Strategy	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approved September 25, 2018	<i>Scope category(ies): Possibilities, Prototypes, Pilot, Policy/Procurement</i>
<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) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from ITAC, the Technology Committee 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> • <i>Recommend changes to Rules of Court as needed and work with the Rules & Policy Subcommittee to draft them.</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, 2019-20, and 2021-22 (pending).</i></p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2020 <u>March 2021</u></p> <p>Fiscal Impact:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</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 	

5. Digital Evidence: Rules, Technology, and Pilot Evaluation



Highlight: Rule and legislative amendment review completed

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Investigate and report on existing local pilots and court practices, including policies and standards, for transmitting, accepting, storing, and protecting digital evidence.	In Progress	The Superior Court of Orange County will start its pilot in December. A survey will be distributed to all courts and to justice partners to collect information on current practices and needs.
(b) Research and recommend available technology and services that would support transmission, acceptance, storage, and protection of digital evidence.	In Progress	Meetings held with vendors NICE, Genetec & Axon. The Superior Court of Orange County is completing its procurement process for a vendor or vendors to conduct a pilot.
(c) Develop and propose changes to Rules of Court and statutes related to digital evidence in collaboration with the Rules and Policy Subcommittee.	Complete	Proposed rules and legislative amendments presented to and accepted by ITAC on November 2, 2020, and referred to the Rules & Policy Subcommittee
(d) Develop a framework for successful possible future pilots, including use case scenarios, costs and benefits, and success criteria.	In Progress	The Superior Court of Orange County is completing its procurement process for a vendor or vendors to conduct a pilot. Other courts may launch projects with the \$25M technology funding being distributed currently. The workstream will gather information from any such projects over the next year.
(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.	Not Started	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2021)

4. Digital Evidence: Rules, Technology and Pilot Evaluation

Priority 1

Workstream membership approved September 25, 2019

*Scope category(ies):
Policies; Pilot*

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.

Key Objectives:

Based on findings from Phase 1 and evaluation of existing local pilots and other court practices:

- (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 a framework for successful possible future pilots, including use case scenarios, costs and benefits, and success criteria
- (d) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, the Technology Committee and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.

Objectives met or resolved:

- *Develop and propose changes to Rules of Court and statutes related to digital evidence in collaboration with the Rules and Policy Subcommittee.*

Origin of Project: *Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-18, 2019-20, and 2021-22 (pending).*

Status/Timeline: December ~~2020~~-2021

Fiscal Impact:

This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.

Resources:

- *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

6. Data Analytics: Assessment and Report



Highlight: Workstream will finalize data and information policy concepts and continues piloting technology solution in five courts.

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	Workstream has drafted a set of recommended initial principles and policies for approval by ITAC, TC, and Judicial Council.
(b) Develop appropriate governance recommendations at the local court and branch level.	In Progress	Workstream has drafted a set of recommended initial principles and policies for approval by ITAC, TC, and Judicial Council.
(c) Assess and report priorities for data collection.	In Progress	This is a key component of the pilots; JBSIS data is the priority.
(d) Identify and evaluate possible data analytical tools and templates.	In Progress	Five pilots are being launched to test a possible technological approach for data analytics, modeled off the Orange Superior Court Innovations Grant. The branch has procured a cloud data warehouse solution and an ETL (Extract, Load, Transform) tool. A consulting firm has been retained for the warehouse and ETL design. Two different types of data visualization tools are being tested.
(e) Identify whether new or amended 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) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval from ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.	In progress	Seeking approval in first quarter of CY2021.

Existing Workstream (Ending 2021)

5. Data Analytics: Assessment and Report

Priority 1

Workstream membership approved July 23, 2018

*Scope category(ies):
Possibilities; Policy*

Project Summary: Scope and recommend a data analytics strategy for the branch.

Key Objectives:

- (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, the Technology Committee and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.

Origin of Project: Topic resulted from a brainstorm of ideas conducted with ITAC and the court CIOs in late 2017; *Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-20 and 2021-22 (pending)*.

Status/Timeline: ~~December 2020~~ March 2021

Fiscal Impact:

This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.

Resources:

- *ITAC:* Workstream, Sponsors: Hon. Tara Desautels, Mr. David Yamasaki
- *Judicial Council Staffing:* Information Technology, Budget Services, Criminal Justice Services, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) Program, Center for Families, Children, and the Courts, Legal Services
- *Collaborations:* CIOs, CEAC, TCPJAC, appellate group representation

7. Disaster Recovery (DR) Initial Pilot and Knowledge Sharing



Highlight: Feasibility assessments underway, templates being developed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
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.
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.
(a) Recommend a list of critical technology services that make business sense for cloud-based recovery adoption.	Completed	<p>The Superior Court of Monterey County engaged with Infinity Consulting for Phase I services - infrastructure and critical systems assessment for feasibility and solution recommendations for cloud-based disaster recovery. The focus of the engagement was on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Assess the court technology environment to document network and server infrastructure that provide essential court services categorized as Priority 1 (P1): Current P1 Services: Odyssey Case Management System, Jury System, Portal Service, Justice Partners Services, Criminal E-filing Services – AutoClerk, Public Website, and Shoretel Telephone System 2) Recommend pathways and connection options to extend local network and security to create a hybrid infrastructure to the cloud service provider: Potential Pathways: Traditional VPN Connection, Microsoft ExpressRoute, and custombuilt high bandwidth option. 3) Evaluate backup and replication solutions that leverage the Court's investments in technology resources and skills to modernize recovery using the cloud: Evaluated Solutions: Microsoft Azure Site Recovery, Zerto, Veeam, and Rubrik Data Protection. <p>Infinity presented its assessment and recommendation report in Sep 2019. The Court is currently in the design and pilot implementation phases to conduct feasibility assessments for its critical systems using the vendor-referred solutions for disaster recovery. We have a successful proof of concept by running Odyssey Case Management System in Microsoft Azure using Microsoft Azure Site Recovery.</p> <p>We have gathered enough data to allow us to prepare a comprehensive list of cloud disaster recovery solutions. This list will outline recommended branch services and the solutions that can be adopted to fulfill disaster recovery requirements.</p>

(Continued next slide)

7. Disaster Recovery (DR) Initial Pilot and Knowledge Sharing *(cont.)*



Highlight: Feasibility assessments underway, templates being developed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(b) Publish disaster recovery to cloud (DR2C) roadmap for judicial branch entities (JBEs) that includes design solution templates from Monterey and other participant courts.	In Progress	We are currently in the process of developing Microsoft Azure Resource Manager (ARM) Templates to be leveraged by other courts when creating infrastructure in Microsoft Azure. Assessment tools and recommendation reports from Infinity were distributed to the court technology community. In addition we are compiling the costs associated with cloud services required for disaster recovery. This will be included in the roadmap.
(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).	In Progress	Infinity presented the disaster recovery solution recommendation based on Monterey's technology environment assessment to the CIO community in Sep 2019. We had 47 participants for this session. Monterey presented our progress to the CIOs at the October CITMF. We continue to maintain an ongoing dialogue with the DR2C workstream members via biweekly meetings to share knowledge and ideas. Plans are underway to make a final presentation to courts after the 2020 holidays.
(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)).	Not Started	
(e) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	Not Started	
(f) 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)**6. Disaster Recovery (DR) Initial Pilot and Knowledge Sharing***Priority 1*

Workstream membership approved February 28, 2019

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) Publish disaster recovery to cloud (DR2C) roadmap for judicial branch entities (JBEs) that includes design solution templates from Monterey and other participant courts.
- (b) 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).
- (c) 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)).
- (d) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.
- (e) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, the Technology Committee 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*
- *Recommend a list of critical technology services that make business sense for cloud-based recovery adoption.*

Origin of Project: *Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-18 and 2019-20; any next phase of project following framework adoption.*

Status/Timeline: ~~December 2020~~ June 2021

Fiscal Impact:

This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.

Resources:

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

8. Online Dispute Resolution (ODR): Assessment



Highlight: Review of ODR solutions from other courts completed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Completed	Executive Sponsor: Hon. Julie R. Culver Project Manager: Dennis Ma Workstream membership was approved on 7/10/2020.
(b) Identify and evaluate available ODR technologies.	In progress	Identified commercial ODR vendors and state court developed ODR platforms. Evaluation is in progress and will be presented in the final findings report.
(c) Review findings from existing court-offered ODR programs.	Completed	Reviewed ODR solutions from various courts across the country. Summary of these findings will be presented in the final report.
(d) Evaluate and describe scenarios where ODR might be beneficially deployed in the judicial branch.	In progress	Identified case types and reviewed scenarios in which ODR is being deployed and considered. Findings will be presented in the final report.
(e) Survey and document best practices in evaluating feasibility and program design to maximize access to justice.	In progress	Received information from courts and vendors regarding best practices (and pitfalls to avoid) in planning for and implementing ODR to maximize access to justice. Findings will be presented in the final report.
(f) Review rules and statutes to identify areas where possible amendments will be needed.	Not Started	
(g) 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 2021)**7. Online Dispute Resolution (ODR): Research***Priority 2*

Workstream membership approved July 10, 2020

*Scope category(ies):
Possibilities*

Project Summary: Identify and evaluate available ODR technologies and potential scenarios in which ODR might benefit the judicial branch and its court users.

Key Objectives:

- (a) Identify and evaluate available ODR technologies.
- (b) Evaluate and describe use case scenarios where ODR might be beneficially deployed in the judicial branch.
- (c) Survey and document best practices in evaluating feasibility and program design to maximize access to justice.
- (d) Review rules and statutes to identify areas where possible amendments will be needed.
- (e) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, the Technology Committee and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.

Objectives met or resolved:

- *Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).*
- *Review findings from existing court-offered ODR programs.*

Origin of Project: *Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-20 and 2021-22 (pending)*

Status/Timeline: ~~December 2020~~ May 2021


Fiscal Impact:

This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.

Resources:

- *ITAC: Workstream: Sponsor: Hon. Julie Culver*
- *Judicial Council Staffing: Information Technology, Legal Services*
- *Collaborations: CEAC; TCPJAC; Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee*

9. Branchwide Information Security Roadmap

 **Highlight:** Sub-tracks continuing their research.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
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.
(a) Define methods, activities and/or initiatives for expanding and strengthening branch information security capabilities.	In Progress	The leads along with internal JC resources are discussing a new direction with internal communications governance to streamline incoming review requests, internal process, and delivery of request.
(b) Create an overarching strategy for educating courts on information security end user education, risk management, and incident response.	In Progress	Sub-tracks for Incident Response, End User Education, and Risk Management are continuing to research framework and platform options.
(c) Identify resources to assist the courts in developing policies and procedures based on the Judicial Branch Information Systems Controls Framework.	In Progress	The workstream is working with identified resources to develop a security gap analysis and tier list that will allow us to identify security domains in need of the most attention. We will then be able to frame out a strategic plan and road map for both Cybersecurity and Information Security domains.
(d) Consult with other workstreams on individual security recommendations and ensure alignment with ongoing development of Judicial Branch security standards.	In Progress – As requested	Worked with Kathy Fink from the Identity Management Workstream. Developing governance model for interactions between workstreams with security review requests.
(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	In Progress	Workstream initial set of recommendation are scheduled to be provided to ITAC during the first quarter of 2021, which includes security education, incident management and recommended security tools.

Continuing Workstream (Ending 2021)

8. Branchwide Information Security Roadmap

Priority 1

Workstream membership approved September 6, 2019

*Scope category(ies):
Possibilities, Policies*

Project Summary: Develop a defined structure of activities and recommendations that will collectively enhance the judicial branch information security posture.

Key Objectives:

- (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, the Technology Committee and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.

Objectives met or resolved:

- *Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).*

Origin of Project: *Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-20 and 2021-22 (pending)*

Status/Timeline: ~~December 2020~~ March 2021

Fiscal Impact:

This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.

Resources:

- *ITAC:* Workstream, Sponsors: Hon. Donald I. Segerstrom, Jr, Mr. Brian Cotta
- *Judicial Council Staffing:* Information Technology (Matt Nicholls)
- *Collaborations:* CITMF

11.1. Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions



Highlight: The Judicial Council approved the rule amendments.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<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>Complete</p>	<p>Amendments to 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 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 2020 meeting. The amendments will be effective January 1, 2021.</p>

Ongoing Project	
9.1 Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions	<i>Priority 1₁</i>
	<i>Scope category(ies): Policies</i>
<p>Project Summary: Revise statutes and 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 and develop recommendations for amendments to align with modern business practices.</p> <p>Proposals within the scope of this item include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Develop legislative and rule proposals for electronic exhibits and evidence based on the needs identified by the Digital Evidence Workstream including defining "lodged electronic exhibits," permitting courts to use vendors for storage of electronic exhibits and evidence; and removing requirements that clerks return exhibits if they are in electronic format. (b) Assist the Criminal Law Advisory Committee (CLAC) with the development of legislative and rule proposals for remote video proceedings in criminal matters including having a Rules and Policy Subcommittee member serve on the CLAC working group. <p>Origin of Project: <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-20</i> <u>and 2021-22 (pending)</u>. Public comments. Standing item on the agenda.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</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> 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 	

^[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.

11.2 Remote Video Appearances in Civil Proceedings



Highlight: The Judicial Council will consider a legislative proposal in January 2021.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(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.	In Progress	<p>The subcommittee developed a legislative proposal generally authorizing remote video in all civil cases and proceedings.</p> <p>A legislative proposal circulated for public comment in spring 2020 and is anticipated to go before the council in January 2021. The subcommittee will develop a rule proposal for circulation for public comment in spring 2021.</p>
(b) Work cooperatively with the ITAC Digital Evidence Workstream, when needed.	Complete	<p>The Digital Evidence Workstream completed its legislative and rule recommendations. The Rules and Policy Subcommittee will develop proposals based on the workstream recommendations.</p>

Existing One-Time Project (Ending 2021)

9.2 Remote Video Appearances in Civil Proceedings

Priority 1

*Scope category(ies):
Policies*

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).

Key Objectives:

- (a) ~~Building on the recommendations of the Futures Commission and ITAC Remote Video Appearances Workstream, Continue~~ participating 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 Rules and Policy subcommittee, when needed.

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.

Status/Timeline: December 2021, effective by January 2022 (Anticipate that legislative proposal would go to the council in ~~November 2020~~ January 2021, and to the Legislature in 2021, with rule proposals to be developed concurrently.)

Fiscal Impact:

This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.

Resources:

- *ITAC:* Joint Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Remote Video Appearances, Co-Chair: Hon. Peter Siggins
- *Judicial Council Staffing:* Information Technology, Legal Services, Center for Families, Children & the Courts, Governmental Affairs
- *Collaborations:* ITAC Rules and Policy Subcommittee; Civil and Small Claims, Family and Juvenile Law, and Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committees