

Chart of Comments

Remote Proceedings Technology Recommendations – Advancing the Hybrid Courtroom Phase 2 Workstream

All comments are verbatim unless indicated.

Commenter	Comment	Committee Response
Chris Berendsen, Superior Court of Kern County, Information Technology Manager	Position: Not indicated.	
Chris Berendsen	Kern County Superior Court has embraced the hybrid courtroom project since its inception. Creating better access and an improved experience for all parties involved has been the priority. JCC funding has played a significant role in getting us to our current level of connectivity. The work of this committee in forming the Advancing the Hybrid Courtroom Workstream, Phase 2 document reflects the diversity of its members. Presenting the Phase 2 document as a guideline, with “functional requirements” as the goal, allows room for interpretation and innovation. Having worked in the AV field for over 25 years, I appreciate the references to industry standards and protocols. The guideline strikes a good balance when discussing platforms and protocols. I do, however, have a couple of comments from a professional experience perspective:	Thank you for your comments. The workstream is appreciative of your input and the perspective you have shared.
Chris Berendsen	2.5.4 Camera and Protocol Considerations – The network protocol NDI is nearly plug-and-play and is a strong option. However, this is a licensed protocol for manufacturers of these products. While there are many camera options that support NDI, there is a limited number of processors that can receive this format natively. NDI-to-HDMI or SDI converters are available and can expand compatibility with a wider selection of video processors. Another option to consider is SDI video output directly from the camera to a video processor. The transmission media is affordable and widely used in the industry. While it is not a one-cable solution, it can streamline connectivity and eliminate the need for converters or adapters. It may also simplify troubleshooting for court staff who are not AV specialists.	The workstream’s recommendations are intentionally descriptive and do not mandate any specific technology, vendor solution, or protocol. Courts retain flexibility to use alternative technologies that meet functional goals.

Commenter	Comment	Committee Response
Chris Berendsen	4.2.2 Cable Management and Routing – This section references “over-the-carpet cable management.” There are limited options on the market for over-floor raceways; however, ADA-compliant solutions are available and may be worth mentioning.	The workstream’s recommendations are not intended to mandate any specific technology, vendor solution, or protocol, nor to serve as an exhaustive list of all possible approaches. Courts retain full flexibility to select alternative technologies or configurations.
Chris Berendsen	Ongoing Maintenance – With budget volatility seeming to be a daily topic of discussion, legislated funding support would be greatly appreciated for modernization of these systems.	The workstream’s recommendations are advisory and do not create new mandates or requirements for courts. Implementation of the recommendations is dependent on local resources, and each court may determine what is feasible based on available funding. The workstream recognizes that budget limitations may affect the ability to undertake certain recommendations. In addition, the workstream acknowledges the concerns raised by several courts that many of these recommendations cannot realistically be implemented without additional funding support from the Legislature. Including these perspectives is important to ensure that statewide guidance accurately reflects the operational and fiscal realities courts face, and to give voice to the need for sustained investment in courtroom modernization.
Jake Chatters, Superior Court of Placer County, Court Executive Officer	Position: Not indicated.	
Jake Chatters	Terms clarification – The introduction seeks to define the difference between the instant document, the Remote Proceedings Technology Recommendations (Recommendations) and the Judicial Council’s Minimum Technology Standards for Remote Proceedings (Standards). This is generally well done. There are instances, however,	The workstream is appreciative of your comments and have incorporated them into the <i>Remote Proceedings Technology Recommendations</i> , pages 6–8.

Commenter	Comment	Committee Response
	where the text uses the terms “these standards.” It is not immediately clear whether this is intended to refer to the Standards or the Recommendations. For example: Page 6 – In this instance, it seems clear that “these standards” refers the Standards as they are mentioned in the prior sentence. Page 8, Principle 4 – In this instance, it is less clear. Is the use of “these standards” referring to the Standards mentioned in the prior paragraph or are they referring to the instant Recommendations document.	
Jake Chatters	There is also a mixture in the use of the terms recommendations and guidelines. Here again on page 8, Principle 4 – “The guidelines...” seems to refer to the Recommendations. Use of the term guideline, however, conveys a higher level of responsibility for court compliance than the term recommendation. Modifying instances of the term “guideline” to “recommendation” would be helpful to avoid confusion about a mandate versus an encouraged practice.	Your comments have been incorporated into the <i>Remote Proceedings Technology Recommendations</i>, pages 6–8.
Jake Chatters	Taking of the record – The Recommendations include Principle 5 regarding the accurate capture of the record. The narrative specifically indicates support for stenographic reporting. While it is important that our systems allow court reporters to effectively capture the record, the current wording might suggest this is not a need for voice-writer reporters. Suggest that the paragraph be modified to remove “and stenographic recording” as stenograph and voice-writing are already captured in the broader statement of “verbatim record of the proceedings.”	Your comments have been incorporated into the <i>Remote Proceedings Technology Recommendations</i>, page 8.
Jake Chatters	Handling Technical Issues – Section 1.1.10 discusses the best practice of having a protocol for some or all technical issues. The section goes on to state what “should” be in any such protocol. The use of “should” appears more prescriptive than other sections of the Recommendations. In addition, “ensur[ing] staff availability for real-time troubleshooting” is depending on funding and available resources. Implementation of this item may be difficult for some or all courts, depending	Your comments have been incorporated into the <i>Remote Proceedings Technology Recommendations</i>, page 10. Implementation of the recommendations is dependent on local resources, and each court may determine what is feasible based on available funding. The workstream recognizes that budget

Commenter	Comment	Committee Response
	on scale of their simultaneous remote proceedings, without additional on-going funding to support expanded information technology functions.	limitations may affect the ability to undertake certain recommendations. To be clear, in order for courts in California to adopt and implement innovation, especially technology innovation, they must receive adequate funding to enable them to do so.
Jake Chatters	Expectations for review of existing installations – Consider adding language in the cover letter and introduction that clarifies that the adoption of these Recommendations does not trigger an expectation that courts review all existing installations. The current language, see page 3, establishes the purpose is to support courts when in their “planning, upgrading, or refining” of technology. It may be helpful, however, to be abundantly clear that the Recommendations do not create an expectation that such tasks occur. This clarification would be helpful to avoid concerns from courts about their financial ability to implement these changes.	Your comments have been incorporated into the <i>Remote Proceedings Technology Recommendations</i> , page 7.
Jake Chatters	Thank you again for the opportunity to review the Recommendations, which are overall comprehensive, flexible, and will be a useful tool to complement the Standards.	
Chad Finke, Superior Court of Alameda County, Court Executive Officer	Position: Not indicated.	
Chad Finke	Global comment relevant to Introduction and Minimum Technology Standards (Recommendations, pp. 6 and 7) We appreciate that the Recommendations differentiate between descriptive and prescriptive requirements. However, and as further detailed below in our comments on recommendations 1.1.5, 1.2.2, 2.1.1, 2.3.1, 2.5.1, and 2.5.2, many of the recommendations would require us to procure technology that we (a) do not currently have, and (b) do not have sufficient funding to purchase and deploy. We believe that it is important for the either the Introduction or Minimum Technology Standards section to acknowledge that some courts may simply be unable to meet the minimum	Thank you for this feedback. The workstream’s recommendations are advisory and do not create new mandates or requirements for courts. Implementation of the recommendations is dependent on local resources, and each court may determine what is feasible based on available funding. The workstream recognizes that budget limitations may affect the ability to undertake certain recommendations. To be clear, in order for courts in California to adopt and implement innovation,

Commenter	Comment	Committee Response
	recommended type and level of technology, unless and until additional funding is available. Without such an acknowledgement, courts could be subjected to criticism and potentially legal action based on a failure to meet the recommended service/technology levels in the Recommendations. We note that cautionary language along the lines of what we are recommending be stated globally already exists in, e.g., recommendations 2.3.2 [“These recommendations exceed minimum requirements and can be omitted if budget or architectural constraints exist”] and 2.5.3 [“While additional cameras beyond the minimum requirements provide broader video coverage and support a more comprehensive courtroom setup, they may be omitted when budget or architectural constraints limit what can be installed”] We are suggesting similar language noting that budget constraints may limit or delay a court’s ability to comply fully even with the recommended minimum requirements set forth in the Recommendations.	especially technology innovation, they must receive adequate funding to enable them to do so. Your comments have been incorporated into the <i>Remote Proceedings Technology Recommendations</i>, page 7.
Chad Finke	Comment on 1.1.1 (Recommendations, p. 9) We believe that this recommendation exceeds the scope of the Workstream’s charge, as we understand it. Specifically, the first sentence of the recommendation is overbroad in that it makes ergonomic recommendations that go far beyond remote or even general courtroom technology. For example, this recommendation is broad enough to cover, e.g., chairs, desks, footrests, and other furniture. Ergonomics is a complex area of court operations that has a significant overlap with Human Resources, Risk Management, Workers Compensation, and Compliance. We do not believe that a broad, general statement about courts’ ergonomic obligations belongs in a document the scope of which is limited to “remote proceedings technology recommendations.”	In response to your comment, the first sentence has been removed.
Chad Finke	Comment on 1.1.5 (Recommendations, p. 10) The Court does not currently have technology that would allow court personnel and judicial officers in each courtroom to visually determine whether electronic recording equipment	The workstream’s recommendations are intentionally descriptive and do not mandate any specific technology, vendor solution, or protocol.

Commenter	Comment	Committee Response
	is on or off. We would need to procure such technology and would need the funding to do so.	Courts retain flexibility to use alternative technologies that meet functional goals.
Chad Finke	Comment on 1.1.7 (Recommendations, p. 10) We are concerned about the recommendation that we provide “comprehensive training” to “stakeholders,” especially as the latter term is undefined. If “stakeholders” means the public generally, then our Court—and, we suspect, most courts—are not funded in a way that would allow us to provide “comprehensive training” as recommended here. We could, however, provide best practices, general user guides, and standard instructions. We would suggest perhaps removing the term “comprehensive” or otherwise clarifying the intended scope of the rule.	Your comments have been incorporated into the <i>Remote Proceedings Technology Recommendations</i> , page 11.
Chad Finke	Comment on 1.2.2 (Recommendations, p. 12) The Court does not currently have a sufficient number of cameras to comply with the recommendation. We would need to procure such technology and would need the funding to do so.	The workstream’s recommendations are advisory and are not intended to mandate purchase of specific technologies or recommendations. Courts may implement recommendations based on local priorities, existing systems, and available funding. The workstream recognizes that both technical capability and budget considerations vary across courts. To be clear, in order for courts in California to adopt and implement innovation, especially technology innovation, they must receive adequate funding to enable them to do so.
Chad Finke	Comment on 2.1.1 (Recommendations, p. 16) The Court does not currently have a sufficient number of AV control systems to comply with the recommendation. We would need to procure such technology and would need the funding to do so.	Same as above
Chad Finke	Comment on 2.3.1 (Recommendations, p. 18)	Same as above

Commenter	Comment	Committee Response
	The Court does not currently have a sufficient number of microphones to comply with the recommendation. We would need to procure such technology and would need the funding to do so.	
Chad Finke	Comment on 2.4.4 (Recommendations, pp. 20-21) At least one of our historical courtrooms does not have acoustics that comply with the recommendation, and our understanding is that additional construction to make the courtroom acoustically acceptable would be either cost prohibitive or outright impossible from a construction/engineering perspective. While the recommendation notes that “acoustic treatment should be an integral part of courtroom design,” implying that this recommendation only applies prospectively to courthouses constructed after the effective date of the Recommendations, we suggest making that point explicitly in the recommendation itself to clarify that extensive acoustical retrofitting is not contemplated.	Same as above.
Chad Finke	Comment on 2.5.1 (Recommendations, p. 21) The Court does not currently have a sufficient number of cameras to comply with the recommendation. We would need to procure such technology and would need the funding to do so.	Same as above
Chad Finke	Comment on 2.5.2 (Recommendations, pp. 21-22) The Court does not currently have a sufficient number of cameras to comply with the recommendation. We would need to procure such technology and would need the funding to do so.	Same as above
Chad Finke	Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on these Recommendations, and for the obvious amount of thought and work that went into preparing them. We would be happy to provide any further clarification that may be needed or to answer any questions you may have about our comments.	
Sarah Lind, Superior Court of Contra Costa County, Court Executive Officer	Position: Agree if modified	The comment below is in response to all comments from Sarah Lind, Superior Court of Contra Costa County, Court Executive Officer

Commenter	Comment	Committee Response
Sarah Lind	1. Technical Training Needs for IT The recommendations rely on A/V and networking capabilities that small and medium-sized IT teams may not be staffed or trained to support. Examples include: • DSP tuning, noise suppression, echo cancellation, and remote monitoring (2.1.2) • Mix-minus audio routing (2.1.4) • Dante protocol networking and VLAN configuration (2.2) • PTZ camera setup, NDI video transport, and maintenance (2.5.4) Given this level of complexity, implementation and long-term maintenance may be challenging without additional support. Suggested JCC support: • Centralized or regional technical training for IT staff • Standard configuration templates (DSP, Dante, and NDI) Troubleshooting guides and support resources.	The workstream’s recommendations are advisory and are not intended to mandate purchase of specific technologies or recommendations. Courts may implement recommendations based on local priorities, existing systems, and available funding. To be clear, in order for courts in California to adopt and implement innovation, especially technology innovation, they must receive adequate funding to enable them to do so. The workstream recognizes that responsibilities of courtroom staff and judicial officers, as well as operational processes vary across courts and will take this into account while refining the recommendations. The workstream sincerely appreciates your thoughtful consideration of the broader role the Judicial Council might play. While the suggestions you raise extend beyond the scope of this workstream, the Judicial Council will give careful consideration to these ideas as it evaluates future opportunities to support the courts. In doing so, we remain mindful of the significant diversity among California’s courts and the communities they serve.
Sarah Lind	2. Operational Training Needs for Judges and Court Staff The recommendations place additional responsibilities on judicial officers, courtroom clerks, and other courtroom staff, including: • Potential management of active speaker mode and camera controls (1.2.1, 1.2.2) • Handling participant identification, chart controls, and display settings (1.2.3) • Managing virtual lobbies, admissions, and reentry control (1.2.6) • Configuring secure breakout rooms (1.2.7)	Same as above

Commenter	Comment	Committee Response
	• Conducting interpreter audio checks (1.1.4) • Responding in real time to technical issues (1.1.10) These responsibilities represent a meaningful shift in courtroom workflows and will require structured training and clear operational guidance to ensure efficiency and consistent use. Suggested JCC support: • Role-specific training modules (judges, clerks, reporters, and interpreters) • Quick-reference guides for common courtroom scenarios (pre-hearing steps, identity protocols, evidence sharing, etc.) Short instructional video/materials for external users, including self-represented litigants.	
Sarah Lind	3. Hardware Review, Model Courts, and Site Visits The recommendations provide detailed guidance on courtroom technology and infrastructure (2.3–2.6, 4.2–5.5.2). Courts may benefit from additional support in evaluating whether existing or planned systems align with these standards, and in identifying which upgrades provide the most value when funding is limited. Suggested JCC support: • Optional hardware/infrastructure assessments for courts planning upgrades • Identification of model courts that have successful implementations • Facilitated site visits or virtual tours so courts can see functioning hybrid setups and learn from real world deployments ○ Including both the technical and operations perspectives.	Same as above
Sarah Lind	4. ADA Web Accessibility Considerations Because remote and hybrid proceedings rely heavily on online tools (appearance platforms, livestreams, instructional	Same as above

Commenter	Comment	Committee Response
	materials, and electronic forms), it is important that accessibility requirements are explicitly incorporated into the recommendations. Additionally, hardware and infrastructure decisions made at the courtroom level may directly influence or constrain the software platforms and accessibility features that can be supported, making it important to consider accessibility holistically across both hardware and software environments. Inaccessible web content can limit participation in the same way as physical barriers in a courthouse. Ensuring accessibility is essential to maintaining equitable access to court services. Key considerations include: • Readable text contrast • Captioning for streamed proceedings • Use of alternative text for images • Full keyboard navigation • Accessible and clearly labeled online forms Incorporating these elements into the framework will help ensure that remote proceedings are accessible to all participants, including those using assistive technologies, while also promoting alignment between technology infrastructure decisions and long-term accessibility requirements.	

Commenter	Comment	Committee Response
Superior Court of Los Angeles County by Stephanie Kuo, Legislative Analyst	Position: Agree if modified The following comments are representative of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles (Court), and do not represent or promote the viewpoint of any particular officer or employee. In response to the Judicial Council of California’s “ITC Remote Proceedings Technology Recommendations,” the Court agrees with the proposal and believes it is a comprehensive set of recommendations to cover all use cases. However, the Court suggests that the document make clear that the recommendations are not required as part of the Minimum Technology Standards for Remote Proceedings and that courts may have difficulty implementing the recommendations without adequate funding.	Thank you for this feedback. The workstream’s recommendations are advisory and do not create new mandates or requirements for courts. Implementation of the recommendations is dependent on local resources, and each court may determine what is feasible based on available funding. The workstream recognizes that budget limitations may affect the ability to undertake certain recommendations. In addition, the workstream acknowledges the concerns raised by several courts that many of these recommendations cannot realistically be implemented without additional funding support from the Legislature. Including these perspectives is important to ensure that statewide guidance accurately reflects the operational and fiscal realities courts face, and to give voice to the need for sustained investment in courtroom modernization.