



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm
jctc@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))
THIS MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED BY TELECONFERENCE
THIS MEETING WILL BE RECORDED

Date: January 11, 2016
Time: 12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831 Passcode: 3511860

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the December 14, 2015 Judicial Council Technology Committee meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(2))

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), public comments about any agenda item must be submitted by January 8, 2016, 12:00 noon. Written comments should be e-mailed to jctc@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to 2255 N. Ontario Street, Suite 220, Burbank, California 91504, attention: Jessica Craven. Only written comments received by January 8, 2016, 12:00 noon will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-7)

Item 1

Chair Report

Provide update on activities of or news from the Judicial Council, advisory bodies, courts, and/or other justice partners.

Presenter: Hon. Marsha G. Slough

Item 2

Update/Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

An update and report on ITAC will be provided; this will include the activities of the workstreams.

Presenter: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair, Information Technology Advisory Committee

Item 3

Review of ITAC Annual Agenda (Action Required)

Review of the annual agenda for ITAC.

Presenter: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers

Item 4

Update on Oracle Survey

Review the survey distributed to the trial courts on using the Oracle products, as well as the survey results.

Presenter: Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds, Senior Manager, Judicial Council Information Technology

Item 5

Update on Civil Case Management System (V3) Replacement Budget Change Proposal

An update and report on the work related to the civil case management system (V3) replacement budget change proposal.

Presenter: Mr. Richard D. Feldstein, JCTC member

Item 6

Update on Sustain Justice Edition Case Management System

An update and report on the work related to the Sustain Justice Edition case management system.

Presenter: Mr. Richard D. Feldstein

Item 7

Discussion on Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) Presentation

Discussion on the upcoming JCTC presentation to the Judicial Council at its February 2016 meeting.

Facilitators: Hon. Marsha G. Slough and Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Vice-Chair, Judicial Council Technology Committee

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm
jctc@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

December 14, 2015
12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m.

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair; Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Vice-Chair; Hon. Ming W. Chin; Hon. David E. Gunn; Hon. Gary Nadler; and Mr. Richard D. Feldstein

Advisory Body Members Absent: Mr. Mark Bonino; Mr. Jake Chatters; and Ms. Debra Elaine Pole

Liaison Members Present: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers

Others Present: Mr. Curt Soderlund; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Ms. Renea Stewart; Ms. Jessica Craven; Ms. Kathy Fink; and Mr. David Koon

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order, took roll call, and advised that no public comments were received.

Approval of Minutes

The members unanimously approved the minutes of the November 9, 2015 Judicial Council Technology Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1 – 6)

Item 1

Chair Report

Update: Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair of the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC), welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. Judge Slough reviewed the agenda for the meeting, as well as provided updates on recent meetings in which she and other members represented the JCTC or reported on the JCTC activities.

Item 2

Update/Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)


Update: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair of ITAC, provided an update and report on the activities of the advisory committee, its subcommittees, and its workstreams.

Action: The committee discussed the activities of ITAC and received the report.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the public portion of the meeting was adjourned.

Judicial Council Technology Committee Open Meeting



January 11, 2016

Call to Order and Roll Call

- Welcome
- Open Meeting Script
- Approve minutes

*Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair, Judicial Council Technology
Committee*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Chair Report

Hon. Marsha G. Slough



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Update/Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

*Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair, Information Technology
Advisory Committee*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Action: Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) Annual Agenda

Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Update on Oracle Survey

*Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds, Senior Manager, Judicial Council
Information Technology*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Update on Civil Case Management System (V3) Replacement Budget Change Proposal

Mr. Richard D. Feldstein, JCTC member



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Update on Sustain Justice Edition Case Management System

Mr. Richard D. Feldstein



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Discussion on Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) Orientation

*Facilitators: Hon. Marsha G. Slough and Hon. Daniel J. Buckley,
Vice-Chair, Judicial Council Technology Committee*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Adjourn

All



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)
Annual Agenda—2016
Approved by: JCTC

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers
Staff:	Ms. Jamel Jones
Advisory Body's Charge: <u>Rule 10.53. Information Technology Advisory Committee</u> (a) Areas of focus 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. (b) Additional duties In addition to the duties described in rule 10.34, the committee must: <ol style="list-style-type: none">(1) Oversee branchwide technology initiatives funded in whole or in part by the state;(2) Recommend rules, standards, and legislation to ensure compatibility in information and communication technologies in the judicial branch;(3) Provide input to the Judicial Council Technology Committee on the technology and business requirements of court technology projects and initiatives in funding requests;(4) Review and recommend legislation, rules, or policies to balance the interests of privacy, access, and security in relation to court technology;(5) Make proposals for technology education and training in the judicial branch;(6) Assist courts in acquiring and developing useful technologies;(7) Establish mechanisms to collect, preserve, and share best practices across the state;(8) Develop and recommend a tactical technology plan, described in rule 10.16, with input from the individual appellate and trial courts; and(9) Develop and recommend the committee's annual agenda, identifying individual technology initiatives scheduled for the next year.	

(c) Sponsorship of branchwide technology initiatives

(1) Oversight of branchwide technology initiatives

The committee is responsible for overseeing branchwide technology initiatives that are approved as part of the committee's annual agenda. The committee may oversee these initiatives through a workstream model, a subcommittee model, or a hybrid of the two. Under the workstream model, committee members sponsor discrete technology initiatives executed by ad hoc teams of technology experts and experienced project and program managers from throughout the branch. Under the subcommittee model, committee members serve on subcommittees that carry out technology projects and develop and recommend policies and rules.

(2) Technology workstreams

Each technology workstream has a specific charge and duration that align with the objective and scope of the technology initiative assigned to the workstream. The individual tasks necessary to complete the initiative may be carried out by dividing the workstream into separate tracks. Technology workstreams are not advisory bodies for purposes of rule 10.75.

(3) Executive sponsorship of technology workstreams

The committee chair designates a member or two members of the committee to act as executive sponsors of each technology initiative monitored through the workstream model. The executive sponsor assumes overall executive responsibility for project deliverables and periodically provides high-level project status updates to the advisory committee and council. The executive sponsor is responsible for facilitating work plans for the initiative.

(4) Responsibilities and composition of technology workstream teams

A workstream team serves as staff on the initiative and is responsible for structuring, tracking, and managing the progress of individual tasks and milestones necessary to complete the initiative. The executive sponsor recommends, and the chair appoints, a workstream team of technology experts and experienced project and program managers from throughout the branch.

Advisory Body’s Membership: There are a total of 21 current ITAC members, representing the following categories:

- 3 Appellate Court Justices
- 9 Trial Court Judicial Officers
- 6 Trial and Appellate Court Judicial Administrators¹
- 1 Attorney (appointed by the State Bar)
- 1 Law School Professor (public member)
- 1 Assembly Member (appointed by the State Assembly)

¹ This includes 1 Court of Appeal Clerk/Administrator; 2 Trial Court Executive Officers; and 2 Trial Court Information/Technology Officers.

Subgroups/Working Groups:

Standing subcommittees:

- ITAC Rules & Policy Subcommittee
- ITAC Projects Subcommittee
- Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee (JATS)

Workstreams:

- (existing) Case Management System (CMS) Data Exchange (DX) Workstream
- (existing) E-Filing Strategy Workstream
- (existing) Next Generation Hosting Strategy Workstream
- (existing) Video Remote Interpreting Pilot Workstream (formerly titled “Remote Courtroom Video Workstream”)
- (new) Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) E-Services Workstream
- (new) Disaster Recovery Workstream

[Link to section IV. Subgroup/Working Group Detail.](#)

Advisory Body’s Key Objectives for 2016:

The *Strategic Plan for Technology 2014-2018* outlines the following goals, to which ITAC’s 2016 Annual Agenda aligns.

1. Goal 1: Promote the Digital Court – Part 1: Foundation, Part 2: Access, Services, and Partnerships
2. Goal 2: Optimize Branch Resources
3. Goal 3: Optimize Infrastructure
4. Goal 4: Promote Rule and Legislative Changes

Additionally, a limited number of initiatives are classified as standing agenda items and considered core responsibilities of the committee.

II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>CMS Data Exchanges</p> <p>Develop Standardized Approaches to Case Management System (CMS) Interfaces and Data Exchanges with Critical State Justice Partners</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) Identify a single data exchange standard between each justice partner and the judicial branch to use as a development target for case management system vendors.</p> <p>(b) Provide a lead court to act as a point of contact for all case management system vendors and justice partners for each justice partner exchange; and document the current implementation status of each exchange by each vendor.</p>	2	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 1: Promote the Digital Court: Develop Standard CMS Interfaces and Data Exchanges</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i></p> <p>Tactical Plan; carryover from Annual Agenda 2015.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <p><i>ITAC:</i> Workstream</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Justice partners and vendors</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> Goal 1</p>	March 2016 (in progress)	<p>Documented data exchange elements and format standards</p> <p>Documented governance and modification processes</p>

² All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

³ For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 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.

#	Project ²	Priority ³	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>(c) Identify the technical standards to be used for the implementation of all data exchanges between the judicial branch and justice partners.</p> <p>(d) Establish a formal governance process for exchange updates and modifications.</p> <p>(e) Maintain a repository of required materials that support development of standardized exchanges.</p> <p>(f) Promote the technical standards as the default standards for local data exchanges.</p>				

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
2.	<p>E-Filing Strategy</p> <p>Update E-Filing Standards; Develop Provider Certification and a Deployment Strategy</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) Update the technical standards for court e-filing, namely, the XML specification and related schema.</p> <p>(b) Develop the E-Filing Service Provider (EFSP) selection/certification process.</p> <p>(c) Develop the roadmap for an e-filing deployment strategy, approach, and branch solutions/alternatives.</p> <p>Note: A future phase RFP may be necessary, dependent upon the outcomes of this workstream.</p>	1	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 1: Promote the Digital Court E-Filing Deployment</p> <p>Origin of Project:</p> <p>Tactical Plan; carryover project from 2015 Annual Agenda.</p> <p>Resources:</p> <p><i>ITAC:</i> Workstream</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Workstream members; CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Goal 1</p>	July 2016 (6 months)	Updated Technical Standards Certification Program

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
3.	<p>Next Generation Hosting Strategy</p> <p>Assess Alternatives for Transition to a Next-Generation Branchwide Hosting Model</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) Define workstream project schedule and detailed tasks; gain approval of workstream membership.</p> <p>(b) Outline industry best practices for hosting (including solution matrix with pros, cons, example applications, and costs).</p> <p>(c) Produce a roadmap tool for use by courts in evaluating options.</p> <p>(d) Consider educational summit on hosting options, and hold summit if appropriate.</p> <p>(e) Identify requirements for centralized hosting.</p> <p>(f) Recommend a branch-level hosting strategy.</p>	2	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 3: Transition to Next-Generation Branchwide Hosting Model</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i></p> <p>Tactical Plan; next phase of project following 2015 assessment.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <p><i>ITAC:</i> Workstream</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> Goal 3</p>	December 2016	<p>Assessment Findings: Best practices, Solution Options</p> <p>Educational Document for Courts</p> <p>Host 1-Day Summit on Hosting</p> <p>Recommendations For Branch-level Hosting</p>

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
4.	<p>Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Pilot</p> <p>Consult As Requested and Implement Video Remote Interpreting Pilot (VRI) Program</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) In cooperation with the Language Access Plan (LAP) Implementation Task Force Technological Solutions Subcommittee (TSS), assist with identifying participants for a video remote interpreting (VRI) pilot program. Steps include identification of a court participant and issuance of an RFP for a no-cost vendor partner, per the programmatic outline developed in 2015.</p> <p>(b) Implement Phase I of the VRI pilot program, in cooperation with the TSS.</p> <p>Note: The workstream is expected to update the technical standards for remote courtroom video following the pilot.</p>	2	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 1: Courthouse Video Connectivity</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Tactical Plan; continuation of project from Annual Agenda 2015.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Court Operations Special Services Office, Information Technology</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Language Access Plan (LAP) Implementation Task Force Technological Solutions Subcommittee (TSS); CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee; CIOs</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> Goal 1</p>	March 2017 (Phase I)	Implementation of VRI Pilot Program

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
5.	<p>SRL E-Services</p> <p>Develop Requirements and a Request for Proposal (RFP) for Establishing Online Branchwide Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) E-Services</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) Develop requirements for branchwide SRL e-capabilities to facilitate interactive FAQ, triage functionality, and document assembly to guide SRLs through the process, and interoperability with the branchwide e-filing solution. The portal will be complementary to existing local court services.</p> <p>(b) Determine implementation options for a branch-branded SRL E-Services website that takes optimal advantage of existing branch, local court, and vendor resources. In scope for 2016 is development of an RFP; out of scope is the actual implementation.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 1: Promote the Digital Court: Implement Portal for Self-Represented Litigants (SRL)</p> <p>Origin of Project:</p> <p>Tactical Plan; next phase of project following feasibility and desirability assessment from Annual Agenda 2015.</p> <p>Resources:</p> <p><i>ITAC:</i> Workstream</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Center for Families, Children and the Courts (CFCC)</p> <p>Collaborations: Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Subcommittee of the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee (C&SCAC) standing subcommittee; Advisory Committee Providing Access & Fairness; CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee; CITMF, the Southern Regional SRL Network, and the California Tyler Users Group (CATUG)</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Goal 1</p>	December 2016 (12 months)	<p>SRL Portal Requirements Document</p> <p>Request for Proposal (RFP)</p>

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
6.	<p>Disaster Recovery (DR) Framework and Pilot</p> <p>Document, Test, and Adopt a Court Disaster Recovery Framework</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) Develop model disaster recovery guidelines, standard recovery times, and priorities for each of the major technology components of the branch.</p> <p>(b) Develop a disaster recovery framework document that could be adapted for any trial or appellate court to serve as a court’s disaster recovery plan.</p> <p>(c) Create a plan for providing technology components that could be leveraged by all courts for disaster recovery purposes.</p> <p>(d) Pilot the framework by having one or more courts use it.</p>	2	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 3: Court Disaster Recovery Framework and Pilot</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Tactical Plan; next phase of project following 2015 assessment.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Workstream members representing various court sizes; CEAC</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> Goal 3</p>	December 2016 (12 months)	<p>Disaster Recovery Framework Document and Checklist</p> <p>Findings from Pilot</p>

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
7.	<p>Modernize Rules of Court (Phase II)</p> <p>Modernize Trial and Appellate Court Rules to Support E-Business</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) In collaboration with other advisory committees, continue review of rules and statutes in a systematic manner and develop recommendations for more comprehensive changes to align with modern business practices (e.g., eliminating paper dependencies).</p> <p>Note: Projects may include rule proposals to amend rules to address formatting of electronic documents, a legislative proposal to provide express statutory authority for permissive e-filing and e-service in criminal cases, and changes to appellate forms to reflect e-filing practices.</p>	2	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i></p> <p>Tactical Plan; next phase of project following item in Annual Agenda 2015.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <p><i>ITAC:</i> Rules & Policy Subcommittee, Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services, Office of Governmental Affairs, Center for Families, Children and the Courts (CFCC), Criminal Justice Services</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Appellate Advisory Committee, Civil & Small Claims, Criminal Law, Traffic, Family and Juvenile Law, and Probate and Mental Health advisory committees; TCPJAC, CEAC and their Joint Technology, Rules, and Legislative Subcommittees</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> Goal 4</p>	December 2018 (2 years)	Rule and/or Legislative Proposal, if appropriate

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
8.	<p>Standards, Rules and/or Legislation for E-Signatures</p> <p>Develop Legislation, Rules, and Standards for Electronic Signatures on Documents Filed by Parties and Attorneys</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) Develop legislative and rule proposal to amend Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6(b)(2) and Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.257, to authorize electronic signatures on documents filed by the parties and attorneys.</p> <p>(b) Develop standards governing electronic signatures to be included in the <i>Trial Court Records Manual</i>.</p>	2	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Tactical Plan; next phase and expansion of 2014 and 2015 Annual Agenda items. Recommendation by Department of Child Support Services and attorney, Tim Perry.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> <i>ITAC:</i> Rules & Policy Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> CEAC Subcommittee on Records Management, CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Rules and Legislative Subcommittees</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> Goal 4</p>	December 2018 (2 years)	<p>Rule and/or Legislative Proposal, if appropriate</p> <p>Recommendation of Standards for Electronic Signatures (Update to the <i>Trial Court Records Manual</i>)</p>

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
9.	<p>Rules for Remote Access to Court Records by Local Justice Partners</p> <p>Develop Rule Proposal to Facilitate Remote Access to Trial Court Records by Local Justice Partners</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i> (a) Amend trial court rules to facilitate remote access to trial court records by local justice partners.</p>	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Rules and Policy Subcommittee discussion/recommendation. Currently, the trial court rules recognize remote electronic access of trial court records in criminal cases and certain civil cases by parties, their attorneys, and persons or entities authorized by statute or rule. This rules proposal would facilitate remote access to trial court records by local justice partners.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> <i>ITAC:</i> Rules & Policy Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee; Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Criminal Law Advisory Committee, Traffic Law Advisory Committee</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> Goal 4</p>	December 2016	Rule Proposal

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
10.	<p>Rules for E-Filing</p> <p>Evaluate Current E-Filing Laws and Rules, and Recommend Appropriate Changes</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) Evaluate current e-filing laws, rules, and amendments. Projects may include reviewing statutes and rules governing Electronic Filing Service Providers (EFSP) and filing deadlines.</p> <p>(b) Develop legislative and rule proposals to amend e-filing laws and rules (Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 and California Rules of Court, rule 2.250 et seq.).</p> <p>Note: This effort will be informed by the E-Filing Workstream work.</p>	2	<p>Judicial Council Direction:</p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change</p> <p>Origin of Project:</p> <p>Tactical Plan; carry over project from 2015 Annual Agenda. Possible additional recommendations from the E-filing Workstream. Recommendation from the Superior Court of Sacramento County (from comment submitted in response to 2015 ITC for Rules Modernization Project rules proposal). Recommendation from Mr. Tony Klein of Attorney Service of San Francisco to review rules governing EFSPs.</p> <p>Resources:</p> <p>ITAC: Rules & Policy Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> ITAC E-Filing Workstream; TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology, Rules and Legislative Subcommittees; also Criminal Law, Civil and Small Claims, Family and Juvenile Law, and Appellate Advisory Committees</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Goal 4</p>	December 2016	Legislative and Rule Proposals

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
11.	<p>Privacy Policy</p> <p>Develop Branch and Model Court Privacy Policies on Electronic Court Records and Access</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) Continue development of a comprehensive statewide privacy policy addressing electronic access to court records and data to align with both state and federal requirements.</p> <p>(b) Continue development of a model (local) court privacy policy, outlining the key contents and provisions to address within a local court's specific policy.</p>	2	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 4: Promote Rule and Legislative Changes</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i></p> <p>Tactical Plan; carryover from Annual Agenda 2014 and 2015. Code Civ. Proc., § 1010.6 (enacted in 1999) required the Judicial Council to adopt uniform rules on access to public records; subsequently the rules have been amended in response to changes in the law and technology, requests from the courts, and suggestions from members of CTAC, the bar, and the public.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <p><i>ITAC:</i> Rules & Policy Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee; Criminal Law Advisory Committee, and the Department of Justice</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> Goal 4</p>	December 2017 (2 years)	<p>Recommendation of Branch Privacy Policy</p> <p>Recommendation of Model Local Court Privacy Policy</p>

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
12.	<p>Standards for Electronic Court Records</p> <p>Develop Standards for Electronic Court Records Maintained as Data</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) In collaboration with the CMS Data Exchange Workstream, develop standards and proposal to allow trial courts to maintain electronic court records as data in their case management systems.</p> <p>(b) Include standards in update to the <i>Trial Court Records Manual</i>.</p>	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC); Government Code section 68150 provides that court records may be maintained in electronic form so long as they satisfy standards developed by the Judicial Council. These standards are contained in the <i>Trial Court Records Manual</i>. However, the current version of the manual addresses maintaining electronic court records only as documents, not data.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> <i>ITAC:</i> Rules & Policy Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> ITAC Data Exchange Workstream; CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> Goal 4</p>	September 2016 (1 year)	Recommendation of Standards for Electronic Court Records as Data (Update to the <i>Trial Court Records Manual</i>)

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
13.	<p>Appellate Rules for E-Filing</p> <p>Amend Rules to Ensure Consistency with E-Filing Practices of Appellate Courts</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) Review appellate rules and amend as needed to ensure consistency between the rules and current e-filing practices and to consider whether statewide uniformity in those practices would be desirable.</p>	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i></p> <p>Members of the Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee (JATS) have noted the need to ensure consistency between the appellate rules and current e-filing practices and also to consider whether certain areas of statewide uniformity in those practices would be desirable. JATS seeks to address these issues.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <p><i>ITAC:</i> Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Appellate Advisory Committee</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> Goal 4</p>	December 2016 (Spring 2016 Rules Cycle)	Rule Proposal, as appropriate

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
14.	<p>Consult on Appellate Court Technological Issues</p> <p>Consult, as Requested, On Technological Issues Arising In Or Affecting the Appellate Courts</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) The Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee (JATS) will provide input on request on technology related proposals considered by other advisory bodies as to how those proposals may affect, or involve, the appellate courts. JATS will consult on the appellate court technology aspects of issues, as requested.</p>	On-going	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i></p> <p>JATS ongoing charge. Proposed resolutions of various issues by advisory bodies will have an impact on appellate court work, or may require changes to court practices. Issues include, for example, changes to protect the privacy of victims and witnesses whose information may be discussed in appellate decisions; changes in trial court e-filing practices that may affect the format of documents in the record on appeal; and e-filing implementation in the appellate courts.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <p><i>ITAC:</i> Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Appellate Advisory Committee</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> Goal 4</p>	December 2016 (availability as issues arise)	Recommendations, as needed

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
15.	<p>Tactical Plan for Technology Update Tactical Plan for Technology for Effective Date 2017-2019</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) Review and update the Tactical Plan for Technology.</p> <p>(b) Circulate for branch and public comment.</p> <p>(c) Finalize and submit for approval.</p> <p>Note: Futures Commission outcomes will provide inputs into Strategic and Tactical Plan.</p>	1	<p><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i> Technology Governance and Funding Model</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Technology Governance and Funding Model; chair recommendation</p> <p><i>Resources:</i> <i>ITAC:</i> Chair and Full Committee</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Broad input from the branch and the public.</p> <p><i>Key Objective Supported:</i> Standing Item</p>	December 2016 (work to begin no later than mid-year 2016)	Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-2019

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
16.	<p>Liaison Collaboration</p> <p>Liaison with Advisory Bodies for Collaboration and Information Exchange</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) Appoint ITAC members to serve as liaisons to identified advisory bodies.</p> <p>(b) Share ITAC status reports with advisory body chairs and attend liaison committee meetings.</p> <p>(c) Identify opportunities to collaborate and share liaison feedback to ITAC, the JCTC, the Judicial Council, and the branch, as appropriate.</p>	On-going	<p>Judicial Council Direction: N/A</p> <p>Origin of Project: Standing item on the annual agenda.</p> <p>Resources: <i>ITAC:</i> Liaisons</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Liaison advisory bodies</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: Standing Item</p>	Ongoing	Liaison Reports at ITAC Meetings

III. STATUS OF 2016 PROJECTS

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1.	<p>CMS Data Exchanges Develop Standardized Approaches to CMS Interfaces and Data Exchanges with Critical State Justice Partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Identify specific justice partners exchanges required and court interface needs. (b) Establish standards for, and define where feasible, common exchange(s), consistent with national standards, and secure methods to share those exchanges for courts wishing to implement them. (c) Work with CMS vendors to facilitate timely implementation of standardized exchanges where needed, consistent with existing court deployment schedules. (d) Develop governance processes to ensure continuing development and maintenance of statewide data exchanges established, and to maintain on-going communication and cooperation with our justice partners and CMS vendors in this effort. 	<p>In progress; project continues into 2016 agenda. Project continues into 2016 agenda. Status is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Primary requirements and needs identified; will be further confirmed and expanded via detailed discussions between justice partners and CMS vendors. (b) Justice partner focus sessions complete. Next phase focuses on CMS vendors working more directly with justice partners to refine data. Designated court representatives will lead sessions, capture/share development, and identify issues for resolution. (c) Implementation continues to be a topic of discussion during the workstream and justice partner/CMS vendor meetings. (d) Key objectives identified. Composition of governance membership to be identified by ITAC. Completion projected by February, 2016.
2.	<p>E-Filing Update E-Filing Standards, and Develop Provider Certification, Deployment Strategy, and Rules Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Update the technical standards for court e-filing, namely, the XML specification and related schema. (b) Develop the E-Filing Service Provider (EFSP) selection/certification process. (c) Develop the roadmap for an e-filing deployment strategy, approach, and branch solutions/alternatives. (d) Evaluate current e-filing rules, including provisions for 	<p>In progress; project continues into 2016 agenda. Status is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The workstream has recommended the NIEM/Oasis ECF specification (https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/legalxml-courtfilling). (b) and (c) The workstream will present E-Filing and EFSP recommendations at the early 2016 ITAC meeting. (d) Rules assessment will take place as part of the 2016 annual agenda Project #2.

	mandatory e-filing.	
3.	<p>Remote Courtroom Video</p> <p>Develop Remote Courtroom Video Standards, a Pilot Program, and Update to Rules</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Develop technical standards for remote courtroom video. (b) Define and implement, in cooperation with the Language Access Plan (LAP) Implementation Task Force, a Video Remote Interpreting Pilot (VRI) Program for foreign languages.* (c) Seek extension of Rule of Court 4.220 (Remote Video Proceedings in Traffic Infraction Cases). Consider Expansion to other case types. 	<p>Partially completed; remainder continues into 2016 agenda.</p> <p>Refer to current status, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The LAP Technological Solutions Subcommittee (TSS) (also chaired by Justice Bruiniers) provisionally approved standards developed by the National Center for State Courts for use in the video remote interpreting (VRI) pilot project (see item (b) below). Refinement of those standards is anticipated as a result of the pilot. (b) The LAP TSS approved a programmatic outline for a pilot and is developing an RFP seeking a vendor partner. The chair also seeks operations support for the project. Once a vendor and court participant(s) are selected, the chair expects to staff an ITAC workstream to coordinate implementation. (c) <u>This item is complete.</u> The Judicial Council approved the permanent authorization for remote video proceedings in traffic infraction cases, effective September 1, 2015.
4.	<p>Next Generation Hosting Strategy Assessment</p> <p>Assessment of Alternatives for Transition to Next-Generation Branchwide Hosting Model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Complete hosting needs assessment, develop implementation recommendations, including an evaluation of alternatives and costs. 	<p>Completed, next phase included in 2016 agenda.</p> <p>An initial assessment was completed in October 2015, and the findings were submitted to the JCTC. This project was then approved by ITAC to move forward as a workstream in 2016 to complete the assessment and recommendations.</p>
5.	<p>Information Security Framework</p> <p>Document and Adopt Court Information Systems Security Policy Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Finish the work that was started on the Court Information Systems Security Policy Framework. (b) Initially adopt the framework at a select group of pilot courts. 	<p>Completed.</p> <p>This effort was completed, and resulted in information security framework “how to” and checklist aids, which 7 pilot courts used to assess their security. The committee plans to incorporate refresh schedule that is concurrent to the Tactical Plan development.</p>

	(c) Adopt the framework at the remaining courts, as needed.	
6.	<p>Disaster Recovery (DR) Framework Assessment Survey and Assessment for Court Disaster Recovery Framework and Pilot</p> <p>(a) Survey and provide a disaster recovery needs assessment and gap analysis for the major technology components in the trial and appellate courts.</p>	<p>Completed, next phase included in 2016 agenda.</p> <p>An initial assessment was completed in October 2015, and the findings were submitted to the JCTC. This project was then approved by ITAC to move forward as a workstream in 2016 to develop and pilot DR framework aids.</p>
7.	<p>Privacy Policy Develop Branch & Model Court Privacy Policies on Electronic Court Records and Access</p> <p>(a) Continue development of a comprehensive statewide privacy policy addressing electronic access to court records and data to align with both state and federal requirements.</p> <p>(b) Continue development of a model (local) court privacy policy, outlining the key contents and provisions to address within a local court's specific policy.</p>	<p>Not started; project carried into 2016 agenda.</p> <p>Project is carried over into 2016 agenda. Effort was deprioritized in 2015 due to resource limitations.</p>
8.	<p>SRL E-Services Portal Evaluate Feasibility and Desirability of Establishing a Branch Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) E-Services Portal</p> <p>(a) Determine and validate both litigant needs (including LEP litigants) and court requirements.</p> <p>(b) Identify available existing technology and infrastructure components to leverage.</p> <p>(c) Identify information resources to assist litigants.</p>	<p>Completed; next phase included in 2016 agenda.</p> <p>This evaluation was complete. The next step for this effort is to develop requirements for e-services, which is proposed in the 2016 agenda.</p>
9.	<p>E-Signatures Develop Standards for Electronic Signatures</p> <p>(a) Develop procedures and standards for use of electronic</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>This effort is complete; e-signature standards were approved by the committee as an update to the <i>Trial Courts Record Manual</i>.</p>

	<p>and digital signatures for court documents, as specified in Government Code section 68150(g), for inclusion in the Court Records Manual.</p> <p>(b) Recommend rule proposal incorporating standards into Rules of Court, as appropriate.</p>	<p>The council will consider approving at its December 2015 meeting.</p>
10.	<p>Tactical Plan for Technology</p> <p>Update Tactical Plan for Technology for Effective Date 2016-2018</p> <p>(a) Review and update the Tactical Plan for Technology.</p> <p>(b) Circulate for branch and public comment.</p> <p>(c) Finalize and submit for approval.</p>	<p>Not Started; project carried into 2016 agenda.</p> <p>This project was placed on hold and work will commence as part of the 2016 agenda. Note that the JCTC approved the change of effective date of the next Tactical Plan to 01/2017-12/2018. The current plan was extended to 12/2016.</p>
11.	<p>Policy & Rules for E-Access to Appellate Court Records</p> <p>Develop Branch Policy and Rules on Public Access to Electronic Appellate Court Records</p> <p>(a) Develop a comprehensive statewide policy addressing reasonable public access to electronic appellate court records to align with access rules for the trial courts.</p> <p>(b) (b) Draft rule proposal to incorporate standards into Rules of Court, as appropriate.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>This project is complete. JATS developed proposed rules (8.80-8.85) on electronic access to appellate court records, which were adopted by the Judicial Council at its October 27 meeting.</p>
12.	<p>Rules for Electronic Service</p> <p>Evaluate Amendment to Rules of Court to Allow Electronic Service Upon Courts if the Court Consents</p> <p>(a) Consider whether to recommend rule amendments to clarify that a court may be served electronically if the court consents to receive this form of service.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>This project is complete. The council adopted the amendments to rules 2.251 and 8.71 per ITAC recommendation at the council's October meeting.</p>
13.	<p>Modernize Rules of Court: Phase I</p> <p>Modernize Trial and Appellate Court Rules to Support E-Business</p> <p>(a) In collaboration with other advisory committees, review rules and statutes in a systematic manner and develop</p>	<p>Completed; next phase included in 2016 agenda.</p> <p>Phase I of the Rules Modernization Project is complete. At its October meeting, the Judicial Council adopted the rule amendments sponsored by ITAC. Work on Phase II is already underway and includes more substantive legislative and rules</p>

	recommendations for comprehensive changes to align with modern business practices (e.g., eliminating paper dependencies).	proposals intended to further promote e-practices.
14.	<p>Collaborations and Information Exchange</p> <p>Liaise with Advisory Bodies and the Branch on Technology Initiatives, Rules and Implementations</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>ITAC assigns liaisons to peer advisory committees to share information and identify opportunities to collaborate and exchange input. This function and relationship is ongoing and will continue onto the 2016 agenda.</p>

DRAFT

IV. SUBGROUPS/WORKING GROUPS - Detail

Subgroups/Working Groups:

Subgroup or working group name: **ITAC Rules & Policy Subcommittee (exclusively ITAC members)**

Purpose of subgroup or working group:

In 2010, an ITAC E-Business Subcommittee was formed merging ITAC's 'Rules' and 'E-Practices' Subcommittees. At the time, the Rules Subcommittee's charter was to review Rules of Court on Electronic Access to Public Information and E-Filing and other technology-related rules and standards. The E-Practices Subcommittee was charged with developing a report and associated policy recommendations on four specific issues related to how courts should operate with electronic documents and information.

At the March 8, 2013 ITAC meeting, the committee renamed its E-Business Subcommittee to the Rules & Policy Subcommittee. The purpose of this subcommittee is to recommend rules and policies to the Judicial Council regarding e-business practices, including in the area of e-filing.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 6 ITAC members are on this subcommittee

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): None.

Date formed: 2010

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: This group participates in at least three (3) teleconferences annually, with additional calls scheduled as needed. This group has not met in person.

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: Standing Subcommittee, Ongoing

Subgroup or working group name: **ITAC Projects Subcommittee (exclusively ITAC members)**

Purpose of subgroup or working group:

In 2010, ITAC's 'Projects' Subcommittee was renamed the 'Technology Services Subcommittee'; however, at the March 8, 2013 ITAC meeting, the subcommittee was renamed the Projects Subcommittee. The subcommittee is tasked with studying and developing guidelines around e-filing endorsements (stamps) and digital signatures; secondly, to identify ways of expanding remote video in the courts. Last year, the subcommittee surveyed the courts regarding current and potential uses of remote video technologies, and created an inventory of master agreements for technology products and services that are available to courts.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 8 ITAC members are on this subcommittee

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): None.

Date formed: 2010

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: This group participates in at least three (3) teleconferences annually, with additional calls scheduled as needed. This group has not met in person.

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: Standing Subcommittee, Ongoing

Subgroup or working group name: **Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee (JATS)**

Purpose of subgroup or working group:

The Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee (JATS) makes recommendations to its oversight advisory committees (i.e., ITAC and AAC) for improving the administration of justice within the appellate courts through the use of technology; and, for fostering cooperative endeavors to resolve common technological issues within the appellate courts.

The subcommittee is needed to focus on technology issues specifically for the appellate courts and to provide recommendations to modernize relevant rules and policy. Neither advisory committee, AAC or ITAC, is equipped to adequately address appellate technology issues by itself. AAC lacks technology expertise and ITAC lacks expertise in appellate procedure and a focus on appellate-specific technology issues. The joint subcommittee provides a membership equipped to focus on technology applications in the appellate courts and to evaluate the legal and rule impacts relating to such technology.

Although this is a joint subcommittee, ITAC serves as the parent advisory group with primary reporting responsibility to the Judicial Council. There will be no additional funding allocated for this subcommittee.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 3 ITAC members are on this subcommittee (appointed by the chair)

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): 4 AAC members are on this subcommittee (appointed by its chair). When formed, this body was approved to include at least one (1) member from the Appellate Presiding Justices Advisory Committee (APJAC), appointed by its Chair. The subcommittee membership was approved not to exceed 12 members.

Date formed: Effective January 1, 2014

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: The group plans to meet primarily by teleconference between 4-6 times per year, with one of those meetings being in person.

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:

The JATS will be a standing committee with no sunset date; however, the need for this subcommittee will be re-evaluated annually as part of the annual agenda development process for ITAC and AAC.

Subgroup or working group name: CMS Data Exchange (DX) Workstream

Purpose of subgroup or working group: To complete tasks outlined in Project #1.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 4

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): 26

Date formed: December 2014.

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: As needed

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: July 2015

Subgroup or working group name: E-Filing Strategy Workstream

Purpose of subgroup or working group: To complete tasks outlined in Project #2.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 3

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): 16

Date formed: January 2015, as part of the annual agenda; member list approved by JCTC September 2015.

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: Bi-weekly

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: December 2016

Subgroup or working group name: Next Generation Hosting Strategy Workstream

Purpose of subgroup or working group: To complete tasks outlined in Project #3.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 2

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): 13

Date formed: September 2015, approved by JCTC.

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: TBD

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: December 2016

Subgroup or working group name: Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Pilot Workstream

Purpose of subgroup or working group: To complete tasks outlined in Project #4.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 1 or more

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): TBD

Date formed: Workstream approved by JCTC as part of January 2015 annual agenda; members not yet identified.

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: TBD

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: March 2017 for Phase I, January 2018 for Phase II

Subgroup or working group name: **(new) SRL E-Services Workstream**

Purpose of subgroup or working group: To complete tasks outlined in Project #5.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 2 or more

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): TBD

Date formed: Workstream approved by JCTC as part of January 2016 annual agenda.

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: TBD

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: December 2016

Subgroup or working group name: **(new) Disaster Recovery Workstream**

Purpose of subgroup or working group: To complete tasks outlined in Project #6.

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 1 or more

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): TBD

Date formed: Workstream approved by JCTC as part of January 2016 annual agenda.

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: TBD

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: December 2016



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel 415-865-4200
TDD 415-865-4272
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. TANIG. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

MARTIN N. HOSHINO
Administrative Director,
Judicial Council

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

HON. MARSHA G. SLOUGH
Chair

HON. DANIEL J. BUCKLEY
Vice-chair

Mr. Mark G. Bonino
Mr. Jake Chatters
Hon. Ming W. Chin
Mr. Richard D. Feldstein
Hon. David E. Gunn
Hon. Gary Nadler
Ms. Debra Elaine Pole

Date

December 11, 2015

Action Requested

Please Review and Respond

To

Court Executive Officers and Court
Information Technology Officers of the
Superior Courts of California

Deadline

December 22, 2015 5:00 pm

From

Hon. Marsha Slough, Chair, Judicial
Council Technology Committee

Contact

Mark Yuan, Manager, Judicial Council
Information Technology (JCIT)
(415) 865-4620
Mark.Yuan@jud.ca.gov

Subject

Oracle Branchwide License Agreement

Virginia Sanders-Hinds, Senior
Manager, JCIT

(415) 865-4617

Virginia.Sanders-Hinds@jud.ca.gov

Dear Court Executive Officers, and Court Information Technology Officers,

The Judicial Council is revising the Oracle Branchwide License agreement and needs to determine whether it is possible to reduce the number of licenses, in order to reduce costs and save the branch money. In order to do this, the Council needs information on how the trial courts currently use the Oracle products, which are available at no charge to the courts. The information provided will ensure the new license agreement continues to meet the needs of the courts in the most cost effective manner possible.

Please complete the survey at <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/BXCP92P> by **Tuesday December 22, 2015 at 5:00 pm**. We understand this is a very short turn around particularly during the holiday season; however, getting a more complete response will hopefully result in a greater benefit for the branch. The survey is intended to provide information about how Oracle fulfills your operational needs, specifically which products are used locally at the court.

Thank you very much for responding to this request. Your court's participation in this survey is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Marsha Slough, Chair
Technology Committee

Attachment

cc: Judicial Council Technology Committee

Mr. Martin Hoshino, Administrative Director

The Judicial Council staff is working with Oracle to better tailor the existing Branchwide License Agreement for Oracle products. A new agreement will still allow courts to use the database products and WebLogic application server, but we will be looking to discontinue maintenance on products that the courts do not use. The Judicial Council staff knows which Oracle products are being used at the California Courts Technical Center (CCTC), but we do not know which Oracle products are being used locally by the courts. Please enter the information, below, only for systems hosted locally at your court.

Please note, that if you do not indicate that a particular product is used by your court -- and we drop maintenance on that product because we do not believe any court is using that product, your court may not be able to receive maintenance from Oracle on that product unless your court negotiates individually with Oracle.

Sample data has been entered for the court and both the number of Oracle users and for the Oracle Database Enterprise Edition product.

Thank you very much for helping us negotiate a financially more favorable agreement with Oracle.

*** 1. Superior Court Name?**

*** 2. Does your court locally use Oracle Database, Enterprise Edition?**

Yes

No

*** 3. Does your court locally use Oracle Tuning Pack?**

Yes

No

*** 4. Does your court locally use Oracle Diagnostics Pack?**

Yes

No

*** 5. Does your court locally use Internet Dev. Suite?**

Yes

No

*** 6. Does your court locally use Oracle Real Applications Clustering (RAC)?**

Yes

No

*** 7. Does your court locally use Oracle Discoverer Desktop**

Yes

No

*** 8. Does your court locally use Oracle Programmer**

Yes

No

*** 9. Does your court locally use Oracle Entitlements Server?**

Yes

No

*** 10. Does your court locally use Oracle WebLogic Suite Processor**

Yes

No

*** 11. Does your court locally use Oracle Configuration Mgmt Pack?**

Yes

No

*** 12. Does your court locally use Oracle Provisioning and Patch Automation?**

Yes

No

*** 13. Does your court locally use Oracle WebLogic Suite NonStd User?**

Yes

No

*** 14. Does your court locally use Oracle Audit Vault Server Processor?**

Yes

No

*** 15. Does your court locally use Oracle Partitioning?**

Yes

No

*** 16. Does your court locally use Oracle Mgmt Pack Identity Mgmt?**

Yes

No

*** 17. Does your court locally use Oracle Database Vault?**

Yes

No

*** 18. Does your court locally use Oracle ID and Access Mgmt?**

Yes

No

*** 19. Does your court locally use Oracle Web Services Management (OWSM)?**

Yes

No

*** 20. Does your court locally use Oracle ID Mgr Connector Sun Java System Dir**

Yes

No

*** 21. Does your court locally use Oracle ID Mgr Connector Msoft Win?**

Yes

No

*** 22. Does your court locally use Oracle ID Mgr Connector DB User Mgmt?**

Yes

No

*** 23. Does your court locally use Oracle ID Mgr Connector Msoft AD?**

Yes

No

*** 24. Does your court locally use Oracle ID Mgr Connector UNIX?**

Yes

No

*** 25. Does your court locally use Oracle ID Mgr Connector Msoft Exchange?**

Yes

No

*** 26. Does your court locally use Oracle ID Mgr Connector SAP?**

Yes

No

*** 27. Does your court locally use Oracle ID Mgr Connector DB Applications Tbl?**

Yes

No

*** 28. Does your court locally use Oracle ID Mgr Connector SAP Enterprise Portal?**

Yes

No

*** 29. Does your court locally use Oracle Advanced Security?**

Yes

No

