



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

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

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

May 9, 2016

12:00 - 1:00 PM

Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair; Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Vice-Chair; Hon. Kyle S. Brodie; Hon. David E. Gunn; Mr. Mark G. Bonino; Mr. Jake Chatters; Mr. Rick Feldstein; and Ms. Debra Elaine Pole

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Ming W. Chin; Hon. Gary Nadler; and Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers

Others Present: Hon. Robert Freedman; Hon. Sheila Hanson; Mr. Snorri Ogata, Mr. Mark Dusman, Mr. Cory Jasperson; Ms. Kathy Fink, Mr. David Koon; Mr. Patrick O'Donnell; Ms. Jessica Goldstein; Ms. Jamel Jones; and Ms. Jenny Phu

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

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

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the April 14, 2016 meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-7)

Item 1

Chair Report

Update: Hon. Marsh G. Slough, Chair of the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC), welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. Justice 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

Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) Annual Agenda Amendment: Workstream for the Tactical Plan Update

Update: Hon. Robert Freedman, Vice-Chair of ITAC, provided an update and report on the amendment to the ITAC Annual Agenda. This was to authorize the use of a workstream to complete the update to the *Tactical Plan for Technology*. The Tactical

Plan Update project was already approved within the ITAC annual agenda; however, at publication, this particular effort was not declared to need a workstream.

Action: The committee discussed the updated annual agenda and voted to approve the amendment, authorizing the use of a workstream to complete the update to the *Tactical Plan for Technology*.

Item 3

Report on E-Filing Workstream: Final Deliverables

Update: Hon. Sheila Hanson, Executive Sponsor, ITAC E-Filing Workstream; and Mr. Snorri Ogata, Project Manager, ITAC E-Filing Workstream, reviewed the proposal to accept the final deliverables of the E-Filing Workstream. The deliverables included a set of high-level and functional recommendations related to establishing a statewide Electronic Filing (E-Filing) capability, and requested that they be recommended to the Judicial Council for review.

The recommendations included:

1. Approve the following statewide e-filing policies:
 - (a) Establish the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM)/Electronic Court Filing (ECF) as the technical standard for State of California trial court e-filing.
 - (b) Allow individual courts to retain authority as to which e-filing manager(s) (EFM(s)) they will use.
 - (c) The California judicial branch will select more than one statewide EFM.
2. Approve the following high-level functional requirements for trial court e-filing:
 - (a) EFMs must support all case types.
 - (b) EFMs must have the ability to integrate with all statewide case management systems (CMS) included in the statewide CMS Master Services Agreement (currently, Tyler Odyssey, Thomson-Reuters C-Track, Justice Systems Inc.) and Journal Technologies eCourt.
 - (c) EFMs must describe their approach for integration with “non-standard” CMSs, including a free-standing e-delivery option
 - (d) EFMs must integrate with Judicial Council approved financial gateway vendors, if directed.
 - (e) EFMs must support electronic payment types beyond credit card.
 - (f) EFMs must provide a zero cost e-filing option for indigent and government filers.
 - (g) EFMs must clearly disclose all costs and services to the e-filing service provider (EFSP) community.
 - (h) EFMs must support electronic service of court generated documents.
 - (i) EFSPs must integrate with all “statewide” EFMs in all participating counties.
3. Commission the ITAC to manage the vendor selection process for a statewide trial court EFM solution.

Action: The committee asked questions for clarification, discussed the recommendations, and voted to approve the recommendations for consideration to the Judicial Council at its June 2016 meeting. It was also clarified that ITAC would provide finalized documents (in Judicial Council report format) to JCTC members prior to the June council meeting.

Item 4

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

Update: Mr. Richard D. Feldstein provided an update and report on the work related to the civil case management system (V3) replacement budget change proposal. The V3 BCP was submitted to the Department of Finance, who have made some additional inquiries that were addressed by Judicial Council Information Technology staff. The next step is to wait for the Governor's May budget revise expected to be delivered on Friday, May 13, 2016.

Action: The committee received the report.

Item 5

Update on Sustain Justice Edition Case Management System

Update: Mr. Richard D. Feldstein provided an update and report on the work related to the Sustain Justice Edition case management system. Mr. Jake Chatters provided an update on the work related to the Placer Court Hosting Center. He shared that Justice Slough and he would be presenting to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee's (TCBAC) Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee to receive their approval on the JCTC recommendation. If approved, they would forward the recommendation to the TCBAC for approval.

Action: The committee received the report.

Item 6

Update on the Video Remote Pilot Project

Update: Ms. Kathy Fink, Manager in Judicial Council Technology Information, provided an update on the video remote pilot project. The Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force (LAPITF) proposes to pilot technology solutions for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for California courts. This project was previously approved by the Judicial Council's Technology Committee and Executive & Planning Committee (E&P) for consideration at the Council's February meeting, but was deferred until June 2016, pending final legal review.

Action: The committee received the report.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.