

**Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)**  
**Annual Agenda—2017**  
**Approved by: JCTC (TBD)**

**I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION**

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

**(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 Administrators<sup>1</sup>
- 1 Attorney (appointed by the State Bar)
- 1 Law School Professor (public member)
- 1 Assembly Member (appointed by the State Assembly)

<sup>1</sup> 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) Tactical Plan Update Workstream
- (existing) Next Generation Hosting Strategy Workstream
- (existing) Disaster Recovery Workstream
- (existing) E-Filing Strategy Workstream
- (existing) Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) E-Services Workstream
- (existing) Video Remote Interpreting Pilot Workstream (formerly titled “Remote Courtroom Video Workstream”)
- **(new)** Intelligent Forms Phase I: Scoping

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

## **Advisory Body’s Key Objectives for 2017:**

The *Strategic Plan for Technology 2014-2018* outlines the following goals, to which ITAC’s 2017 Annual Agenda aligns.

- (a) Goal 1: Promote the Digital Court – Part 1: Foundation, Part 2: Access, Services, and Partnerships
- (b) Goal 2: Optimize Branch Resources
- (c) Goal 3: Optimize Infrastructure
- (d) 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 <sup>2</sup>	Priority <sup>3</sup>	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p><b>Tactical Plan for Technology Update Tactical Plan for Technology for Effective Date 2017-2018</b></p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) Complete circulation of updated Tactical Plan for public comment and revise, as needed.</p> <p>(b) Finalize and submit for approval to the JCTC and the Judicial Council.</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Technology Governance and Funding Model</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Specific charge of ITAC per Rule 10.53 (b)(8).</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Broad input from the branch and the public. Futures Commission outcomes will provide inputs into Strategic and Tactical Plan.</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b> Standing Item</p>	April 2017	Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-2018

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
2.	<p><b>Next Generation Hosting Strategy</b></p> <p><b>Assess Alternatives for Transition to a Next-Generation Branchwide Hosting Model</b></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> <p>(g) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.</p>	1	<p><b><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></b> Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 3: Transition to Next-Generation Branchwide Hosting Model</p> <p><b><i>Origin of Project:</i></b> Tactical Plan; next phase of project following 2015 assessment; carryover from 2016 Annual Agenda.</p> <p><b><i>Resources:</i></b> <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream</p> <p><b><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i></b> Information Technology</p> <p><b><i>Collaborations:</i></b> CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee; CITMF</p> <p><b><i>Key Objective Supported:</i></b> Goal 3</p>	June 2017	<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
3.	<p><b>Disaster Recovery (DR) Framework</b></p> <p><b>Document and Adopt a Court Disaster Recovery Framework</b></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) Develop recommendations for a potential BCP (e.g., if it is appropriate to fund a pilot, to assist courts, or to purchase any products). (Note: Drafting a BCP would be a separate effort.)</p> <p>(e) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 3: Court Disaster Recovery Framework and Pilot</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> Tactical Plan; next phase of project following 2015 assessment.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> <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, CITMF</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b> Goal 3</p>	June 2017	<p>Disaster Recovery Framework Document and Checklist</p> <p>BCP Recommendations</p>

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
4.	<p><b>E-Filing Strategy</b></p> <p><b>Update E-Filing Standards; Develop Provider Certification and a Deployment Strategy</b></p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) Develop and issue an RFP for statewide E-Filing Managers (EFMs).</p> <p>(b) Select statewide EFMs.</p> <p>(c) Develop the E-Filing Service Provider (EFSP) selection/certification process.</p> <p>(d) Develop the roadmap for an e-filing deployment strategy, approach, and branch solutions/alternatives.</p> <p>(e) Report on the plan for implementation of the approved NIEM/ECF standards, including effective date, per direction of the Judicial Council at its June 24, 2016 meeting.</p> <p>(f) Identify and select an identity management service/provider.</p> <p>(g) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 1: Promote the Digital Court E-Filing Deployment</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b></p> <p>Tactical Plan; carryover project from 2015 and 2016 Annual Agenda; also, directive from June 2016 Judicial Council meeting.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b></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><b>Key Objective Supported:</b> Goal 1</p>	December 2017	<p>Selection of Statewide EFMs</p> <p>Certification Program</p> <p>E-Filing Roadmap and Implementation Plan</p> <p>Selection of Identity Management Service/Provider</p>

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
5.	<p><b>SRL E-Services</b></p> <p><b>Develop Requirements and a Request for Proposal (RFP) for Establishing Online Branchwide Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) E-Services</b></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.</p> <p>(c) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.</p> <p>Note: In scope for 2017 is development of an RFP; out of scope is the actual implementation.</p>	1	<p><b><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></b></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology  Goal 1: Promote the Digital Court:  Implement Portal for Self-Represented Litigants (SRL)</p> <p><b><i>Origin of Project:</i></b></p> <p>Tactical Plan; next phase of project following feasibility and desirability assessment from Annual Agenda 2015 and 2016.</p> <p><b><i>Resources:</i></b></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><i>Collaborations:</i>  Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Subcommittee of the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee (C&amp;SCAC) standing subcommittee; Advisory Committee Providing Access &amp; Fairness; CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee; CITMF, the Southern Regional SRL Network, and the California Tyler Users Group (CATUG)</p> <p><b><i>Key Objective Supported:</i></b> Goal 1</p>	December 2017	<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><b>Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Pilot</b></p> <p><b>Consult As Requested and Implement Video Remote Interpreting Pilot (VRI) Program</b></p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>In cooperation and under the direction of the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force (LAPITF) Technological Solutions Subcommittee (TSS):</p> <p>(a) Support implementation of the Assessment Period of the VRI pilot program (including kickoff, court preparations, site visits, and deployment), as requested.</p> <p>(b) Review pilot findings; validate, refine, and amend, if necessary, the technical standards.</p> <p>(c) Identify whether new or amended rules of court are needed (and advise the Rules &amp; Policy Subcommittee for follow up).</p> <p>(d) Consult and collaborate with LAPITF, as needed, in preparing recommendations to the Judicial Council on VRI implementations.</p> <p>(e) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 1: Courthouse Video Connectivity</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b></p> <p>Tactical Plan; continuation of project from Annual Agenda 2015 and 2016.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b></p> <p><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 Implementation Task Force (LAPITF) Technological Solutions Subcommittee (TSS); CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee; CIOs</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b> Goal 1</p>	September 2018	<p>Implementation of VRI Pilot Program</p> <p>Recommendations for Updated Technical Standards</p>

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
7.	<p><b>Intelligent Forms Phase I: Scoping</b></p> <p><b>Investigate Options for Modernizing the Electronic Format and Delivery of Judicial Council Forms</b></p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i> Investigate, prioritize and scope a project, including:</p> <p>(a) Evaluate Judicial Council form usage (by courts, partners, litigants) and recommend a solution that better aligns with CMS operability and better ensures the courts' ability to adhere to quality standards and implement updates without reengineer.</p> <p>(b) Address form security issues that have arisen because of the recent availability and use of unlocked Judicial Council forms in place of secure forms for e-filing documents into the courts; seek solutions that will ensure the forms integrity and preserves legal content.</p> <p>(c) Investigate options for redesigning forms to take advantages of new technologies, such as document assembly technologies.</p> <p>(d) Investigate options for</p>	2	<p><b><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></b> This project is not explicitly outlined in the Tactical Plan. Emerging initiative Strategic Plan for Technology Goal 1: Promote the Digital Court</p> <p><b><i>Origin of Project:</i></b> Proposal submitted jointly by Judge Freedman and Judge Lucky, ITAC members to address concerns raised by courts and council legal/forms staff.</p> <p><b><i>Resources:</i></b> <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services, Center for Children, Families and the Courts</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Workstream members; CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee</p> <p><b><i>Key Objective Supported:</i></b> Goal 1</p>	September 2017	<p>Recommendations on approach to modernize forms</p> <p>BCP Recommendations</p>

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p>developing a standardized data dictionary that would enable “smart forms” to be efficiently electronically filed into the various modern CMSs across the state.</p> <p>(e) Explore the creation and use of court generated text-based forms as an alternative to graphic forms.</p> <p>(f) Investigate whether to recommend development of a forms repository by which courts, forms publishers, and partners may readily and reliably access forms in alternate formats.</p> <p>(g) Develop recommendations for a potential BCP to support proposed solutions. (Note: Drafting a BCP would be a separate effort.)</p> <p>(h) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.</p>				

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
	<p><b>Digital Evidence</b> <b>(Placeholder Item)</b></p> <p><i>The committee anticipates proposing an amendment to the agenda following the update of the Tactical Plan on the topic of digital evidence. Further detail, including resource information, to be provided at that time.</i></p>		<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b> Anticipated in the Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-2018</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b> TBD</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> TBD</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b> TBD</p>		

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
8.	<p><b>Modernize Rules of Court for the Trial Courts</b></p> <p><b>Modernize Trial Court Rules to Support E-Business</b></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 include proposals to amend rules to conform to Judicial Council-sponsored legislation to be introduced in 2017. For example if the legislation is enacted, the rules on e-filing and e-service (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.250-2.275) to be amended by January 1, 2018 to replace the current “close of business” provisions in the rules. Additional codes sections that would benefit from review and amendments to modernizing them include Code Civ. Proc. § 405.23, 594, 680.010-724.260; Civ. Code § 1719; Gov. Code § 915.2; and Labor Code § 3082.</p>	2	<p><b><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></b></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change</p> <p><b><i>Origin of Project:</i></b></p> <p>Tactical Plan; standing item on annual agenda.</p> <p><b><i>Resources:</i></b></p> <p><i>ITAC:</i> Rules &amp; Policy Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology, Office of Governmental Affairs, Center for Families, Children and the Courts (CFCC), Criminal Justice Services</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> ITAC Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee; Appellate Advisory Committee, Civil &amp; 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><b><i>Key Objective Supported:</i></b> Goal 4</p>	Ongoing	Rule and/or Legislative Proposal(s), if appropriate

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
9.	<p><b>Standards, Rules and/or Legislation for E-Signatures</b></p> <p><b>Develop Legislation, Rules, and Standards for Electronic Signatures on Documents Filed by Parties and Attorneys</b></p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) Develop 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) CEAC Records Management Subcommittee to develop standards governing electronic signatures for documents filed into the court to be included in the "Trial Court Records Manual" with input from the Court Information Technology Managers Forum (CIOs). Rules &amp; Policy Subcommittee to review.</p>	2	<p><b><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></b></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change</p> <p><b><i>Origin of Project:</i></b></p> <p>Tactical Plan; next phase and expansion of 2014, 2015, and 2016 Annual Agenda items. Recommendation by Department of Child Support Services and attorney, Tim Perry.</p> <p><b><i>Resources:</i></b></p> <p><i>ITAC:</i> Rules &amp; Policy Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> ITAC Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee; CEAC Subcommittee on Records Management, CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Rules and Legislative Subcommittees; Civil &amp; Small Claims Advisory Committee, and the Court Information Technology Managers Forum (CITMF)</p> <p><b><i>Key Objective Supported:</i></b> Goal 4</p>	December 2017, effective January 2018 (2 years)	<p>Rule and/or Legislative Proposal, if appropriate</p> <p>Recommendation of Standards for Electronic Signatures (Update to the "Trial Court Records Manual")</p>

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
10.	<p><b>Rules for Remote Access to Records for Justice Partners</b></p> <p><b>Develop Rule Proposal to Facilitate Remote Access to Trial Court Records by Local Justice Partners</b></p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) In collaboration with the Criminal Law Advisory Committee, amend trial court rules to facilitate remote access to trial court records by state and local justice partners, parties, and their attorneys.</p>	1	<p><b><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></b></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change</p> <p><b><i>Origin of Project:</i></b></p> <p>Carryover from 2016 Annual Agenda. 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><b><i>Resources:</i></b></p> <p><i>ITAC:</i> Rules &amp; Policy Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology, Criminal Justice Services, Center for Families, Children &amp; the Courts</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Criminal Law Advisory Committee, CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee; Family &amp; Juvenile Law and Traffic Law Advisory Committee</p> <p><b><i>Key Objective Supported:</i></b> Goal 4</p>	December 2017, effective January 2018 (2 years)	Rule Proposal

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
11.	<p><b>Standards for Electronic Court Records as Data</b></p> <p><b>Develop Standards for Electronic Court Records Maintained as Data</b></p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) CEAC Records Management Subcommittee -- in collaboration with the Data Exchange Workstream governance body (TBD) -- to develop standards and proposal to allow trial courts to maintain electronic court records as data in their case management systems to be included in the "Trial Court Records Manual" with input from the Court Information Technology Managers Forum (CITMF). Rules &amp; Policy Subcommittee to review.</p> <p>(b) Determine what statutory and rule changes may be required to authorize and implement the maintenance of records in the form of data; develop proposals to satisfy these changes.</p>	1	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b></p> <p>Carryover from 2016 Annual Agenda. 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 Trial Court Records Manual. However, the current version of the manual addresses maintaining electronic court records only as documents, not data.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b></p> <p><i>ITAC:</i> Rules &amp; Policy Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Data Exchange governance body (TBD); CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee</p> <p><b>Key Objective Supported:</b> Goal 4</p>	December 2018 (2 years)	<p>Recommend Statutes and Rules to be Developed</p> <p>Adoption of Standards for Maintaining Electronic Court Records as Data (Update to the "Trial Court Records Manual")</p>



#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
12.	<p><b>Rules for E-Filing</b></p> <p><b>Evaluate Current E-Filing Laws and Rules, and Recommend Appropriate Changes</b></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 rule proposals to implement the legislative proposal developed in 2016, which amends 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 and SRL E-Services Workstreams, and the CMS Data Exchange governance body (TBD) for any additional rules development needed.</p>	2	<p><b>Judicial Council Direction:</b></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change</p> <p><b>Origin of Project:</b></p> <p>Tactical Plan; carry over project from 2015 and 2016 Annual Agenda.</p> <p><b>Resources:</b></p> <p><i>ITAC:</i> Rules &amp; Policy Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> ITAC E-Filing and SRL Workstreams; DX governance body (TBD); 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><b>Key Objective Supported:</b> Goal 4</p>	December 2017, effective January 2018 (2 years)	Legislative and Rule Proposal(s)

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
13.	<p><b>Privacy Policy</b></p> <p><b>Develop Branch and Model Court Privacy Policies on Electronic Court Records and Access in Trial and Appellate Courts</b></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><b><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></b></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 4: Promote Rule and Legislative Changes</p> <p><b><i>Origin of Project:</i></b></p> <p>Tactical Plan; carryover from Annual Agenda 2014, 2015 and 2016. 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><b><i>Resources:</i></b></p> <p><i>ITAC:</i> Rules &amp; Policy Subcommittee, Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Identity Management Working Group; Appellate Advisory Committee, CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee; Criminal Law Advisory Committee, and the Department of Justice</p> <p><b><i>Key Objective Supported:</i></b> Goal 4</p>	December 2018 (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
14.	<p><b>Modernize Rules of Court for the Appellate Courts</b></p> <p><b>Modernize Appellate Court Rules to Support E-Business</b></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 the appellate rules regarding format and handling of records filed electronically in the appellate courts.</p>	2	<p><b><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></b></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change</p> <p><b><i>Origin of Project:</i></b></p> <p>Tactical Plan; standing item on annual agenda. Divided from similar trial court rule project.</p> <p><b><i>Resources:</i></b></p> <p><i>ITAC:</i> Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology, Office of Governmental Affairs, Center for Families, Children and the Courts (CFCC), Criminal Justice Services</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> ITAC Rules &amp; Policy Subcommittee; Appellate Advisory Committee, Civil &amp; 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><b><i>Key Objective Supported:</i></b> Goal 4</p>	Ongoing	Rule and/or Legislative Proposal(s), if appropriate

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
15.	<p><b>Consult on Appellate Court Technological Issues</b></p> <p><b>Consult as Requested on Technological Issues Arising In or Affecting the Appellate Courts</b></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 appellate court technology aspects of issues, as requested.</p>	2	<p><b><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></b></p> <p>Tactical Plan for Technology Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change</p> <p><b><i>Origin of Project:</i></b></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 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. JATS will consult on appellate court technology aspects of issues, as requested.</p> <p><b><i>Resources:</i></b></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><b><i>Key Objective Supported:</i></b> Goal 4</p>	Ongoing (availability as issues arise)	Recommendations, as needed

#	Project	Priority	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
16.	<p><b>Liaison Collaboration</b></p> <p><b>Liaise with Advisory Bodies for Collaboration and Information Exchange</b></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>	1	<p><b><i>Judicial Council Direction:</i></b> N/A</p> <p><b><i>Origin of Project:</i></b> Standing item on the annual agenda.</p> <p><b><i>Resources:</i></b> <i>ITAC:</i> Liaisons</p> <p><i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology</p> <p><i>Collaborations:</i> Liaison advisory bodies</p> <p><b><i>Key Objective Supported:</i></b> Standing Item</p>	Ongoing	Liaison Reports at ITAC Meetings

### III. STATUS OF 2016 PROJECTS

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(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.</li> <li>(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.</li> <li>(c) Identify the technical standards to be used for the implementation of all data exchanges between the judicial branch and justice partners.</li> <li>(d) Establish a formal governance process for exchange updates and modifications.</li> <li>(e) Maintain a repository of required materials that support development of standardized exchanges.</li> <li>(f) Promote the technical standards as the default standards for local data exchanges.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Completed.</b></p> <p>Governing principles, primary requirements and exchange needs were identified. The workstream established justice partner relationships and identified liaison CIOs, responsible for facilitating sessions between justice partners and vendors to further refine the exchange information. A document repository was established to house the schema information.</p> <p>At its 12/2/2016 meeting, ITAC accepted the workstream’s final report and approved closure of the workstream. JC IT is responsible for reporting back to the committee at a future date with recommendations on how it plans to continue to update and govern the exchanges, after which, the recommendations will continue to the JCTC for approval.</p>

<p>2.</p>	<p>E-Filing Strategy</p> <p>Update E-Filing Standards; Develop Provider Certification and a Deployment Strategy</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Update the technical standards for court e-filing, namely, the XML specification and related schema.</li> <li>(b) Develop the E-Filing Service Provider (EFSP) selection/certification process.</li> <li>(c) Develop the roadmap for an e-filing deployment strategy, approach, and branch solutions/alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Partially completed; project extended into 2017 annual agenda.</b></p> <p>Year-end status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <b>Completed.</b> The workstream recommended the NIEM/Oasis ECF specification (<a href="https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/legalxml-courtfilling">https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/legalxml-courtfilling</a>) as the technical information exchange standard. ITAC, the JCTC and the Judicial Council approved this recommendation, with the directive to report back at a future meeting regarding implementation (e.g., effective date).</li> <li>(b) A BCP request for E-Filing Implementation and Operational Support will be presented to the Department of Finance in January 2017, which includes establishing an EFSP certification authority and process.* Meanwhile, Los Angeles court has hired a consultant to assist in the development of this process.</li> <li>(c) At its June 2017 meeting the Judicial Council approved the Workstream’s roadmap recommendations. Recommendations include: statewide policies, high-level functional requirements, and direction for ITAC to undertake and manage a procurement process to select multiple EFMs.</li> </ul> <p>The workstream continues to meet and define requirements for an RFP to select more than one statewide E-Filing Manager.</p> <p>*Additionally, the BCP request being developed is to support ancillary aspects of a statewide e-filing program, for example, resources for policy and vendor management, infrastructure to leverage the state’s favorable payment processor, and identity management support and licensing.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Next Generation Hosting Strategy</p> <p>Assess Alternatives for Transition to a Next-Generation</p>	<p><b>In progress; project extended into 2017 annual agenda.</b></p> <p>Year-end status:</p>

	<p>Branchwide Hosting Model</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Define workstream project schedule and detailed tasks; gain approval of workstream membership.</li> <li>(b) Outline industry best practices for hosting (including solution matrix with pros, cons, example applications, and costs).</li> <li>(c) Produce a roadmap tool for use by courts in evaluating options.</li> <li>(d) Consider educational summit on hosting options, and hold summit if appropriate.</li> <li>(e) Identify requirements for centralized hosting.</li> <li>(f) Recommend a branch-level hosting strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Membership approved. A high-level project schedule/plan has been developed; and is being progressively detailed as topics are completed.</li> <li>(b) Workstream members met in-person November 30-December 1, 2016 for finalizing initial toolset, court inventory, and services' levels; and to continue cloud solutions education session.</li> <li>(c) Draft initial toolset is scheduled to be completed by the end of December 2016 for workstream review.</li> <li>(d) The workstream held educational sessions on cloud hosting in July and December 2016.</li> <li>(e) Requirements for hosting court inventory solutions are currently being discussed by the workstream technical group.</li> </ul>
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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(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.</li> <li>(b) Implement Phase I of the VRI pilot program, in cooperation with the TSS.</li> </ul>	<p><b>In progress; project extended into 2017 annual agenda.</b></p> <p>Status is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <b>Completed.</b> Three pilot courts have been identified. An RFP was issued, and three vendors were selected to participate in the program.</li> <li>(b) The Judicial Council approved the pilot project to proceed in June 2016. Along with pilot courts and vendors being identified, the project and workstream teams have formed. The deployment and evaluation period (also referred to as the assessment period) is tentatively scheduled to begin in March 2017, with a six month duration followed by analysis and findings. San Diego State University will perform an independent evaluation of the pilot.</li> </ul>
5.	<p>SRL E-Services</p> <p>Develop Requirements and a Request for Proposal (RFP) for Establishing Online Branchwide Self-Represented Litigants</p>	<p><b>In progress; project extended into 2017 annual agenda.</b></p> <p>The workstream largely used 2016 to define and study the problem including through demonstrations of existing key</p>



	<p>(SRL) E-Services</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(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.</li> <li>(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.</li> </ul>	<p>services and researching possible strategies to move forward. The workstream also divided into four workgroups to help accomplish their work: (1) existing solutions, (2) technology, (3) requirements definition, and (4) document access.</p>
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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Develop model disaster recovery guidelines, standard recovery times, and priorities for each of the major technology components of the branch.</li> <li>(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.</li> <li>(c) Create a plan for providing technology components that could be leveraged by all courts for disaster recovery purposes.</li> <li>(d) Pilot the framework by having one or more courts use it.</li> </ul>	<p><b>In progress; project extended into 2017 annual agenda.</b></p> <p>Current status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <b>Nearly complete.</b> Members gathered information on DR definitions, expectations and requirements; applications and services that would require recovery in a DR situation; and infrastructure required to facilitate a recovery. The workstream surveyed the courts to assess existing backup posture and preparedness, and received more than an 80% response rate from the trial courts; and full participation from the trial courts and JCC.</li> <li>(b) Documentation has begun. The expectation is that the document will be a framework wherein courts may enter pertinent information as it relates to their court.</li> <li>(c) As part of the DR framework document, recommended, proven and reference technology components are being identified that courts can purchase or pursue for DR purposes.</li> <li>(d) <b>Withdrawn.</b> This deliverable has been removed from the scope of the workstream, which will defer to individual courts to voluntarily pilot the end products.</li> </ul>

<p>7.</p>	<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>(b) 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>	<p><b>Completed; extended into 2017 annual agenda as a standing/ongoing item.</b></p> <p>Current status:</p> <p>(a) Phase II of the trial and appellate court rules modernization package amending titles 2, 3, and 5 of the Rules of court was approved and will become effective January 1, 2017. The proposed amendments included substantive rule changes to facilitate modern e-business, e-filing, and e-service practices including on the topics of text searchability of e-filed documents, bookmarking of electronic exhibits, and various formatting and technical amendments.</p> <p>The full Judicial Council reports are here:  <a href="#">Trial Court Rules Modernization Package</a>  <a href="#">Appellate Rules Modernization Package</a></p>
<p>8.</p>	<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>	<p><b>Partially complete; project extended into 2017 annual agenda.</b></p> <p>(a) <b>Nearly complete.</b> This year, ITAC, the JCTC and PCLC approved a proposal of the Rules &amp; Policy Subcommittee (RPS) recommending that the council approve a legislative proposal to amend the Code of Civil Procedure that would authorize <u>electronic signatures</u> on electronically filed documents. The Judicial Council will consider this action at its December meeting (for effective date of January 1, 2018).</p> <p>(b) The Court Executive Advisory Committee (CEAC) Records Management Subcommittee has primary responsibility for developing the Trial Court Records Manual update.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>Rules for Remote Access to Court Records by Local Justice Partners</p> <p>Develop Rule Proposal to Facilitate Remote Access to Trial</p>	<p><b>Not Started; project carried into 2017 agenda.</b></p> <p>This project was placed on hold and work will commence as part of the 2017 annual agenda.</p>

	<p>Court Records by Local Justice Partners</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <p>(a) Amend trial court rules to facilitate remote access to trial court records by local justice partners.</p>	
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><b>In progress; project extended into 2017 annual agenda.</b></p> <p>(a) and (b) This year, ITAC, the JCTC and PCLC approved a proposal of the Rules &amp; Policy Subcommittee (RPS) recommending that the council approve a legislative proposal to amend the statutes governing <u>e-filing and e-service</u> in the Code of Civil Procedure. The Judicial Council will consider this action at its December meeting (for effective date of January 1, 2018). A corresponding rules proposal implementing this legislation and the E-Filing Workstream recommendations will be developed by RPS in 2017.</p>
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>(a) 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><b>Not Started; project carried into 2017 agenda.</b></p> <p>This project was placed on hold due to limited resources and competing priorities; work is expected to commence as part of the 2017 annual agenda.</p>
12.	<p>Standards for Electronic Court Records</p>	<p><b>Not Started; project carried into 2017 agenda.</b></p>

	<p>Develop Standards for Electronic Court Records Maintained as Data</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(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.</li> <li>(b) Include standards in update to the <i>Trial Court Records Manual</i>.</li> </ul>	<p>This project is dependent on CEAC to develop and provide draft standards for ITAC review.</p>
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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Completed.</b></p> <p>The JATS proposal to revise the e-filing rules in accordance with current e-filing practices was approved by ITAC, the JCTC, RUPRO, and the Judicial Council; and will take effective on January 1, 2017.</p>
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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Ongoing.</b></p> <p>JATS did not receive any requests from other advisory bodies for input on technology related proposals this year.</p>

15.	<p>Tactical Plan for Technology</p> <p>Update Tactical Plan for Technology for Effective Date 2017-2018</p> <p><i>Major Tasks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Review and update the Tactical Plan for Technology.</li> <li>(b) Circulate for branch and public comment.</li> <li>(c) Finalize and submit for approval.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Nearly complete; extended to April 2017 for approval process.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <b>Completed.</b> The workstream convened in May, and began its work by using traditional SWOT analysis to define judicial branch business drivers; and collected input from internal stakeholders (CITMF, CEAC, TCPJAC, the JCTC) on their findings. Input was used in drafting the updated plan, along with a general solicitation for input on new ideas. Two new initiatives were added on the topics of branch resource collaboration and digital evidence.</li> <li>(b) The draft plan is circulating for public comment in December 2016-January 2017.</li> <li>(c) The team is targeting submitting a finalized plan for review and approval at the Judicial Council’s April meeting.</li> </ul>
16.	<p>Liaison Collaboration</p> <p>Liaise with Advisory Bodies for Collaboration and Information Exchange</p>	<p><b>Ongoing.</b></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 2017 agenda.</p>

#### 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:* 7 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:* 4 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:* **Tactical Plan Update 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:* 2

*Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body):* 6

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

*Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets:* Ad-hoc

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* April 2017

*Subgroup or working group name:* **Next Generation Hosting 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:* 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:* Ad-hoc, quarterly

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* June 2017

*Subgroup or working group name:* **Disaster Recovery 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):* 24

*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:* Bi-weekly

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* June 2017

*Subgroup or working group name:* **E-Filing Strategy 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:* 3

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

*Date formed:* Workstream approved 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 2017

**Subgroup or working group name: 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:* 7

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

*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:* Monthly

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* December 2017

**Subgroup or working group name: Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Pilot 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:* 2 or more

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

*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:* September 2018

**Subgroup or working group name: Intelligent Forms Workstream**

*Purpose of subgroup or working group:* To complete tasks outlined in Project #7.

*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:* New

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

*Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed:* September 2017