JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

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: September 11, 2017

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 July 10, 2017 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 September 8, 2017, 12:00 noon. Written comments should be e-mailed to jctc@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, attention: Jessica Craven Goldstein. Only written comments received by September 8, 2017, 12:00 noon will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–5)

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, Chair, Judicial Council Technology Committee

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. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair, Information Technology Advisory Committee

Item 3

Review of Workplans for ITAC-Assigned Futures Commission Directives (Action Requested)

Review workplans for the ITAC-assigned Futures Commission directives. The directives are to study the feasibility of and resource requirements for developing and implementing pilot projects of three technologies: remote appearances by parties, counsel, and witnesses for most noncriminal court proceedings; voice-to-text language interpretation services at court filing and service counters and in self-help centers; and intelligent chat technology to provide information and self-help services. Decide whether to approve the workplans for submission, as directed.

Presenters: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, and Mr. Robert Oyung, Chief Information Officer, Judicial Council of California

Item 4

Update/Report on the Judicial Branch Technology Summit
An update and report on the Judicial Branch Technology Summit that was held in conjunction with the Statewide Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC) and the Court Executive Advisory Committee (CEAC) on August 23 and 24, 2017.
Presenter: Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Vice-Chair, Judicial Council Technology Committee

Item 5

Welcome new members/Farewell to members
Welcome to new members and farewell to members whose term is ending. Members will have an opportunity to make comments.

Facilitator: Hon. Marsha G. Slough

A D J O U R N M E N T

Adjourn

Judicial Council Technology Committee Open Meeting

September 11, 2017

Call to Order and Roll Call

- Welcome

- Open Meeting Script

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

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Chair Report

Hon. Marsha G. Slough

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Update: Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair, Information Technology Advisory Committee

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Action: Review of Workplans for ITAC-Assigned Futures Commission Directives

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson; and Mr. Robert Oyung, Chief Information Officer

Update: Judicial Branch Technology Summit

Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Vice-Chair, JCTC

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Welcome new members/Farewell to members

Facilitator: Hon. Marsha G. Slough

Adjourn

All

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

J U D I C I A L   C O U N C I L   T E C H N O L O G Y   C O M M I T T E E

M I N U T E S   O F   O P E N   M E E T I N G

July 10, 2017
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; Mr. Jake Chatters; Hon. Ming W. Chin; David E. Gunn; Mr. Rick Feldstein; Ms. Audra Ibarra; Hon. Gary Nadler; and Ms. Debra Elaine Pole
Liaison Members Present:	Hon. Sheila F. Hanson
Others Present:	Mr. John Wordlaw; Mr. Robert Oyung, Ms. Jessica Goldstein; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Mr. Mark Dusman; Mr. David Koon; Ms. Kathy Fink; Ms. Jamel Jones; Ms. Daphne Light; Ms. Fati Farmanfarmaian; and Ms. Andrea Jaramillo

O P E N   M E E T I N G

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 June 12, 2017 meeting.

D I S C U S S I O N   A N D   A C T I O N   I T E M S

Item 1

Chair Report

Update: Hon. Marsha 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

Update/Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

Update: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, 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.

Item 3

Update on V3 Case Management System

Update: Ms. Kathy Fink, a Manager in Judicial Council Information Technology, provided an update and report on the work related to V3 since receiving the funding for civil case management system replacement.

Action: The committee received the report.

Item 4

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 replacement including the budget change proposal and next steps.

Action: The committee received the report.

Item 5

Update on the Placer Court Hosting Center

Update: Mr. Jake Chatters provided an update and report on the work related to the Placer Court Hosting Center (PCHC) project, a consortium project supported by branch-level funding. Once complete, the PCHC will host six courts that previously received hosting services from the Judicial Council via the California Court Technology Center (CCTC).

Action: The committee received the report.

Item 6

Update/ Report on the Statewide Technology Summit

Update: Mr. Robert Oyung, Chief Information Officer for the Judicial Council provided an update and report on the upcoming Statewide Technology Summit to be held in conjunction with the Statewide Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC) and the Court Executive Advisory Committee (CEAC) that will be held in August 2017.

Discussion: Following the report, Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Vice-Chair of the committee, facilitated a discussion to gather additional input from members.

Action: The committee received the report and held the brainstorming session.

Item 7

Review Legislative Proposal to Amend Civil Code Section 1719 and Code of Civil Procedure Sections 405.22, 405.23, 594, 659, 660, and 663a

Update: Ms. Andrea Jaramillo, Attorney with the Judicial Council Legal Services office, provided an update and report on the legislative proposal to amend Civil Code Section 1719 and Code of Civil Procedure Sections 405.22, 405.23, 594, 659, 660, and 663a.

Action: The committee received and discussed the report. The committee voted to approve the Legislative Proposal to go to the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC) subject to the outcome of pending legislation related to electronic service (A.B. 976). If the portion of the bill prohibiting electronic service of documents that must be served by registered mail passes, the amendments to Code of Civil Procedure sections 405.22 and 405.23 are to be removed from the proposal. The committee directed staff to include additional information in the memorandum to PCLC concerning consistent use of language in proposed legislative amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue ▪ San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 ▪ Fax 415-865-4205 ▪ TDD 415-865-4272

M E M O R A N D U M

Date
August 23, 2017

To
Members of the Judicial Council Technology
Committee

From
Hon. Sheila Hanson,
Chair, Information Technology Advisory
Committee

Hon. Louis Mauro
Vice-Chair, Information Technology
Advisory Committee

Subject
Status of Draft Workplans for ITAC-Assigned
Futures Commission Directives

Action Requested
Review and Comment

Deadline
August 30, 2017

Contact
Mr. Robert Oyung
Information Technology
415-865-4994 phone
robert.oyung@jud.ca.gov

Ms. Jamel Jones
Information Technology
415-865-4629 phone
jamel.jones@jud.ca.gov

Summary

The Chief Justice directed the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) to report on the feasibility and resources necessary to pilot three technology innovations recommended by the Futures Commission: remote appearances for most noncriminal court proceedings; voice-to-text language interpretation services at court filing, service counters, and in self-help centers; and intelligent chat technology to provide self-help services. As a first step, ITAC is developing workplans to implement the recommendations. The workplans are due by September 29, 2017, and require approval from ITAC's oversight committee, the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC).

This memorandum provides a brief background on this assignment and ITAC's approach to the project, along with providing the draft workplans. We would appreciate your review and input on the workplans by Wednesday, August 30, prior to them being finalized. Please send feedback to Jamel Jones (jamel.jones@jud.ca.gov).

Directive and Workplans

In a May 17, 2017 letter to the chairs of the Judicial Council internal committees—including Justice Slough, Chair of the JCTC—the Chief Justice provided the following directive:

> ***Expansion of technology in the courts.*** The Judicial Council's Information Technology Advisory Committee is directed to consider, for presentation to the Judicial Council, the feasibility of and resource requirements for developing and implementing a pilot project to allow remote appearances by parties, counsel, and witnesses for most noncriminal court proceedings. Further, the committee is directed to explore available technologies and make recommendations to the Judicial Council on the potential for a pilot project using voice-to-text language interpretation services at court filing and service counters and in self-help centers. Finally, the committee is directed to explore and make recommendations to the council on the potential for a pilot project using intelligent chat technology to provide information and self-help services. The committee should seek input for these efforts from pertinent council advisory committees and stakeholders. Where pilot projects are implemented, the committee is directed to report back on outcomes and make recommendations for statewide expansion.

As a first deliverable for this directive, ITAC was instructed to prepare workplans identifying the tasks and assignments that need to occur to ensure there is a structure to track and monitor the tasks needed to implement the respective recommendations. The workplans are due September 29, 2017 following approval by the JCTC.

Process for Developing the Workplans

Since receiving this directive, the JCTC and ITAC chairs met several times to discuss the approach to this assignment, which includes defining a strategy for the efforts, drafting the workplan tasks, and seeking broad input to refine the plans. The following process is being utilized to develop the workplans:

- On June 29, the Judicial Council's Chief Information Officer/Director Rob Oyung, along with staff, hosted an all-day planning session with court information officers (CIOs) Snorri Ogata from Los Angeles, Rick Walery from San Mateo, Jeannette Vannoy from Napa, and Brian Cotta from the Fifth District Court of Appeal, to brainstorm and develop

an initial draft of the workplan for each technology topic. This session included a demonstration of the voice-to-text and intelligent chat technologies.

- On July 17 and 19, the CIO leads and Judicial Council staff hosted branch webinars to share and review each of the draft workplans and gather input. All clerk and court executive officers and court information officers were invited to attend the sessions, along with ITAC and JCTC members. Over 60 branch participants joined the calls. Most of the input centered on coordinating this assignment with existing court and branch efforts, including innovation grant activities, relevant workstreams (such as the ITAC Self-Represented Litigants E-Services and Video Remote Interpreting Pilot Program workstreams), and other advisory group initiatives (such as work by the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force).

- On August 7, the CIO leads presented refined workplans to ITAC members at their meeting. Again, most of the discussion related to ensuring coordination with existing efforts.

- As the next step in this process, the plans are being shared with JCTC members for input. In addition, the Judicial Branch Technology Summit on August 23 and 24 will feature a workshop to identify specific use cases for the potential pilot projects. The workplans will be revised based on JCTC and Summit participant comment.

- Finally, the finalized workplans will be circulated to ITAC and the JCTC for formal approvals.

Recommending a Two-Phased Pilot Approach

Early in the workplan development process, a two-phased pilot approach was proposed. The workplans propose that quick, small-scale proof-of-concepts be deployed in three to six months prior to conducting larger pilot projects. This approach will allow us to quickly learn about potential uses and deployment in a controlled environment.

The first phase of the projects would be funded through existing budget and provide quick but limited information while we work in parallel to prepare for more extensive pilots projects.

We are extremely pleased with the draft workplans that have been generated and also with the broad input received from the branch. We would appreciate your additional review and input prior to finalizing the workplans. Please send feedback to Jamel Jones (jamel.jones@jud.ca.gov) by Wednesday, August 30. Thank you for your assistance in this important endeavor.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

C O V E R   P A G E

Contents

Workplan 1: Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings

Draft workplan developed by:

- Mr. Brian Cotta, CIO, Fifth District Court of Appeals and ITAC Member
- Ms. Jeannette Vannoy, CIO, Superior Court of California, County of Napa and ITAC Member

Approach – Reference existing proven remote video appearance deployments and conduct a proof of concept (POC) for any additional functionality that may not be included in existing solutions. It is believed that one or more solutions that are in place today at trial court(s) likely meet both technical and business requirements/readiness.

I. Proof of Concept - Short Term (3-6 months)

Goal: Conduct a mock remote video hearing using a web conferencing system for a specific hearing type (e.g., Civil - Small Claims) as a POC in a court.* The initial scope of the POC would be to conduct one or more mock hearings of the selected hearing type.**

* If the court conducting the POC were interested in expanding the POC to include additional hearing types or to conduct real (non-mock) hearings, then additional tasks required for local rule changes and agreement with the parties to participate would need to be addressed and time would need to be added to the schedule as appropriate. The intent would be to ensure the relevant rules of court are not limiting so that courts could choose to use the solution/technology for all fitting case types as business needs dictate.

** Input from the branch Technology Summit (Aug 2017) will help identify potential use case(s).

1. Reach out to courts, to identify which court will conduct the POC (including those awarded an Innovation Grant focused on video hearings). – **Week 1**

2. Reach out to the court community to identify an evaluation team – **Week 2**

3. Identify common web conferencing solutions and select one or two to be used for the POC – **Week 2**

4. Determine operational impacts and document considerations – **Week 3-4**
   a. Calendaring/scheduling
   b. Conducting the hearing (formalities, procedures, etc.)
   c. Training staff and judicial officers
   d. Determine the need for and accommodation of interpreting (standard and ASL)
   e. Ongoing quality control(s) for latency, ease of use and accessibility

5. Conduct POC – **Week 4-8* (see note above if POC is more extensive than conducting mock hearings of a specific type, then additional tasks/time would be required)**
   a. Setup environment
   b. Use the Judicial Branch's electronic signature solution to accommodate remote signing if/when applicable

      c. Use the web conferencing solution and/or other standard cloud solutions to accommodate remote viewing and sharing of evidence and/or other related documents

      d. Use the web conferencing solution's recording capability to capture "the record"

      e. Use a survey tool to collect feedback from POC participants (e.g. outside parties as applicable)

6. Establish regular communication and review with evaluation team (regularly scheduled call, monitor progress, capture lessons learned, report feedback). – **Weekly**

7. Wrap up findings from POC and propose next steps. – **Week 8-10**

II. Pilot and Productizing Plan - Long Term

Goal: Use learnings from the pilot and propose how to implement more broadly

1. Existing activities - purpose is to understand what may be leverage/linkages – **Week 1-4**
   1.1. Workstreams
       1.1.1. Reach out to Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Workstream
   1.2. Active projects in courts (including Innovation Grants)
       1.2.1. Determine collaboration opportunities with Innovation Grants awardees (Note: The #'s below reflect the official grant #, for informational/relational purposes only)
           1.2.1.1.   Video hearings - Placer (8, 24), Humboldt (41), Merced (44), Sacramento (50), San Bernardino (51);
           1.2.1.2.   Video conferencing- Butte (18), San Bernardino (29), Ventura (36)
       1.2.2. Survey courts for additional related projects
       1.2.3. Communicate with courts already conducting remote video appearances to evaluate lessons learned and what solutions were or were not successful.
2. Determine technology maturity and categorize – **N/A**
   2.1. Categorize
       2.1.1. Monitor
       2.1.2. Ready for pilot
       2.1.3. Ready for production
   2.2. Report recommendations
3. Identify plan/next steps – **Week 4-45** *(timelines to be adjusted once the scope is determined)*
   3.1. **Identify and select use cases**
       3.1.1. Identify business problems being solved
       3.1.2. Identify measures of success, value add, success criteria
       3.1.3. Identify fit within existing portfolio of services
       3.1.4. Brainstorm at Technology Summit
   3.2. **Identify challenges and mitigations**
       3.2.1. Brainstorm at Technology Summit

3.2.1.1.   Barriers, mitigations, measures of success

3.2.1.2.   Practical limitations

3.3. Research

3.3.1. General market research including available tools/various vendors

3.3.1.1.   Identify alternative solutions/approaches to the same business problem(s) and attempt to standardize on a limited number (2?) of solutions that can coexist and work seamlessly together.

3.3.1.2.   Determine level(s) of integration/compatibility with existing technology being used with VRI project(s).

3.3.2. Vendor visits/demos

3.3.2.1.   TBD – based on research & only if determined necessary

3.3.3. California court demos/data gathering

3.3.3.1.   Dependent upon results of survey

3.3.4. Find out what other state courts are doing

3.3.4.1.   Court IT Officers Consortium (CITOC) query

3.3.4.2.   National Center for State Courts (NCSC) query

3.3.4.3.   National Conference of Appellate Court Clerks (NCACC) query

3.3.5. Explore build versus buy versus hybrid

3.3.5.1.   Analyze pros/cons, cost/benefit analysis

3.4. Financial considerations

3.4.1. Identify cost for possible technologies/solutions

3.4.2. Identify funding source (e.g., BCP, cost recovery, etc.)

3.4.2.1.   For pilot

3.4.2.2.   For production/implementation

3.4.2.3.   For ongoing support and maintenance

3.5. Survey and identify existing rules and policy constraints, impacts, and changes necessary

3.6. Pilot – TBD based on findings above (current category is ready for production)

3.6.1. Scope the pilot

3.6.2. Create project timeline

3.6.3. Identify pilot participants and methodology

3.6.4. Launch/implement

3.6.5. Evaluate pilot

3.7. Recommendations for a production implementation – TBD based on findings above (current category is ready for production)

3.7.1. Scope the service

3.7.2. Create proposed timeline

3.7.3. Recommendations re: directives and alternative approaches

3.7.4. Align with strategic plan

3.7.5. Determine priorities and resources

3.7.6. Incorporate into a workstream

3.7.7. Determine appropriate operational processes and procedures

3.7.8. Ongoing support considerations and planning

3.7.9.Training and Marketing

##

Comments from conference calls conducted 7/17/17 and 7/17/19 to discuss this topic at high-level

Comment #1: How is step #3 related to #1; should #1 inform #3; opportunities to coordinate/connect.

Comment #2: Consider relationship to VRI project; only region (3) has met and conferred with union; capitalize on other work going forward.

Comment #3: Judicial officer shared experience of video conferencing with the prisoner, stipulated, trial entirely conducted via video conference; he was not sure of how any evidence was handled or displayed and suggested to contact CIO for information.

Comment #4: Judicial officer shared two experiences using video: 1) with court trial in which plaintiff—long-term inmate; was a civil case with most difficult issue being transportation of the inmate to the video room; and 2) conducted mental health assessment trials with patients in mental health facilities, all trials done remotely.

Workplan 2: Voice-to-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom

Draft workplan developed by:

- Mr. Rick Walery, Superior Court of California, County of San Mateo
- Ms. Heather Pettit, Superior Court of California, County of Contra Costa

Use case as laid in the Future's Commission report, a non-English speaking individual comes to a filing counter or a self-help center. That person speaks in his/her own language is heard by the court staff member, the text of the spoken word is displayed on a screen in the speaker's language and then translated into the listener's language and the translation is also spoken in the listener's language. At the end of the process, a transcript of the interaction would be made available.

Approach – Given the immaturity of real-time voice-to-text translation and transcription services, we recommend assessing and validating the maturity of this technology in a controlled lab environment prior to potentially piloting in a local court. Part of the assessment within the lab will be to gauge the alignment of the technical tool(s) to deliver an accurate, useful translation within a complex environment such as the legal environment. The lab assessment will consider tools from personal device translation tools to enterprise-scale translation API toolkits.

Current state of technology vis-à-vis the FC recommendation. Solving more issues than it may introduce.

I. Proof of Concept (POC) - Short Term (3-6 months)

Goal – Setup a technical lab environment at the Judicial Council or a local court to test the technical recommendations of the Futures Commission for this initiative. Piloting various voice-to-text language services in a lab environment will allow for exposure to more technologies and shorter learning cycles than if a specific technology is deployed at a court for piloting. The goal of the lab pilot will be to determine next steps with this technology. Potential next step outcomes may be to continue to research the technology within a lab environment while it matures, to pilot at one court for a specific use case, or to pilot at multiple courts for multiple use cases.

---

1. Reach out to courts to identify steering committee and lab participants – **Week 1 - Week 2**

2. Setup governance structure to facilitate exposure to various technologies and quick learning cycles – **Week 3**

3. Establish regular communication and discussion with project team (regularly scheduled call, monitor progress, capture lessons learned, report feedback) – **Bi-weekly**

4. Determine high-level use cases within a court environment outside the courtroom. One forum for determining use cases will be at the August Technology Summit. – **Week 3**

5. Determine the various technologies and services models for delivering real-time voice-to-text translation and transcription services – **Week 4**

6. Setup demos with vendors – **Week 5 - Week 7**

7. Produce a white paper on the lessons learned within the pilot and a recommendation for next steps – **Week 8 – Week 10**

II. Pilot and Productizing Plan- Long Term

> **Goal –** Based on the learnings from the Proof of Concept phase, devise a strategy for piloting the technology in a local court to continue to learn lessons for a broader, long-term deployment.

1. Existing activities- purpose is to understand what may be leverage/linkages
    1.1. Workstreams
        1.1.1. Reach out to the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force (LAPITF; http://www.courts.ca.gov/LAP.htm) for a touchpoint regarding any current projects that may be able to provide insight or input on this initiative.
        1.1.2. Reach out to VRI workstream to determine if any lessons learned in VRI apply to the voice-to-text initiative
    1.2. Active projects in courts (including Innovation Grants)
        1.2.1. Survey courts for additional projects that may align with this initiative
2. Determine technology maturity and categorize
    2.1. Categorize
        2.1.1. Monitor
        2.1.2. Ready for pilot
        2.1.3. Ready for production
    2.2. Report recommendations
3. Identify plan/next steps
    3.1. **Identify and select use cases**
        3.1.1. Identify business problems being solved
        3.1.2. Identify measures of success, value add, success criteria
        3.1.3. Identify fit within existing portfolio of services
        3.1.4. Brainstorm at Technology Summit
    3.2. **Identify challenges and mitigations**
        3.2.1. Brainstorm at Technology Summit
            3.2.1.1.   Barriers, mitigations, measures of success
            3.2.1.2.   Practical limitations
    3.3. **Research**
        3.3.1. General market research including available tools/various vendors
            3.3.1.1.   Conduct analyst briefing(s)
            3.3.1.2.   Identify alternative solutions/approaches to the same business problem(s)
                3.3.1.2.1.   Research commercially available speech interfaces

        3.3.1.2.2.   Research commercially available translation interfaces

  3.3.2. Vendor visits/demos

     3.3.2.1.   Learn about products:

        3.3.2.1.1.   Identify commercially available API toolkits and services

        3.3.2.1.2.   Research options using personal devices (i.e. smartphones, tablets)

  3.3.3. California court demos/data gathering

     3.3.3.1.   Dependent upon results of survey

  3.3.4. Find out what other state courts are doing

     3.3.4.1.   Court Information Technology Officers Consortium query

     3.3.4.2.   National Center for State Courts query

  3.3.5. Explore build versus buy versus hybrid

     3.3.5.1.   Analyze pros/cons, cost/benefit analysis

3.4. Financial considerations – TBD based on proof of concept lab findings above

  3.4.1. Identify cost for possible technologies/solutions

  3.4.2. Identify funding source (e.g., BCP, cost recovery, etc.)

     3.4.2.1.   For pilot

     3.4.2.2.   For production/implementation

     3.4.2.3.   For ongoing support and maintenance

3.5. Survey and identify existing rules and policy constraints, impacts, and changes necessary

3.6. Pilot – TBD based on proof of concept lab findings above

  3.6.1. Scope the pilot

  3.6.2. Create project timeline

  3.6.3. Identify pilot participants and methodology

  3.6.4. Launch/implement

  3.6.5. Evaluate pilot

3.7. Recommendations for a production implementation – TBD based on lab findings above

  3.7.1. Scope the service

  3.7.2. Create proposed timeline

  3.7.3. Recommendations re: directives and alternative approaches

  3.7.4. Align with strategic plan

  3.7.5. Determine priorities and resources

  3.7.6. Incorporate into a workstream

  3.7.7. Determine appropriate operational processes and procedures

  3.7.8. Ongoing support considerations and planning

  3.7.9. Training and marketing

##

Comments from conference calls conducted 7/17/17 and 7/17/19 to discuss this topic at high-level

Comment #1: mainstream language may work but there is a lot of nuance in spoken language, idioms, and dialects that could lead to misinterpretation. The workstream my want to consider potentially including language academics/experts given the complexity of spoken language

Comment #2: similar questions are asked in the two use cases (filing counter and self-help), so perhaps real-time, spoken translation may work for common questions. Some questions that are similar and could lend themselves to macros/repetition/simplicity to overcome complexity of language difficulty. True real-time translation may be more challenging with a true, interactive conversation.

Comments from ITAC conference calls conducted 8/7/17

Comment #1: Judge Mize discussed the percentage of accuracy necessary for moving forward with this initiative, noting that 100% may not be needed and the concept that something may be better than nothing.

Comment #2: Justice Mauro agreed that testing in a lab environment first is desirable. Justice Mauro recommended that the workgroup consider any potential ramifications from inaccurate or out-of-context translations.

Comment #3: Judge Perkins suggested baseline testing of common questions.

Workplan 3: Intelligent Chat Technology *(Virtual Customer Assistant)*

Draft workplan developed by:

- Mr. Snorri Ogata, CIO, Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles and ITAC Member
- Mr. Paras Gupta, CIO, Superior Court of California, County of Monterey

Approach – Gain insights from related capabilities already deployed (e.g., FAQ in Orange County, Avatar in Los Angeles) and conduct a series of proofs of concept (POCs) to identify target areas for high-value implementation. It is believed that this technology is readily available and the primary opportunity is to gain insight on specific technology alternatives and specific use cases.

I. Proof of Concept (POC) - Short Term (3-6 months)

Goal – Conduct a series of proofs of concepts (POCs) to assess technology readiness for various use cases (e.g., Court of Appeal, E-Filing, Self-Help). Identify key performance indicators and benchmark before/after success and capture learnings.

1. Define the overall POC goals (e.g., quick implementations, for multiple use cases, with the intent of gaining insights on what works and doesn't work). – 1 week
2. Define broad categories of desired data that need to be captured from each POC (before and after). – 1 week
3. Solicit input from interested courts to identify business usage scenarios for ChatBot that meet the POC criteria. – 1 weeks
4. Identify readily available technology solutions that support program objectives. – 1 week
5. Find pilot courts (preliminary list includes: Court of Appeal; Superior Courts of Los Angeles and Monterey) – 1 week

For each POC…

6. Work with POC courts to define / refine / publish success measures (e.g., # uses, % of questions answered correctly, …) tailored to the measures to their specific usage scenario. – 1 week

7. Provide direction/assistance to POC courts: - 2 weeks
   a. Formalize performance metrics to collect
   b. Formalize features to evaluate (e.g., ease of authoring, ease of integration, usability of the Q&A engine)
   c. Identify reporting and minimum duration/sampling size to draw meaning conclusion

8. Conduct POCs – 8 weeks
   a. Build and deploy pilot implementation
   b. Measure pilot implementations
   c. Pilot court quarterly results meeting and repeat steps 6-8 for next "sprint"

9. Wrap up findings from POC and propose next steps. – 2 weeks
   a. Assessment of Use Cases
   b. Assessment of Technologies

       c.   Recommendation of solution sets (e.g., use cases with technology)

II. Pilot and Productizing Plan- Long Term

> **Goal –** Learnings from the pilot and how to more broadly implement

1. Existing activities- purpose is to understand what may be leverage/linkages – 4 weeks
    1.1. Workstreams
        1.1.1. Explore alignment opportunities with SRL workstream
    1.2. Active projects in courts (including Innovation Grants)
        1.2.1. Innovation Grants- Determine if virtual customer assistant is scoped within grant project for:
            1.2.1.1. Avatar – LA, Riverside and Yolo (project #'s: 21, 27, 38)
            1.2.1.2. Self-help Portal – 5DCA, Contra Costa, Orange, Riverside, San Diego, San Mateo (project #'s 17, 19, 23, 26, 30, 31)
        1.2.2. Survey courts for additional projects
2. Determine technology maturity and categorize – 2-4 weeks
    2.1. Categorize
        2.1.1. Monitor
        2.1.2. Ready for pilot
        2.1.3. Ready for production
    2.2. Report recommendations
3. Identify plan/next steps – 6-12 months
    3.1. **Identify and select use cases**
        3.1.1. Identify business problems being solved
        3.1.2. Identify measures of success, value add, success criteria
        3.1.3. Identify fit within existing portfolio of services
        3.1.4. Brainstorm at Technology Summit
    3.2. **Identify challenges and mitigations**
        3.2.1. Brainstorm at Technology Summit
            3.2.1.1. Barriers, mitigations, measures of success
            3.2.1.2. Practical limitations
    3.3. **Research**
        3.3.1. General market research including available tools/various vendors
            3.3.1.1. Conduct IT Advisory Service Analyst briefings
            3.3.1.2. Review additional products identified through additional research
        3.3.2. Vendor visits/demos
            3.3.2.1. Learn about specific products
        3.3.3. California court demos/data gathering
            3.3.3.1. Los Angeles

      3.3.3.2.   Orange

    3.3.4. Find out what other state courts are doing

      3.3.4.1.   CITOC query

      3.3.4.2.   NCSC query

    3.3.5. Explore build versus buy versus hybrid

      3.3.5.1.   Analyze pros/cons, cost/benefit analysis

3.4. Financial considerations – BCP PROCESS

    3.4.1. Identify cost for possible technologies/solutions

    3.4.2. Identify funding source (e.g., BCP, cost recovery, etc.)

      3.4.2.1.   For pilot

      3.4.2.2.   For production/implementation

      3.4.2.3.   For ongoing support and maintenance

3.5. Survey and identify existing rules and policy constraints, impacts, and changes necessary

3.6. Pilot

    3.6.1. Scope the pilot

    3.6.2. Create project timeline

    3.6.3. Identify pilot participants and methodology

    3.6.4. Launch/implement

    3.6.5. Evaluate pilot

3.7. Recommendations for a production implementation

    3.7.1. Scope the service

    3.7.2. Create proposed timeline

    3.7.3. Recommendations re: directives and alternative approaches

    3.7.4. Align with strategic plan

    3.7.5. Determine priorities and resources

    3.7.6. Incorporate into a workstream

    3.7.7. Determine appropriate operational processes and procedures

    3.7.8. Ongoing support considerations and planning

    3.7.9. Training and marketing

Status Reports

- Civil Case Management System (V3) Replacement Projects

- Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Case Management System Replacement Projects

- Placer Court Hosting Consortium

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date August 28, 2017	**Action Requested** Please Review
To Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Vice-Chair Judicial Council Technology Committee	**Deadline** N/A
From Kathleen Fink, Manager, Judicial Council Information Technology	**Contact** Kathleen Fink, Manager 415-865-4094 kathleen.fink@jud.ca.gov
Subject Civil Case Management System (V3) Replacement Projects – Status July 8 – July 31, 2017	

Project: Civil Case Management System (CMS) (V3) Replacement projects for the Superior Courts of Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura Counties

Status: All Intra-Branch Agreements (IBAs) for the fiscal year 2016/2017 have been fully executed and disbursements for Milestone 1: Execution of the IBA have been processed and received by the courts.

Projects for all courts are progressing. There are no other significant updates or issues for this reporting period.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date	**Action Requested**
August 28, 2017	Please Review
To	**Deadline**
Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair	N/A
Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Vice-Chair	
Judicial Council Technology Committee	**Contact**
	Kathleen Fink, Manager
From	415-865-4094
Kathleen Fink, Manager,	kathleen.fink@jud.ca.gov
Judicial Council Information Technology	
Subject	
Civil Case Management System (V3)	
Replacement Projects – Status August 1 -	
August 28, 2017	

Project: Civil Case Management System (CMS) (V3) Replacement projects for the Superior Courts of Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura Counties

Status: Disbursement to Ventura Superior Court for Milestone 2, Execution of contract with the selected CMS vendor (Journal Technologies) has been submitted to JCC Budget Services for processing.

The monthly Project Status meeting was held on August 14, 2017, to review the first quarterly Project Monitoring Reports from each court. No issues were reported and no changes were requested. The reports are being routed to JC IT and Budget Services executives for approval.

Ventura
- Held Kickoff meeting
- Began recruitment for backfill staff and hired a database administrator

- Procuring equipment for development and test environments

San Diego

- Met with Tyler Technologies to discuss the gap analysis and project costs
- Court and Tyler Technologies reviewing Project Participation Agreement, Statement of Work, and Project Plan.

Sacramento

- Began recruitment for a Project Manager

Orange

- Continuing to consider updating CMS V3 for short-term supportability until a COTS product can meet local business requirements. Will be prepared to formalize shortly. In long-term (5-10 years) and as COTS products mature, Orange will investigate migrating to a COTS system.
- Refining detailed Project Plan and Timeline

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

Date
July 30, 2017

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

From
Rick Feldstein, Judicial Council
Technology Committee member

Subject
Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement
Projects - Status June 26 - July 26, 2017

Action Requested
Please Review

Deadline
N/A

Contact
Rick Feldstein, JCTC Member
Richard.Felstein@napa.courts.ca
.gov

Members of the Judicial Council Technology Committee:

As requested, this communication provides my written update regarding the progress of the Sustain Courts and Judicial Council efforts to find funding to migrate away from the current Sustain Justice Edition case management system to an updated CMS platform.

Project: Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement projects for the Superior Courts of Humboldt, Lake, Madera, Modoc, Plumas, San Benito, Sierra, Trinity, and Tuolumne counties.

Status: The SJE BCP funding to replace the SJE case management system for nine courts was included in the FY 17-18 budget signed by the Governor on June 27, 2017. A "kick off" meeting was held with the nine SJE BCP courts on July 20, 2017. Topics discussed in the "kick off" meeting included the need for an Intra-Branch Agreement (IBA) with each of the nine courts to distribute the funding. Within the IBA, each could will need to identify the installment payments they will need under the IBA as well as define high-level project milestones. The process of meeting with the Judicial Council staff on a monthly basis to discuss project status as well as the quarterly written reporting process was also discussed.

Next Steps: Courts execute an IBA and begin work to implement the new CMS.

Further updates will be provided in upcoming meetings. Thank you.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

Date
August 30, 2017

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

From
Rick Feldstein, Judicial Council
Technology Committee member

Subject
Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement
Projects - Status June 26 - July 26, 2017

Action Requested
Please Review

Deadline
N/A

Contact
Rick Feldstein, JCTC Member
Richard.Felstein@napa.courts.ca
.gov

Members of the Judicial Council Technology Committee:

As requested, this communication provides my written update regarding the progress of the Sustain Courts and Judicial Council efforts to find funding to migrate away from the current Sustain Justice Edition case management system to an updated CMS platform.

Project: Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement projects for the Superior Courts of Humboldt, Lake, Madera, Modoc, Plumas, San Benito, Sierra, Trinity, and Tuolumne counties.

Status: The SJE Courts are working to specify the installment payments and high-level project milestones to be included in each court's Intra-Branch Agreement (IBA).

Next Steps: Courts execute an IBA and begin work to implement the new CMS.

Further updates will be provided in upcoming meetings. Thank you.

Monthly Project Monitoring Report

Report Period: 07/01/2017-8/31/2017
Report Date:007/06/2017
Court Name: Placer
Prepared By: Greg Harding

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA**
ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Project Name	Placer Court Hosting Center
Court Project Manager	Greg Harding
IBA Number	1033111
IBA Effective Date	11/1/2016
IBA End Date	4/30/2019
Project Start Date	October 2015
Estimated Finish Date	January 2018
Estimated % Complete	65%

1. Accomplishments / Plans

Accomplishments during *this Reporting Period*:

- DMV Connection for the Hosting Center Tested and fully configured
- DMV Connection for Plumas Court Tested and failed, DMV working on solution. ETA September 5th.
- Firewall rules updated.
- AT&T circuits installed and fully tested at Plumas and Lake Courts.
- AT&T circuits installed awaiting testing San Benito, Trinity, and Modoc Court.
- Sustain SJE Tested by Plumas, Sierra, Trinity and Lake Courts.
- Domain Naming Services transferred to Placer Hosting Center for Plumas.
- Email files copied for Plumas copied and delivered to Placer.
- Shared Files for Plumas copied and delivered to Placer
- Network Share rights for Plumas derived.
- WAN Routers installed in Plumas, San Benito and Lake Court.
- Crystal Reports server fully installed for Lake and San Benito.

Plans during the *next Reporting Period*:

- Plumas Go-Live; September 28, 2017
- Sierra Go-Live; September 28, 2017
- Trinity Go-Live; October 16, 2017

2. Risks and Issues

Issue Status (Issues requiring resolution or others that may affect the proposed approach baseline)**:**

- DMV Connection to Plumas failed initial test on the DMV side. DMV working on a solution. ETA September 5th.

Change Status (Considerations or new course of actions that change the proposed approach)**:**

- None

Risk Status (Report risks to the current approach, any risks discovered, and proposed risk responses)**:**

- None

3. Scheduled Milestones / Deliverables

List any Milestones that are late as well as Milestones due in the next 4 to 6 weeks (as applicable).

Milestone	Due Date (Actual)	Status
WBS 15.1 – Plumas/Sierra go-live plan created		On-Schedule
WBS 15.2 – Plumas/Sierra CMS hosting transition complete		On-Schedule
WBS 15.3 – Plumas/Sierra Managed Court services transition complete		On-Schedule
WBS 16.1 Lake go live plan created		On-Schedule
		On-Schedule

4. Payment Schedule and Milestones

List IBA payment milestones that have been completed, are yet to be completed, total IBA amount and payments remaining to be made.

IBA Installment Payments	IBA Installment Amount	IBA Payment Date	IBA Actual Payment
Court signs executed contracts with vendors	$265,599.00	PAID	$265,599.00
Court develops all hardware and software specifications	$470,901.00	PAID	$470,901.00
Total IBA Amount	**$736,500.00**		**$736,500.00**
Remaining IBA Amount To Be Paid	**$736,500.00**		**0**

Project Tracking Milestones	Project Milestone Target Date	Project Milestone Actual Date	N/A For Project Milestone Tracking
WBS 1 – CCTC Requirements Document Completed	NOV 16	DEC 16	
WBS2 – Server Design	MAR17	FEB 17	
WBS3 – Server Build	APR17	APR17	
WBS4 – Network and Connectivity Design	JAN 17	JAN 17	
WBS5 – Network and Connectivity Implemented with connectivity to CCTC	MAY 17	JUNE 17	
WBS6 – Information Systems Framework and Security Policies Developed and Implemented	JUL17	AUG 17	
WBS7 – DMV Service Transition	JUL 17	AUG 17	
WBS7.1 – DMV DISA Approval	MAR 17	FEB 17	
WBS7.2 – DMV Connectivity Configured and implemented	JUN 17	APR17	
WBS9 – Interface rework completed	JUL 17	TBD	
WBS10 – SJE Core Environments Created	MAY 17	MAY 17	
WBS11 – Initial SJE Data Copy	MAY 17	MAY 17	
WBS12 – Non-CMS Applications Installed	JUN 17	MAY 17	
WBS 13 – UAT of CCTC connectivity	SEPT 17	TBD	
WBS14 –UAT of SJE and interfaces including DMV	AUG 17	AUG 17	
WBS15 – UAT of "managed court" services	SEPT 17	TBD	
WBS 15.1 – Plumas/Sierra go-live plan created	AUG 17	AUG 17	
WBS 15.2 – Plumas/Sierra CMS hosting transition complete	OCT 17	TBD	
WBS 15.3 – Plumas/Sierra Managed Court services transition complete	OCT 17	TBD	
WBS 15.4 – Plumas/Sierra transition complete	OCT 17	TBD	
WBS 16.1 Lake go live plan created	SEPT 17	TBD	
WBS 16.2 Lake CMS hosting transition complete	NOV 17	TBD	
WBS 16.3 Lake Managed Court services transition complete	NOV 17	TBD	
WBS 16.4 Lake transition complete	NOV 17	TBD	
WBS 17.1 Trinity go-live plan created	SEPT 17	TBD	
WBS 17.2 Trinity CMS hosting transition complete	OCT 17	TBD	
WBS 17.3 Trinity Managed Court services transition complete	NA	TBD	
WBS 17.4 Trinity transition complete	OCT 17	TBD	

WBS 18.1 San Benito go-live plan created	OCT 17	TBD	
WBS 18.2 San Benito CMS hosting transition complete	DEC 17	TBD	
WBS 18.3 San Benito Managed Court services transition complete	DEC 17	TBD	
WBS 18.4 San Benito transition complete	DEC 17	TBD	
WBS 19.1 Modoc go-live plan created	NOV 17	TBD	
WBS 19.2 Modoc CMS hosting transition complete	JAN 18	TBD	
WBS 19.3 Modoc Managed Court services transition complete	JAN 18	TBD	
WBS 19.2 Modoc transition complete	JAN 18	TBD	