

Information Technology Advisory Committee Q1 2018 Status Report


April 2018

This report was provided at the **April 30, 2018** ITAC meeting. Status updates are submitted by workstream sponsors and subcommittee chairs.




JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

1.1. Futures Commission Directive: Intelligent Chat (Phase 1)

 **Highlight:** Identified core team and submitted initial funding request (IFR) submitted; orientation meeting expected in May.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	In Progress	<p>The core team was identified and includes the Executive Sponsor, Judge Michael Groch, Superior Court of San Diego; Technical Lead Oversight, John Yee, Lead Enterprise Architect, Judicial Council Information Technology, along with support from the Judicial Council Information Technology Office (JCIT) subject matter experts (SMEs). A project manager is TBD. Planning is underway to convene the core team, SMEs, and CIO workplan authors for a project orientation. The meeting will reinforce the Chief’s directive, set core team and support staff expectations, revisit the proposed workplan tasks, and brainstorm ways to update and execute Phase 1.</p> <p>Staff drafted and submitted an initial funding request to support more formalized and broader deployment of all three directives; unfortunately, the request did not make the short list of proposals recommended to advance to a BCP for FY19/20 due to competing priorities and program readiness.</p>
(a) Identify and monitor a series of court proofs of concepts (POCs) to assess technology readiness for various cases (e.g., Court of Appeal, E-Filing, Self-Help).	Not Started	
(b) Identify key performance indicators and benchmark before/after success.	Not Started	
(c) Capture learnings and report findings.	Not Started	
(d) Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results.	Not Started	
(e) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; annual agenda accordingly.	Not Started	

1.2. Futures Commission Directive: Voice-To-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom (Phase 1)

 **Highlight:** In progress of identifying core team; submitted initial funding request (IFR).

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	In Progress	<p>The core team was identified and includes the Executive Sponsor, Judge James Mize, Superior Court of Sacramento; Project Manager, Rick Walery, CEO, Superior Court of San Mateo, along with support from the Judicial Council Information Technology Office (JCIT) subject matter experts (SMEs). The team is seeking a co-sponsor/business lead—TBD. Planning is underway to convene the core team members, SMEs, and CIO workplan authors for a project orientation. The meeting will reinforce the Chief’s directive, set core team and support staff expectations, revisit the proposed workplan tasks, and brainstorm ways to update and execute Phase 1.</p> <p>Staff drafted and submitted an initial funding request to support more formalized and broader deployment of all three directives; unfortunately, the request did not make the short list of proposals recommended to advance to a BCP for FY19/20 due to competing priorities and program readiness.</p>
(a) 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.	Not Started	
(b) Pilot 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.	Not Started	
(c) Capture learnings and draft a white paper report on the lessons learned, findings, and recommendations for next steps.	Not Started	
(d) Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results.	Not Started	
(e) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; annual agenda accordingly.	Not Started	

1.3. Futures Commission Directive: Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings (Phase 1)

 **Highlight:** Held core team orientation for official handoff/knowledge transfer; submitted initial funding request (IFR).

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	In Progress	<p>Formed the core team, which includes the Executive Sponsor, Judge Samantha Jessner, Superior Court of Los Angeles; Business Lead, Jake Chatters, CEO, Superior Court of Placer; Project Manager, Alan Crouse, Deputy CEO, Superior Court of San Bernardino, along with support from the Judicial Council Information Technology Office (JCIT) subject matter experts (SMEs)—including from the Language Access Plan and VRI programs.</p> <p>On 3/22, held project orientation and knowledge transfer with core team along with the original workplan authors (Brian Cotta, Asst CEO, 5DCA and Jeannette Vannoy, CIO, Napa). The meeting reinforced the Chief’s directive, set core team and support staff expectations and brainstormed ways to execute Phase 1. Since then, the core team updated the workplan and expects to set regular meetings, launch the initial discovery, and outreach to courts for participation.</p> <p>Staff drafted and submitted an initial funding request to support more formalized and broader deployment of all three directives; unfortunately, the request did not make the short list of proposals recommended to advance to a BCP for FY19/20 due to competing priorities and program readiness.</p>
(a) Identify and conduct a mock remote video hearing using a web conferencing system for a specific hearing type (e.g., Civil – Small Claims) as a Proof of Concept (POC) in a court. Include one or more mock hearings of the selected hearing type.	Not Started	
(b) Capture learnings and report findings.	Not Started	
(c) Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results.	Not Started	
(d) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; annual agenda accordingly.	Not Started	

2. Tactical Plan for Technology Update



Highlight: Membership roster approved and planning initiated.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Initiate workstream, including formation of membership and conduct orientation/kickoff meeting.	In Progress	Membership roster approved and planning kickoff in coordination with output from the Strategic Plan Update that is in progress.
(b) Review, gather input, and update the Tactical Plan for Technology.	Not Started	
(c) Circulate the draft plan for branch and public comment; revise as needed.	Not Started	
(d) Finalize, and seek approval by the JCTC and the Judicial Council; thereafter, formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

3. Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Pilot



Highlight: VRI Pilot Project went live in January 2018. All 3 courts are live with the VRI equipment and have successfully completed multiple events.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Support implementation of the Assessment Period of the VRI pilot program (including kickoff, court preparations, site visits, and deployment), as requested.	In Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> January 2018: Onsite training was conducted at the Sacramento, Merced and Ventura Superior Courts. January-April 2018: The three Superior Courts went live with the VRI pilot equipment. This first phase is for the courts to use the VRI equipment within their own courts. March-April 2018: SDSU Research Foundation (the independent evaluator) conducted onsite observations visits to gather additional data. May 2018: Plans to move into the second phase for the courts to share interpreters inter-court (between the courts) will take place.
(b) Review pilot findings; validate, refine, and amend, if necessary, the technical standards.	Not Started	
(c) Identify whether new or amended rules of court are needed (and advise the Rules & Policy Subcommittee for follow up).	Not Started	
(d) Consult and collaborate with LAPITF, as needed, in preparing recommendations to the Judicial Council on VRI implementations.	Not Started	
(e) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	Not Started	

4. E-Filing Strategy



Highlight: Continued progress on EFM negotiations.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Finalize master agreements with the three (3) E-Filing Managers (EFMs) selected to provide services.	In Progress	We continue to negotiate with each of the 3 chosen EFM Vendors Tyler, JTI and ImageSoft. We are targeting end of April for execution of these Master Agreements.
(b) Develop the E-Filing Service Provider (EFSP) selection/certification process.	Not Started	
(c) Monitor the progress of EFSP accessibility compliance.	In Progress	JCIT issued a survey to collect accessibility information for AB 103, with responses due April 23. The Judicial Council is required to report to the Legislature on the current state of electronic filing and document service in the courts by June 30, 2018.
(d) Develop the roadmap for an e-filing deployment strategy, approach, and branch solutions/alternatives.	Not Started	
(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.	Not Started	
(f) Consult and report on the implementation of the court cost recovery fee that will support the statewide e-filing program.	Not Started	
(g) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support of the ongoing e-filing program being funded through the court cost-recovery fee.	Not Started	
(h) At the completion of these objectives and with the approval of the JCTC, formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

5. Identity and Access Management Strategy



Highlight: Identity and Access Management service acquired: Microsoft Azure AD Identity Service.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Develop and issue an RFP for a statewide identity management service/provider; identify and select.	Complete	Microsoft Azure AD Identity Service acquired under a Leveraged Procurement Agreement (LPA), County of Riverside RFQ #PUARC-1518, Microsoft Master Agreement Number 01E73970.
(b) Develop the roadmap for a branch identity management strategy and approach.	Not Started	
(c) Determine policies and processes for identity management (including proofing and access management).	Not Started	
(d) Ensure linkage and alignment with other branchwide initiatives such as E-Filing, SRL Portal, Next Generation Hosting, CMS Migration and Development.	In Progress	Sponsors or project managers for the aligned initiatives are members of the workstream.
(e) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	In Progress	JCIT staff are participating in the pilot at Los Angeles Superior Court and are on the workstream.

6. Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) E-Services



Highlight: Supported progress of the FY18/19 BCP; initiated RFP data collection.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Provide input for, and track, a SRL E-Services Budget Change Proposal (BCP) process for FY 18-19 funding.	In Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BCP for FY18/19 has been submitted to the Department of Finance • Provided responses to questions from the DOF and LAO • Support for legislative sessions and questions
(b) 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, and vendor resources.	In Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is being done in conjunction with the next line item (c) as part of the development of the RFP
(c) Develop and issue a request for proposal (RFP) or other solicitation, as needed, to support the implementation of the branchwide e-services portal.	In Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial work has been started to reuse some of the common components and requirements from other recent RFPs issued but the JC.
(d) Determine implementation options for a branch-branded SRL E-Services website that takes optimal advantage of existing branch, local court, and vendor resources.	In Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JCIT is funding a project as a pre-cursor to the SRL portal project which will pilot a small subset of features to get some experience and understanding in this area.
(e) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate. Note: In scope for 2018 is the submission and tracking of a budget change proposal (BCP) and development of an RFP; out of scope is the actual implementation.	Not Started	

7. IT Community Development



Highlight: Began initial planning and drafted program outline.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Initiate new workstream: Identify sponsor and leads; form workstream membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	In Progress	Sponsor has held brainstorming sessions to develop a workstream outline, draft a Charter document and organize the approach on how to execute on this initiative. Expected to outreach to branch for volunteers and seek approval of membership in early May.
(a) Survey the courts to identify (i) their interest in exploring opportunities to share key technical resources and (ii) IT leadership and resource development needs and priorities; report findings.	Not Started	
(b) Assess court CEO/CIO interest in an IT peer consulting program and develop recommendations.	Not Started	
(c) Partner with CJER to develop and implement an annual plan for keeping judicial officers, CEO's, and CIO's abreast of technology trends.	Not Started	
(d) Identify, prioritize, and report on collaboration needs and tools for use within the branch.	Not Started	
(e) Evaluate and prioritized possible technologies to improve advisory body and workstream meeting administration; pilot recommended solutions with the committee.	Not Started	
(f) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regrading operational support, as appropriate.	Not Started	

8. Intelligent Forms Strategy: Research & Scope (Phase 1)



Highlight: Presenting final recommendations for consideration by ITAC at its April 30 meeting.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(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.	Completed	Final recommendation, Target Solutions Two and Five: Create and publish Application Programming Interface (API) that will merge data files with Judicial Council forms
(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.	Completed	Final recommendation, Target Solutions One, Two and Five: Identify and deploy resources to certify all Judicial Council forms. Assign version numbering to all forms. Host all forms on a separate "Judicial Council forms server". Populate forms by merging data files with Judicial Council forms. Move away from filling out PDFs to completing web forms instead.
(c) Investigate options for redesigning forms to take advantages of new technologies, such as documents assembly technologies.	Completed	Final recommendation, Target Solutions Two, Six and Seven: The proposed solution will eventually separate the PDF from the data gathering tool, allowing a multitude of ways to populate forms, including third-party app developers. This proposal also recommends creating a clearinghouse for interview-based solutions so that best practices can be shared across platforms.
(d) Investigate options for developing standardized forms definitions and delivery methods that would enable forms to be efficiently electronically filed into the various modern CMSs across the state.	Completed	Final recommendation, Target Solutions Two, Four and Five: Standardize form field naming conventions by extending NIEM/ECF standards, preferably in collaboration with courts and vendors. Assign version numbering to all forms. Design form update governance standard to enable courts and vendors to easily identify changes.

8. Intelligent Forms Strategy: Research & Scope (Phase 1) (cont'd)



Highlight: Presenting final recommendations for consideration by ITAC at its April 30 meeting.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(e) Explore the creation and use of court generated text-based forms as an alternative to graphic forms.	Completed	Final recommendation, Target Solution Six: Develop pilot project to create truly dynamic forms. Such forms include only mandatory items and any optional items that contain data, but would not display empty fields.
(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.	Completed	Final recommendation, Target Solution Two: Host all Judicial Council forms on a separate “Judicial Council forms server”.
(g) Develop recommendations for a potential BCP to support proposed solutions. (Note: Drafting a BCP would be a separate effort.)	Completed	An Initial Funding Request for three additional positions to support the recommendations in the workstream’s report was drafted and submitted to the JCTC and JBBC for consideration.
(h) Initiate Phase 2 of the workstream, based on the recommendations.	In Progress-Under Review	The workstream has submitted its final recommendation to ITAC for consideration at its April 30 meeting. In the workstream’s review and discussions, it became clear that the proposed project is too complex for the current workstream membership to undertake. It will require technical resources that are not currently available. The workstream has proposed a roadmap for future efforts to modernize Judicial Council forms.

9. Digital Evidence: Assessment (Phase 1)



Highlight: Branchwide survey completed with 49 trial and appellate courts responding.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Review existing statutes and rules of court to identify impediments to use of digital evidence and opportunities for improved processes.	In Progress	Existing statewide statutes and rules reviewed and documented. Will review survey results for local rules and statutes.
(b) Survey courts for existing business practices and policies regarding acceptance and retention of digital evidence.	In Progress	Survey complete with 49 trial and appellate courts responding. Preparing survey results.
(c) Survey courts and justice system groups regarding possible technical standards and business practices for acceptance and storage of digital evidence.	In Progress	Branch wide survey complete with 49 trial and appellate courts responding. Justice partner surveys in progress.
(d) Report findings to ITAC and provide recommendations on next steps.	Not Started	
(e) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	Not Started	

10. Data Analytics : Access and Report (Phase 1)



Highlight: Core team held orientation and conducted initial planning.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Research, scope, and recommend a data analytics strategy for the branch (e.g., this may include gaining case processing and resource data).	In Progress	The group met by phone two times during the quarter: March 5 and March 22, and is making plans for an in-person meeting in the late spring. The group is also identifying key participants to include in the workstream. Core team participants are also planning to attend the DataEdge Conference hosted at UC Berkeley in April.
(b) Investigate possible policies, processes, and technologies to help the branch utilize data analytics to improve business effectiveness.	Not Started	
(c) Assess priorities for data collection and present findings to ITAC.	Not Started	
(d) Identify possible data analytical tools and templates.	Not Started	

11.1. Disaster Recovery (DR) Framework Phase 1



Highlight: Completed Phase 1 workstream deliverables, including Judicial Council approval.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Coordinate with JCIT to define and plan the operational or ongoing support needed to maintain the <i>Disaster Recovery Framework Guide</i> and associated deliverables.	Completed	The final report included the recommendation that Judicial Council IT would update the document on a periodic basis, as needed.
(b) Seek approval of the proposed framework from the JCTC and adoption by the Judicial Council; thereafter, formally sunset this phase of the workstream.	In Progress-nearly complete	<p>Framework and toolkit was approved by the Judicial Council on March 2, 2018. Additionally, a presentation was made to the Executive Committees of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and Court Executive Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Seeking formal approval from ITAC to sunset this phase of the workstream.</p>

11.2. Disaster Recovery (DR) Framework Phase 2



Highlight: Initiating workstream in coordination with Innovation Grant pilot.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Initiate new workstream: Identify sponsor and leads; form workstream membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	In Progress	Sponsor and Project Manager have been identified. Through our collaborative efforts initiated by the Innovation Grants funded Cloud-Based Disaster Recovery project, members representing 26 JBEs have formed two teams with the objective of crafting a branch-wide RFP that serves the majority of the courts. Kick-off meetings were held in November 2017, and the RFP is still in progress. We plan to seek members of the workstream from the RFP strategy and review teams.
(a) Leverage the innovation grant awarded to the Superior Court of Monterey County for a Cloud DR Pilot Program.	In Progress	We are currently in the midst of executing phase I of the innovation grant project – Issuance of the branch wide RFP to select a list of vendors and cloud based disaster recovery solutions. The next phase will include Monterey County Superior Court to select one for the award vendor solution, design and implement recovery for selected systems and programs.
(b) Recommend a list of critical technology services that make business sense for cloud-based recovery adoption.	Not Started	
(c) Establish a cloud DR master agreement with a short list of cloud service providers for judicial branch entities/courts to leverage.	Not Started	Master agreements expected to be in place June – July.
(d) Publish design solution templates using technologies and solutions from vendors selected in the cloud DR master agreement.	Not Started	
(e) Host knowledge sharing sessions for interested judicial branch entities/courts (including tools to estimate cost for deploying recovery solution using a particular cloud service provider; and Monterey solution case study).	Not Started	As part of the RFP for the Cloud-Based Disaster Recovery project, a proposal conference will be the first opportunity to build knowledge on the leveraging cloud technologies for disaster recovery. After the conclusion of the pilot phase, additional avenues for knowledge sharing will be made available to the judicial branch technology community.
(f) Provide input to JCIT that will be used in drafting a BCP to fund a pilot group of courts interested in implementing Cloud-based DR for critical technology services (see (b)).	Not Started	
(g) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	Not Started	

12.1. Next-Generation Hosting Strategy Phase 1



Highlight: Completed Phase 1 workstream deliverables, including Judicial Council approval.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Coordinate with JCIT to define and plan the operational or ongoing support needed to maintain the <i>Next-Generation Hosting Framework Guide</i> and associated deliverables.	In Progress	
(b) Seek approval of the proposed framework from the JCTC and adoption by the Judicial Council; thereafter, formally sunset this phase of the workstream.	In Progress-nearly complete	Framework and toolkit was approved by the Judicial Council on March 2, 2018. Seeking formal approval from ITAC to sunset this phase of the workstream.

12.2. Next-Generation Hosting Strategy Phase 2



Highlight: No activity this period.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Initiate new workstream: Identify sponsor and leads; form workstream membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Not Started	Awaiting formal sunset of Phase 1 and discussion at ITAC April 30 meeting.
(a) Identify and implement a pilot program to test the branch Next-Generation Hosting Framework and report findings. Pilot courts to include those with available funding; also, will include collaboration with courts already in progress of transitioning to next-generation hosting.	Not Started	
(b) Establish master agreements for cloud service providers. (Potential shared effort with DR Workstream initiative.)	Not Started	
(c) Establish the judicial branch support model for IT services.	Not Started	
(d) Determine funding mechanism to transition courts to new hosting models; this includes exploring a potential Budget Change Proposal (BCP)	Not Started	


13.1. Modernize Trial Court Rules



Highlight: Amendments to title 2, division 3, chapter 2 of the California Rules of Court were submitted for public comment.


Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) Proposals to create and amend rules to conform to legislation enacted in 2017. For example, new provisions of Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 expressly require the Judicial council to adopt rules of court related to disability access and electronic signatures for documents signed under penalty of perjury. The new provisions also require express consent for electronic service, which will require a rule amendment, and creation of a form for withdrawal of consent.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments to title 2, division 3, chapter 2 of the California Rules of Court are being circulated for public comment. The proposed amendments respond to new requirements in Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6, amend definitions in the rules, and ensure indigent filers are not required to have a payment mechanism to create an account with electronic filing service providers. Proposed Judicial Council form EFS-006, <i>Withdrawal of Consent to Electronic Service</i> is being circulated for public comment. The purpose of the proposal is to comply with Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6(a)(6), which requires the Judicial Council to create such a form by January 1, 2019. This is a joint proposal with the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee. <p>The public comment period ends on June 8, 2018.</p>
<p>(b) Proposals based on suggestions from the public such as revising definitions and addressing a barrier to indigent users accessing services of electronic filing service providers.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>(c) Proposals for technical amendments to amend rules language that is obsolete or otherwise unnecessary.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>See above.</p>

13.2 Standards for E-Signature

 **Highlight:** E-signature rule proposal presented to CEAC Records Management Subcommittee and circulation for public comment.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) CEAC Records Management Subcommittee to develop standards governing electronic signatures for documents filed into the court with input from the Court Information Technology Managers Forum (CIOs). Rules & Policy Subcommittee to review.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>AB 976 amended Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 to require express consent for electronic service and not allow the act of electronic filing to be deemed as consent to electronic service. The proposed e-signature rule was presented to CEAC Records Management Subcommittee. The proposed rule defines electronic signature as it is defined in California’s Uniform Electronic Transactions Act (UETA) and bases process for using an electronic signature under penalty of perjury on the process in UETA. The subcommittee did not raise any concerns with this approach. The rule proposal is being circulated for public comment. The public comment period ends on June 8, 2018.</p> <p>RPS still waiting on CEAC Records Management Subcommittee to develop standards, at which point RPS will review.</p>

13.3. Remote Access Rules for Government Entities, Parties, Attorneys

 **Highlight:** The Joint Ad Hoc Subcommittee reviewed/approved rules proposal, which is currently posted for public comment.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Lead the Joint Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Remote Access to amend trial court ruled to facilitate remote access to trial court records by state and local government entities, parties, parties' attorneys, and certain court-appointed persons.	In Progress	The rule proposal has been reviewed and approved by RPS, ITAC, JCTC and RUPRO and is circulating for public comment. The public comment period ends on June 8, 2018.

13.4. Standards for Electronic Court Records as Data



Highlight: Members of CEAC Records Management Subcommittee have started working on this project.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) CEAC Records Management Subcommittee – in collaboration with the Data Exchange Workstream governance body – 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 & Policy Subcommittee to review.	In Progress	The CEAC Records Management Subcommittee held a preliminary meeting and has started work on this project.
(b) Determine what statutory and rule changes may be required to authorize and implement the maintenance of record in the form of data; develop proposals to satisfy these changes.	In Progress	Same as above.

13.5. Privacy Resource Guide



Highlight: The draft text of a Privacy Resource Guide (PRG) has been prepared and is continuing to be finalized.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Continue development of a comprehensive statewide privacy resource guide addressing, among other things, electronic access to court records and data, to align with both state and federal requirements.	In Progress	Finalizing the draft Privacy Resource Guide that will assist the branch in addressing privacy issues; this preliminary draft will be presented to the committee.
(b) Continue development of court privacy resource guide, outlining the key requirements, contents, and provisions for courts to address within its specific privacy policy.	In Progress	The Privacy Resource Guide will include a section on best privacy practices for local courts and model templates for them to use; this section has been outlined but has not yet been drafted. Legal staff has contacted various committees and divisions for assistance with this project.

14.1. Modernize Appellate Court Rules



Highlight: Rules proposals out for public comment; some items deferred for future rules cycle.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) Formatting of electronic reporters’ transcripts: Rule 8.144 was amended in the prior rules cycle to provide format requirements for electronic court reporter transcripts consistent with amendments to Code of Civil Procedure section 271. In this rules cycle JATS will consider whether additional amendments to Rule 8.144 are needed.</p>	<p>In Progress-Monitoring</p>	<p>To date, JATS has not received reports of issues or problems with the rule amendment in practice, and thus have no issues to examine. The subcommittee will continue to monitor and be responsive to comments or concerns as they are raised.</p>
<p>(b) Sealed & Confidential Material: Rules for the handling of sealed or confidential materials that are submitted electronically.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>This rule proposal was developed and is published for public comment, per approval of JATS and the Appellate Advisory Committee to circulate. ITAC will discuss its comments to the proposal at its April 30 meeting.</p>
<p>(c) Return of lodged electronic records: The trial court rule modernization changes made in 2016 amend rules 2.551(b) and 2.577d)(4) to give the moving party ten days after a motion to seal is denied, to notify the court if the party wants the record to be filed unsealed. If the clerk does not receive notification in then days, the clerk must return the record, if lodged in paper form, or permanently delete it if lodged in electronic form. JATS will consider whether equivalent appellate rules are desirable.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>This proposal was consolidated with the above proposal; the proposal is currently out for public comment and will be discussed at ITAC’s April 30 meeting.</p>
<p>(d) Rule amendments regarding access: JATS will consider possible rule amendments to address online access to trial court records for parties, their attorneys, local justice partners, and other government agencies. The plan is for JATS to review what is ultimately proposed at the trial court level and use that as a basis for developing a companion proposal for access to appellate court records.</p>	<p>Not Started-On Hold</p>	<p>This project is dependent on pending action related to the trial court rules. JATS will review what is ultimately proposed for the trial courts and consider whether similar rules should be applied at the appellate court level.</p>

14.1. Modernize Appellate Court Rules (cont'd)



Highlight: Rules proposals out for public comment; some items deferred for future rules cycle.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(e) Bookmarking: The 2016 trial court rules modernization changes include a new requirement, added to rule 3.1110(f), that electronic exhibits be electronically bookmarked. This issue was set aside by JATS for 2016, to permit those appellate courts new to e-filing at the time (or not yet on e-filing at the time) a chance to gain some experience with e-filing before participating in statewide decisions on this topic.</p>	<p>Not Started-Deferred</p>	<p>This subject was consolidated with item (f) below. The subcommittee discussed this matter, which led to additional questions and issues. Thus, the subcommittee opted to defer this proposal until the next rules cycle—with the intention of including this on the 2019 Annual Agenda. In doing so, the subcommittee would like to broaden the scope of this subject to include consideration of formatting rules for e-filed documents generally.</p>
<p>(f) Exhibits: Create a requirement that exhibits submitted in electronic form be submitted in electronic volumes, rather than individually.</p>	<p>Not Started-Deferred</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>(g) Numbering of materials in requests for judicial notice: Consider amending rule 8.252, which requires numbering materials to be judicially noticed consecutively, starting with page number one. The materials are attached to a motion and declaration(s) and are electronically filed as one document, making pagination and references to these materials in the briefs confusing for litigants and the courts.</p>	<p>Not Started</p>	<p>This is a two year project. The subcommittee plans to start this work in the Fall of 2018.</p>

14.2. Rules Regarding Certification of Electronic Records, E-Signature, and Paper Copies



Highlight: Start is dependent upon pending trial court rules proposal development.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Provide input on proposed changes to the trial court rules of court governing certifications of electronic records, standards for electronic signatures, and requirements for paper copies of e-filed documents that will impact the appellate courts.	Not Started	JATS is holding on this item while the Rules & Policy Subcommittee develops the applicable trial court rules.
(b) Consider whether to propose changes to the appellate court rules on this topic.	Not Started	This project is dependent on pending action related to the trial court rules. JATS will review what is ultimately proposed for the trial courts and consider whether similar rules should be applied at the appellate court level.


14.3. Input on Appellate Document Management System



Highlight: Ready to provide consultation, as needed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Monitor and provide input on the implementation of a new document system (DMS) for the appellate courts.	In Progress-Monitoring	To date, JATS has not been requested to provide input. The DMS contract is now in place and is expected to move forward. JATS remains available to provide comment or input, as needed.

15. Liaison Collaboration

 **Highlight:** Liaisons assigned; reports to be received at the next ITAC meeting.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Appoint ITAC members to serve as liaisons to identified advisory bodies.	Completed	Members assigned to liaison roles. Eliminated the liaison relationship with the Jury Instructions advisory body, due to a lack of need.
(b) Share ITAC status reports with advisory body chairs and attend liaison committee meetings.	In Progress	
(c) Identify opportunities to collaborate and share liaison feedback to ITAC, the JCTC, the Judicial Council, and the branch, as appropriate.	In Progress	Liaisons are invited to report at the April 30 ITAC meeting.