



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

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

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))

THIS MEETING WILL BE RECORDED

Date: January 16, 2020
Time: 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831 Public 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 November 15, 2019 meeting.

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

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), public comments about any agenda item must be submitted by January 15, 2020, 1:00 p.m. 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: Rita Alderucci. Only written comments received by January 15, 2020, 1:00 p.m. will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-3)

Item 1

Chair Report

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

Presenter: Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair, Judicial Council Technology Committee

Item 2

Review of Information Technology Advisory Committee's (ITAC) 2020

Annual Agenda (Action Requested)

Review of the annual agenda for ITAC. The committee will then be asked to provide feedback and consider approval of the annual agenda.

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

Item 3

Technology Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) (Action Requested)

The JCTC will consider the concepts for potential technology-related Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) for funding beginning FY 21/22. The JCTC will prioritize these concepts for submission to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee.

Presenter: Ms. Heather L. Pettit, Chief Information Officer, Information Technology

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

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

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

November 15, 2019

9:00 – 9:45 AM

In Person

Redwood Room, Judicial Council Conference Center
455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3688

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair; Hon. Ming W. Chin; Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin; Hon. Rebecca Wightman; Ms. Nancy Eberhardt; Ms. Rachel W. Hill; and Ms. Andrea K. Rohmann

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. C. Todd Bottke, Vice-Chair

Liaison Members Present: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson

Others Present: Hon. Tara M. Desautels; Ms. Heather L. Pettit; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Jessica Goldstein; Ms. Jamel Jones; Ms. Kathy Fink; Mr. Richard Blalock; Mr. Jake Chatters; Mr. Alan Crouse; Ms. Rica Abesa; Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin; and Ms. Rose Butler

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

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

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the September 24, 2019 meeting and October 29, 2019 action by email.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Chair Report

Update: Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair, welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. Judge Brodie reviewed the agenda for the meeting and provided updates on recent meetings in which the Chair 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. Workstreams with key milestones highlighted included the Data Analytics Workstream and the Futures Commission Directives related to Voice-to-Text Language Services Outside the courtroom.

Action: The committee received the report.

Item 3

Futures Commission Directive: Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings – Status and Final Report

Update: Mr. Jake Chatters, Business Lead, and Mr. Alan Crouse, Project Manager, for the Remote Video Appearances Working Group, provided an update and final report on the feasibility, rule, regulation and statutory requirements, to support implementation of remote appearances by parties, counsel, and witnesses for most noncriminal court proceedings. The charge for the working group came from the Chief Justice's Future Commission and was to consider 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. The goal of the project is to improve access to justice.

Action: The committee received the report and will do an action by email to consider acceptance and submission of the report to the Judicial Council.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

Annual Agenda¹—2020

Approved by Judicial Council Technology Committee: _____

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Superior Court of California, County of Orange
Lead Staff:	Mr. Richard Blalock, Senior Business Systems Analyst, Judicial Council, Information Technology
Committee's Charge/Membership: <p><u>Rule 10.53. Information Technology Advisory Committee</u> of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Information Technology Advisory Committee. 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.</p> <p><u>Rule 10.53. Information Technology Advisory Committee</u> sets forth additional duties of the committee.</p> <p>The ITAC currently has 24 members. The <u>ITAC website</u> provides the composition of the committee.</p> <p>Subcommittees²:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rules & Policy Subcommittee<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Trial court rules and statutes revisions○ Standards for electronic court records as data• Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee (JATS) [suspended status for 2020]• Joint Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Remote Video Appearances	

¹ The annual agenda outlines the work a committee will focus on in the coming year and identifies areas of collaboration with other advisory bodies and the Judicial Council staff resources

² California Rules of Court, rule 10.30 (c) allows an advisory body to form subgroups, composed entirely of current members of the advisory body, to carry out the body's duties, subject to available resources, with the approval of its oversight committee

All proposed projects for the year are included on the Annual Agenda, as follows:

Futures Commission Directives

Two directives are in the last stages of the approval process:

- **Intelligent Chat (Phase 1) (continued):** Explore and make recommendations to the Judicial Council on the potential for a pilot project using intelligent chat technology to provide information and self-help services. (Draft report pending committee approvals)
- **Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings (Phase 1) (continued):** Consider, for presentation to the Judicial Council, the feasibility of and resource requirements for developing and implementing a pilot to allow remote appearances by parties, counsel, and witnesses for most noncriminal court proceedings. (Update to Judicial Council pending)

One directive is ongoing:

- **Voice-to-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom (continued):** Explore available technologies and make recommendations to the Judicial Council on the potential for a pilot project using voice-to-text language interpretation at service counters and in self-help centers.

Workstreams

- **Tactical Plan for Technology Update (new):** Update the *Tactical Plan for Technology* for effective date 2021-2022.
- **Identity and Access Management Strategy (continued):** Develop a branch identity management strategy.
- **IT Community Development (continued):** Expand collaboration and professional development within the branch IT community.
- **Digital Evidence: Rules, Technology and Pilot Evaluation (continued):** Investigate and draft technology best practices, standards, and policies, and propose changes to evidence-based rules and statutes.
- **Data Analytics: Assessment and Report (continued):** Scope and recommend a data analytics strategy for the branch.
- **Disaster Recovery Initial Pilot and Knowledge Sharing (continued):** Implement branch disaster recovery pilot program, master agreement, knowledge-sharing; evaluate need for BCP.
- **Online Dispute Resolution (ODR): Research (continued):** Identify and evaluate available ODR technologies and potential scenarios in which ODR might benefit the judicial branch and its court users.
- **Branchwide Information Security Roadmap (continued):** Develop a defined structure of activities that will collectively enhance the judicial branch information security posture.
- **Remote Video Appearances in Criminal Proceedings: Research (new):** Review existing technical standards, rules, and statutes; define and prioritize use cases for remote video appearances in criminal proceedings.

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

Existing Project (Ending 2020)	
<p>1.1 Futures Commission Directive: Intelligent Chat for Self-Help Services</p>	<i>Priority 1</i>
<p>Workstream membership approved July 9, 2018</p>	<i>Scope category(ies): Policy</i>
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> The committee was directed by the Chief Justice to explore and make recommendations to the Judicial Council on the potential for a pilot project using intelligent chat technology to provide information and self-help services.</p> <p><i>Key Objectives:</i></p> <p>(a) Present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from the JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.</p> <p><i>Objectives met or resolved:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Identify and monitor a series of court proofs of concepts (POCs) to assess technology readiness for various use cases (e.g. Court of Appeal, e-filing, self-help).</i> • <i>Identify key performance indicators and benchmark before/after success.</i> • <i>Capture learnings and report findings.</i> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Chief Justice directive from the Futures Commission recommendations report; assigned to ITAC in May 2017.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> December 2020</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: Hon. Michael Groch • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> Broad input from the branch and the public 	

Existing Project (Ending 2020)	
1.2 Futures Commission Directive: Voice-to-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom	<i>Priority 1³</i>
Workstream membership approved October 15, 2018	Scope category(ies): Possibilities, Pilot
<p>Project Summary: The committee was directed by the Chief Justice to explore available technologies and make recommendations to the Judicial Council on the potential for a pilot project using voice-to-text language services at court filing and service counters and in self-help centers. To leverage current BCP funding, a pilot program will be implemented as a part of this workstream.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Test various voice-to-text language services in a lab environment, which will allow for exposure to more technologies and shorter learning cycles than if a specific technology is deployed at a court for piloting. (b) Identify and pursue any possible pilot collaborations with the Legal Design Lab at the Stanford University Law School. (c) Support implementation of a voice-to-text pilot program (including kickoff, court preparations, site visits, and deployment). (d) Capture learnings and draft a white paper report on the lessons learned, findings, use cases, usage guidelines, and recommendations for next steps. (e) At the completion of these directives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Define the standard of success and how to measure it as well as define the difference between translation and interpretation.</i> • <i>Determine how, or if, the work for this initiative aligns with existing work of the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force (LAPITF) and the work of The Legal Design Lab at the Stanford University Law School.</i> • <i>Set up a technical lab environment at the Judicial Council or a local court to test the technical recommendations of the Futures Commission for this initiative.</i> <p>Origin of Project: Chief Justice directive from the Futures Commission recommendations report; assigned to ITAC in May 2017.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2020</p>	

³ For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done).

Resources:

- *ITAC*: Workstream, Sponsor: Hon. James Mize
- *Judicial Council Staffing*: Information Technology
- *Collaborations*: Court CIOs, pilot courts, Court Innovation Grant awardees

DRAFT

New Workstream (Ending 2020)	
2. Tactical Plan for Technology Update	<i>Priority 1</i>
	<i>Scope category(ies): Policy</i>
<p>Project Summary: Update <i>Tactical Plan for Technology</i> for effective date 2021-2022.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (b) Initiate workstream, including formation of membership and conduct orientation/kickoff meeting. (c) Review, gather input, and prepare an update of the <i>Tactical Plan for Technology</i>. (d) Circulate the draft plan for branch and public comment; revise as needed. (e) Finalize, and seek approval from ITAC, JCTC, and the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Origin of Project: Specific charge of ITAC per Rule 10.53 (b)(8).</p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: Hon. Sheila Hanson • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> Broad input from the branch and the public 	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
3. Identity and Access Management Strategy	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approved September 25, 2018	Scope category(ies): Possibilities, Prototypes, Pilot, Policy/Procurement
<p>Project Summary: Develop a branch identity management strategy.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Develop the roadmap for a branch identity management strategy and approach. (b) Determine policies and processes for identity management (including proofing and access management). (c) Ensure linkage and alignment with other branchwide initiatives such as E-Filing, SRL Portal, Next Generation Hosting, CMS Migration and Deployment. (d) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support. (e) Recommend changes to Rules of Court as needed and work with the Rules & Policy Subcommittee to draft them. (f) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Phase 1: Develop and issue an RFP for a statewide identity management service/provider; identify and select (completed 2018).</i> <p>Origin of Project: Previously, this was a sub-task of the e-filing initiative. The item was promoted to its own annual agenda initiative given its many touchpoints with other workstreams (including Self-Represented Litigants E-Services, Next-Generation Hosting, E-filing Strategy, etc.). <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-18 and 2019-20.</i></p> <p>Status/Timeline: June 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: Mr. Snorri Ogata • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services, Branch Accounting and Procurement • <i>Collaborations:</i> CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee 	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
4. IT Community Development	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approved May 17, 2018	<i>Scope category(ies): Possibilities</i>
<p>Project Summary: Expand collaboration and professional development within the branch IT community.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding ongoing operational support, as appropriate. (b) Provide recommendations for next steps based on findings. (c) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to formally sunset the workstream. <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>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.</i> • <i>Assess court CEO/CIO interest in an IT peer consulting program and develop recommendations.</i> • <i>Assess needs and make recommendations for expanded opportunities for technology-related education for judicial officers, CEOs, CIOs, and court staff. Consult with CJER for educational planning considerations.</i> • <i>Identify, prioritize, and report on collaboration needs and tools for use within the branch.</i> • <i>Evaluate and prioritize possible technologies to improve advisory body and workstream meeting administration; pilot recommended solutions with the committee.</i> <p>Origin of Project: Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-18 and 2019-20.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: April 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: Ms. Jeannette Vannoy (formerly co-sponsored by now retired Judge Alan Perkins) • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee 	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
5. Digital Evidence: Rules, Technology and Pilot Evaluation	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approved September 25, 2019	Scope category(ies): Policies; Pilot
<p>Project Summary: Consider existing pilots and court practices along with available technology pertaining to the use of digital evidence; propose changes to rules and statutes related to digital evidence; develop a framework for successful possible future pilots.</p> <p>Key Objectives: Based on findings from Phase 1 and evaluation of existing local pilots and other court practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Investigate and report on existing local pilots and court practices, including policies and standards, for transmitting, accepting, storing, and protecting digital evidence. (b) Research and recommend available technology and services that would support transmission, acceptance, storage, and protection of digital evidence. (c) Develop and propose changes to Rules of Court and statutes related to digital evidence in collaboration with the Rules and Policy Subcommittee. (d) Develop a framework for successful possible future pilots, including use case scenarios, costs and benefits, and success criteria <p>At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.</p> <p>Origin of Project: <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-18 and 2019-20.</i></p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: Hon. Kimberly Menninger • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services • <i>Collaborations:</i> CEAC, TCPJAC, ITAC Rules and Policy Subcommittee, and other advisory bodies as needed 	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
6. Data Analytics: Assessment and Report	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approved July 23, 2018	<i>Scope category(ies): Possibilities; Policy</i>
<p>Project Summary: Scope and recommend a data analytics strategy for the branch.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Identify, evaluate and prioritize possible policies, processes, and technologies to help the branch utilize data analytics to improve business effectiveness. (b) Develop appropriate governance recommendations at the local court and branch level. (c) Assess and report priorities for data collection. (d) Identify and evaluate possible data analytical tools and templates. (e) Identify whether new or amended Rules of Court and/or statutes are needed and advise the Rules & Policy Subcommittee for follow up. (f) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Origin of Project: Topic resulted from a brainstorm of ideas conducted with ITAC and the court CIOs in late 2017; <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-20.</i></p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsors: Hon. Tara Desautels, Mr. David Yamasaki • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Budget Services, Criminal Justice Services, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) Program, Center for Families, Children, and the Courts, Legal Services • <i>Collaborations:</i> CIOs, CEAC, TCPJAC, appellate group representation 	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
7. Disaster Recovery (DR) Initial Pilot and Knowledge Sharing	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approved February 28, 2019	<i>Scope category(ies): Pilot</i>
<p>Project Summary: Implement branch disaster recovery (DR) pilot program, master agreement, knowledge-sharing; evaluate need for BCP.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <p>Leveraging the innovation grant awarded to the Superior Court of Monterey County for a Cloud DR Pilot Program, the workstream will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Recommend a list of critical technology services that make business sense for cloud-based recovery adoption. (b) Publish disaster recovery to cloud (DR2C) roadmap for judicial branch entities (JBEs) that includes design solution templates from Monterey and other participant courts. (c) Host knowledge-sharing sessions for interested JBEs (including tools to estimate cost for deploying recovery solution using a particular cloud service provider; and Monterey solution case study). (d) Evaluate the need for a BCP to fund a pilot group of courts interested in implementing cloud-based DR for critical technology services (see (a)). (e) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate. (f) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream. <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).</i> • <i>Establish a cloud DR master agreement with a short list of cloud service providers for judicial branch entities/courts to leverage.</i> <p>Origin of Project: Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-18 and 2019-20; any next phase of project following framework adoption.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: June 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: Mr. Paras Gupta • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> Pilot courts; CEAC, CITMF 	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
8. Online Dispute Resolution (ODR): Research	<i>Priority 2</i>
	<i>Scope category(ies): Possibilities</i>
<p>Project Summary: Identify and evaluate available ODR technologies and potential scenarios in which ODR might benefit the judicial branch and its court users.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s). (b) Identify and evaluate available ODR technologies. (c) Review findings from existing court-offered ODR programs. (d) Evaluate and describe use case scenarios where ODR might be beneficially deployed in the judicial branch. (e) Survey and document best practices in evaluating feasibility and program design to maximize access to justice. (f) Review rules and statutes to identify areas where possible amendments will be needed. (g) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Origin of Project: <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-20</i></p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream: Sponsor: Hon. Julie Culver • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services • <i>Collaborations:</i> CEAC; TCPJAC; Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee 	

Continuing Workstream (Ending 2020)	
9. Branchwide Information Security Roadmap	Priority 1
Workstream membership approved September 6, 2019	Scope category(ies): Possibilities, Policies
<p>Project Summary: Develop a defined structure of activities and recommendations that will collectively enhance the judicial branch information security posture.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Define methods, activities and/or initiatives for expanding and strengthening branch information security capabilities. (b) Create an overarching strategy for educating courts on information security end user education, risk management, and incident response. (c) Identify resources to assist the courts in developing policies and procedures based on the Judicial Branch Information Systems Controls Framework. (d) Consult with other workstreams on individual security recommendations and ensure alignment with ongoing development of Judicial Branch security standards. (e) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).</i> <p>Origin of Project: <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-20</i></p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsors: Hon. Donald I. Segerstrom, Jr, Mr. Brian Cotta • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology (Matt Nicholls) • <i>Collaborations:</i> CITMF 	

New Workstream (End 2020)	
10. Remote Video Appearances in Criminal Proceedings: Research	<i>Priority 2</i>
	Scope category(ies): Possibilities
<p>Project Summary: Review existing technical standards, rules, and statutes; define and prioritize use cases for remote video appearances in criminal proceedings.</p> <p>Key Objectives: Reviewing outcomes of Video Remote Interpreting pilot and Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings workstream:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Validate, refine, and amend, if necessary, the technical standards applicable to criminal proceedings. (b) Identify whether new or amended Rules of Court and statutes are needed and advise the Rules & Policy Subcommittee for follow up. (c) Define and prioritize use case scenarios and define success criteria for a pilot. (d) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council Technology Committee; <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-20</i></p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2020</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: TBD • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Criminal Justice Services • <i>Collaborations:</i> Family & Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, Criminal Law Advisory Committee, Traffic Advisory Committee 	

Ongoing Project	
11.1 Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions	<i>Priority 2⁴</i>
	<i>Scope category(ies): Policies</i>
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Revise the California Rules of Court for the trial courts to support e-business. In collaboration with other advisory committees, as needed, review rules and statutes in a systematic manner and develop recommendations for amendments to align with modern business practices (e.g., eliminating paper dependencies).</p> <p><i>Proposals within the scope of this item include:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(a) Amend the California Rules of Court to indicate that an electronic filing service provider must allow the party to proceed with an electronic filing even if the party does not consent to receive electronic service.</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-20.</i> Public comments. Standing item on the agenda.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Rules & Policy Subcommittee, Chair: Hon. Peter Siggins • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology, Office of Governmental Affairs, • <i>Collaborations:</i> Appellate, Civil & Small Claims, Criminal Law, Traffic, Family and Juvenile Law, and Probate and Mental Health advisory committees; TCPJAC, CEAC and their Joint Technology, Rules, and Legislative Subcommittees 	

⁴ For rules and forms proposals, the following priority levels apply: 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.

One-Time Project (Ending 2021)	
11.2 Remote Video Appearances in Civil Proceedings	<i>Priority 2</i>
	Scope category(ies): Policies
<p>Project Summary: Develop legislative and rule proposals to further the recommendations of the Commission on the Future of California’s Court System (Futures Commission) relating to video remote appearances by parties, counsel, and witnesses for most noncriminal court proceedings (pursuant to directive to ITAC from the Chief Justice).</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Building on the recommendations of the Futures Commission and ITAC Remote Video Appearances Workstream, participate in a joint ad hoc subcommittee with Civil and Small Claims, Family and Juvenile Law, and Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committees to develop legislative and rule proposals to allow video remote appearances in most civil court proceedings. (b) Work cooperatively with the ITAC Digital Evidence Workstream, when needed. <p>Origin of Project: In April 2017, the Futures Commission recommended allowing remote video appearances at trials and evidentiary hearings in civil matters. In May 2017, the Chief Justice directed ITAC to consider feasibility and resource requirements for implementing pilot projects for remote video appearances. ITAC formed the Remote Video Appearances Workstream for this purpose, which issued its final report and recommendations to ITAC, including policy recommendations in August 2019.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2021, effective by January 2022 (Anticipate that legislative proposal would go to the council in November 2020, and to the Legislature in 2021, with rule proposals to be developed concurrently.)</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Joint Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Remote Video Appearances, Co-Chair: Hon. Peter Siggins • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services, Center for Families, Children & the Courts, Governmental Affairs • <i>Collaborations:</i> ITAC Digital Evidence Workstream, Civil and Small Claims, Family and Juvenile Law, and Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committees; Digital Evidence Workstream 	

III. LIST OF 2019 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.1	Futures Commission Directive: Intelligent Chat for Self-Help Services (Phase 1) – The Workstream presented its final report to ITAC on August 19. The recommendations included establishing an intelligent chatbot program to be administered by the Judicial Council, with an advisory board made up of stakeholder representatives from the branch. FY19-20 BCP funding of \$760,336 awarded to implement the pilot phase.
1.3	Futures Commission Directive: Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings (Phase 1) – ITAC accepted the workstream’s final report on August 19; JCTC approved via email action on November 25. The recommendations included rulemaking and legislative changes that would facilitate the implementation of digital or video appearance initiatives by local courts. FY19-20 BCP funding of \$1,276,910 awarded to implement the pilot phase. A report to the Judicial Council is anticipated in the coming year.
2.	Tactical Plan for Technology for 2019-2020 – The updated plan was approved by the Judicial Council on May 17, 2019. The plan includes several continuing and new initiatives, including Data Analytics, Identity Management, and Online Dispute Resolution.
3.	Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Pilot – The Workstream and the Language Action Plan (LAP) Implementation Task Force presented the final report to the Judicial Council on March 15, 2019. The council adopted the recommendations to adopt the LAP guidelines, including recommended minimum technology requirements, and to develop and implement a coordinated VRI program for the branch.
4.	E-Filing Strategy – FY17-18 BCP loan funding of \$1,162,000 . Two of three master agreements for statewide e-filing managers were finalized and a branchwide e-filing program being funded through the court cost recovery fee is being developed.
5.	Identity and Access Management – Selected a statewide identity management service/provider (in 2018). (Project continues.) BCP funding for a Data Analytics/Business Intelligence pilot , supported by Identity and Access Management, awarded for FY19-20.
6.	Self-Represented Litigants E-Services – Awarded BCP funding for FY18-19 (\$3.2 million) and FY19-20 (\$1.3 million) to support development of branchwide SRL e-capabilities that will facilitate interactive FAQ, triage functionality, and document assembly to guide SRLs through the process, and interoperability with the branchwide e-filing solution. The workstream concluded its specific objectives on June 21, 2019; the ongoing program continues through JCIT.
8.1	Digital Evidence Phase 1 - Surveyed courts and justice partners on current use of digital evidence. Survey results were conveyed to ITAC and JCTC, concluding Phase 1; and Phase 2 was approved to go forward.
11.	Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee – Developed uniform formatting rules for electronic documents filed or otherwise submitted to the appellate courts; and removed the requirement of a separate service copy of a petition for review. Proposals were approved by the Judicial Council and became effective January 1, 2020.

- | |
|--|
| <p>13. Rules & Policy Subcommittee – Rule change proposals developed to support and clarify e-filing and service and remote access to court records (including adding additional local government entities). Received council approval for amendments to 2.251, 2.255, 2.257, and 2.540, effective January 1, 2020. Further developed legislative proposals to amend statutes to support and clarify e-business, including allowing courts to recover actual costs of permissive e-filing (similar to mandatory e-filing) and clarifying provisions for signatures not made under penalty of perjury.</p> |
|--|

DRAFT

BCP FY21-22 - Summary of Concepts for Discussion

Last revised 01/13/2020

A. Judicial Branch Data Governance

This was submitted as a FY 2020-21 BCP and was not included in the Governor's proposed Budget (January 2020). This BCP will be resubmitted as part of a Spring 2020 BCP request. If this BCP is not included in the FY 2020-21 budget, it will be submitted for consideration in FY 2021-22.

B. Branchwide Security Operations Center and Identity Management Solution for Trial Courts, Appellate Courts, Supreme Court and Judicial Council

The Judicial Council's Information Technology Department is responsible for ensuring the confidentiality, integrity, availability and access of branch systems and applications, as well as promoting and protecting privacy, as part of the development and operation of branch systems. A Security Operations Center helps the Judicial Branch fulfill this mission by providing detection of, protection against, and response to malicious activities targeting Judicial Branch Entities.

C. California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) Modernization

The Judicial Council requests an augmentation for modernizing the California Courts Protective Order Registry. The modernization effort will include new functionality to more efficiently access protective for litigants, law enforcement, judicial officers and court staff. New features include a cloud-based application, electronic and mobile access, enhanced data entry and processing functionality, enhanced integration with local systems and DOJ.

D. Judicial Virtual Customer Service Center (Live Chat and Automated Chat)

The Judicial Council of California funding to establish and maintain a live chat digital service program for 18 subject matter domains to support the public. This proposal looks at providing a multi-service platform whereby chat services will be delivered through an on-line automated chatbot, as well as a live person chat support.

Live Chat services provide a natural online extension of courts services for the public. By providing an online service, the public does not need to endure some of the burden when seeking court services, such as taking time off from work, incur travel time and costs, arranging for child support care, and eliminate the need to physically wait in line at the court houses. The information gained from the live chat feeds into the development of the automated chatbot, which ensures the accuracy and performance of the automated chatbot.

E. Trial Court Digital Services: Improving Public Access and Customer Service

The Judicial Council requesting funding augmentation for four new full-time positions and Cloud Hosting services to assist trial courts in expanding the depth and breadth of statewide online services delivered to

Californians via public-facing trial court websites. In partnership with trial courts throughout the state, the project will target improvements in service design, visual design, user experience, data analytics, document assembly, and mobile access. This request will also support the integration of several emerging statewide e-services into trial court websites, including: intelligent chat, intelligent forms, remote video, and identity and access management.

F. Branchwide Automated Email and Text Reminders

The Judicial branch spends significant time and money to email reminders for court appearances. It has been shown over the last several years, that courts who have moved to an electronic reminder solution have had higher success rates for people showing up for their court appearance. Electronic reminder functions are included in many courts existing CMS but lack the ability for text message or electronic voice reminder calls. This request to allow courts to access an on-line reminder system for court appearances regardless of their CMS or Jury solution, by provide a more consistence experience for court users with the counties that opt into the notification system.

Submissions of additional ideas

- **Online Dispute Resolution (submitted by ITAC and San Bernardino)**

Fund five trial courts to pilot ODR solutions, including three non-interactive courts and two interactive courts (with facilitators) provide outcomes, policy decisions, lessons learned and court roadmap templates.

- **Digital Evidence (submitted by ITAC) – to draft/refine as phase 2 progresses**

Fund five trial courts to pilot digital evidence solutions, provide outcomes, policy decisions, lessons learned and court roadmap templates.



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

January 2, 2020

Action Requested

Please Review

To

Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair
Hon. C. Todd Bottke, 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 October 28,
2019 – January 2, 2020

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

Status: The Monthly Project Status meeting was held on November 25, 2019. No status meeting was held in December.

The next Monthly Project Status meeting is scheduled for January 27, 2020.

Judicial Council Information Technology is working with Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura to coordinate “lights on” planning and court funding for V3 support after June 2020.

Intra Branch Agreements (IBAs):

The final disbursement for Sacramento’s 2016-17 IBA is in progress.

Ventura Superior Court (Journal Technologies - eCourt):

Civil requirements-gathering and documentation sessions are continuing and are on target for completion in January 2020. Journal Technologies is working on site one – two days a week through the end of 2019.

A working session was held with Presiding Judge and Judicial head of Ventura’s Technology Committee. Participants reviewed the Judges screens.

San Diego Superior Court (Tyler Odyssey):

Deep Dive Cycle 5 conversion testing is in progress.

Tyler is making progress on reducing issues reported during conversion testing, down 30%.

Tyler has made progress in addressing system slowness through tuning and configuration. However, they acknowledge code changes will be needed and are working on those.

The Tyler Executive team has notified the court that they will be requesting an extension to the current project plan. New dates have not yet been proposed.

Sacramento Superior Court (Thomson Reuters C-Track):

To improve the timeline for deployment, the court and Thomson Reuters are working on a deeper dive into the CMS Master Services Agreement, to further prioritize requirements and reduce what is needed for deployment.

Thomson Reuters and the court participated in a design review of the mediation module.

Thomson Reuters demonstrated their Matter Management module for Tentative Rulings.

Orange Superior Court (Update CMS V3 for supportability and reliability):

Orange was unable to attend the November status meeting.

Orange is on track to complete their conversion by June 2020.



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 January 9, 2019	Action Requested Please Review
To Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair Hon. C. Todd Bottke, Vice-Chair Judicial Council Technology Committee	Deadline N/A
From David Koon, Manager, Judicial Council Information Technology	Contact David Koon, Manager 415-865-4618 david.koon@jud.ca.gov
Subject Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement Projects: Status November 1 – December 31, 2019	

As requested, this communication provides a written update regarding the progress of the nine courts using the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system which collectively received \$4.1 million in funding for FY 17/18 and \$896,000 in FY 18/19 as a result of submitting a BCP to replace the SJE case management system with a modern CMS platform.

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

Status: Judicial Council staff and the SJE courts met on November 20 and on December 18, 2019 for their monthly status meeting. At these meetings, the SJE courts review the status of the deployments of the new case management system. Currently, there are four courts (Humboldt, Madera, Plumas and Sierra) which have gone live on their new case management system. The focus of the project activity is preparing for the next wave of court deployments which will begin in early 2020.

October 31, 2019

Page 2

Next Steps: Judicial Council staff and the SJE courts will continue to meet monthly to review progress and upcoming milestones.