

Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

Annual Agenda¹—2023

Approved by Judicial Council Technology Committee: _____

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Superior Court of California, County of Orange
Lead Staff:	Camilla Kieliger, Sr. Business Systems Analyst, Judicial Council Information Technology
Committee's Charge/Membership: <p>Rule 10.53. Information Technology Advisory Committee 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>Rule 10.53. Information Technology Advisory Committee sets forth additional duties of the committee.</p> <p>ITAC currently has 25 members. The ITAC website provides the composition of the committee.</p> Subcommittees²: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rules & Policy Subcommittee<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Trial court rules and statutes revisions• Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee (JATS) [suspended status for 2023]• Joint Information Security Governance Subcommittee	

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:

Workstreams

- **Tactical Plan for Technology Update:** Update the *Tactical Plan for Technology* for 2023-2024.
- **Electronic 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.
- **Statewide E-Filing Program Review/Evaluation (continued):** Review and evaluate the existing statewide e-filing program. Expand the number of e-filing manager (EFM) solutions in the program and standardize electronic filing fees across the state.
- **Advancing the Hybrid Courtroom (continued):** Assess the current implementation of hybrid courtrooms; recommend metrics and data collection to facilitate court compliance with AB 177 and SB 241; develop standards for hybrid courtrooms; assist in developing a Request for Proposal (RFP).
- **IT Modernization Program:** Review and recommend court applications/project proposals; evaluate status reports tracking progress; and provide related program support activities.

Rules & Policy Subcommittee

- The Rules and Policy Subcommittee is drafting its Annual Agenda objectives. The specific projects will be included here when finalized.

Joint Information Security Governance Subcommittee

- The Joint Information Security Governance Subcommittee will be formed towards the end of 2022; the Annual Agenda will be updated with specific projects once the subcommittee finalizes its objectives for 2023.

Other:

- **Projects Referred by the Ad-Hoc Workgroup on Post-Pandemic Initiatives (P3):** The Ad Hoc Workgroup on Post-Pandemic Initiatives (P3) is currently working to identify successful court practices that emerged during the COVID-19 pandemic. P3 recommendations may be referred to specific advisory bodies for development and/or implementation.

III. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

Continued Workstream (Ending 2023)	
1. Tactical Plan for Technology Update	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approval date: July 21, 2022	<i>Scope category(ies): Policies</i>
<p>Project Summary: Update <i>Tactical Plan for Technology</i> for effective date 2023-2024.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Review, gather input, and prepare an update of the Tactical Plan for Technology. b) Circulate the draft plan for branch and public comment; revise as needed. c) Finalize, and seek approval from ITAC, the Technology Committee, and the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Initiate workstream, including formation of membership and conduct orientation/kickoff meeting.</i> <p>Origin of Project: Specific charge of ITAC per Rule 10.53 (b)(8).</p> <p>Status/Timeline: May 2023</p> <p>Fiscal Impact:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</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; Subject Matter Experts from other offices, as needed • <i>Collaborations:</i> Broad input from the branch and the public 	

Continued Workstream (Ending 2023)	
2. Electronic Evidence: Rules, Technology and Pilot Evaluation	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approved September 25, 2019	<i>Scope category(ies): Policies; Pilot</i>
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Consider existing pilots and court practices along with available technology pertaining to the use of electronic evidence; propose changes to rules and statutes related to electronic evidence; develop a framework for successful possible future pilots.</p> <p><i>Key Objectives:</i></p> <p>Based on findings from Phase 1 and evaluation of existing local pilots and other court practices:</p> <p>a) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, the Technology Committee 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>Investigate and report on existing local pilots and court practices, including policies and standards, for transmitting, accepting, storing, and protecting electronic evidence.</i> • <i>Develop and propose changes to Rules of Court and statutes related to electronic evidence in collaboration with the Rules and Policy Subcommittee.</i> • <i>Research and recommend available technology and services that would support transmission, acceptance, storage, and protection of electronic evidence.</i> • <i>Develop a framework for successful possible future pilots, including use case scenarios, costs and benefits, and success criteria.</i> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-18, 2019-20, and 2021-22.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> April 2023</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC: Workstream, Sponsor: Hon. Kimberly Menninger</i> • <i>Judicial Council Staffing: Information Technology, Legal Services</i> • <i>Collaborations: CEAC, TCPJAC, ITAC Rules and Policy Subcommittee, and other advisory bodies as needed</i> 	

Continued Workstream (Ending 2022)	
3. Statewide e-Filing Program Review/Evaluation	Priority 2
Workstream membership approved: June 17, 2021	Scope category(ies): Possibilities; Policies
<p>Project Summary: Review and evaluate the existing statewide e-filing program. Expand the number of e-filing manager (EFM) solutions in the program and standardize electronic filing fees across the state.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <p>a) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, the Technology Committee and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.</p> <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>Explore the strengths and weaknesses of current e-filing programs and practices across the state.</i> • <i>Explore benefits of statewide EFM solutions inclusive of development opportunities and potential funding sources.</i> • <i>Evaluate standardizing e-filing transaction fees across the state.</i> • <i>Review e-filing rules and statutes to clarify language and improve consistency across the branch.</i> <p>Origin of Project: Tactical Plan for Technology 2021-2022; branch-identified business need.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: February 2023</p> <p>Fiscal Impact:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC: Workstream: Sponsor: Snorri Ogata</i> • <i>Judicial Council Staffing: Information Technology, Legal Services</i> • <i>Collaborations: ITAC Rules and Policy Subcommittee</i> 	

Continued Workstream (Ending 2022)	
4. Advancing the Hybrid Courtroom	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approval date: December 13, 2021	<i>Scope category: Policies</i>
<p>Project Summary: Assess the current implementation of hybrid courtrooms; recommend metrics and data collection to facilitate court compliance with AB 177 and SB 241; develop standards for hybrid courtrooms; assist in developing a Request for Proposal (RFP).</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Define consistent standards for branchwide solutions, platforms, and programs in support of hybrid courtrooms. b) Review and evaluate the 2020 <i>California Trial Court Facilities Standards</i> to align with hybrid court proceedings. c) Develop and define quantitative and qualitative metrics associated with hybrid court proceedings and remote court services to measure efficacy and areas for improvement, and make recommendations on the collection of associated data by which courts would comply with AB 177 and SB 241. d) Review the California Rules of Court to identify and recommend any potential rule changes needed. e) Assist with development of an RFP to establish branch Master Service Agreements (MSAs) and other procurement vehicles, where needed. f) Finalize recommendations and seek approval from ITAC, the Technology Committee, and the Judicial Council, if appropriate. Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Initiate workstream, including formation of membership and conduct orientation/kickoff meeting.</i> • <i>Explore hybrid court proceedings involving a combination of in-person and remote participants and their use of technology.</i> • <i>Assess the differing technology needs associated with supporting in-person, remote, and hybrid services and proceedings.</i> <p>Origin of Project: Access 3D; California Courts Connected framework; AB 177; AB 716; SB 241.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: <u>July 2023</u></p> <p>Fiscal Impact:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsors: Hon. Samantha P. Jessner and Adam Creiglow • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> Ad Hoc Committee on Civil Remote Appearance Rules, Court Facilities Advisory Committee, Data Governance Group (newly formed) 	

New Workstream (TBD)	
5. IT Modernization Program (Placeholder)	Priority 1
Workstream membership approved:	Scope category(ies): Possibilities; Policies
<p>Project Summary: Review and recommend court applications/project proposals; evaluate status reports tracking progress; and provide related program support activities.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership for fiscal year cycle; hold kickoff meeting(s). b) Refine category requirements and success metrics. c) Review and evaluate court applications/project proposals based on program criteria and intentions. d) Propose a list of approved projects to ITAC for recommendation to the Technology Committee. e) Review the courts' progress reports, including identifying projects needing branch attention; report findings to staff for assistance. f) At the completion of these objectives for the fiscal year, conclude the workstream and start the cycle again for the new fiscal year. <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <p>Origin of Project: Budget Act of 2022 provides a permanent allocation of \$12.5 million to support local court projects proposed by the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and trial courts. Beginning in the FY23-24 cycle, the Technology Committee assigned ITAC the task of evaluating court proposals and progress reports.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: TBD</p> <p>Fiscal Impact:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream: Sponsor: • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> Judicial Council advisory bodies, as relevant 	

Ongoing Project	
6.1 Rules & Policy Subcommittee project(s) (pending)	<i>Priority 2(b)</i> ³
	<i>Scope category:</i> Policy
<p><i>Project Summary: TBD</i></p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Judicial Council staff.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Project(s) will follow the regular rule cycle in 2023 for a January 1, 2024, effective date for the amendment.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> Committee staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Rules & Policy Subcommittee, Chair: Hon. Julie R. Culver • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> Joint Rules Subcommittee of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and Court Executives Advisory Committee 	

³ For rules and forms proposals, the following priority levels apply: 1(a) The proposal is urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) The proposal is urgently needed to respond to a recent law change; 1(c) A statute or council decision requires a doption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date; 1(d) The proposal will provide significant cost savings and efficiencies, generate significant revenue, or a void a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) The change is urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; or 1(f) The proposal is 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 changes in law; 2(b) Responsive to identified concerns or problems; or 2(c) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

Ongoing Project	
6.2 Review and Provide Input on Pending Legislation	<i>Priority 1</i>
	<i>Scope category:</i> Policy
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Review pending legislation related to court technology and provide input on the impact the legislation may have on the courts.</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Judicial Council Office of Governmental Affairs.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact:</i> Committee staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Rules & Policy Subcommittee, Chair: Hon. Julie R. Culver • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology, Governmental Affairs 	

Ongoing Project

7. Joint Information Security Governance Subcommittee projects (pending)

Priority 1

Scope category:
Policy

Project Summary: [e.g., Assist the new Information Security Office; policymaking; security awareness training parameters; will be staffed by Information Security Office staff under Chief Information Security Officer]

Origin of Project: Judicial Council Information Security Office.

Status/Timeline: Ongoing.

Fiscal Impact/Resources: Committee staff.

This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.

Resources:

- *ITAC and CEAC:* Joint Information Security Governance Subcommittee members; Chair: TBD.
- *Judicial Council Staffing:* Information Technology, Leadership Services, Legal Services.
- *Collaborations:* Court Executives Advisory Committee; other advisory bodies as needed.

Ongoing Project	
8. Projects Assigned by the Ad-Hoc Workgroup on Post-Pandemic Initiatives (P3)	<i>Priority 1</i>
	<i>Scope category(ies):</i> Policy
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> The Ad Hoc Workgroup on Post-Pandemic Initiatives (P3) referred two recommendations to ITAC for development and/or implementation: Promoting the filing of documents across courthouses as well as the use of e-signatures; and monitoring the Judicial Council’s programs to optimize online self-help services and chat options. P3 may refer additional recommendations to ITAC that need to be considered for inclusion on the Annual Agenda.</p> <p><i>Key Objectives:</i></p> <p><i>Expand Options for E-Filing and E-Signatures</i></p> <p>(a) Review, identify and make recommendations for any relevant amendments of California Rules of Court and legislation that may hinder the filing of documents at different courthouses (e.g., through the use of e-filing), as well as what may constrain the ability of filers to use e-signatures.</p> <p><i>Maintain or Improve Online Self-Help Services and Live Chat on Court Websites</i></p> <p>(b) ITAC will monitor the Judicial Council's existing and ongoing effort to optimize the California Courts Self-Help Center and assist courts in migrating to the web hosting platform offered by the council.</p> <p>(c) ITAC will monitor the council’s current and ongoing program to create viable chatbots and live chat options for use by courts.</p> <p>(d) Judicial Council Information Technology will report progress on these programs to ITAC.</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Ad Hoc Workgroup on Post-Pandemic Initiatives</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> December 2023</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Rules & Policy Subcommittee • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology, Legal Services, Leadership Services • <i>Collaborations:</i> Court Executives Advisory Committee and other advisory bodies as needed 	

IV. LIST OF 2022 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1	Tactical Plan Workstream (Continuing) —The Tactical Plan Update Workstream has initiated a thorough review and update of the <i>Tactical Plan for Technology</i> after the update of <i>Strategic Plan for Technology</i> was completed, adding one new goal: Promote Equal Access to Digital Services. As a new feature included this year, the workstream is identifying metrics that can be tracked to demonstrate progress towards the tactical initiatives.
5	Advancing the Hybrid Courtroom Workstream (Continuing) —After kicking off in January, the workstream conducted interviews and gathered input from participants in hybrid proceedings. Members split into several subteams to draft recommendations that will be submitted to ITAC for consideration.
6.1 6.2 6.3	Rules & Policy Subcommittee (Ongoing) —The subcommittee circulated three proposals for public comment. One rule proposal (amend rule 2.253(b)(7) to remove a semi-annual report requirement for courts with mandatory e-filing) was approved by the Judicial Council on September 20, 2022. Two rule proposals (authorizing remote access to court records by appellate courts, appellate projects contracted to run appointed appellate counsel programs, and the Habeas Corpus Resource Center; and by private criminal defense attorneys) circulated for comment but have been deferred pending activity in other advisory bodies, including the Ad Hoc Workgroup on Post-Pandemic Initiatives.

Allocation of Funding for Remote Access to Court Proceedings (AB 716)

January 31, 2023

What is AB 716?

October 5, 2021

The bill would require the court to provide, at a minimum, a public audio stream or telephonic means by which to listen to the proceedings when the courthouse is physically closed, except when the law authorizes or requires the proceedings to be closed.

Assumptions for BCP Funding

- **Pre-pandemic:** Audio and video (AV) refresh averaged \$50,000/courtroom
- One-time IT Mod Fund projects totaling: \$6.9m (over 3 fiscal years)
- BCP assumed 1775 courtrooms* funded at average of \$35,000 each for one-time, pre-pandemic costs for upgrades to Audio and Video

** Total count of eligible courtrooms as of January 2021*

BCP Approved Funding

- Facility older than 2000
- Audio and Video upgrades (pre-pandemic costs)
- Funding disbursement
 - Year 1 money \$31,062,500
 - Year 2 money \$31,062,500

New Reality 2023

- **Post-pandemic: AV per courtroom cost averages****

Full AV upgrades: \$150,000-\$300,000 per courtroom

Audio only upgrade: \$50,000 per courtroom

***Estimates based on LA Branch RFP*

Funding Distribution Criteria

Year 1 Funding

- Courts who submitted courtroom audio/video inventory

Courts that did not submit: Alpine, Colusa, Del Norte, Lake, Mendocino, Plumas, Riverside, San Benito, Trinity

- Courts who requested funding or have not been funded

Many courts were previously funded with one-time IT Modernization Funding

- For larger courts, focus on civil case types and max allocation of \$50,000 for audio only

Analysis and Next Steps

- Current funding can provide **audio** upgrades for all courtrooms meeting requirements and criteria.
- Due to price increase, video will be removed from scope.
- JC will be going back to the Department of Finance to request additional funding for **video**.
- Year 2 funding will be scheduled for first quarter of next fiscal year.
- Preparing a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for the additional \$70 Million needed for courtroom video upgrades.

Recommendation/Action Requested

- That the Technology Committee consider recommending to the Judicial Council the allocation of funding to courts related to the remote access to court proceedings (AB 716) budget appropriation.

Questions & Discussion

Thank you!

AB 716 Distributions

Year 1

Court	Number of Locations to be upgraded	Number of courtrooms to be upgraded	Distribution
Alameda	8	61	\$561,500
Butte	1	8	\$800,000
Contra Costa	1	5	\$13,886
El Dorado	1	1	\$30,000
Humboldt	1	8	\$100,000
Inyo	2	2	\$50,000
Kern	10	37	\$83,000
Los Angeles	15	274	\$13,700,000
Mariposa	1	1	\$20,000
Merced	1	1	\$67,000
Modoc	1	1	\$12,000
Mono	1	1	\$40,000
Monterey	3	8	\$124,831
Orange	6	128	\$6,400,000
Placer	3	7	\$285,000
Sacramento	1	1	\$4,000
San Bernardino	3	12	\$300,000
San Diego	5	90	\$4,500,000
San Francisco	2	66	\$1,360,000
San Joaquin	2	4	\$300,000
San Luis Obispo	4	15	\$600,000
Santa Barbara	1	1	\$20,000
Santa Clara	4	30	\$1,500,000
Santa Cruz	4	10	\$440,000
Solano	2	2	\$40,000
Stanislaus	2	16	\$80,000
Tulare	2	17	\$145,000
Ventura	1	6	\$77,600
Grand Total	88	813	\$31,653,817