



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

COURT TECHNOLOGY  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/ctac.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/ctac.htm)  
[ctac@jud.ca.gov](mailto:ctac@jud.ca.gov)

## COURT TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### PROJECTS SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

February 19, 2015  
12:00 PM to 1:30 PM  
Teleconference

---

**Subcommittee Members Present:** Hon. Robert B. Freedman, Chair; Mr. Jake Chatters; Mr. Brian Cotta; Hon. Sheila F. Hanson; Mr. Robert Oyung; Mr. Pat Patterson; Hon. Alan G. Perkins

**Subcommittee Members Absent:** Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton; Hon. Samantha P. Jessner; Hon. James Mize

**Others Present:** Ms Karen Cannata; Ms Diana Glick; Ms. Kathy Fink; Ms. Fati Farmanfarmaian; Ms. Tara Lundstrom

---

#### OPEN MEETING

---

##### **Call to Order and Roll Call**

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:03pm. Roll call was taken.

##### **Approval of Minutes**

This is the first open meeting of the Projects Subcommittee since rule 10.75 became effective. There are no minutes to be approved.

##### **Public Comment**

No public comments were received.

---

#### DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-2)

---

The Chair started the agenda with item 2 to accommodate guests on the call, from the Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC), who will be collaborating with the subcommittee on the SRL E-Services Portal project.

##### **Item 2**

##### **SRL E-Services Portal - Evaluate Feasibility and Desirability of Establishing a Branch Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) E-Services Portal**

The Chair summarized the goal of this project as defined in the subcommittee's work plan and reported on two vendor demos have already taken place: TurboCourt and Tyler and described both vendors approaches to providing the a SRL E-Service solution.

Ms. Cannata, from CFCC provided an update on some of the projects CFCC has been working on, pertaining to the SRL portal agenda item. CFCC is gathering and compiling information and to compile information from courts' websites about the existing resources and tools. CFCC has also been doing their own document assembly work in collaboration with the courts over the past several years, to support their self help centers and their workshops, mainly in the area of family law and probate conservatorship and guardianship, with domestic violence to be started at the end of March. This effort has helped self litigants and self help centers generate Judicial Council family forms saving them a lot of time.

Ms. Fink, Judicial Council (JC) IT manager, mentioned that JC IT is looking at what resources the JC may have available to support a SRL portal.

The Chair added that one other demo might be scheduled to show how the HotDocs document assembly tool works, as it is currently available under a license agreement. Ms. Cannata mentioned that about 20 courts may be using HotDocs at this time and confirmed that the licensing for the server and the software is covered through the Judicial Council for a low cost. Ms. Cannata can provide the number of interviews already completed to the subcommittee at a later date.

The Chair added that to determine what the state of the art is now, what courts are interested in doing going forward and whether it's feasible to have a central hub/portal for this purpose, raises issues about cost, and about the acceptability to the individual courts to participate on a centralized service. In order to get to that ultimate determination of cost it would be necessary to put out a vendor neutral request for proposal or an RFP. This will determine whether there are some economies that would facilitate the overall goal which is access to justice.

Mr. Chatters asked for clarification as to the intent of the project to accomplish three tasks:

- To validate the needs as we see them
- To identify what currently exists
- And then to make a recommendation to do an RFP or not?

The Chair confirmed and added that an RFP is technically and literally not within the subcommittee's annual plan. The subcommittee may want to amend the plan if there is sufficient progress, however all the ground work to lead up to an RFP is within the scope of the annual plan.

Mr. Chatters added that this is one of those services that we have a lot of expertise on the user end and as Ms. Cannata stated, a lot of work has already been done by CFCC to develop forms, and structural material to help people complete their forms, so perhaps part of this process would be to look at whether this really is appropriately a vendor based solution vs. a branch constructed and maintained solution. Or has a decision already been made to use a vendor based solution?

The Chair indicated that the subcommittee's task is to look at all the choices available and make a recommendation. It could be one solution, it could be multiple solutions.

Mr. Chatters volunteered to help on this project.

Ms. Cannata will distribute information on what the existing resources are before the subcommittee's next meeting.

Ms. Cannata and Ms. Glick signed off the teleconference and the Chair proceeded to item 1 on the agenda.

## **Item 1**

### **Disaster Recovery Framework and Next Generation Hosting Strategy Assessments**

The Chair reported that preliminary work has been done on a disaster recovery (DR) survey, also covering in part next generation hosting as it may relate to DR. A working draft of the survey will be circulated for the next mtg.

The survey should be sensitive to security issues.

Mr. Patterson, Mr. Yamasaki, and Mr. Cotta volunteered to help formulate the survey.

---

## **A D J O U R N M E N T**

---

### **Further Business:**

Mr. Yamasaki, who sponsors the CTAC Data Exchange workstream, reported on the status of the workstream effort. The workstream has held meetings with the following justice partners: the Department of Justice (DOJ), the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS), the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), the California Highway Patrol (CHP), and the Department of Social Services (DSS), and is identifying some of the key principles for governance and is narrowing the scope of the technology solution. They will submit a strategy framework and recommendations to CTAC and the Judicial Council.

### **Closing Remarks**

Judge Freedman thanked subcommittee members for their work at this meeting and announced the next meeting to be tentatively held on March 17, 2015.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:46 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on [enter date].

**Review of Online Services and Other Supports for Self-Represented Litigants  
Available on Superior Court Websites  
March 2015**

A review of the court websites for all California counties was undertaken to understand generally the types of online and other services available to self-represented litigants (SRLs) in each county.

Each court website was reviewed and the following information was gathered:

1. Is there a brick and mortar site for SRLs to go for help?
2. Does the website contain links to fee-for-service document assembly programs?
3. Does the website contain a link to the Judicial Council's Self-Help Website?
4. Does the court offer e-filing or e-delivery for any proceeding?
5. Does the website post local forms?
  - a. Are these local forms in a fillable format?
  - b. Are any local forms or info sheets available in other languages?
6. Does the website offer an online payment service for traffic or other infractions?
7. Does the website offer any online jury services, such as checking to see whether a jury group needs to report, or requesting a postponement?
8. Does the website offer access to calendars organized on a departmental basis, i.e., can any member of the public access a list and schedule of non-confidential cases being heard by the various departments that day, week or month?
9. Does the website offer access to case information?
  - a. Does access require a case number, or can any member of the public do a name search and pull up case information?
  - b. What kind of information (index, ROA, calendar, access to actual documents)
  - c. Is there a charge for any of this information?
10. Does the website describe or offer any other services for SRLs, such as workshops, information packets, links to online videos, etc.

## Key Findings

### Online case access for parties

- Thirty-seven courts (64%) offer some kind of public and party access to case information.
- Thirty-one of these (or 53% of all courts) offer online access to a searchable database.
- Six courts (10% of all courts) offer only a link to current tentative rulings and/or probate notes that are available to the public at large.
- Several courts required registration to do a public search of case information.
- Two court websites charge for name searches and database searches.
- Three courts charge only to look at actual documents from the case.

### Online payment

- Fifty-five court websites (95%) offer some form of online payment for traffic citations and/or infractions.
  - Approximately one half of these courts use a vendor solution for this function
  - The other half of these courts use an internal solution to accept credit card payments online

### E-filing/E-delivery

- Fifteen courts (26%) had e-filing or e-delivery options available for both attorneys and SRLs. One court offers both e-filing and fax filing (e-delivery) and charges for both services.
- It is unknown what type of integration exists between e-filing services and case management in those courts that have moved to e-filing.
- E-delivery (fax filing): Seven Courts
  - Only one court indicated that it accepts fax filings for all case types; most limit the case types to some combination of small claims, family, probate or other civil.
  - Three courts accept fax filings through their online payment vendor.
  - One court only accepts faxed documents for filing through a fax filing agency, which did not appear to be available for SRLs.
  - Two courts charge for fax filing.
- E-filing: Nine Courts
  - Only one court indicated that it accepts e-filing for all civil case types; most limit the case types to some combination of small claims, family, probate or other civil.
  - One court offers e-filing only for complex litigation.
  - One court allows attorneys and SRLs electronically file *new* adoption, civil, family, probate and small claims cases only. All subsequent filings must be done at the courthouse.
  - Two courts are going online with e-filing through a vendor that also provides case management.
  - Two courts charge for e-filing.

**Preliminary Data Only:** This information reflects only the types of services and programs described on the websites of the 58 county courts and does not represent a comprehensive survey of services and supports for self-represented litigants.

**Document assembly**

- Thirty-six courts (62%) have a link to a fee-for-service vendor for document assembly.
- Only five court websites did not contain a link to the Judicial Council’s Self-Help Center, although many were not using the most updated “button” link that is available in both English and Spanish.
- Many courts made “form packets” available online for SRLs, which consisted of groupings or lists of forms for particular proceedings.
- Twenty-two court websites (38%) offered fillable .pdfs for their local forms.

**Other Findings**

- Forty-six court websites (79%) have some kind of online interface for jurors. Jurors can use it to check the status of their group and in some cases can request a postponement with an online form.

***Preliminary Data Only:** This information reflects only the types of services and programs described on the websites of the 58 county courts and does not represent a comprehensive survey of services and supports for self-represented litigants.*

# Disaster Recovery Framework and Next-Generation Hosting Solutions Assessment

This assessment is designed to determine:

- Current court practices regarding disaster recovery (DR) planning, DR plan maintenance, and DR testing
- Activity by courts without a current disaster recovery plan (DRP) to implement planning for DR preparedness
- The percentages of courts that have alternate recovery sites, the number of sites, and the distance between sites.
- Current recovery objectives and technology selections
- Court confidence in DR preparedness.

## Survey Definitions

“**Disaster Recovery**” (DR) refers to security planning and procedures to protect the courts’ technology infrastructure (including telecommunications) from the effects of significant negative events such as cyber attacks, vandalism, equipment failures, and natural disasters.

“**Disaster Recovery Plan**” (DRP) refers to documents, policies, procedures and actions to limit the disruption to court operations and to recover from a disaster

“**Hosted Solutions**” refers to the physical servers supporting and storing court data whether provided internally, by the branch data center, or a vendor either locally, offsite, or via “cloud” hosting.

## 1 DR planning, maintenance and testing

### 1.1 Do you have a formal and documented DR plan in place?

- Yes – as part of our Continuity of Operations Plans (COOP) plan
- Yes – standalone
- No, but one is currently planned in the next 6-12 months
- No, we currently do not have plans to develop a formal DR plan
- Other - describe

### 1.2 How often is your disaster recovery plan updated?

- Continuously (our DR plan is updated as part of change and configuration management process)
- Quarterly
- Twice per year
- Once per year

- Every two years
- It's been longer than two years
- We don't have a plan
- Other - describe

**1.3 How many times a year do you conduct a full test (a live or simulated failover of all infrastructure at a given site) of your DR plan?**

- More than twice per year
- Twice a year
- Once a year
- We don't test our plan
- Don't know
- Other – describe

**1.4 Do you have dedicated staff to support your DRP?**

- Yes, full time court employees
- Yes, a combination of full time court employees and outsourced or on call staff
- Yes, all outsourced or on call staff
- No, it is supported among other responsibilities by our internal IT department
- No. Please explain.

## **2 Disaster recovery sites**

**2.1 Do you have a recovery site for your data center and IT operations in the event of a disaster or other primary site failure?**

- Yes, one
- Yes, more than one
- No, but one is currently planned in the next 6-12 months
- No, we do not currently have plans for a recovery site. Please explain.

**2.2 If you responded “Yes, one”, or “Yes, more than one”, how would you characterize the way you source your recovery disaster site(s)?**

- Equal mix of outsourced and insourced
- Primarily outsourced
- Primarily insource
- Other - describe

**2.3 How do you provision your recovery site?**

- We own the site
- Shared fixed-site IT infrastructure at a service provider



- Collocation site
- Multi-tenancy managed hosting
- Dedicated fixed-site IT infrastructure at a service provider
- Dedicated managed hosting
- Cloud-based
- Other - Describe

**2.4 If you responded "No, but one is currently planned in the next 6-12 months", please describe what strategy you are pursuing in establishing a recovery site:**

- Our own site
- At another court site
- California Court Technology Center (CCTC)
- Shared fixed-site IT infrastructure at a service (IaaS) provider
- Collocation site
- Multi-tenancy managed hosting
- Dedicated fixed-site IT infrastructure at a service (IaaS) provider
- Dedicated managed hosting
- Cloud
- Other - Describe

Comment [FFF1]: Added question to address what courts are planning for hosting

**2.5 What is the distance between your primary data center and your furthest backup data center, in miles?**

- Greater than 1000 miles
- 500 to less than 1000 miles
- 250 to less than 500 miles
- 100 to less than 250 miles
- 50 to less than 100 miles
- 25 to less than 50 miles
- less than 25 miles
- Don't know
- Other – describe

Comment [FFF2]: NOTE: We can consolidate options in whatever range we choose

**2.6 What risks is your primary datacenter faced with? Check all that apply:**

- Our datacenter is in a flood zone or area would flooding could occur
- Our datacenter is very near or on a fault (earthquakes)
- Our datacenter has fire sprinklers (standard, not pre-action)
- Our datacenter has a single cooling unit, or cannot withstand the failure of one unit
- Our datacenter has a single emergency power source (UPS)

### 3 Application criticality and preferred recovery technology

#### 3.1 *What percentage of your applications and data fall into the following tiers? (Note: The total of all four categories should equal 100%)*

- Mission critical
- Standard business
- Non-critical applications
- Other - describe

#### 3.2 *How do you copy data between your primary and recovery site(s)? Check all that apply.*

- Mission critical applications and data
  - o Synchronous replication (via software or SAN)
  - o Asynchronous replication (via software or SAN)
  - o Virtual replication/DR solution (e.g. "VMware Site Recovery Manager")
  - o Periodic (manual) point in time copies
  - o Remote backup to DR site over the wide area network
  - o Remote backup to "cloud"
  - o Backup locally to tape and physically transport our tapes (staff or courier)
  - o Backup locally to disk/tape and then automatically copy to disk/tape offsite
  - o Backup locally to disk/tape and then automatically copy to the "cloud"
  - o Other – describe
  - o None/not applicable
- Standard business applications and data
  - o Synchronous replication (via software or SAN)
  - o Asynchronous replication (via software or SAN)
  - o Virtual replication/DR solution (e.g. "VMware Site Recovery Manager")
  - o Periodic (manual) point in time copies
  - o Remote backup to DR site over the wide area network
  - o Remote backup to "cloud"
  - o Backup locally to tape and physically transport our tapes (staff or courier)
  - o Backup locally to disk/tape and then automatically copy to disk/tape offsite
  - o Backup locally to disk/tape and then automatically copy to the "cloud"
  - o Other – describe
  - o None/not applicable
- Non-critical applications and data
  - o Synchronous replication (via software or SAN)
  - o Asynchronous replication (via software or SAN)
  - o Virtual replication/DR solution (e.g. "VMware Site Recovery Manager")

- Periodic (manual) point in time copies
- Remote backup to DR site over the wide area network
- Remote backup to “cloud”
- Backup locally to tape and physically transport our tapes (staff or courier)
- Backup locally to disk/tape and then automatically copy to disk/tape offsite
- Backup locally to disk/tape and then automatically copy to the “cloud”
- Other – describe
- None/not applicable

#### **4 Redundancy, resiliency, distributed, monitoring and notification**

##### ***4.1 Is your physical layer redundant with dual power sources such as UPS & generators?***

- Yes
- No
- Other – describe

##### ***4.2 Are your network devices redundant?***

- Yes
- No
- Other – describe

##### ***4.3 Do your applications have multiple paths to the network and storage resources?***

- Yes
- No
- Other – describe

##### ***4.4 Are your databases fault tolerant with cluster or replication technology?***

- Yes
- No
- Other – describe

##### ***4.5 Are your applications fault tolerant with cluster or load balancing technology?***

- Yes
- No
- Other – describe

**4.6 Do you have active load balancing the applications and resources such that the end users receive the best possible experience in an automated manner?**

- Yes
- No
- Other – describe

**4.7 Do you have mechanisms that dynamically prioritize, perform low priority tasks during low activity periods and defer them during high load?**

- Yes
- No
- Other – describe

**4.8 Are your applications distributed across multiple servers and/or across multiple sites geographically?**

- Yes
- No
- Other – describe

**4.9 Are your directory data replicated across multiple servers and/or across multiple sites geographically?**

- Yes
- No
- Other – describe

**4.10 What monitoring and notification systems do you use? Please describe.**

**4.11 Can you monitor the applications' system utilization and capacity?**

- Yes
- No
- Other – describe

**4.12 Do you have 24/7 staff that support the applications, diagnose, log, audit, and trace issues for root cause?**

- Yes
- No
- Other – describe

## **5 Recovery times and data loss from disaster or major disruptions**

### **5.1 *What were the biggest challenges you faced when recovering from most recent disaster or major disruption (Rank 1-3)***

- Mismatched business expectations with IT capabilities
- Not knowing when to “declare” a disaster and execute a recovery
- Lack of communication between IT and business
- Plan not up to date with current environment
- Insufficient planning for a specific scenario
- Insufficient testing and overall preparedness
- Service provider did not meet expectations
- Lack of communication between recovery staff
- Staff not available to execute recovery plan
- Lack of staff
- Plan not useful for actual recover process
- Limited budget/resources
- Service provider was unresponsive

### **5.2 *In days, hours and/or minutes, approximately how long does it take for you to recover all mission-critical applications and data? Note: The time would start when the “go-ahead” is issued to execute the DRP and would end once all applications and data are available.***

## **6 Market drivers for improving DR and confidence levels**

### **6.1 *How would you rate your ability to recover your data center in the event of a site failure or disaster event?***

- Very prepared
- Prepared
- Somewhat prepared
- Not prepared
- Other - describe

### **6.2 *On a scale of 1-4, where 1 is not critical and 4 is very critical, how important is it to improve your court’s overall disaster recovery preparedness and capabilities? Please explain.***