



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

COURT TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

COURT TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

PROJECTS SUBCOMMITTEE
MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

June 16, 2015
12:00 PM to 1:00 PM
Teleconference

Subcommittee Members Present: Hon. Robert B. Freedman, Chair; Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton, Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Hon. Samantha P. Jessner, Hon. Alan G. Perkins, Mr. Jake Chatters, Mr. Brian Cotta, Mr. Robert Oyung, Mr. Pat Patterson, Mr. David Yamasaki

Subcommittee Members Absent: Hon. James Mize

Others Present: Ms Karen Cannata; Ms Diana Glick; Ms. Fati Farmanfarmaian; Mr. Patrick O'Donnell, Ms. Tara Lundstrom

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:07pm. Roll call was taken.

Approval of Minutes

The subcommittee reviewed and approved the minutes of the May 1, 2015, public CTAC Projects Subcommittee meeting.

Public Comment

No public comments were received.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-2)

Item 1

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

Judge Freedman referred to **The Critical Role of the State Judiciary in Increasing Access for Self-Represented Litigants: Self-Help Access 360°** document included in the meeting materials and asked Ms. Glick, from CCFC, to give an overview of the document. Ms. Glick proceeded with the overview, including a detailed explanation of the graphic on page 8, which represents how self-represented litigant access the courts for information and help. Ms. Glick finished with a recommendation to CTAC and the Judicial Council to consider making the state self-help website a one shop stop with a centralized EFSP

and EFM model for self-represented litigants, and to establish a workstream to explore what it would take to build such a portal with respect to resources and cost.

There was a lengthy discussion with the following comments:

The recommendation being made in this document is actually within scope of the existing E-filing Workstream, which is scoped to determine what model of EFSPs and EFM to implement. And depending on what model the workstream comes up, the workstream will take into account the opportunity to have a statewide portal as a front end.

It was clarified that the recommendation is to focus on an e-filing/e-delivery solution for SRLs. The document assembly efforts are currently ongoing. This means that the proposed self-represented litigant portal would potentially have a different e-filing service provider solution than an e-filing/e-delivery solution for attorney services.

It's worthwhile considering rolling this proposal into the e-filing workstream because of more leverage with potential providers when there are multiple components to the service. Vendors are willing to do the self-represented piece without cost in consideration of getting the other businesses.

The scope of the effort of the existing workstream does not necessary cover two aspects of the self-represented litigants. One: the up to date maintenance of the documents and the online interview process; and two: taking into consideration the courts that do not have e-filing resources. So there could still be a delivery gap between the generation of the documents using a branch branded portal and the ability to get these documents to the court. Should the mandate of the existing ee-filing workstream be expanded to cover those issues?

The generation of the documents is not within the scope of the e-filing workstream, therefore the document assembly piece can be separate. We should distinguish between e-filing activities vs other activities related to SRLs.

Building a document assembly program and transmitting the documents generated are two inter-related issues, but separate. The skills needed to build the document assembly are different than those needed to build the technology behind the EFSPs and EFMs.

The current e-filing workstream has not yet determined the e-filing implementation of a single model or 2 different models for the SRL population and the attorneys. The goal is for the workstream to publish their recommendation somewhere between December 2015 and February 2016.

It would appear to be worthwhile to have a workstream that is focused on the SRL and the document assembly and preparation of the documents, and to avoid having two different workstreams making decisions on the actual implementation model that may be inconsistent with each other.

Another concern: maybe pushing the standardization of documents in high SRL population areas might be more effective at this point?

The issue is not just with forms to file but with the ability for the self-litigant to input information into the forms that the court needs and the party needs to adequately represent their interest. And that's why the online interview process, which is not just filling in the blanks, is so much of a potential benefit.

Another concern: the different systems the different courts are going live with. At this point we don't know if each system has a separate mechanism for these documents to be prepared and filed, or if that's even an issue. Many courts will be going live quickly and will rely on an e filing component across all case types. If we want this piece up and running by the time they go live, it will put undue pressure on the

CCFC staff to put something together as there are about 25 courts that may have something on the way. The Tyler user group was created for the courts implementing Tyler to share information together. There may be something in the works and close to completion. We need to gather more information that would include all vendors and courts with where they are in their implementations and whether they have a solution. If that is the case, can we change course? And if it isn't then we can look at a possible workstream for the benefit of all the courts.

Item 2

Disaster Recovery Framework and Next Generation Hosting Strategy Assessments

Staff gave an update on the survey: the request to participate in the survey was sent to the CIMTF roster, a total of 46 emails, comprised of CIOs and IT Directors, with a deadline of this Friday. So far 39 participants have responded, with only 25 who have provided information on what county they are from. The rest have partially filled out the survey, without giving information on their county.

The Chair is considering extending the deadline for the completion of the survey and is encouraging everyone to reach out to their courts to encourage them to submit the survey with their county information.

A D J O U R N M E N T

Closing Remarks

Next CTAC mtg July 10.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:48pm.

Approved by the subcommittee members on _____.