



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE OPEN MEETING WITH NONPUBLIC SESSION AGENDA

Open to the Public Unless Indicated as Closed or Not Subject to the Rule
(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))

THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS
OPEN PORTION OF THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date:	December 4, 2015	
Time:	10:00 a.m. to 10:35 a.m.	Nonpublic Meeting
	10:35 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.	Open Meeting
Location:	Ronald M. George State Office Complex William C. Vickrey Judicial Council Conference Center Malcolm M. Lucas Board Room 455 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, California 94102-3688	
Call-In Number:	1-877-820-7831	Public Access Code # 4348559

Meeting materials for open portions of the meeting 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.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR NONPUBLIC SESSION TOPICS NOT SUBJECT TO RULE OF COURT 10.75

The chair has exercised discretion to publicly agendize the items for this nonpublic session:
i.e., topics not covered by Rule of Court 10.75.

I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (ACTION REQUIRED)

Approval of Minutes (Action Required)

Approve minutes of the October 30, 2015 Information Technology Advisory Committee nonpublic session.

II. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED) (INFO 1-3)

Info 1

Chair Opening Remarks

Presenter: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers

Info 2

Update on the Judicial Council's (internal) Technology Committee (JCTC)

Provide report on activities and news coming from the JCTC.

Presenter: Hon. Marsha Slough, Chair, JCTC

Info 3

Work of the Judicial Council Information Technology Organization

Presenter: Mark Dusman, Director, Information Technology

III. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn to Public Session

OPEN MEETING AGENDA

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

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Time:	10:35 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.	Open Meeting
Location:	Ronald M. George State Office Complex William C. Vickrey Judicial Council Conference Center Malcolm M. Lucas Board Room 455 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, California 94102-3688	
Call-In Number:	1-877-820-7831	Public Access Code # 4348559

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.

Note: Times are estimated. Actual start and end times may vary.

IV. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes (Action Required)

Approve minutes of the October 30, 2015 Information Technology Advisory Committee public meeting.

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

Public Comment

Members of the public requesting to speak during the public comment portion of the meeting must place the speaker's name, the name of the organization that the speaker represents if any, and the agenda item that the public comment will address, on the public comment sign-up sheet. The sign-up sheet will be available at the meeting location at least 2 hours prior to the meeting start time. The Chair will establish speaking limits at the beginning of the public comment session. While the advisory body welcomes and encourages public comment, time may not permit all persons requesting to speak to be heard at this meeting.

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to itac@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to 455 Golden Gate Avenue, 8th Floor, San Francisco 94102, attention: Jackie Woods, Judicial Council. Only written comments received by **10 a.m. at December 3** will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

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

Item 1

Chair Report

Provide general update on activities relevant to the committee.

Presenter: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair

Item 2

Annual Agenda Planning Session:

Note: Times are estimated. Actual start and end times may vary.

a. Part I – Review & Discuss

Review of proposals submitted for the ITAC 2016 annual agenda. The chair will allot approximately 10 minutes for each proposal. The committee will discuss proposals in the following order:

- (1) Rules & Policy Subcommittee proposals
- (2) Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee proposals
- (3) Workstream proposals
- (4) Tactical Plan

Facilitators: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair
Ms. Renea Stewart, Senior Manager, Information Technology
Ms. Jamel Jones, Senior Business Analyst, Information Technology

b. Part II – Approve (Action Required)

The committee will discuss any proposal removals and/or deferrals and consider approving the annual agenda content, with the changes discussed.

Facilitators: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair
Ms. Renea Stewart, Senior Manager, Information Technology
Ms. Jamel Jones, Senior Business Analyst, Information Technology

Item 3

New Business and Closing Remarks

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn Public Session

Note: Times are estimated. Actual start and end times may vary.

Project Proposals for 2016 ITAC Annual Agenda

Workstreams

Pg. 1.	CMS Data Exchanges	Develop Standardized Approaches to Case Management System (CMS) Interfaces and Data Exchanges with Critical State Justice Partners	Carryover
Pg. 2.	E-Filing Strategy	Update E-Filing Standards, and Develop Provider Certification, Deployment Strategy	Carryover
Pg. 3.	Next Generation Hosting Strategy	Assessment of Alternatives for Transition to Next-Generation Branchwide Hosting Model	Phase II
Pg. 4.	Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Pilot	Consult As Requested and Implement Video Remote Interpreting Pilot (VRI) Program	Carryover
Pg. 5.	SRL E-Services Portal: Phase II	Develop Requirements and a Request for Proposal (RFP) for Establishing a Branch Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) Portal	Phase II
Pg. 6.	Disaster Recovery Phase II: Framework and Pilot	Document, Test, and Adopt Court Disaster Recovery Framework	Phase II

Rules & Policy Subcommittee

Pg. 7.	Modernize Rules of Court: Phase II	Modernize Trial and Appellate Court Rules to Support E-Business	Phase II
Pg. 8.	E-Signature Standards, Rules and/or Legislation	Develop Legislation, Rules, and Standards for Electronic Signatures on Documents Filed by Parties and Attorneys	Phase II
Pg. 9.	Rules for Data Exchanges with Local Justice Partners	Develop Rule Proposal To Authorize Data Exchanges With Local Justice Partners	New
Pg. 10.	Standards for Electronic Court Records	Develop Standards for Electronic Court Records Maintained as Data	New
Pg. 11.	E-Filing Rules	Evaluate Current E-Filing Laws and Rules and Recommend Appropriate Changes	Carryover
Pg. 12.	Privacy Policy	Develop Branch and Model Court Privacy Policies on Electronic Court Records and Access	Carryover

Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee

Pg. 13.	Appellate Rule: E-Filing	Amend Rules to Ensure Consistency with E-Filing Practices of Appellate Courts	New
Pg. 14.	Consultation on Appellate Court Technological Issues	Consult As Requested On Technological Issues Arising In Or Affecting The Appellate Courts	New

Chair/Full Committee

Pg. 15.	Tactical Plan for Technology	Update Tactical Plan for Technology for Effective Date 2017-2019	New
---------	------------------------------	--	-----

[1] CMS Data Exchanges

(Carryover)

Assigned To: Workstream

SUMMARY: Develop Standardized Approaches to Case Management System (CMS) Interfaces and Data Exchanges with Critical State Justice Partners

PRIORITY: P2/Medium

CATEGORY: Policy, Standard, Guideline, Study, and/or Report; also, Technology Program or Solution

ORIGIN: Tactical Plan; carryover from Annual Agenda 2015.

ALIGNMENT: Tactical Plan Goal 1: Promote the Digital Court: Develop Standard CMS Interfaces and Data Exchanges

COMPLETION: March 2016 (in progress)

RESOURCES:	<i>Assigned to:</i>	Workstream Executive Sponsor(s): David Yamasaki
	<i>JCC Support:</i>	Information Technology
	<i>Collaborations:</i>	Justice partners and vendors

Major Tasks:

- (a) Identify a single data exchange standard between each justice partner and the judicial branch to use as a development target for case management system vendors.
- (b) Provide a lead court to act as a point of contact for all case management system vendors and justice partners for each justice partner exchange; and document the current implementation status of each exchange by each vendor.
- (c) Identify the technical standards to be used for the implementation of all data exchanges between the judicial branch and justice partners.
- (d) Establish a formal governance process for exchange updates and modifications.
- (e) Maintain a repository of required materials that support development of standardized exchanges.
- (f) Promote the technical standards as the default standards for local data exchanges.

Deliverables/Outcomes	Timeline
Documented data exchange elements and format standards	
Documented governance and modification processes	

Include only deliverables expected for submission to the JCTC and/or to the Judicial Council.

[2] E-Filing Strategy

(Carryover)

Assigned To: Workstream

SUMMARY: Update E-Filing Standards, and Develop Provider Certification, Deployment Strategy
 PRIORITY: P1/High
 CATEGORY: Technology Program or Solution
 ORIGIN: Tactical Plan; carryover project from 2015 Annual Agenda.
 ALIGNMENT: Tactical Plan Goal 1: Promote the Digital Court E-Filing Deployment
 COMPLETION: July 2016 (6 months)

RESOURCES:	<i>Assigned to:</i>	Workstream Executive Sponsor(s): Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Rob Oyung
	<i>JCC Support:</i>	Information Technology, Legal Services
	<i>Collaborations:</i>	Workstream members; CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee

Major Tasks:

- (a) Update the technical standards for court e-filing, namely, the XML specification and related schema.
- (b) Develop the E-Filing Service Provider (EFSP) selection/certification process.
- (c) Develop the roadmap for an e-filing deployment strategy, approach, and branch solutions/alternatives.

Deliverables/Outcomes	Timeline
Updated Technical Standards	
Certification Program	

Include only deliverables expected for submission to the JCTC and/or to the Judicial Council.

[3] Next Generation Hosting Strategy

(Phase II)

Assigned To: Workstream

SUMMARY: Assessment of Alternatives for Transition to Next-Generation Branchwide Hosting Model

PRIORITY: P2/Medium

CATEGORY: Technology Program or Solution

ORIGIN: Tactical Plan; next phase of project following 2015 assessment. Workstream approved to move forward in 2015.

ALIGNMENT: Tactical Plan Goal 3: Transition to Next-Generation Branchwide Hosting Model

COMPLETION: December 2016

RESOURCES:	<i>Assigned to:</i>	Workstream Executive Sponsor(s): Hon. Kyle Brodie, Brian Cotta
	<i>JCC Support:</i>	Information Technology
	<i>Collaborations:</i>	CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee

Major Tasks:

- (a) Define workstream project schedule and detailed tasks; gain approval of workstream membership
- (b) Outline industry best practices for hosting (including solution matrix with pros, cons, example applications, and costs).
- (c) Produce a roadmap tool for use by courts in evaluating options.
- (d) Consider educational summit on hosting options, and hold summit if appropriate.
- (e) Identify requirements for centralized hosting.
- (f) Recommend a branch-level hosting strategy.

Deliverables/Outcomes	Timeline
Assessment Findings: Best practices, Solution Options	
Educational Document for Courts	
Host 1-Day Summit on Hosting	
Recommendations For Branch-level Hosting	

Include only deliverables expected for submission to the JCTC and/or to the Judicial Council.

[4] Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Pilot

(Carryover)

Assigned To: Workstream

SUMMARY: Consult As Requested and Implement Video Remote Interpreting Pilot (VRI) Program
 PRIORITY: P2/Medium
 CATEGORY: Technology Program or Solution
 ORIGIN: Tactical Plan; continuation of project from Annual Agenda 2015.
 ALIGNMENT: Tactical Plan Goal 1: Courthouse Video Connectivity
 COMPLETION: December 2018

RESOURCES:	<i>Assigned to:</i>	Workstream Executive Sponsor(s): Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers
	<i>JCC Support:</i>	Court Operations Special Services Office, Information Services
	<i>Collaborations:</i>	Language Access Plan Technological Solutions Subcommittee; CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee; CIOs

Major Tasks:

- (a) In cooperation with the Language Access Plan (LAP) Technological Solutions Subcommittee (TSS), assist with identifying participants for a video remote interpreting (VRI) pilot program. Steps include identification of a court participant and issuance of an RFP for a no-cost vendor partner, per the programmatic outline developed in 2015.
- (b) Implement Phase I of the VRI pilot program, in cooperation with the LAP Technological Solutions Subcommittee.

Note: The Workstream is expected to update the technical standards for remote courtroom video following the pilot.

Deliverables/Outcomes	Timeline
Implementation of VRI Pilot Program	

Include only deliverables expected for submission to the JCTC and/or to the Judicial Council.

[5] SRL E-Services Portal: Phase II

(Phase II)

Assigned To: Workstream

SUMMARY: Develop Requirements and a Request for Proposal (RFP) for Establishing a Branch Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) Portal

PRIORITY: P2/Medium

CATEGORY: Technology Program or Solution

ORIGIN: Tactical Plan; carryover from Annual Agenda 2014 and 2015.

ALIGNMENT: Tactical Plan Goal 1: Promote the Digital Court: Implement Portal for Self-Represented Litigants (SRL)

COMPLETION: December 2016 (12 months)

RESOURCES:	<i>Assigned to:</i>	Workstream Executive Sponsor(s): Hon. Robert Freedman, Hon. James Mize
	<i>JCC Support:</i>	Information Technology, Center for Families, Children and the Courts (CFCC)
	<i>Collaborations:</i>	Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Subcommittee of the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee (C&SCAC) standing subcommittee; Advisory Committee Providing Access & Fairness; CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee; CITMF, and the Southern Regional SRL Network, California Tyler Users Group (CATUG)

Major Tasks:

- (a) Develop requirements for a branchwide SRL portal that is e-delivery/e-filing-ready.
 - (b) Develop RFP for branchwide SRL E-Service Portal.
- (Note 1: Other key functionality to include is document assembly, interactive FAQ, and a triage function to guide SRLs through the process. The portal will prioritize directing SRLs to local courts for existing services.)
- (Note 2: In scope for this year is the RFP; out of scope is the actual implementation.)

Deliverables/Outcomes	Timeline
SRL Portal Requirements Document	
Request for Proposal (RFP)	

Include only deliverables expected for submission to the JCTC and/or to the Judicial Council.

[6] Disaster Recovery Phase II: Framework and Pilot

(Phase II)

Assigned To: Workstream

SUMMARY: Document, Test, and Adopt Court Disaster Recovery Framework
 PRIORITY: P2/Medium
 CATEGORY: Technology Program or Solution
 ORIGIN: Tactical Plan; next phase of project following item in Annual Agenda 2015.
 ALIGNMENT: Tactical Plan Goal 3: Court Disaster Recovery Framework and Pilot
 COMPLETION: December 2016 (12 months)

RESOURCES:	<i>Assigned to:</i>	Workstream Executive Sponsor(s): TBD
	<i>JCC Support:</i>	Information Technology
	<i>Collaborations:</i>	Workstream members representing various court sizes; CEAC

Major Tasks:

- (a) Develop model disaster recovery requirements, standard recovery times, and priorities for each of the major technology components of the branch.
- (b) Develop a disaster recovery framework document that could be adapted for any trial or appellate court to serve as a court’s disaster recovery plan.
- (c) Create a plan for providing technology components that could be leveraged by all courts for disaster recovery purposes.
- (d) Pilot the framework by having one or more courts use it.

Note: This project follows the survey/assessment completed in 2015.

Deliverables/Outcomes	Timeline
Disaster Recovery Framework Document and Checklist	
Findings from Pilot	

Include only deliverables expected for submission to the JCTC and/or to the Judicial Council.

[] Modernize Rules of Court: Phase II

(Phase II)

Assigned To: Rules & Policy Subcommittee, Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee

SUMMARY: Modernize Trial and Appellate Court Rules to Support E-Business
 PRIORITY: P2/Medium
 CATEGORY: Rule/Judicial Council Form
 ORIGIN: Tactical Plan; next phase of project following item in Annual Agenda 2015.
 ALIGNMENT: Tactical Plan Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change
 COMPLETION: December 2018 (2 years)

RESOURCES:	<i>Assigned to:</i>	Rules & Policy Subcommittee, Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee Chair: Hon. Peter J. Siggins, Hon. Louis R. Mauro
	<i>JCC Support:</i>	Information Technology, Legal Services, Office of Governmental Affairs, Center for Families, Children and the Courts (CFCC), Criminal Justice Services
	<i>Collaborations:</i>	Appellate Advisory Committee, 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

Major Tasks:

- (a) In collaboration with other advisory committees, continue review of rules and statutes in a systematic manner and develop recommendations for more comprehensive changes to align with modern business practices (e.g., eliminating paper dependencies).

Note: Projects may include rule proposals to amend rules to address formatting of electronic documents, a legislative proposal to provide express statutory authority for permissive e-filing and e-service in criminal cases, and changes to appellate forms to reflect e-filing practices.

Deliverables/Outcomes	Timeline
Rule and/or Legislative Proposal, if appropriate	

Include only deliverables expected for submission to the JCTC and/or to the Judicial Council.

[] E-Signature Standards, Rules and/or Legislation

(Phase II)

Assigned To: Rules & Policy Subcommittee

SUMMARY: Develop Legislation, Rules, and Standards for Electronic Signatures on Documents Filed by Parties and Attorneys

PRIORITY: P2/Medium

CATEGORY: Policy, Standard, Guideline, Study, and/or Report; and also, Rule/Judicial Council Form

ORIGIN: Tactical Plan; carryover and expansion of 2014 and 2015 Annual Agenda. Recommendation by Department of Child Support Services and attorney, Tim Perry.

ALIGNMENT: Tactical Plan Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change

COMPLETION: December 2018 (2 years)

RESOURCES:	<i>Assigned to:</i>	Rules & Policy Subcommittee Chair: Hon. Peter J. Siggins
	<i>JCC Support:</i>	Legal Services, Information Technology
	<i>Collaborations:</i>	CEAC Subcommittee on Records Management, CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Rules and Legislative Subcommittees

Major Tasks:

- (a) Develop legislative and rule proposal to amend Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6(b)(2) and Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.257, to authorize electronic signatures on documents filed by the parties and attorneys.
- (b) Develop standards governing electronic signatures to be included in the "Trial Court Records Manual."

Deliverables/Outcomes	Timeline
Rule and/or Legislative Proposal, if appropriate	
Recommendation of Standards for Electronic Signatures (Update to the Trial Court Records Manual)	

Include only deliverables expected for submission to the JCTC and/or to the Judicial Council.

[] Rules for Data Exchanges with Local Justice Partners

(New)

Assigned To: Rules & Policy Subcommittee

SUMMARY: Develop Rule Proposal To Authorize Data Exchanges With Local Justice Partners

PRIORITY: P1/High

CATEGORY: Rule/Judicial Council Form

ORIGIN: Rules and Policy Subcommittee discussion/recommendation. Currently, the trial court rules authorize remote electronic access of trial court records in criminal cases and certain civil cases only by parties, their attorneys, and persons or entities authorized by statute or rule. In the absence of any statute or rule authorizing remote access by local justice partners that do not represent a party in the case, they must go to the courthouse to request access to these public records, resulting in significant inefficiencies for them and the courts.

ALIGNMENT: Tactical Plan Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change

COMPLETION: December 2016

RESOURCES:	<i>Assigned to:</i>	Rules & Policy Subcommittee Chair: Hon. Peter J. Siggins
	<i>JCC Support:</i>	Information Technology, Legal Services
	<i>Collaborations:</i>	CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee

Major Tasks:

- (a) Amend trial court rules to authorize data exchanges of trial court records with local justice partners.

Deliverables/Outcomes	Timeline
Rule Proposal	

Include only deliverables expected for submission to the JCTC and/or to the Judicial Council.

[] Standards for Electronic Court Records

(New)

Assigned To: Rules & Policy Subcommittee

SUMMARY: Develop Standards for Electronic Court Records Maintained as Data

PRIORITY: P1/High

CATEGORY: Policy, Standard, Guideline, Study, and/or Report

ORIGIN: Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC); Government Code section 68150 provides that court records may be maintained in electronic form so long as they satisfy standards developed by the Judicial Council. These standards are contained in the Trial Court Records Manual. However, the current version of the manual addresses storing electronic court records only as documents, not data.

ALIGNMENT: Tactical Plan Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change

COMPLETION: September 2016 (1 year)

RESOURCES:	<i>Assigned to:</i>	Rules & Policy Subcommittee Chair: Hon. Peter J. Siggins
	<i>JCC Support:</i>	Information Technology, Legal Services
	<i>Collaborations:</i>	CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee

Major Tasks:

- (a) Develop standards and proposal to allow trial courts to maintain electronic court records as data in their case management systems.
- (b) Include standards in update to the Trial Court Records Manual.

Deliverables/Outcomes	Timeline
Recommendation of Standards for Electronic Court Records as Data (Update to the Trial Court Records Manual)	

Include only deliverables expected for submission to the JCTC and/or to the Judicial Council.

[] E-Filing Rules

(Carryover)

Assigned To: Rules & Policy Subcommittee

SUMMARY: Evaluate Current E-Filing Laws and Rules and Recommend Appropriate Changes
PRIORITY: P2/Medium
CATEGORY: Rule/Judicial Council Form
ORIGIN: Tactical Plan; carry over project from 2015 Annual Agenda. Possible additional recommendations from the E-filing Workstream. Recommendation from the Superior Court of Sacramento County (from comment submitted in response to 2015 ITC for Rules Modernization Project rules proposal). Recommendation from Mr. Tony Klein of Attorney Service of San Francisco to review rules governing EFSPs.
ALIGNMENT: Tactical Plan Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change
COMPLETION: December 2016

RESOURCES:	<i>Assigned to:</i>	Rules & Policy Subcommittee Chair: Hon. Peter J. Siggins
	<i>JCC Support:</i>	Legal Services, Information Technology
	<i>Collaborations:</i>	TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology, Rules and Legislative Subcommittees; also Criminal Law, Civil and Small Claims, Family and Juvenile Law, and Appellate Advisory Committees

Major Tasks:

- (a) Evaluate current e-filing laws and rules and amendments. Projects may include reviewing statutes and rules governing Electronic Filing Service Providers (EFSP) and filing deadlines.
- (b) Develop legislative and rule proposals to amend e-filing laws and rules (Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 and California Rules of Court, rule 2.250 et seq.).

Deliverables/Outcomes	Timeline
Legislative and Rule Proposals	

Include only deliverables expected for submission to the JCTC and/or to the Judicial Council.

[] Privacy Policy

(Carryover)

Assigned To: Rules & Policy Subcommittee

SUMMARY: Develop Branch and Model Court Privacy Policies on Electronic Court Records and Access

PRIORITY: P2/Medium

CATEGORY: Policy, Standard, Guideline, Study, and/or Report

ORIGIN: Tactical Plan; carryover from Annual Agenda 2014 and 2015. Code Civ. Proc., § 1010.6 (enacted in 1999) required the Judicial Council to adopt uniform rules on access to public records; subsequently the rules have been amended in response to changes in the law and technology, requests from the courts, and suggestions from members of CTAC, the bar, and the public.

ALIGNMENT: Tactical Plan Goal 4: Promote Rule and Legislative Changes

COMPLETION: December 2017 (2 years)

RESOURCES:	<i>Assigned to:</i>	Rules & Policy Subcommittee Chair: Hon. Peter J. Siggins
	<i>JCC Support:</i>	Legal Services, Information Technology
	<i>Collaborations:</i>	CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee; Criminal Law Advisory Committee, and the Department of Justice

Major Tasks:

- (a) Continue development of a comprehensive statewide privacy policy addressing electronic access to court records and data to align with both state and federal requirements.
- (b) Continue development of a model (local) court privacy policy, outlining the key contents and provisions to address within a local court’s specific policy.

Deliverables/Outcomes	Timeline
Recommendation of Branch Privacy Policy	
Recommendation of Model Local Court Privacy Policy	

Include only deliverables expected for submission to the JCTC and/or to the Judicial Council.

[] Appellate Rule: E-Filing

(New)

Assigned To: Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee

SUMMARY: Amend Rules to Ensure Consistency with E-Filing Practices of Appellate Courts

PRIORITY: P1/High

CATEGORY: Rule/Judicial Council Form

ORIGIN: Discussions among members of the Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee have noted areas where current e-filing practices are inconsistent with the existing rules or where consistency among the appellate courts is desirable but there is no statewide rule. JATS seeks to address these issues.

ALIGNMENT: Tactical Plan Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change

COMPLETION: December 2016 (Spring 2016 Rules Cycle)

RESOURCES:	<i>Assigned to:</i>	Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee Chair: Hon. Louis R. Mauro
	<i>JCC Support:</i>	Information Technology, Legal Services
	<i>Collaborations:</i>	Appellate Advisory Committee

Major Tasks:

- (a) Review appellate rules and amend as needed to ensure that the rules are consistent with current e-filing practices and local rules.

Deliverables/Outcomes	Timeline
Rule Proposal, as appropriate	

Include only deliverables expected for submission to the JCTC and/or to the Judicial Council.

[] Consultation on Appellate Court Technological Issues

(New)

Assigned To: Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee

SUMMARY: Consult As Requested On Technological Issues Arising In Or Affecting The Appellate Courts

PRIORITY: P1/High

CATEGORY: Technology Program or Solution

ORIGIN: JATS ongoing charge. Proposed resolutions of various issues under consideration by advisory bodies will have an impact on the work of the appellate courts, or may require changes to the practices of the appellate courts. These issues include, for example, possible changes to protect the privacy of victims and witnesses whose information may be discussed in appellate decisions; changes in trial court e-filing practices that may affect the format of documents in the record on appeal; and e-filing implementation in the appellate courts. JATS is available to consult on the appellate court technology aspects of these issues, as requested.

ALIGNMENT: Tactical Plan Goal 4: Identify New Policy, Rule, and Legislation Change

COMPLETION: December 2016 (availability as issues arise)

RESOURCES:

<i>Assigned to:</i>	Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee Chair: Hon. Louis R. Mauro
<i>JCC Support:</i>	Information Technology, Legal Services
<i>Collaborations:</i>	Appellate Advisory Committee

Major Tasks:

- (a) The Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee will provide input on request on technology related proposals considered by other advisory bodies as to how those proposals may affect, or involve, the appellate courts.

Deliverables/Outcomes	Timeline
Recommendations, as needed	

Include only deliverables expected for submission to the JCTC and/or to the Judicial Council.

[] Tactical Plan for Technology

(New)

Assigned To: Chair and Full Committee

SUMMARY: Update Tactical Plan for Technology for Effective Date 2017-2019
 PRIORITY: P1/High
 CATEGORY: Policy, Standard, Guideline, Study, and/or Report
 ORIGIN: Technology Governance and Funding Model; chair recommendation
 ALIGNMENT: Technology Governance and Funding Model
 COMPLETION: December 2016 (work to begin mid-year 2016)

RESOURCES:	<i>Assigned to:</i>	Chair and Full Committee Executive Sponsor(s):
	<i>JCC Support:</i>	Information Services
	<i>Collaborations:</i>	Broad input from the branch and the public

Major Tasks:

- (a) Review and update the Tactical Plan for Technology.
- (b) Circulate for branch and public comment.
- (c) Finalize and submit for approval.

Note: Futures Commission outcomes will provide inputs into Strategic and Tactical Plan.

Deliverables/Outcomes	Timeline
Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-2019	

Include only deliverables expected for submission to the JCTC and/or to the Judicial Council.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

October 30, 2015

10:00 AM

Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair; Hon. Robert B. Freedman, Vice Chair; Hon. Kyle S. Brodie; Mr. Jake Chatters; Mr. Brian Cotta; Hon. Julie R. Culver; Prof. Dorothy J. Glancy; Hon. Michael S. Groch; Hon. Sheila F. Hanson; Hon. Samantha P. Jessner; Hon. Jackson Lucky; Ms. Alison Merrilees in for Hon. Mark Stone; Hon. James Mize; Mr. Terry McNally; Mr. Snorri Ogata; Mr. Robert Oyung; Mr. Darrel Parker; Mr. Pat Patterson; Hon. Alan G. Perkins; Hon. Peter J. Siggins; Mr. Don Willenburg; Mr. David H. Yamasaki

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton; Hon. Louis R. Mauro; Hon. Theodore C. Zayner

Others Present: Hon. Daniel J. Buckley; Hon. Kimberly Gaab; Hon. Marsha Slough; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Renea Stewart; Ms. Kathy Fink; Ms. Fati Farmanfarmaian; Ms. Jamel Jones; Mr. Patrick O'Donnell; Ms. Tara Lundstrom; Ms. Karen Cannata; Mr. Manny Floresca; Ms. Jackie Woods; Mr. Neil Payne, Ms. Jessica Craven

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM, and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the August 18, 2015, Information Technology Advisory Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS X-X)

Item 1

Opening Remarks and Chair Report

Provide general update on activities relevant to the committee.

Presenter: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair

Update: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers welcomed and introduced returning and new members. Judge James Mize, returning; and new members: Judge Michael Groch, San Diego Superior Court; Judge Jackson Lucky, Riverside Superior Court; Mr. Terry

McNally, CEO Kern Superior Court; Mr. Snorri Ogata, CIO Los Angeles Superior Court; Mr. Darrel Parker, CEO Santa Barbara Superior Court. There will be a new member orientation early November. Justice Bruiniers also thanked outgoing members: Mr. Pat Patterson, Judge Jeffery Barton, Judge Theodore Zayner, and Mr. Jake Chatters for their contributions to this advisory committee.

Standing subcommittees were outlined for new members and members were advised a final list will be out next month.

The Chair is also reviewing liaison assignments; Mr. David Yamasaki will be the liaison to CEAC; Judge Samantha Jessner volunteered for the vacant Civil Jury; leaving only the PJ advisory committee vacant, please let Justice Bruiniers know if you are interested.

Later in this meeting ITAC will be reviewing the Annual Agenda and possible workstreams.

Justice Bruiniers provided an update on the Court Technology Conference that he and Judge Freedman recently attended in Minneapolis in September. CTC 2015 – The conference provided an opportunity to see what other states are doing and what new technologies were emerging. The area of most interest was on VRI, most states are limited. However, equipment used has gotten better and cheaper for courts to consider VRI.

Item 2

Data Exchange Workstream Status Report

Update on the progress of this workstream (Annual Agenda Project #1).

Presenter: Mr. David Yamasaki, Executive Sponsor

Update: Mr. David Yamasaki updated ITAC that this project has been underway for 10 months. In this time they have identified four of the major tasks; narrowed Justice Partners to 5: DMV, DOJ, DCSS, CHP, and Dept. of Rehabilitation and Collections. These justice partners were selected because they routinely share data with the courts. Each justice partner operates slightly differently. It's been agreed to move toward using the NEIM standard and the team has identified a deployment schedule for courts. CIOs have been assigned and are taking the lead to identify specific requirements with each vendor and justice partner going forward and it will be documented for courts using that vendor. The last piece is governance; which hasn't moved forward, but will once the CIOs have all the information from the justice partner and vendor sessions. Expect to wrap up early 2016.

Item 3

E-Filing Workstream Status Report

Update on the progress of this workstream (Annual Agenda Project #2).

Presenters: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson and Mr. Robert Oyung, Executive Co-Sponsors

Update: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson reported that since the kick off in May, Mr. Snorri Ogata meets every other week with participants and they are looking at e-filing approach, then developing roadmap to present to ITAC. Mr. Rob Oyung added that there are two paths being considered. One is not slowing any existing e-filing projects down so not to have courts wait, they could later adopt recommendations; the second is a branchwide solution that allows the courts to use components with fees being set by court. Mr. Ogata added, the group focused on three models: status quo model, which is not recommended; branch built e-filing system, also not recommended; the final option was to go out to bid for an e-filing vendor solution – must include all case types. All courts should operate e-filing in this framework. Final decision was for a multiple vendor solution, probably 2 vendors. Also considering EFSPs

Item 4

Remote Video Workstream Status Report

Update on the progress of this workstream (Annual Agenda Project #3).

Presenter: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Executive Sponsor

Update: Justice Bruiniers reported that he's working with the Language Access Plan subcommittee to establish a timeline. Looking for operational support to help with implementation. Justice Bruiniers will develop and publish an RFP seeking no-cost vendor partner in a least one court during phase one. He is also speaking at CEAC on November 4 to discuss court participation.

Item 5

Information Security Framework Workstream Status Report

Update on the progress of this workstream (Annual Agenda Project #5).

Presenter: Mr. Robert Oyung, Executive Sponsor

Update: Mr. Robert Oyung provided an update to ITAC. In August 2014 the Judicial Council published an information security framework document for systems controls. This project started April 2015. This workstream modified the original document for the courts' use. The framework is flexible and advises courts what

areas require a control, but leaves it up to the court based on their available resources to execute.

Item 6

Next Generation Hosting Workstream Status Report

Update on the progress of this workstream (Annual Agenda Project #4).

Presenter: Hon. Kyle Brodie and Mr. Brian Cotta, Executive Co-Sponsors

Update: Hon. Kyle S. Brodie reported that this workstream was delayed due to Jake Chatters leaving ITAC. Scheduling is underway for a kick off meeting; membership has been finalized. Anticipate complete assessment once the current contract is up for renewal then a branchwide judgement can be made at that time.

Item 7

ITAC Projects Subcommittee Report

a. Disaster Recovery and Next Generation Hosting Solutions Assessment

Report on the findings from the *Disaster Recovery and Next Generation Hosting Solutions in California Courts* survey conducted in June 2015.

Presenter: Hon. Robert B. Freedman, Chair, ITAC Projects Subcommittee

Update: Hon. Robert B. Freedman advised that the SRL and disaster recovery survey results are in your materials packet. He added that these were both topics of interest at the recent Court Technology Conference he attended.

Item 8

ITAC Rules & Policy Subcommittee Report

a. Electronic Signature Standards and Guidelines (Action Required)

Review trial court comments and decide whether to recommend a proposal to update the *Trial Court Records Manual* with standards and guidelines governing electronic signatures by judges and courts. These standards and guidelines were developed by the Court Executives Advisory Committee's Records Management Subcommittee to implement Government Code section 68150(g).

Presenter: Hon. Peter J. Siggins, Chair, Rules and Policy Subcommittee
Mr. Patrick O'Donnell, Managing Attorney, Legal Services
Ms. Tara Lundstrom, Attorney, Legal Services

Action: Request a Motion to Approve the recommended proposal to update the Trial Court Records Manual with standards and guidelines governing electronic signatures.
1st Judge Alan G. Perkins; 2nd Judge Kyle S. Brodie
Motion approved.

Item 9

Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee Report

Provide general update on activities relevant to the committee.

Presenter: Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Chair, Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee

Update: Please refer to the written report in meeting materials.

Item 10

Update on the Judicial Council's (internal) Technology Committee (JCTC)

Provide report on activities and news coming from the JCTC.

Presenter: Hon. Marsha Slough, Chair, JCTC

Update: Hon. Marsha Slough provided a JCTC update. As newly appointed Chair of JCTC she has spent much time reviewing ITAC projects and workstreams. She also recently attended an orientation with Judicial Council IT team that supports JCTC. The next JCTC meeting is November 9. She added that she is looking forward to working with ITAC.

Item 11

Annual Agenda Planning

Facilitators: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair

Ms. Renea Stewart, Senior Manager, Information Technology

Update: Ms. Renea Stewart reviewed the annual agenda objectives, status, and terms. Members were introduced to the proposals and asked if any needed further clarification or if there were any missing from the list. This meeting, review focused on select proposals outlined in the materials. Next steps are for members to review all proposals and submit additional feedback. Subcommittee chairs and sponsors should review and update deliverables and establish timelines for deliverables. ITAC chairs will refine proposals, review resource availability, and prioritize for the December ITAC meeting.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.