



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

August 25, 2016

12:00 - 1:30 PM

Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair; Hon. Robert B. Freedman, Vice Chair; 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; Hon. Louis R. Mauro; Mr. Darrel Parker; Mr. Snorri Ogata; Mr. Robert Oyung; Hon. Alan G. Perkins; Hon. Peter J. Siggins; Mr. David H. Yamasaki

Advisory Body Members Absent: Mr. Terry McNally; Hon. James Mize; Hon. Mark Stone; Mr. Don Willenburg; Hon. Joseph Wiseman

Others Present: Hon. Douglas P. Miller; Hon. Daniel J. Buckley; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Kathy Fink; Ms. Fati Farmanfarmaian; Ms. Jamel Jones; Mr. Patrick O'Donnell; Ms. Tara Lundstrom; Ms. Jenny Phu; Ms. Donna Keating; Ms. Nicole Rosa; Mr. Tony Rochon; Ms. Jessica Craven; Ms. Diana Glick; Ms. Jackie Woods

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:00 PM, and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the August 1, 2016 meeting of the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC).

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-3)

Hon. Terence L Bruiniers, Chair announced upcoming changes to ITAC beginning September 15. The new ITAC chair will be Hon. Shelia F. Hanson and vice-chair will be Hon. Louis R. Mauro. Additionally, there will be two new members Hon. Kimberly Menninger, Orange County Superior Court and Ms. Alexandra Grimwade, CIO, Twentieth Century Fox Television. Both new members will be participate in the new member orientation meeting late September. Professor Glancy will be leaving ITAC; Justice Bruiniers thanked her for her contributions especially around rules and policy with the subcommittee. Mr. Patrick O'Donnell has hired a new attorney to assistant ITAC, Andrea Jaramillo is familiar with ITAC as she once interned with ITAC when it was formally CTAC.

Item 1**Legislative Proposal to Authorize E-Service in Probate Proceedings (Action Required)**

Review public comments received and decide whether to recommend proposed amendments to a legislative proposal that would amend the Probate Code and Welfare and Institutions Code sections 728 and 5362 to authorize e-service by consent of notices and other papers in guardianship, conservatorship, and other probate matters.

Action: Hon. Peter J. Siggins and Mr. Patrick O'Donnell provided an update on this proposal. Developed in coordination with Probate and Mental Health Advisory committee. Six public comments were received, all comments approved. Comments included clarification, typographical errors and future project suggestions.

Motion to approve the recommendation of proposed amendments to the legislative proposal amending the Probate Code and Welfare and Institutions Code sections 728 and 5326 as specified.

Approved

Item 2**Legislative Proposal to Authorize E-Service and E-Filing in Juvenile Proceedings (Action Required)**

Review public comments received and decide whether to recommend proposed amendments to a legislative proposal that would amend the Welfare and Institutions Code to allow for e-service by consent and e-filing in juvenile dependency and delinquency proceedings.

Action: Justice Siggins advised these are changes on juvenile proceedings. Ms. Diana Glick provided a general update regarding comments. There were 5 comments received. Suggested changes included language and redundancy and document was tightened up. It is believed the encryption standard in the proposal meets standards under HIPA as well.

Motion to approve the recommendation of proposed amendments to the legislative proposal amending the Welfare and Institutions Code to allow for e-service by consent and e-filing in juvenile dependency and delinquency proceedings.

Approved

Item 3**Annual Agenda^[FFF1] Planning**

Info: Justice Bruiniers asked Ms. Kathy Fink and Ms. Jamel Jones to review the annual agenda process. This is the document that authorizes ITAC's work for the coming year and the projects need to align to the Tactical Plan for the branch. A draft is developed by ITAC and approved by Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC). Amendments must be submitted and also approved by JCTC. A project request form is used for new forms, redline existing annual agenda, and for carry over projects.

Following today's meeting an email will be sent inviting members to redline the annual agenda and their suggestions are due by September 23. ITAC will meet in October to review and prepare materials for the December in person meeting. Final draft will be sent to ITAC before submission to JCTC.

Justice Bruiniers added, that the workstream approach relies on trial court resources. Some concerns about over stretching trial courts resources, will need to find additional branch resources; also judicial council staff resource need to be considered.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:31 PM.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

ITAC PROJECT STATUS REPORT

October 2016

Annual Agenda Project 1. CMS Data Exchanges

Summary	Develop Standardized Approaches to Case Management System (CMS) Interfaces and Data Exchanges with Critical State Justice Partners		
ITAC Resource	Workstream		
Sponsor(s) or Chair(s)	David Yamasaki, Judge Robert Freedman (Vice-Chair)	Project Manager	Alan Crouse
JCC Resources	JCIT (Nicole Rosa, Jackie Woods)		
Project Authorized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Approved (1/11/2016) as part of 2016 Annual Agenda.		
Membership Established	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved by ITAC Chair (8/21/2015) and JCTC (9/15/2015); forwarded to E&P (staff).		
Project Active	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Governance Committee and Repository planning active.		
Expected Outcomes	1. Documented data exchange elements and format standards 2. Documented governance and modification processes		
Expected Completion	July 2016 (extended to October 2016, per ITAC chair approval 6/28/2016) Request extension to December 2016 to complete current scope of work.		

MAJOR TASKS	STATUS	DESCRIPTION
(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.	Completed	Primary requirements and needs were identified, with further confirmation and expansion occurring during justice partner and CMS vendor sessions.
(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.	Completed	Designated court CIOs facilitated sessions between justice partners and CMS vendors to refine information, processes, and identify issues for resolution.
(c) Identify the technical standards to be used for the implementation of all data exchanges between the judicial branch and justice partners.	Completed	Implementation of CMS applications was included within the recent Vendor-Partner meetings and will continue as needed.
(d) Establish a formal governance process for exchange updates and modifications.	In Progress	Workstream leads are in process of finalizing a Workstream Summary report and Governance Plan (which outlines how to manage the use, ongoing support, addition, and modification of data exchanges) for presentation and approval at the December ITAC and JCTC meetings. These deliverables will conclude the scope of work for the current workstream. Additionally, the workstream leads have submitted a request to ITAC – as part of its 2017 annual agenda – to create an entity that will support the ongoing maintenance of the exchanges.

<p>(e) Maintain a repository of required materials that support development of standardized exchanges.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>Repository created and readied for documentation. Meetings held with CIOs and justice partners to identify exchange update and modification goals, and provide a walk-through for updating the repository with required materials for the standardized exchanges. Additional meetings to be held, as needed.</p>
<p>(f) Promote the technical standards as the default standards for local data exchanges.</p>	<p>Not Started</p>	<p>Expected as part of the 2017 governance implementation and maintenance activities.</p>

ITAC PROJECT STATUS REPORT

October 2016

Annual Agenda Project 2. E-Filing Strategy

Summary	Update E-Filing Standards; Develop Provider Certification and a Deployment Strategy	
ITAC Resource	Workstream	
Sponsor(s) or Chair(s)	Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Rob Oyung	Project Manager Snorri Ogata
JCC Resources	Legal Services (Patrick O'Donnell); Information Technology (Edmund Herbert); Branch Accounting and Procurement	
Project Authorized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Approved (1/11/2016) as part of 2016 Annual Agenda.	
Membership Established	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved by ITAC Chair (8/21/2015) and JCTC (9/15/2015); forwarded to E&P (staff).	
Project Active	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conducting bi-weekly meetings.	
Expected Outcomes	1. Updated Technical Standards 2. Certification Program	
Expected Completion	July 2016 (extended to December 2016, per ITAC chair approval 6/28/2016)	

MAJOR TASKS	STATUS	DESCRIPTION
(a) Update the technical standards for court e-filing, namely, the XML specification and related schema.	In Progress	At its June 2017 meeting the Judicial Council approved the Workstream's recommendation of the NIEM/Oasis ECF specification as the technical information exchange standards for the purposes of e-filing in all state trial courts. Additionally, the council directed ITAC/the workstream to develop a plan for implementation and to report back to the council at a future date.
(b) Develop the E-Filing Service Provider (EFSP) selection/certification process.	In Progress	MTG consulting was hired to assist in developing the certification process for EFSPs seeking to access the California e-filing business. The group will explore the possibility of using the IJIS Institute's Springboard Certification process.
(c) Develop the roadmap for an e-filing deployment strategy, approach, and branch solutions/alternatives.	In Progress	At its June 2017 meeting the Judicial Council approved the Workstream's roadmap recommendations. Recommendations include: statewide policies, high-level functional requirements, and direction for ITAC to undertake and manage a procurement process to select multiple EFMs.
Note: A future phase RFP may be necessary, dependent upon the outcomes of this workstream.	In Progress	The workstream continues to meet and define requirements for an RFP or other procurement process. MTG consulting are also attending these meetings. Two sub-groups have been created. The first sub-group will review and discuss the requirements associated with "ClerkReview". This sub-group will also

		<p>include clerks from existing e-filing courts in their review and discussions. The second sub-group will review and discuss the technical requirements for the project and are currently focusing on Identity Management in a multiple EFM environment.</p> <p>Additionally, a BCP is being developed to request funds for supporting ancillary aspects of a statewide e-filing program, for example, resources for policy and vendor management, infrastructure to leverage the state's favorable payment processor, and identity management support and licensing.</p>
--	--	--

ITAC PROJECT STATUS REPORT

October 2016

Annual Agenda Project 3. Next Generation Hosting Strategy

Summary	Assess Alternatives for Transition to a Next-Generation Branchwide Hosting Model		
ITAC Resource	Workstream		
Sponsor(s) or Chair(s)	Hon. Jackson Lucky, Brian Cotta	Project Manager	Heather Pettit
JCC Resources	JCIT (Donna Keating and others as specific technical topics are discussed)		
Project Authorized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Approved (1/11/2016) as part of 2016 Annual Agenda.		
Membership Established	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved by ITAC Chair (8/21/2015) and JCTC (9/15/2015); forwarded to E&P (staff).		
Project Active	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Meeting ad-hoc.		
Expected Outcomes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assessment Findings: Best practices, Solution Options 2. Educational Document for Courts 3. Host 1-Day Summit on Hosting 4. Recommendations For Branch-level Hosting 		
Expected Completion	December 2016		

MAJOR TASKS	STATUS	DESCRIPTION
(a) Define workstream project schedule and detailed tasks; gain approval of workstream membership.	In Progress	Membership approved. A high-level project schedule/plan has been developed; and is being progressively detailed as topics are completed.
(b) Outline industry best practices for hosting (including solution matrix with pros, cons, example applications, and costs).	In Progress	Members agreed that a first set of tools, including court system inventory, service level definitions and recommended service levels should be finalized for delivery to ITAC and trial courts. Members are also working with VMWare on a statewide license agreement, as included in the Judicial Council tactical plan. Lastly, members are meeting with other workstream leadership to discuss security and identity management on October 20, 2016.
(c) Produce a roadmap tool for use by courts in evaluating options.	In Progress	Starting July 20, 2016
(d) Consider educational summit on hosting options, and hold summit if appropriate.	In Progress	
(e) Identify requirements for centralized hosting.	In Progress	

ITAC PROJECT STATUS REPORT

October 2016

Annual Agenda Project 4. Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Pilot

Summary	Consult As Requested and Implement Video Remote Interpreting Pilot (VRI) Program		
ITAC Resource	Workstream		
Sponsor(s) or Chair(s)	Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers	Project Manager	Olivia Lawrence
JCC Resources	Court Operations Services (Olivia Lawrence, VRI Project Manager; Anne Marx, SME) JCIT (Fati Farmanfarmaian, IT Project Manager; Jenny Phu, SME; Nate Moore, SME)		
Project Authorized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Approved (1/11/2016) as part of 2016 Annual Agenda.		
Membership Established	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved by ITAC Chair (8/30/2016) and JCTC Chair (9/8/2016); forwarded to E&P staff.		
Project Active	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, from the perspective of the LAPITF activity.		
Expected Outcomes	1. Implementation of VRI Pilot Program		
Expected Completion	March 2017 (Phase I) – Requesting extension into 2017 annual agenda, through August 2017.		

MAJOR TASKS	STATUS	DESCRIPTION
(a) In cooperation with the Language Access Plan (LAP) Implementation Task Force Technological Solutions Subcommittee (TSS), assist with identifying participants for a video remote interpreting (VRI) pilot program project, and initiation of a VRI pilot . Steps include identification of a court participants, and issuance of an RFP for a no-cost vendor partner(s), and implementation of a six month pilot program per the programmatic outline developed in 2015.	In Progress	<p>Pilot project proposal was presented and approved at June 24 Judicial Council meeting. Three pilot courts (Sacramento, Ventura, and Merced) have been identified.</p> <p>The no-cost RFP to select participant vendors has been issued; and demonstrations conducted by four responding vendors on Sept 21-22. Notice of intent to award will be in November.</p> <p>The tentative launch of the “program assessment period” is April 2017; with a six month duration. A contract for independent evaluation of the VRI Pilot Project is under negotiation. The workstream membership has been approved, and governance of the pilot (between LAPITF and ITAC’s VRI Workstream) is being coordinated.</p>
(b) Implement Phase I of the VRI pilot program project , in cooperation with the TSS.	Not Started	

* Red text indicates non-substantive edits to annual agenda description, per project definitions derived post-annual agenda approval.

ITAC PROJECT STATUS REPORT

October 2016

Annual Agenda Project 5. SRL E-Services

Summary	Develop Requirements and a Request for Proposal (RFP) for Establishing Online Branchwide Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) E-Services		
ITAC Resource	Workstream		
Sponsor(s) or Chair(s)	Hon. Robert Freedman, Hon. James Mize	Project Manager Brett Howard	
JCC Resources	JCIT (Mark Gelade) and CFCC (Karen Cannata, Diana Glick)		
Project Authorized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Approved (1/11/2016) as part of 2016 Annual Agenda.		
Membership Established	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved by ITAC Chair (4/5/2016) and JCTC (4/14/2016); forwarded to E&P (staff).		
Project Active	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Held 5 meetings; next meeting scheduled for October 19, 2016.		
Expected Outcomes	1. SRL Portal Requirements Document 2. Request for Proposal (RFP)		
Expected Completion	December 2016 (12 months)		

MAJOR TASKS	STATUS	DESCRIPTION
(a) Develop requirements for branchwide SRL e-capabilities to facilitate interactive FAQ, triage functionality, and document assembly to guide SRLs through the process, and interoperability with the branchwide e-filing solution. The portal will be complementary to existing local court services.	In Progress	<p>The workstream held its kickoff meeting on March 30 and have met 5 times.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the August 17th meeting, a presentation regarding ‘Document Assembly’ was made by Diana Glick. A special meeting was held on September 12, 2016, for two presentations/demos: Guide & File presented by Michelle Farnsworth, and eFiling Update presented by Snorri Ogata. <p>Four workgroups were established to further investigate and divide the workload.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Existing Solutions Workgroup</i> met on July 26, 2016, to discuss high level focus and scope, and to establish list of resources statewide and nationally, for review by the group. Next meeting scheduled October 25, 2016. <i>Technology Workgroup</i> met on July 12th and August 10, 2016, to discuss high level focus and scope, and to establish list of technical resources for review by the group. Next meeting scheduled October 12, 2016. <i>Requirements Definition Workgroup</i> met on July 25th and August 24, 2016, to discuss high level focus and scope, and to establish list of available resources for review by the group. Next meeting scheduled October 20, 2016.

		<p>4. <i>Document Access Workgroup</i> kick-off meeting held August 9, 2016, to discuss high level focus and scope. Next meeting scheduled October 3, 2016.</p>
<p>(b) Determine implementation options for a branch-branded SRL E-Services website that takes optimal advantage of existing branch, local court, and vendor resources. In scope for 2016 is development of an RFP; out of scope is the actual implementation.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>See above.</p>

ITAC PROJECT STATUS REPORT

October 2016

Annual Agenda Project 6. Disaster Recovery (DR) Framework and Pilot

Summary	Document, Test, and Adopt a Court Disaster Recovery Framework		
ITAC Resource	Workstream		
Sponsor(s) or Chair(s)	Hon. Alan Perkins, Brian Cotta	Project Manager	Brian Cotta
JCC Resources	JCIT (Michael Derr)		
Project Authorized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Approved (1/11/2016) as part of 2016 Annual Agenda.		
Membership Established	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved by ITAC Chair (4/21/2016) and JCTC Chair (4/27/2016); forwarded to E&P (staff).		
Project Active	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conducting bi-weekly meetings.		
Expected Outcomes	1. Disaster Recovery Framework Document and Checklist 2. Findings from Pilot		
Expected Completion	December 2016 (extended to March 2017, per ITAC chair approval 6/28/2016)		

MAJOR TASKS	STATUS	DESCRIPTION
(a) Develop model disaster recovery guidelines, standard recovery times, and priorities for each of the major technology components of the branch.	In Progress – near completion	Members are continuing efforts to gather information on DR definitions, expectations and requirements. The focus has also expanded to include the documentation of applications and services that would require recovery in a DR situation, as well as the underlying technology infrastructure required to facilitate a recovery. A survey to court executives to assess the backup infrastructure and posture currently in place at courts has been distributed. The survey will help substantiate various areas within the DR framework and provide a better gauge of levels of preparedness throughout 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.	In Progress	Work on the document has begun and substantial progress has been made. The document will be a DR plan skeleton, enabling courts to enter pertinent information as it relates to their court and ultimately having a structured and documented DR plan.
(c) Create a plan for providing technology components that could be leveraged by all courts for disaster recovery purposes.	In Progress	As part of the DR framework document, recommended, proven and reference technology components are being identified that courts can purchase or pursue for DR purposes.
(d) Pilot the framework by having one or more courts use it.	Withdrawn	The workstream unanimously agreed to remove this deliverable from the current workstream's scope. Instead, the team recommends that the piloting of the framework be on a volunteer and self-funded basis by any interested courts after the workstream

		<p>has concluded. The results of such would be independently monitored by the volunteer court(s). Thus, the final deliverable of the workstream in its current form would be to create the framework, inclusive of DR guidelines, recommendations and standards. Additionally, a DR plan skeleton document will be included as a deliverable as noted above in (Major Task “B”).</p>
--	--	--

ITAC PROJECT STATUS REPORT

October 2016

Annual Agenda Project 7. Modernize Rules of Court (Phase II)

Summary	Modernize Trial and Appellate Court Rules to Support E-Business
ITAC Resource	Rules & Policy Subcommittee, Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee
Sponsor(s) or Chair(s)	Hon. Peter J. Siggins, Hon. Louis R. Mauro
JCC Resources	Legal Services (Patrick O'Donnell, Tara Lundstrom, Doug Miller), JCIT (Fati Farmanfarmaian, Julie Bagoye), CFCC (Diana Glick)
Project Authorized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Approved (1/11/2016) as part of 2016 Annual Agenda.
Membership Established	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rules & Policy Subcommittee, Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee
Project Active	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Meeting as needed.
Expected Outcomes	1. Rule and/or Legislative Proposal, if appropriate
Expected Completion	December 2018 – and expected to be ongoing

MAJOR TASKS	STATUS	DESCRIPTION
<p>(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).</p> <p>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.</p>	In Progress	<p><u>Rules & Policy Subcommittee (trial court proposals)</u>: Public comments reviewed for three legislative proposals and one rules proposal. RPS presented updated recommendations to ITAC in August. ITAC approved the proposals, as did the JCTC in September. RUPRO considered the rules proposals at their September meeting and will submit them for approval at the Judicial Council October meeting. PCLC will consider the legislative proposals at their October 27 meeting for the Judicial Council approval at its December meeting. Effective January 1 2017, the rules proposal would amend titles 2, 3, and 5 of the California Rules of Court. Effective January 1, 2018, the legislative proposals would amend the Probate Code, the Welfare and Institutions Code, and the Penal Code to facilitate e-filing and e-service in the probate, juvenile, and criminal courts.</p> <p><u>Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee</u>: Following the public comment period, JATS presented its final recommendations regarding the Phase 2 Appellate Rules Modernization proposal (affecting appellate rules and forms) to ITAC at the August 1 meeting, which ITAC approved. The JCTC approved the proposal in August, and RUPRO approved in September. The Judicial Council will consider the proposal at its October 27-28 meeting, with the changes going into effect January 1, 2017, if approved.</p>

ITAC PROJECT STATUS REPORT

October 2016

Annual Agenda Project 8. Standards, Rules and/or Legislation for E-Signatures

Summary	Develop Legislation, Rules, and Standards for Electronic Signatures on Documents Filed by Parties and Attorneys
ITAC Resource	Rules & Policy Subcommittee
Sponsor(s) or Chair(s)	Hon. Peter J. Siggins
JCC Resources	Legal Services (Patrick O'Donnell, Tara Lundstrom), JCIT (Fati Farmanfarmaian)
Project Authorized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Approved (1/11/2016) as part of 2016 Annual Agenda.
Membership Established	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rules & Policy Subcommittee
Project Active	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Meeting as needed.
Expected Outcomes	1. Rule and/or Legislative Proposal, if appropriate 2. Recommendation of Standards for Electronic Signatures (Update to the Trial Court Records Manual)
Expected Completion	December 2018 – Needs correction to December 2017 (Effective Jan 1, 2018)

MAJOR TASKS	STATUS	DESCRIPTION
(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.	In Progress	Public comments have been received and were reviewed by the Rules & Policy Subcommittee (RPS) for a legislative proposal that would authorize <u>electronic signatures</u> on electronically filed documents. At its August 1 meeting, ITAC approved the RPS recommendation that the council amend the Code of Civil Procedure. This proposal was also approved by JCTC and is now being considered by PCLC for Judicial Council's approval at their December meeting (for effective date of January 1, 2018).
(b) Develop standards governing electronic signatures to be included in the "Trial Court Records Manual."	Not Started	CEAC Records Management Subcommittee have primary responsibility for developing the Trial Court Records Manual update.

ITAC PROJECT STATUS REPORT

October 2016

Annual Agenda Project 9. Rules for Remote Access to Court Records by Local Justice Partners

Summary	Develop Rule Proposal to Facilitate Remote Access to Trial Court Records by Local Justice Partners	
ITAC Resource	Rules & Policy Subcommittee	
Sponsor(s) or Chair(s)	Hon. Peter J. Siggins	
JCC Resources	Legal Services (Patrick O'Donnell, TBD), JCIT (Fati Farmanfarmaian)	
Project Authorized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Approved (1/11/2016) as part of 2016 Annual Agenda.	
Membership Established	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rules & Policy Subcommittee	
Project Active	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Expected Outcomes	1. Rule Proposal	
Expected Completion	December 2016 – Will need extension to December 2017 (Effective Jan 1, 2018)	
MAJOR TASKS	STATUS	DESCRIPTION
(a) Amend trial court rules to facilitate remote access to trial court records by local justice partners.	Not Started	

ITAC PROJECT STATUS REPORT

October 2016

Annual Agenda Project 10. Rules for E-Filing

Summary	Evaluate Current E-Filing Laws and Rules, and Recommend Appropriate Changes
ITAC Resource	Rules & Policy Subcommittee
Sponsor(s) or Chair(s)	Hon. Peter J. Siggins
JCC Resources	Legal Services (Patrick O'Donnell, Tara Lundstrom), JCIT (Fati Farmanfarmaian)
Project Authorized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Approved (1/11/2016) as part of 2016 Annual Agenda.
Membership Established	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rules & Policy Subcommittee
Project Active	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Meeting as needed.
Expected Outcomes	1. Legislative and Rule Proposals
Expected Completion	December 2016 – Needs correction to December 2017 (Effective Jan 1, 2018)

MAJOR TASKS	STATUS	DESCRIPTION
(a) Evaluate current e-filing laws, rules, and amendments. Projects may include reviewing statutes and rules governing Electronic Filing Service Providers (EFSP) and filing deadlines.	In Progress	The Rules & Policy Subcommittee (RPS) evaluation of the e-filing laws and rules informed its development of the legislative proposal (below).
(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.).	In Progress	Public comments have been received and were reviewed by RPS for a legislative proposal that would amend the statutes governing e-filing and e-service in the Code of Civil Procedure. At its August 1 meeting, ITAC approved the RPS recommendation that the council amend the Code of Civil Procedure. This proposal was also approved by JCTC and is now being considered by PCLC for Judicial Council's approval at their December meeting (for effective date of January 1, 2018) Rules proposal implementing this legislation and the E-Filing Workstream recommendations will be developed by RPS in 2017.
Note: This effort will be informed by the E-Filing Workstream work.		

ITAC PROJECT STATUS REPORT

October 2016

Annual Agenda Project 11. Privacy Policy

Summary	Develop Branch and Model Court Privacy Policies on Electronic Court Records and Access
ITAC Resource	Rules & Policy Subcommittee
Sponsor(s) or Chair(s)	Hon. Peter J. Siggins
JCC Resources	Legal Services (Patrick O'Donnell, TBD), JCIT (Fati Farmanfarmaian)
Project Authorized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Approved (1/11/2016) as part of 2016 Annual Agenda.
Membership Established	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rules & Policy Subcommittee
Project Active	<input type="checkbox"/>
Expected Outcomes	1. Recommendation of Branch Privacy Policy 2. Recommendation of Model Local Court Privacy Policy
Expected Completion	December 2017

MAJOR TASKS	STATUS	DESCRIPTION
(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.	On Hold	This initiative is currently on hold due to limited resources and competing priorities.
(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.	On Hold	

ITAC PROJECT STATUS REPORT

October 2016

Annual Agenda Project 12. Standards for Electronic Court Records

Summary	Develop Standards for Electronic Court Records Maintained as Data
ITAC Resource	Rules & Policy Subcommittee
Sponsor(s) or Chair(s)	Hon. Peter J. Siggins
JCC Resources	Legal Services (Patrick O'Donnell, TBD), JCIT (Fati Farmanfarmaian, Nicole Rosa)
Project Authorized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Approved (1/11/2016) as part of 2016 Annual Agenda.
Membership Established	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rules & Policy Subcommittee
Project Active	<input type="checkbox"/> Being developed primarily by CEAC. ITAC expects to review in latter part of the year.
Expected Outcomes	1. Recommendation of Standards for Electronic Court Records as Data (Update to the Trial Court Records Manual)
Expected Completion	September 2016

MAJOR TASKS	STATUS	DESCRIPTION
(a) In collaboration with the CMS Data Exchange Workstream, develop standards and proposal to allow trial courts to maintain electronic court records as data in their case management systems.	Not Started	Waiting for CEAC to develop and provide to ITAC for review.
(b) Include standards in update to the Trial Court Records Manual.		

ITAC PROJECT STATUS REPORT

October 2016

Annual Agenda Project 13. Appellate Rules for E-Filing

Summary	Amend Rules to Ensure Consistency with E-Filing Practices of Appellate Courts
ITAC Resource	Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee
Sponsor(s) or Chair(s)	Hon. Louis R. Mauro
JCC Resources	Legal Services (Katherine Sher, Heather Anderson), JCIT (Julie Bagoye)
Project Authorized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Approved (1/11/2016) as part of 2016 Annual Agenda.
Membership Established	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee
Project Active	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meeting as needed.
Expected Outcomes	1. Rule Proposal, as appropriate
Expected Completion	December 2016 (Spring 2016 Rules Cycle)

MAJOR TASKS	STATUS	DESCRIPTION
(a) Review appellate rules and amend as needed to ensure consistency between the rules and current e-filing practices and to consider whether statewide uniformity in those practices would be desirable.	In Progress	Following the public comment period on the JATS proposal to revise the appellate e-filing rules in accordance with current e-filing practices, JATS made its final recommendations to ITAC, which the committee approved at its August 1 meeting. The proposal was approved by the JCTC at its August 8 meeting and by RUPRO at its September 7 meeting. The Judicial Council will consider the proposal at its October 27-28 meeting, with the changes going into effect January 1, 2017, if approved.

ITAC PROJECT STATUS REPORT

October 2016

Annual Agenda Project 14. Consult on Appellate Court Technological Issues

Summary	Consult, as Requested, On Technological Issues Arising In Or Affecting the Appellate Courts
ITAC Resource	Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee
Sponsor(s) or Chair(s)	Hon. Louis R. Mauro
JCC Resources	Legal Services (Katherine Sher, Heather Anderson), JCIT (Julie Bagoye)
Project Authorized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Approved (1/11/2016) as part of 2016 Annual Agenda.
Membership Established	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee
Project Active	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meeting as needed.
Expected Outcomes	1. Recommendations, as needed
Expected Completion	December 2016 (availability as issues arise)

MAJOR TASKS	STATUS	DESCRIPTION
(a) The Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee (JATS) 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. JATS will consult on appellate court technology aspects of issues, as requested.	As Needed	No JATS input has been sought by other advisory bodies thus far in 2016.

ITAC PROJECT STATUS REPORT

October 2016

Annual Agenda Project 15. Tactical Plan for Technology

Summary	Update Tactical Plan for Technology for Effective Date 2017-2018		
ITAC Resource	Workstream		
Sponsor(s) or Chair(s)	Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers	Project Manager	Kathleen Fink
JCC Resources	JCIT (Kathleen Fink, Tony Rochon, Jamel Jones)		
Project Authorized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. Approved (1/11/2016) as part of 2016 Annual Agenda.		
Membership Established	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved by ITAC Chair (5/3/2016) and JCTC (6/3/2016); forwarded to E&P (staff).		
Project Active	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meeting as needed.		
Expected Outcomes	1. Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-2018		
Expected Completion	April 2017 – Request for extension through April 2017		

MAJOR TASKS	STATUS	DESCRIPTION
(a) Review and update the Tactical Plan for Technology.	In Progress	<p>Team held orientation meeting in May; and, finalized a Tactical Plan progress report to date in July.</p> <p>The workstream met several times and used SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) to define judicial branch business drivers. The workstream discussed this analysis with CITMF for input in July; and with CEAC and TCPJAC in August. Input from these meetings has been used in drafting a proposed Tactical Plan for 2017-18.</p> <p>Current Tactical Plan initiatives were also reviewed by the associated workstreams and subcommittees for input on updates.</p>
(b) Circulate for branch and public comment.	Not Started	The first draft of the Tactical Plan for 2017-18 will be reviewed with CITMF, CEAC, TCPJAC and other stakeholders in October 2016, with input incorporated by mid-November. It is anticipated that the draft plan can then be reviewed by ITAC at its December meeting, circulated for public comment in December and January, and submitted to the JCTC and the Judicial Council for approval in April.
(c) Finalize and submit for approval.	Not Started	
Note: Futures Commission outcomes will provide inputs into Strategic and Tactical Plan.		



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date	Action Requested
October 9, 2016	Review and Recommend Revised Guidelines for Reports on Remote Video Proceedings
To	Deadline
Information Technology Advisory Committee	October 14, 2016
From	Contact
Patrick O'Donnell, Principal Managing Attorney, Legal Services	Patrick O'Donnell, 415-865-7665, patrick.o'donnell@jud.ca.gov
Subject	
Revise Guidelines for Semiannual Reports to the Judicial Council on Remote Video Proceedings in Traffic Infraction Cases	

Executive Summary

The Information Technology Advisory Committee should review the draft revised *Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Remote Video Proceedings in Traffic Infraction Cases* and recommend a set of updated guidelines to be approved by the Judicial Council's Technology Committee (JCTC). The revisions to the guidelines are necessary to reflect the amendments to rule 4.220, on remote video proceedings in traffic infraction cases, that became effective September 1, 2015. The draft guidelines are also being reviewed by the Traffic Advisory Committee, which will also make recommendations to JCTC.

Recommendation

The Information Technology Advisory Committee should review the revised draft guidelines for the semiannual reports, determine if any further changes should be made to the guidelines, and recommend a revised set of guidelines to be approved by the Judicial Council's Technology Committee.

Revised Guidelines for Reports on RVP

October 9, 2016

Page 2

Rationale for Recommendation

California Rules of Court, rule 4.220,¹ which authorizes superior courts to establish remote video proceedings (RVP) in traffic infraction cases, was adopted in 2013.² Initially, the RVP project was established on a pilot basis. Also, under the original rule, courts were required to request approval to establish remote video proceedings in traffic. And pilot courts were required to provide semiannual reports to the council that would be of assistance in evaluating RVP pilot projects and developing additional RVP programs in the courts. To assist the pilot courts in preparing their semiannual reports, the council's Technology Committee adopted guidelines entitled *Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Pilot Projects for Remote Video Proceedings*, effective January 28, 2013. (A copy of the original guidelines is included as attachment 1 to this memorandum.)

Last year, the rule was amended in several significant respects.³ The authorization for RVP in traffic infraction cases was made permanent and all references in the rule to pilot projects were eliminated. In addition, under the amended rule, courts are no longer required to seek Judicial Council approval to establish remote video proceedings in traffic. However, courts are still required to prepare provide semiannual reports on their RVP programs to the Judicial Council that include an assessment of the costs and benefits of remote video proceedings at the court. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.220(p).) Accordingly, the guidelines need to be revised to reflect the recent amendments to rule 4.220.

For the committee's review, draft revised guidelines entitled *Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Remote Video Proceedings in Traffic Infraction Cases* has been prepared (A copy of the draft revised guidelines is included as attachment 2 to this memorandum.) The guidelines have been modified to reflect the recent changes in rule 4.220. First, all references to pilot projects have been eliminated. Second, a comment about courts being required to request approval to establish RVP programs has been removed. Third, the revised guidelines provide a more practical and realistic timeline for submitting semiannual reports. Finally, although most of the specific guidelines regarding the required contents and desirable information to be included in the semiannual reports have been retained, the description has been slightly modified to reflect the rule amendments.

The information provided in the semiannual reports will continue to provide basic information about RVP projects as they are established, as well as information about the costs and benefits of

¹ The link to the rule is: [Rule 4.220. Remote video proceedings in traffic infraction cases.](#)

² The Judicial Council report on the adoption of rule 4.220 in 2013 is available at: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20130117-itemG.pdf>.

³ The Judicial Council report on the 2015 amendments to rule 4.220 is available at: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150821-itemA2.pdf>.

Revised Guidelines for Reports on RVP

October 9, 2016

Page 3

these programs. This information will be useful to the Judicial Council in developing rules and policies, and to trial courts planning to establish their own RVP programs. If there is any new or different content or information that the committee thinks should be contained in future reports about RVP programs, the committee should propose including these in the updated guidelines.

Attachments

1. *Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Pilot Projects for Remote Video Proceedings* (the original guidelines adopted effective January 28, 2013)

2. *Draft Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Remote Video Proceedings in Traffic Infraction Cases* (the revised guidelines to be approved in 2016)

Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Pilot Projects for Remote Video Proceedings

Introduction

The authorization to establish a pilot project for remote video proceedings (RVP) is in California Rules of Court, rule 4.220, adopted effective February 1, 2013. With the approval of the Judicial Council, a superior court may, by local rule, establish a pilot project to permit arraignments, trials, and other related proceedings to be conducted by remote two-way video in traffic infraction cases. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.220(a), (b).) Any court that is approved and establishes a pilot project for RVP must provide semiannual reports on the project to the Judicial Council. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.220(p).) These guidelines are intended to assist courts in preparing and submitting reports.

Time of Submission

Reports are due semiannually and should be submitted July 1 and January 1 of each year. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.220(p).)

Place of Submission

The reports should be submitted by e-mail to the Judicial Council's Technology Committee at: rvp@jud.ca.gov

Contents of reports

The reports must contain, at a minimum, the following information:

- The number and types of RVP conducted for arraignments, trials, and other proceedings;
- The locations and facilities used to conduct RVP;
- Details on the type of technology used to conduct RVP;
- The number of appeals from RVP and the outcome of the appeals; and
- The number of cases where the law enforcement officer appeared at court instead of at the remote location with the defendant.

In addition, the semiannual reports should contain any other information that is relevant to evaluating the pilot project and determining whether the pilot project should be continued beyond December 31, 2015, or expanded to other types of cases. This might include:

- How well the existing procedures and forms for RVP have worked and whether any changes are needed in these procedures and forms;
- How the court handled evidence and exhibits at RVP;
- The court's experience with clerk activities at the remote location for RVP;
- Any specific issues relating to the use of non-court facilities to conduct RVP; and
- Any other experiences or issues, such as use of interpreters, encountered by the courts that may be relevant to evaluating the pilot project.

Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Remote Video Proceedings in Traffic Infraction Cases

Introduction

California Rules of Court, rule 4.220 authorizes superior courts, by local rule, to permit arraignments, trials, and other related proceedings to be conducted by remote two-way video in traffic infraction cases. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.220(a), (b).) Each court that adopts a local rule authorizing remote video proceedings (RVP) for traffic infraction cases must notify the Judicial Council, institute procedures for collecting and evaluating information about that court's RVP program, and provide semiannual reports on the program to the Judicial Council that include an assessment of the costs and benefits of remote video proceedings at the court. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.220(p).) These guidelines are intended to assist courts in preparing and submitting reports.

Time of Submission

Reports are due semiannually and should be submitted August 1 (for January – June) and February 1 (for July – December) of each year. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.220(p).)

Place of Submission

The reports should be submitted by e-mail to the Information Technology Committee at: rvp@jud.ca.gov

Contents of reports

The reports must contain, at a minimum, the following information:

- The number and types of RVP conducted for arraignments, trials, and other proceedings;
- The locations and facilities used to conduct RVP;
- Details on the type of technology used to conduct RVP;
- The number of appeals from RVP and the outcome of the appeals; and
- The number of cases where the law enforcement officer appeared at court instead of at the remote location with the defendant.

In addition, the semiannual reports should contain any other information relevant to evaluating the effectiveness of the court's RVP traffic program and determining whether the use of RVP should be expanded to other types of cases. This might include:

- How well the existing procedures and forms for RVP have worked and whether any changes are needed in these procedures and forms;
- How the court handled evidence and exhibits at RVP;
- The court's experience with clerk activities at the remote location for RVP;
- Any specific issues relating to the use of non-court facilities to conduct RVP; and
- Any other experiences or issues, such as use of interpreters, encountered by the courts that may be relevant to evaluating the RVP program.

Project Request Form

ITAC: Judicial Council Forms Modernization



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

This form is used to initiate Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) projects. It should be completed by the requestor, to the extent information is known. It is submitted to itac@jud.ca.gov (or in escalated circumstances, jctc@jud.ca.gov) for processing, which includes review and consideration for inclusion as a committee annual agenda project. Instructions on completing the request are annotated via the **Comments** feature.

1 ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Program Name	Information Technology Advisory Committee	ITAC Request ID	<ITAC assigns>
Request Title	Judicial Council Forms Modernization Project	Other ID	<JCIT assigns>
Category	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Branchwide Technology Program or Solution e.g., to develop a proof of concept, pilot solution, process, or event <input type="checkbox"/> Branchwide Policy, Standard, Guideline, Study, and/or Report e.g., to conduct research, survey, report findings, or define a court best practice <input type="checkbox"/> Rule or Judicial Council Form e.g., to systematically analyze and propose amendments to modernize rules of court		

	Submission Date	Proposed Project Duration	Rationale
Dates	10/3/2016	18 months	Duration is needed to adequately form, study, and recommend solutions for this complex problem.
Project Cycle	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regular (submitted by Sep 30 for inclusion within following year ITAC Annual Agenda) <input type="checkbox"/> Urgent/Escalated (submitted for immediate consideration)		

Request Originator	Judge Robert Freedman and Judge Jackson Lucky	Organization	ITAC
Request Contact	Patrick O'Donnell	Phone	[REDACTED]
		Email	[REDACTED]

Project Request Form

ITAC: Judicial Council Forms Modernization



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2 REQUEST SUMMARY

High-Level Summary	Review and investigate options for modernizing Judicial Council forms to improve their usage and efficiency in the non-paper based, electronic world, thereby providing more benefits to all users (courts, partners, and litigants).
Description Include bulleted list of major activities.	<p>The forms modernization project would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Evaluate Judicial Council form usage (by courts, partners, and litigants) and seek a solution that provides the Judicial Council forms in a modernized format that better aligns with case management system operability and better ensures the courts ability to adhere to quality standards and implement updates without form reengineer. <p><i>Background: With the new case management system (CMS) implementations rapidly deploying, it has come to light that some CMS' (JSI, Thomson Reuter, Tyler) cannot easily integrate the use of outbound court forms using the current JC form PDF state. Instead, the forms must be reengineered (i.e., created in MSWord or used as watermarks with coordinate drawing) for input into these systems. In doing so, this creates a potential issue with the courts ability to ensure form integrity; and could pose problems to timely updating due to implementation overhead.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Address form security issues that have arisen because of the recent availability and use of unlocked Judicial Council forms in place of secure forms for electronically filing documents into the courts, and seek solutions that will ensure the integrity of the forms and preserve the legal content. c) Investigate options for redesigning forms to take advantages of new technologies, such as document assembly technologies that could eliminate problems with attachments. d) Investigate options for developing a standardized data dictionary that would enable "smart forms" to be efficiently electronically filed into all the different new case management systems across the state. e) Explore the creation and use of court generated text-based forms as an alternative to graphic forms. f) Investigate whether to recommend development of a forms repository by which courts, forms publishers, and partners may readily and reliably access forms in alternate formats.
Constraints/ Out-of-Scope	

Project Request Form

ITAC: Judicial Council Forms Modernization



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Project Origin	Check all that apply. <input type="checkbox"/> Carryover/Continued from previous annual agenda <input type="checkbox"/> Specified in the <i>Tactical Plan for Technology</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Project (describe project genesis/origin below)	
Outcomes Include deliverables expected to go to the Judicial Council.	<p>This Workstream will address current problems that are preventing forms from being used fully, effectively, and in a cost efficient manner; and it will propose solutions. The major activities listed above (a.-e.) should result in various specific recommendations to the Judicial Council and the courts to modernize and improve the effectiveness of forms that are filed into, and generated by, the courts. The Workstream should also result in the identification, development and expanded use of new technologies that will make the forms used more flexible and efficient. And the Workstream should (e.g., by initiating the process for creating a data dictionary) reduce the inconsistencies and incompatibilities in the diversified business environment in which forms are presently operating.</p>	
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better ensure form quality and integrity usage across the courts, in alignment with Judicial Council policy. • Ensure that form updates continue to be appropriately maintained. • Increase form data portability. • Better integrate the content of the forms with court case management systems. • Achieve efficiencies and cost savings by adopting standardized approaches to data definitions. 	
Strategic Alignment	<p>NEW ITEM - NOT IN TACTICAL PLAN</p> <p>Although this project is not explicitly outlined in the Tactical Plan, it does, however, indirectly align to and have intersection with the SRL E-Services, E-Filing, and Innovative Services initiatives.</p>	
Potential Funding Sources	<p>Possible funding sources include grants (e.g., from the State Justice Institute) and developing a BCP to fund recommended solutions.</p>	
Criticality	<input type="checkbox"/> High/Priority 1: Must be done (e.g. legal mandate, JCTC/council directive, urgently needed to remedy a problem causing significant cost or inconvenience to courts or the public, other urgency) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium/Priority 2: Provides significant business value or supports non-urgent technology/infrastructure changes <input type="checkbox"/> Low/Priority 3: Nice-to-have enhancements to be addressed time and budget permitting	
Branch Impact Assessment (Collaborations)	Key Leadership Advisory Bodies <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Presiding Justices (APJAC) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Court Executives (CEAC) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trial Court Presiding Judges (TCPJAC) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee	JCC Office <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Center for Children, Families and the Courts (CFCC) <input type="checkbox"/> Education <input type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Services <input type="checkbox"/> Human Resources <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Technology <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Legal Services

Project Request Form

ITAC: Judicial Council Forms Modernization



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

	<input type="checkbox"/> Trial Court Budget (TCBAC) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: Family and Juvenile Law Civil and Small Claims Criminal Law Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/> Office of Governmental Affairs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Criminal Justice Services
	Review Advisory Bodies by Subject Matter to identify other stakeholder groups. <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
Workstream Requested	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, next page included <input type="checkbox"/> No, not included/not requested	
The following is to be completed by ITAC (not the requestor):		
ITAC Disposition	<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Deferred <input type="checkbox"/> Denied	
Assignment	<input type="checkbox"/> Projects Subcmte <input type="checkbox"/> Rules Subcmte <input type="checkbox"/> Joint Appellate Technology <input type="checkbox"/> Workstream, Executive Sponsor: <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
By ITAC Chair		Date

The next step for “accepted” project requests **that are a Branchwide Technology or Solution** (as defined in the **Category** section on page 1) is completion of the Project Assessment Form. Assignment of dispositions of “deferred” or “denied” does not imply unilateral close of a request life cycle; rather, such dispositions are communicated to the Requestor and likely discussed further.

3 WORKSTREAM REQUEST

Include the remainder of this form only if a workstream would assist with this project. **Provide as much information as possible**; note that some details may change during the review and assessment of this request.

Workstream ¹	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, this project would benefit from a workstream.
Scope of Workstream	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project and Workstream scopes are the same (see Page 2). <input type="checkbox"/> Workstream scope is limited/different (please explain):
Tracks	<input type="checkbox"/> One track <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple tracks (list track name and objective for each):

¹ Workstreams are *ad hoc* teams formed to address well-defined, tightly scoped, and discrete subprojects to meet the short-term critical technology needs for the branch. Workstreams are a set of distinct court-driven initiatives of a technology project, using a community-style model that executes projects using experts from all appropriate areas of the judicial branch—including trial courts, appellate courts, the Judicial Council, and partners—to lead, participate in, and be accountable for project completion. A workstream’s Executive Sponsor, Project Manager and membership are appointed by the ITAC Chair.

Project Request Form

ITAC: Judicial Council Forms Modernization



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

	Given the scope it is likely that multiple tracks will be desired; however, that would be determined at the onset or via the initial formation of the workstream.		
Specific Outcome or Deliverable	Please refer to the outcomes previously stated.		
Workstream Staffing Checklist			
Role	Needed?	Description, including number of resources needed	Request JCC to staff this role?
Executive Sponsor*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Judge Jackson Lucky and Judge Robert Freedman	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Manager(s)*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Analyst	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Administrative Support*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Subject Matter Experts (SMEs)			
Technical	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Web based forms SME	<input type="checkbox"/>
Business	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Court Operations SME	<input type="checkbox"/>
Legal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	JC Forms SME	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Camilla Kieliger
Justice Partner Liaison	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Workstream Members	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Various on-going CMS Implementation user group representatives/liaisons	<input type="checkbox"/>

* These roles must be filled for workstreams.

Project Request Form

ITAC: Next Generation Infrastructure & Support



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

This form is used to initiate Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) projects. It should be completed by the requestor, to the extent information is known. It is submitted to itac@jud.ca.gov (or in escalated circumstances, jetc@jud.ca.gov) for processing, which includes review and consideration for inclusion as a committee annual agenda project. Instructions on completing the request are annotated via the **Comments** feature.

1 ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Program Name	Information Technology Advisory Committee	ITAC Request ID	<ITAC assigns>
Request Title	Next Generation Infrastructure and Support	Other ID	<JCIT assigns>
Category	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Branchwide Technology Program or Solution e.g., to develop a proof of concept, pilot solution, process, or event <input type="checkbox"/> Branchwide Policy, Standard, Guideline, Study, and/or Report e.g., to conduct research, survey, report findings, or define a court best practice <input type="checkbox"/> Rule or Judicial Council Form e.g., to systematically analyze and propose amendments to modernize rules of court		

Dates	Submission Date	Proposed Project Duration	Rationale
	9/21/2016	2017 and on	
Project Cycle	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regular (submitted by Sep 30 for inclusion within following year ITAC Annual Agenda) <input type="checkbox"/> Urgent/Escalated (submitted for immediate consideration)		

Request Originator	San Joaquin County	Organization	IT
Request Contact	Name	Phone	Email
	Anh Tran	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Project Request Form

ITAC: Next Generation Infrastructure & Support



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2 REQUEST SUMMARY

High-Level Summary	Next Generation Infrastructure and In-sourcing Support for courts.
Description Include bulleted list of major activities.	<p>Please refer to attached slides.</p> <p>This proposal is to request that the branch explore developing a framework that would leverage existing technical network and infrastructure support resources across the courts in a manner that is virtualized, optimizes technical expertise, and minimizes the court costs incurred for these services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Review cost and potential ROI (b) Develop architecture and support model (c) Review models and decision for implementation w/ location choices for beta (d) Evaluate beta results and decision for implementation going forward
Constraints/ Out-of-Scope	
Project Origin	<p>Check all that apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Carryover/Continued from previous annual agenda <input type="checkbox"/> Specified in the <i>Tactical Plan for Technology</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Project (describe project genesis/origin below) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) High cost of maintaining a network architecture across CA (b) Vendor centric Support model (c) Inconsistent Support model across CA <p>Please refer to "Problem" slide.</p>
Outcomes Include deliverables expected to go to the Judicial Council.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Disaggregation of hardware and software for networking stack (b) Increase hardware life cycle (life cycle strictly based on the performance limitation) (c) Services and features are only dependent upon the software (d) Use of existing open source tools for automation (e) In-source Support (f) Review cost and potential ROI (g) Review models and decision for implementation w/ location choices for beta (h) Evaluate beta results and decision for implementation going forward
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Reduce Total Cost Ownership – cost savings (b) Enable next generation architecture (c) Enable the next wave of scale, collaboration and innovation (d) Enhance smaller court support and minimize single person liabilities within individual counties
Strategic Alignment	<p>Goal 3: Optimize Infrastructure</p> <p>This aligns to the above strategic goal.</p>
Potential Funding Sources	
Criticality	<p><input type="checkbox"/> High/Priority 1: Must be done (e.g. legal mandate, JCTC/council directive, urgently needed to remedy a problem causing significant cost or inconvenience to</p>

Project Request Form

ITAC: Next Generation Infrastructure & Support



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

	courts or the public, other urgency) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium/Priority 2: Provides significant business value or supports non-urgent technology/infrastructure changes <input type="checkbox"/> Low/Priority 3: Nice-to-have enhancements to be addressed time and budget permitting	
Branch Impact Assessment (Collaborations)	Key Leadership Advisory Bodies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Administrative Presiding Justices (APJAC) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Court Executives (CEAC) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trial Court Presiding Judges (TCPJAC) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trial Court Budget (TCBAC) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	JCC Office <input type="checkbox"/> Center for Children, Families and the Courts (CFCC) <input type="checkbox"/> Education <input type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Services <input type="checkbox"/> Human Resources <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Technology <input type="checkbox"/> Legal Services <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Governmental Affairs <input type="checkbox"/> Other:
	Review Advisory Bodies by Subject Matter to identify other stakeholder groups. <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
Workstream Requested	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, next page included <input type="checkbox"/> No, not included/not requested	
The following is to be completed by ITAC (not the requestor):		
ITAC Disposition	<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Deferred <input type="checkbox"/> Denied	
Assignment	<input type="checkbox"/> Projects Subcmte <input type="checkbox"/> Rules Subcmte <input type="checkbox"/> Joint Appellate Technology <input type="checkbox"/> Workstream, Executive Sponsor: <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
By ITAC Chair	<input type="text"/>	Date <input type="text"/>

The next step for “accepted” project requests **that are a Branchwide Technology or Solution** (as defined in the **Category** section on page 1) is completion of the Project Assessment Form. Assignment of dispositions of “deferred” or “denied” does not imply unilateral close of a request life cycle; rather, such dispositions are communicated to the Requestor and likely discussed further.

3 WORKSTREAM REQUEST

Include the remainder of this form only if a workstream would assist with this project. **Provide as much information as possible**; note that some details may change during the review and assessment of this request.

Project Request Form

ITAC: Next Generation Infrastructure & Support



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Workstream ¹	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, this project would benefit from a workstream.		
Scope of Workstream	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project and Workstream scopes are the same (see Page 2). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Workstream scope is limited/different (please explain):		
Tracks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> One track <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple tracks (list track name and objective for each):		
Specific Outcome or Deliverable			
Workstream Staffing Checklist			
Role	Needed?	Description, including number of resources needed	Request JCC to staff this role?
Executive Sponsor*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TBD	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Manager(s)*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TBD	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Analyst	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TBD	<input type="checkbox"/>
Administrative Support*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TBD	<input type="checkbox"/>
Subject Matter Experts (SMEs)			
Technical	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Business	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Legal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Justice Partner Liaison	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Workstream Members	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

* These roles must be filled for workstreams.

¹ Workstreams are *ad hoc* teams formed to address well-defined, tightly scoped, and discrete subprojects to meet the short-term critical technology needs for the branch. Workstreams are a set of distinct court-driven initiatives of a technology project, using a community-style model that executes projects using experts from all appropriate areas of the judicial branch—including trial courts, appellate courts, the Judicial Council, and partners—to lead, participate in, and be accountable for project completion. A workstream's Executive Sponsor, Project Manager and membership are appointed by the ITAC Chair.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN

Next Generation Court Networks
and Support Models

Overview

- Problem
- Solution
- Benefits

Problem

- High cost of maintaining a network architecture across CA
 - Cisco based hardware CAPEX is high
 - Cisco based support OPEX is high
 - Fast life cycle of aggregated hardware/software equipment
- Vendor centric support model
 - Services contract for mgmt services
 - Services contract for deployment services
 - Services contract for RMA services
 - Dependency to vendors for foreseeable future
- Inconsistent Support model across CA
 - Larger courts have \$ and support
 - Smaller courts are at the mercy of vendors
 - How do we provide smaller courts with services, access to skillsets and operation model?

Solution

- Disaggregation of hardware and software for networking stack
 - Bare metal equipment
 - Penguin Computing - <http://www.penguincomputing.com/>
 - IWNnetworks - <http://www.iwnetworks.com/main/>
 - Edge-Core - <http://www.edge-core.com/>
 - Quanta Cloud Technology - <http://www.quantaqct.com/>
 - Etc.
 - Software to manage bare metal equipment
 - Cumulus Linux - <http://www.cumulusnetworks.com/>
 - Big Switch - <http://www.bigswitch.com/>
 - Pica8 - <http://www.pica8.com/>
 - Etc.
- Increase hardware life cycle (life cycle strictly based on the performance limitation)
- Services and features are only dependent upon the software
- Use of existing open source tools for automation
- In-source Support
 - Use existing resources across the courts and JCC
 - Develop new Operations Support' model

Benefits

- Reduce Total Cost Ownership
 - Comparisons have TCO reduction of conservatively >50%
- Automate using existing open source tools
 - Increase operational efficiency
 - Improve Change Mgmt process
- Enable next generation architecture
- Enable the next wave of scale, collaboration and innovation
- Simplify orchestration, automation and monitoring of networks
- Consolidation of network administration with Linux system administrator skillset
- Enhance smaller court support and minimize single person liabilities within individual counties

Assumptions

- In-sourcing of support and network management
 - Incremental increase due to the fact that resources are already required for day to day task/activities.
 - Centralized (focused) escalation support
 - Co-operative support model across court personnel
- Linux Administration will be a required skillset going forward

Project Request Form

ITAC: Transcript Assembly Platform



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

This form is used to initiate Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) projects. It should be completed by the requestor, to the extent information is known. It is submitted to itac@jud.ca.gov (or in escalated circumstances, jetc@jud.ca.gov) for processing, which includes review and consideration for inclusion as a committee annual agenda project. Instructions on completing the request are annotated via the **Comments** feature.

1 ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Program Name	Information Technology Advisory Committee	ITAC Request ID	<ITAC assigns>
Request Title	Transcript Assembly Platform	Other ID	<JCIT assigns>
Category	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Branchwide Technology Program or Solution e.g., to develop a proof of concept, pilot solution, process, or event <input type="checkbox"/> Branchwide Policy, Standard, Guideline, Study, and/or Report e.g., to conduct research, survey, report findings, or define a court best practice <input type="checkbox"/> Rule or Judicial Council Form e.g., to systematically analyze and propose amendments to modernize rules of court		

	Submission Date	Proposed Project Duration	Rationale
Dates	9/8/2016	6-9 months	
Project Cycle	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regular (submitted by Sep 30 for inclusion within following year ITAC Annual Agenda) <input type="checkbox"/> Urgent/Escalated (submitted for immediate consideration)		

Request Originator	5DCA (Brian Cotta)	Organization	5DCA
Request Contact	Brian Cotta	Phone	
		Email	

Project Request Form

ITAC: Transcript Assembly Platform



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2 REQUEST SUMMARY

High-Level Summary	Adoption and Deployment of the Transcript Assembly Platform in all superior courts / appellate districts. This project is not expected to be a drain on ITAC or JCC-IT resources. It packs big value in a small footprint. As proposed to be delivered via SaaS, it should be easily repeated and agile for all CA courts.
Description Include bulleted list of major activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Finish overall SaaS design with manufacturer. (b) Establish engagement between superior courts and appellate courts in order to prepare for the transmission and receiving ends of electronic clerk's transcripts. (c) Establish aggressively discounted pricing (MC/MA) with the TAP SaaS manufacturer and provider (DocuWare / Ricoh). (d) Onboard each superior court, by district.
Constraints/ Out-of-Scope	
Project Origin	<p>Check all that apply.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Carryover/Continued from previous annual agenda</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Specified in the <i>Tactical Plan for Technology</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Project (describe project genesis/origin below)</p> <p>NOTE: Project was also submitted to be added to the revised Tactical Plan.</p> <p>A product called Transcript Assembly Program (TAP) was developed through the efforts of the Court of Appeal, Fifth District and the Fresno Superior Court – which was and still is a huge success. It was acknowledged by a Kleps Award. TAP simplifies and automates the difficult and error-prone task (creation) of an electronic clerk's transcript that the trial courts submit to the courts of appeal. The TAP program was originally built as a side application upon a heavy document management software system/application called Fortis, which required professional implementation. The original CAPEX purchase of the development, software implementation and scanners for the trial courts within the Fifth Appellate District were funded by a grant. There has been strong interest by <u>many</u> superior courts to get TAP and interest from appellate courts in respect to receiving the record electronically, however, their interest declines once they recognize what is involved with the existing product and what server/desktop/software components are necessary in order to make it usable. In other words, the application is not portable. TAP can be used by paper-based courts or by superior courts that already have electronic records. The proposed project is to continue working with the existing manufacturer to enhance and reengineer the "TAP" product to be a web/cloud based system (100% SaaS). This would ideally negate large CAPEX investments, allow the solution to be used and easily implemented by any court (small, medium and large) and not require local IT support, beyond the support that is needed for accessing the Internet and a desktop or production scanner(s). Being a proposed SaaS offering, the application and software stack(s) behind the scenes would naturally be kept current with the latest technologies. Additionally, the project would include onboarding each superior court onto the TAP solution and begin transmitting electronic clerk's transcripts to their respective appellate court and/or the Supreme Court for DP/special cases. Lastly, depending upon</p>

Project Request Form

ITAC: Transcript Assembly Platform



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

	ITAC's recommendation, a possible branch-wide contract or agreement with the manufacturer could be established to lock-in pricing at an aggressive and discounted rate due to the increase in customer volume. No comparable COTS products exist today that we are aware of.	
Outcomes Include deliverables expected to go to the Judicial Council.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> All superior courts will be submitting clerk's transcripts to the appellate/supreme court(s). Evidence of cost savings – no copying, printing, toner/ink or shipping costs for the compilation of clerk's transcripts in each superior court. 	
Benefits	With TAP, the superior courts benefit from a significant reduction in the time it takes to compile a clerk's transcript and reduction of errors that can easily be made upon doing so, in addition to no longer paying shipping costs or physically handling boxes of paper. The appellate courts benefit from receiving the clerk's transcripts electronically and allowing them to be easily searched through and/or attached to their case management system (ACCMS) for immediate and future access. Additionally, it eliminates the need to store the boxes of paper (clerk's transcripts) at each appellate court.	
Strategic Alignment	Goal 1: Promote the Digital Court: Identify and encourage projects that provide innovative services	
Potential Funding Sources	Potentially the Innovations Grant. Otherwise, funding is recommended through each superior court for the SaaS annual subscription/fee to use the system. Based on existing and affordable costs that superior courts are paying for TAP within the 5 th Appellate District, we believe that other superior courts will welcome the efficiencies, technology and the small annual cost that comes with it.	
Criticality	<input type="checkbox"/> High/Priority 1: Must be done (e.g. legal mandate, JCTC/council directive, urgently needed to remedy a problem causing significant cost or inconvenience to courts or the public, other urgency) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium/Priority 2: Provides significant business value or supports non-urgent technology/infrastructure changes <input type="checkbox"/> Low/Priority 3: Nice-to-have enhancements to be addressed time and budget permitting	
Branch Impact Assessment (Collaborations)	Key Leadership Advisory Bodies <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Presiding Justices (APJAC) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Court Executives (CEAC) <input type="checkbox"/> Trial Court Presiding Judges (TCPJAC) <input type="checkbox"/> TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee <input type="checkbox"/> Trial Court Budget (TCBAC) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	JCC Office <input type="checkbox"/> Center for Children, Families and the Courts (CFCC) <input type="checkbox"/> Education <input type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Services <input type="checkbox"/> Human Resources <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Technology <input type="checkbox"/> Legal Services <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Governmental Affairs <input type="checkbox"/> Other:
	Review Advisory Bodies by Subject Matter to identify other stakeholder groups. <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
Workstream Requested	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, next page included <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, not included/not requested	

Project Request Form

ITAC: Transcript Assembly Platform



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following is to be completed by ITAC (not the requestor):			
ITAC Disposition	<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	<input type="checkbox"/> Deferred	<input type="checkbox"/> Denied
Assignment	<input type="checkbox"/> Projects Subcmte	<input type="checkbox"/> Rules Subcmte	<input type="checkbox"/> Joint Appellate Technology
	<input type="checkbox"/> Workstream, Executive Sponsor:		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:		
By ITAC Chair			Date <input type="text"/>

The next step for “accepted” project requests **that are a Branchwide Technology or Solution** (as defined in the **Category** section on page 1) is completion of the Project Assessment Form. Assignment of dispositions of “deferred” or “denied” does not imply unilateral close of a request life cycle; rather, such dispositions are communicated to the Requestor and likely discussed further.

3 WORKSTREAM REQUEST

Include the remainder of this form only if a workstream would assist with this project. **Provide as much information as possible**; note that some details may change during the review and assessment of this request.

Workstream ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, this project would benefit from a workstream.		
Scope of Workstream	<input type="checkbox"/> Project and Workstream scopes are the same (see Page 2). <input type="checkbox"/> Workstream scope is limited/different (please explain):		
Tracks	<input type="checkbox"/> One track <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple tracks (list track name and objective for each):		
Specific Outcome or Deliverable			
Workstream Staffing Checklist			
Role	Needed?	Description, including number of resources needed	Request JCC to staff this role?
Executive Sponsor*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	n/a	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Manager(s)*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	n/a	<input type="checkbox"/>

¹ Workstreams are *ad hoc* teams formed to address well-defined, tightly scoped, and discrete subprojects to meet the short-term critical technology needs for the branch. Workstreams are a set of distinct court-driven initiatives of a technology project, using a community-style model that executes projects using experts from all appropriate areas of the judicial branch—including trial courts, appellate courts, the Judicial Council, and partners—to lead, participate in, and be accountable for project completion. A workstream’s Executive Sponsor, Project Manager and membership are appointed by the ITAC Chair.

Project Request Form

ITAC: Transcript Assembly Platform



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Project Analyst	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Administrative Support*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Subject Matter Experts (SMEs)			
Technical	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Business	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Legal	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Justice Partner Liaison	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Workstream Members	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

* These roles must be filled for workstreams.

Project Request Form

ITAC: CMS Data Exchange / Phase II



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

This form is used to initiate Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) projects. It should be completed by the requestor, to the extent information is known. It is submitted to itac@jud.ca.gov (or in escalated circumstances, jctc@jud.ca.gov) for processing, which includes review and consideration for inclusion as a committee annual agenda project. Instructions on completing the request are annotated via the **Comments** feature.

1 ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Program Name	Information Technology Advisory Committee	ITAC Request ID	<ITAC assigns>
Request Title	CMS Data Exchanges / Phase II – Maintenance Effort	Other ID	<JCIT assigns>
Category	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Branchwide Technology Program or Solution e.g., to develop a proof of concept, pilot solution, process, or event <input type="checkbox"/> Branchwide Policy, Standard, Guideline, Study, and/or Report e.g., to conduct research, survey, report findings, or define a court best practice <input type="checkbox"/> Rule or Judicial Council Form e.g., to systematically analyze and propose amendments to modernize rules of court		

	Submission Date	Proposed Project Duration	Rationale
Dates	9/27/2016	2017 -Ongoing	Operations function required to maintain the exchanges.
Project Cycle	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regular (submitted by Sep 30 for inclusion within following year ITAC Annual Agenda) <input type="checkbox"/> Urgent/Escalated (submitted for immediate consideration)		

Request Originator	David Yamasaki	Organization	Santa Clara Superior Court
	Name	Phone	Email
Request Contact	David Yamasaki	██████████	██████████

Project Request Form

ITAC: CMS Data Exchange / Phase II



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2 REQUEST SUMMARY

High-Level Summary	Ph II: Implement the DX Exchanges Governance Plan & Repository Maintenance Policy with Critical Justice Partners
Description Include bulleted list of major activities.	<p>(a) Initiate Phase II of the governance and maintenance effort and establish the new governance entity;</p> <p>(b) Implement the governance model (expected to be approved in December 2016) for managing the use, ongoing support, addition, and modification of data exchanges, which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Promote the single data exchange standard established between each justice partner and the judicial branch to use as a development target for case management system vendors and default for local data exchanges; ○ Provide the continued support of a lead court as a point of contact for all case management system vendors and justice partners for each justice partner exchange; ○ Continue to collect the required documentation to support exchange development, and track the current implementation status of each exchange by each vendor; ○ Establish a formal process and brokerage for acceptance of standard exchanges, updates, and modifications; ○ Finalize the “goal state” for the long-term data exchange standards; ○ Maintain the repository of required materials that support the development of standardized exchanges.
Constraints/ Out-of-Scope	TBD – based on governance plan expected to be approved December 2016.
Project Origin	<p>Check all that apply.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carryover/Continued from previous annual agenda</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Specified in the <i>Tactical Plan for Technology</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> New Project (describe project genesis/origin below)</p> <p>Note: This project request represents a new phase of this effort. The first phase is expected to conclude in December 2016.</p>
Outcomes Include deliverables expected to go to the Judicial Council.	This phase of the project is not expected to have additional outcomes to present to the Judicial Council Technology Committee, unless there are substantive changes to previously approved deliverables (e.g., technical standards, governance plan).
Benefits	<p>a) Provides a foundation for future mandates and improvements;</p> <p>b) Provides statewide comprehensive and time sensitive communication strategy and mechanism to update all parties involved in standards, DX implementations, technical improvements, relationships, policies and guidelines;</p> <p>c) Maintains the long term consistency and oversight of data exchanges;</p>

Project Request Form

ITAC: CMS Data Exchange / Phase II



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

	d) Increase accuracy and currency of the information shared.	
Strategic Alignment	Goal 1: Promote the Digital Court: Develop standard CMS interfaces and data exchanges	
Potential Funding Sources	N/A	
Criticality	<input type="checkbox"/> High/Priority 1: Must be done (e.g. legal mandate, JCTC/council directive, urgently needed to remedy a problem causing significant cost or inconvenience to courts or the public, other urgency) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium/Priority 2: Provides significant business value or supports non-urgent technology/infrastructure changes <input type="checkbox"/> Low/Priority 3: Nice-to-have enhancements to be addressed time and budget permitting	
Branch Impact Assessment (Collaborations)	Key Leadership Advisory Bodies <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Presiding Justices (APJAC) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Court Executives (CEAC) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trial Court Presiding Judges (TCPJAC) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee <input type="checkbox"/> Trial Court Budget (TCBAC) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	JCC Office <input type="checkbox"/> Center for Children, Families and the Courts (CFCC) <input type="checkbox"/> Education <input type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Services <input type="checkbox"/> Human Resources <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Technology <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Legal Services <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Governmental Affairs <input type="checkbox"/> Other:
	Review Advisory Bodies by Subject Matter to identify other stakeholder groups. <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
Workstream Requested	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, next page included <input type="checkbox"/> No, not included/not requested Note: This project requests an operational entity that consists of the existing justice partner, vendor, and CIO participants (which a workstream model permits), but that will be ongoing (as in a subcommittee model). Thus, request advisement as to the most appropriate model to use to support this request. See workstream section for support necessary.	
The following is to be completed by ITAC (not the requestor):		
ITAC Disposition	<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Deferred <input type="checkbox"/> Denied	
Assignment	<input type="checkbox"/> Projects Subcmte <input type="checkbox"/> Rules Subcmte <input type="checkbox"/> Joint Appellate Technology <input type="checkbox"/> Workstream, Executive Sponsor: <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
By ITAC Chair		Date

The next step for “accepted” project requests **that are a Branchwide Technology or Solution** (as defined in the **Category** section on page 1) is completion of the Project Assessment Form. Assignment of dispositions of

Project Request Form

ITAC: CMS Data Exchange / Phase II



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

“deferred” or “denied” does not imply unilateral close of a request life cycle; rather, such dispositions are communicated to the Requestor and likely discussed further.

3 WORKSTREAM REQUEST

Include the remainder of this form only if a workstream would assist with this project. **Provide as much information as possible**; note that some details may change during the review and assessment of this request.

Workstream ¹	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, this project would benefit from a workstream. Or other appropriate ongoing entity.		
Scope of Workstream	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project and Workstream scopes are the same (see Page 2). <input type="checkbox"/> Workstream scope is limited/different (please explain):		
Tracks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> One track <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple tracks (list track name and objective for each):		
Specific Outcome or Deliverable			
Workstream Staffing Checklist			
Role	Needed?	Description, including number of resources needed	Request JCC to staff this role?
Executive Sponsor*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	One resource, Court CEO (appointed by ITAC Chair)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Manager(s)*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	One resource, Court CIO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Analyst	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Administrative Support*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	One resource, JCC I.T. Staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Subject Matter Experts (SMEs)			
Technical	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Business	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Legal	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

¹ Workstreams are *ad hoc* teams formed to address well-defined, tightly scoped, and discrete subprojects to meet the short-term critical technology needs for the branch. Workstreams are a set of distinct court-driven initiatives of a technology project, using a community-style model that executes projects using experts from all appropriate areas of the judicial branch—including trial courts, appellate courts, the Judicial Council, and partners—to lead, participate in, and be accountable for project completion. A workstream’s Executive Sponsor, Project Manager and membership are appointed by the ITAC Chair.

Project Request Form

ITAC: CMS Data Exchange / Phase II



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Justice Partner Liaison	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vendor Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 vendor resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Court Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11 court resources, CIOs	<input type="checkbox"/>

* These roles must be filled for workstreams.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF CLOSED MEETING

June 17, 2016
11:10 AM - Noon

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair; Hon. Robert B. Freedman, Vice Chair; 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; Hon. Louis R. Mauro; Mr. Terry McNally; Hon. James Mize; Mr. Snorri Ogata; Mr. Robert Oyung; Hon. Alan G. Perkins; Hon. Peter J. Siggins; Mr. Don Willenburg; Mr. David H. Yamasaki

Advisory Body Members Absent: Ms. Alison Merrilees for Hon. Mark Stone; Mr. Darrel Parker; Hon. Joseph Wiseman

Others Present: Hon. Daniel J. Buckley; Mr. Mark Dusman; Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic Ms. Renea Stewart; Mr. Mike Planet; Ms. Kathy Fink; Ms. Fati Farmanfarmaian; Ms. Jamel Jones; Mr. Patrick O'Donnell; Ms. Tara Lundstrom; Ms. Katherine Sher; Ms. Jessica Craven; Ms. Jackie Woods

CLOSED SESSION

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 11:10 AM, and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the December 4, 2015, Information Technology Advisory Committee meeting.

Item 1

Judicial Council Technology Committee Update (JCTC)

Provide report on activities and news coming from this oversight committee.

Update: Hon. Marsha Slough provided an update on JCTC activities. JCTC is working on the CMS replacement options for V3 and Sustain courts with a glide path off state funding. There will be additional funding in the new budget and having a plan in place has been key to successful funding. Hoping to build on momentum for the RFP for Sustain courts, 20 vendors attended the RFP bidder's conference and 3 vendors' submitted proposals. Six of the Sustain courts will be hosted by Placer court. Proposal presented at the Judicial Council June meeting. Future BCPs were discussed, those not branchwide were eliminated at this time. Focus is on

initiatives. June 23, JCTC will complete ranking on BCP concepts then send to Chief for ranking. Trial courts received a request for the VRI pilot project for the Language Access Plan. JCTC is also looking forward to the e-filing proposals being presented to the Judicial Council.

Item 2

Branch Update

Provide report on the status of the branch and its budget, along with any technology-related discussions with the Department of Finance and/or with Legislators.

Update: Mr. Mark Dusman invited Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Finance Director to provide an update on the budget. Some other proposals included in the final budget are: \$25 million innovation grants for the courts, grants awarded within the branch and includes trial, Supreme Court and COA; includes \$7 million for language access, convinced legislature that in person isn't the only method; trial court operations of \$20 million and preceding access; Prop 47 funding \$3.2 million information system control enhancements; funding Phoenix from general fund \$8.7 million shift from IMF to general fund, which will provide fiscal stability to the IMF; and CMS glide path off state funding from IMF, once courts have transitioned this will provide greater relief for IMF for future years.

Non technology issues, the administration was pushing sending out budget memo to the branch.

Item 3

Futures Commission Update

Provide a report on activities and news coming from the Futures Commission.

Update: Mr. Mike Planet, CEO Ventura Superior Court provided an update. This is a spin off from fiscal court workgroup and membership includes judges, court officers, and outside court individuals. Meetings have included leaders in technology. They visited Las Vegas court to view audio visual technologies. Next steps include: creating concept papers to give to Judicial Council; providing a timely and cost effective record in all case types; creating a comprehensive digital record (word, video, and audio); leveraging technology to provide access to all court users and use of technology for remote access; and finally creating a judicial branch technology lab. Drafts will be out later this summer.

Item 4

Key Statewide Technology Initiatives Update

Provide report on the status of key branch/enterprise technology initiatives.

Action: Ms. Renea Stewart provided an update on key statewide initiatives: Appellate E-Filing, Appellate Document Management, CMS replacement BCPs for V3 and

Sustain, Expansion of LAN/WAN, and System upgrades for Appellate Court Case Management (ACCMS) and California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR). Please see slides for further details.

Item 5**Liaison Reports**

Reports from members appointed as liaisons to/from other advisory bodies.

Update: Hon. Alan Perkins provided an update on the Criminal Law Advisory Committee (CLAC). There will be a demonstration of criminal law e-filing at their next meeting. He has offered to work with CLAC to get Sacramento Superior Court to show CLAC their system. Riverside is also active and Alameda is going live right now. Judge Robert Freedman will follow up with Judge Perkins on a Sacramento demonstration of their e-filing.

Hon. Robert Freedman advised the next Civil and Small claims meeting is June 28. Waiting for items out for public comment.

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.

 Judicial Council Information Technology Advisory Committee Roster

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

*Co-Sponsor, E-Filing Strategy Workstream
Liaison, Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee*

Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Vice-Chair

Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal,
Third Appellate District

*Chair, Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee
Liaison, Appellate Advisory Committee*

Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers

Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal,
First Appellate District

*Sponsor, Video Remote Interpreting Workstream
Sponsor, Tactical Plan Workstream*

Mr. Brian Cotta

Assistant Clerk/Administrator
Court of Appeal, Fifth District

*Co-Sponsor and Project Manager,
Disaster Recovery Framework Workstream
Co-Sponsor, Next Generation Hosting Strategy Workstream*

Hon. Julie R. Culver

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Monterey

Liaison, CJER (Education) Governing Committee

Hon. Robert B. Freedman

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

*Chair, Projects Subcommittee
Co-Sponsor, Self-Represented Litigants E-Services
Workstream
Lead, Governance Track of the CMS Data Exchange
Workstream*

Ms. Alexandra Grimwade

Court Information Officer,
Twentieth Century Fox Television

New Member (9/15/2016)

Hon. Michael S. Groch

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

Hon. Samantha P. Jessner

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Liaison, Civil Jury Instructions Advisory Committee

Hon. Jackson Lucky

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Riverside

Co-Sponsor, Next Generation Hosting Strategy Workstream

Hon. Kimberly Menninger

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

New Member (9/15/2016)

Hon. James M. Mize

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Sacramento

*Co-Sponsor, Self-Represented Litigants E-Services
Workstream*

Liaison, Advisory Committee on Providing Access & Fairness

Mr. Terry McNally

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Kern

Mr. Snorri Ogata

Chief Information Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Project Manager, E-Filing Strategy Workstream

Mr. Robert Oyung

Chief Technology Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara

Co-Sponsor, E-Filing Strategy Workstream

Mr. Darrel E. Parker

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Barbara

 Judicial Council Information Technology Advisory Committee Roster

Hon. Alan G. Perkins

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Sacramento

*Liaison, Criminal Law Advisory Committee
Co-Sponsor, Disaster Recovery Framework Workstream*

Hon. Peter J. Siggins

Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
First Appellate District, Division Three

Chair, Rules & Policy Subcommittee

Hon. Mark Stone

Member, California State Assembly

Mr. Don Willenburg

Partner, Gordon & Rees LLP
San Francisco

Mr. David H. Yamasaki

Chief Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara

*Sponsor, CMS Data Exchange Workstream
Liaison, Court Executives Advisory Committee*

COMMITTEE STAFF**Ms. Jamel Jones (Principal)**

Information Technology
Judicial Council of California

Mr. Patrick O'Donnell (Legal)

Legal Services
Judicial Council of California

Ms. Jackie Woods

Information Technology
Judicial Council of California

Appointments from other Advisory Bodies

**TRIAL COURT PRESIDING JUDGES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE LIAISON**

Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

CJER GOVERNING COMMITTEE LIAISON**Hon. Jackson Lucky**

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Riverside

TRIBAL COURT COMMITTEE LIAISON**Hon. Joseph J. Wiseman**

Chief Judge of the Dry Creek Rancheria Band
of Pomo Indians

AND

Chief Judge of the Northern California Intertribal
Court System

**COURT EXECUTIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
LIAISON****Mr. David H. Yamasaki**

Chief Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara

**TRAFFIC GOVERNING COMMITTEE LIAISON
(vacant)****CIVIL AND SMALL CLAIMS****ADVISORY COMMITTEE LIAISON (vacant)****CALIFORNIA STATE SENATE MEMBER
(vacant)**