



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

December 2, 2016

10:00 A.M.

Judicial Council of California Conference Center Boardroom, San Francisco

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair; Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Vice Chair; Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers; Mr. Brian Cotta; Hon. Julie R. Culver; Hon. Robert B. Freedman; Ms. Alexandra Grimwade; Hon. Michael S. Groch; Hon. Jackson Lucky; Mr. Terry McNally; Hon. Kimberly Menninger; Ms. Allison Merrilees in for Hon. Mark Stone; Hon. James Mize; Mr. Snorri Ogata; Mr. Hon. Alan G. Perkins; Hon. Peter J. Siggins; Mr. Don Willenburg; Mr. David H. Yamasaki

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Hon. Samantha P. Jessner; Mr. Darrel Parker; Hon. Joseph Wiseman

**Others Present:** Mr. Robert Oyung; Mr. Jake Chatters; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Ms. Kathy Fink; Ms. Jamel Jones; Mr. Patrick O'Donnell; Ms. Andrea Jaramillo; Ms. Fati Farmanfarmaian; Ms. Jackie Woods; Mr. Mark Gelade; Mr. Brett Howard

---

#### OPEN MEETING

---

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

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

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

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the October 14, 2016 Information Technology Advisory Committee meeting.

##### **Public Comment**

There was no written public comments received nor any requests to comment in person visitors for this meeting.

---

#### DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-9)

---

##### **Item 1**

##### **Chair Opening Remarks**

**Presenter:** Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair

**Update:** Hon. Sheila F. Hanson welcomed members to the annual in-person meeting. She extended a welcome to the two newer members who are joining in-person for the first

time, Judge Kimberly Menninger, Orange County and Ms. Alexandra Grimwade, CIO, Twentieth Century Fox Television. The agenda for today's meeting is full with the focus on closing out the current year of activities and developing the annual agenda for the coming year. Because of the full agenda, there will be no subcommittee or workstream reports today. Written update reports have been included in your materials. Additionally, there are two action items for consideration on behalf of the data exchange and tactical plan workstreams.

Updates since the last ITAC meeting include appointing Judge Michael Groch as the ITAC liaison to the Traffic Advisory Committee, Judge Menninger to the Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) workstream, and Judge Alan G. Perkins to Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee (JATS). Judge Hanson is seeking volunteers to join the privacy policy-working group and there may be a need for executive sponsors for new workstreams identified by ITAC on the 2017 annual agenda. Members not currently participating are welcome to volunteer in areas of interest to help distribute workload evenly.

## Item 2

### **Judicial Council Chief Information Officer (CIO) Introduction**

Presenter: Robert Oyung, CIO/Director, Information Technology

**Update:** Judge Hanson welcomed Mr. Rob Oyung to update and discuss his new CIO role at the Judicial Council. Mr. Oyung has been in his new position for four weeks. He is currently working on his 60-day plan to gain customer insight via outreach with the Trial and Appellate Courts, Supreme Court, as well as internal JC offices. He sees feedback on what works and where there could be improvement at JCIT. He feels there should be stronger ties between committees as well. The timing is right for JCIT to help take work from committees into a production phase.

Mr. Oyung believes updating the ITAC Annual Agenda and Tactical Plan at the same time will help reduce the amount of staff time, overlap and redundancy. Justice Terence L. Bruiniers agrees there is overlap and wonders how to rationalize and prioritize resource allocation issues in the court and with JC staff. Mr. Snorri Ogata feels this is an opportunity to plan coordinating projects, to avoid feeling disjointed. Justice Louis R. Mauro noted there is a lot of paperwork, suggesting reviewing and reducing paperwork. If the paperwork advances the project, keep and if not trim down. Judge Hanson would like members to consider how ITAC can streamline planning opportunities regarding these various issue.

### Item 3

#### ITAC Organization Discussion

Presenters: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson,  
Chair Robert Oyung, CIO/Director, Information Technology

**Update:** Judge Hanson welcomed Mr. Oyung to discuss overall organization around ITAC work. It became apparent this year there is a need for alignment of planning processes. Noting there is overlap, redundancy and confusion while developing both the Tactical Plan and Annual Agenda. In the coming months the chairs and staff will review ways to streamline planning activities and improve effectiveness of reporting.

Mr. Oyung opened a dialogue regarding the role of the Projects Subcommittee. As Judge Robert B. Freedman has mentioned before, since the advent of workstreams, the Project Subcommittee has less projects. One reason the workstream model has been successful is that it unites key stakeholders within the branch, allowing the branch to actively participate and drive initiatives forward. While the Projects Subcommittee members are a standing body assigned topics as they arise and members may not have expertise in the assigned subjects. Therefore, there is more of a challenge moving things forward. The ITAC members discussed whether it is appropriate to sunset the Projects Subcommittee at the end of the year. There have been immense and successful changes over the last four years in the branch (workstreams, new CMS systems, etc.) and this subcommittee may be very useful in the future, if there are less workstreams. Members see value in keeping this subcommittee available as needed. Mr. Oyung indicated from the JCIT perspective, there are some resource issues with staffing so many subcommittees and workstreams. He is looking to identify a more effective way for securing resources. One suggestion is an ad hoc group instead of the Projects Subcommittee that would allow more flexibility in staffing. Judge Hanson asked members to send her or Mr. Oyung any additional thoughts or comments. No final decision at this time.

Due to Mr. Oyung transitioning from ITAC to the Judicial Council Information Office, there is now a CIO vacancy on the committee. Ms. Jamel Jones will coordinate the recruitment for that position this month, and if successful, the new member will begin in February.

### Item 4

#### CMS Data Exchange Workstream Update – Final Report and Governance Plan (Action Required)

Review the Data Exchange Workstream Final Report & Governance Plan proposal prepared by the workstream and justice partner stakeholders. Decide whether to accept this deliverable and provide appropriate direction on next steps, as needed.

Presenters: Mr. David Yamasaki, Workstream Executive Sponsor  
Hon. Robert B. Freedman, Governance Lead

**Action:** Judge Hanson welcomed Mr. David Yamasaki to provide a status report on the Data Exchange Workstream. Since the last ITAC meeting the workstream there have been

several completed activities. These include adding an additional justice partner (DSS) to the participants; primary data exchange and interface requirements identified and tested by justice partners; identified complete for technical solution; created a central repository for sharing and created a Governance Committee Plan for managing use, support, modifications and relationships. As a deliverable, they established five workstream principles: 1) Limit the types of exchange approaches; 2) Use of standards-based solutions; 3) Establish prospective solutions; 4) Leverage and reuse solutions where possible; and 5) Safeguard integrity and privacy of data.

Next steps will be to implement the Governance Committee Plan; promote the single data exchange standard; provide continued support of lead court; continue collections of required documentation to support exchange development; and to track current implementation status of each exchange by each vendor.

Mr. Oyung suggests there is a need for a bridge between the completed and ongoing action items and Governance Plan and having a single point of contact with justice partners. While JCIT is in transition, he does not want there to be any loss of continuity. Focus is on a quality, not a rushed Governance Plan. Judge Menninger suggests finishing the first workstream then adding a timeline for the Governance Plan workstream. Justice Bruiniers added that the Judicial Council will need to approve the Governance Plan at some point, but JCTC and ITAC will review first.

Mr. Yamasaki is asking ITAC to accept the workstream's final report and conclude it upon the implementation of the Governance Plan. Additionally, that ITAC recommend that JCIT (Mr. Oyung) develop a plan on how to resource and meet the objectives of the Governance Plan and report back to ITAC.

**Modified Motion to accept the workstream's final report and for JCIT to take on the governance part with Mr. Rob Oyung as contact. Approved.**

#### **Item 5**

##### **Tactical Plan Workstream Update – Progress Report and Approval to Circulate Draft for Public Comment (Action Required)**

A report on progress toward the updated Tactical Plan (2017-2018), which incorporates the comments received from judicial branch stakeholders. Meeting materials include a red-line of the edits and a comment matrix. Decide whether to recommend that the draft be posted for public comment.

Presenters: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Workstream Executive Sponsor  
Kathleen Fink, IT Manager and Workstream Project Manager

**Action:** Judge Hanson welcomed Justice Bruiniers and Ms. Kathy Fink to provide a status report on the Tactical Plan Workstream. Ms. Kathy Fink and JCIT staff have included comment

suggestions from the branch into the Tactical Plan. Some substantive comments included deferment and branch wide purchasing agreements concerns. The workstream is continuing to move plan forward for public comment.

**Motion to Approve distribution of the updated Tactical Plan for Public comment, subject to JCTC approval.**

**Approved.**

**Items 6 & 7**

**Annual Agenda Planning Session: Part I & II – Review & Discuss**

*Review of the proposals will resume at 1 p.m. (when the committee reconvenes) and continue through 2:30 p.m.*

**Action:**

Judge Hanson welcomed Ms. Jamel Jones to review the ITAC Annual Agenda. Slides were handed out to members and are included in the materials. ITAC's goal is to align their annual agenda to the Tactical Plan going forward. There are currently 17 initiatives for review, 3 new and 14 carryover. Ms. Jones reviewed and took feedback on each one. These are on the worksheet given to members at meeting. Below includes feedback from members.

1. Modernize Rules of Court for the Trial Courts – No comments.
2. Standards, Rules and/or Legislation for E-Signatures – Will work with JATS & Appellate Courts. E-Signature requirement for bench warrants; special penal code efficiencies; enabling rules for external parties. Will work with JATS as these apply to all courts.
3. Rules for Remote Access to Records for Justice Partners – Omitting welfare section at this time. In development by Juvenile & Family Law Advisory Committee, currently only criminal law.
4. Standards for Electronic Court Records as Data – Note to remove collaboration area from the data exchange and change to term that is more generic.
5. Rules for E-Filing– No comments.
6. Privacy Policy – No comments.
7. Modernize Rules of Court for the Appellate Courts – No comments.
8. Consult on Appellate Court Technological Issues – No comments.
9. E-Filing Strategy – More than cost recovery, potential mod fund replacement. There is a 2017 completion date. Council needs to adopt NIEM as standard. Add as major task to implement with timeframe.
10. Next Generation Hosting Strategy – Target June ITAC/end of 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter. Changes to tasks and deliverables (keep A, B, C, E, delete D, F). Mr. Oyung feels this should be a P1.

11. Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) – Pilot ends 2017. Outside evaluation being done by San Diego University. Workstream kickoff will be mid December with selected courts to go live 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter 2017. This is a 6-month program with deliverables due in 2018.
12. SRL E-Services – Education phase ends Jan. 2017; requirements phase ends Dec. 2017; and then will develop the RFP.
13. Disaster Recovery (DR) Framework – Mr. Cotta suggests priority change to P1 from P2. June 2017 is the new date.
14. Tactical Plan for Technology – Plan to Judicial Council for approval no later than April 2017.
15. New Item: Forms Technology Modernization (Rename?) – Investigation to identify most important courts and prioritize them. Timeframe 6-9 months for deliverables. Amend to 9-month scope. Judge Lucky will continue to sponsor. Renaming should express these aspects: new validating single source, data entry consistent on forms, data e-signature, data centric, and smart data collection of Judicial Council forms. There should be consistency in the forms that current forms do not have. Intelligent Forms Phase 1: Scoping was the selected name.
16. New Item: Next Generation Infrastructure & Support Strategy – Define and develop team of network experts and what that looks like. Will it be resources across court or new hire and train? The team would support network infrastructure. Should this be in-house staff or will there be outsourcing? Looking at modernization or changing current infrastructure? It is not ITAC's place to make a recommendation. This should be CIOs and CITMF to discuss with courts and community. The share Governance structure across courts. Not ITAC project work.

**Motion to Defer and not include in the ITAC annual agenda.**

**Approved**

17. New Item: CMS Data Exchanges Phase II: Operation & Maintenance – Mr. Oyung will assume ownership of this item, no longer needs to be and action item on ITAC's annual agenda. He will review the workstream's Governance Plan draft and report to ITAC with next steps at the March 2017 meeting.

**Motion to remove CMS Data Exchanges Phase II from ITAC Annual Agenda and for JCIT to take the lead.**

**Approved**

**Motion to Approve contents of the Annual Agenda as restructured at the December 2, 2016 ITAC meeting.**

**Approved.**

Ms. Jones will update and circulate to members via e-mail in one week for final review. She will then send to JCTC for their review and approval at their January 2017 meeting.

#### **Item 8**

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

Provide report on activities and news coming from the JCTC.

Presenter: Mr. Jake Chatters, Member, JCTC

**Update:** Judge Hanson welcomed Mr. Jake Chatters, member of JCTC to provide a JCTC update. Justice Marsha Slough, Chair of JCTC sends her regrets as she is unable to attend today's ITAC meeting and that she is very appreciative of the partnership between committees. Since the October 14 meeting, JCTC held an orientation meeting and two committee meetings. JCTC has reviewed the update on the Tactical Plan draft and approves going for public comment in December. Work continues on modernizing the trial court CMS systems and there is a BCP for the V3 courts funding. There will be a new batch of courts currently on legacy systems for funding and the hosted courts moving from the Judicial Council CCTC. Placer court will host six courts who are receiving one-time funding from the Judicial Council. Humboldt and Madera are working on their own projects and sending a funding request this month to Trial Court Budget Committee. Project is on schedule to move several other smaller courts by end of 2017. Of note is that DOF funding successes the past 3 years are largely due to having a branch governance in place. This shows DOF that the branch has long-term plans and goals. Other government branches are appreciative of our efforts.

#### **Item 9**

##### **New Business and Closing Remarks**

**Action:** Hon. Sheila F. Hanson welcomed Judge Hanson asked members if there was any new business for ITAC members to consider. Justice Bruiniers contributed a potential new workstream on electronic or digital evidence. He believes this is urgent enough to be in the ITAC Annual Agenda and he is asking if this committee will consider this project. Mr. Oyung suggested reaching out to the courts to see if they are able to support as well. After approving the Tactical Plan, ITAC will still needs to delay this a short time to identify resources. Judge Menninger volunteered to be the executive sponsor as her court is currently working electronic evidence; she also noted that Los Angeles could provide resources. Judge Hanson is assigning this to the Projects Subcommittee to continue the momentum. Deferring this project until after approval of the Tactical Plan.

---

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

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:45 PM.

Upcoming 2017 ITAC meetings are March 17, June 9, October TBD and December TBD.

Approved by the advisory body on March 17, 2017.