



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

February 3, 2020

10:00 AM - 12:00 PM

Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present:	Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair; Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Vice Chair; Mr. Jake Chatters; Mr. Brian Cotta; Mr. Adam Creiglow; Mr. Alan Crouse; Hon. Julie R. Culver; Hon. Tara Desautels; Hon. Michael S. Groch; Mr. Paras Gupta; Hon. Samantha P. Jessner; Mr. Snorri Ogata; Mr. Darrel Parker; Hon. Peter Siggins; Hon. Bruce Smith; Ms. Jeannette Vannoy; Mr. Don Willenburg; Mr. David H. Yamasaki; Hon. Theodore Zayner
Advisory Body Members Absent:	Assemblymember Marc Berman; Ms. Alexandra Grimwade; Senator Robert Hertzberg; Hon. Kimberly Menninger; Hon. James Mize; Hon. Donald Segerstrom; Hon. Joseph Wiseman
Others Present:	Hon. Kyle Brodie; Mr. Kevin Lane; Ms. Heather Pettit; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Jamel Jones; Mr. Alex Barnett (Sen. Hertzberg); Mr. Richard Blalock; Ms. Camilla Kieliger; Ms. Andrea Jaramillo; Ms. Nicole Rosa; Ms. Jackie Woods and other JCC staff present

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:01 AM and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the October, 18, 2019 and January 8, 2020, Information Technology Advisory Committee meeting.

There were no public comments received.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-6)

Item 1

Chair's Report

Presenter: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair

Report: Judge Hanson reported that the ITAC Annual Agenda was approved by the Judicial Council Technology Committee at their January 16 meeting. ITAC has a full year ahead,

with many important initiatives, including work on the Futures Commission directives, 9 workstreams, and subcommittees.

Also reported, the Identity and Access Management workstream will present their preliminary policy recommendations to the Presiding Judge and Court Executive Officer advisory bodies later this week. Mr. Snorri Ogata, executive sponsor, and Ms. Rebecca Fleming, policy track lead, will receive feedback from those groups.

Item 2

Judicial Council Technology Committee Update (JCTC)

Update on activities and news coming from this internal oversight committee.

Presenter: Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair, JCTC

Report: Judge Brodie reported on Judicial Technology Advisory Committee activities since the December 2019 ITAC meeting. They held one open meeting and one education session as well as reporting to the Judicial Council on both technology committees' activities at their January 2020 meeting. Judge Hanson presented the ITAC Annual Agenda at their January open meeting. There was a good dialogue and she answered questions from members and outlined new scoping categories with easily understandable summaries to help set better expectations for project outcomes. Additionally, she explained the new process of inviting the court CIO community to review the annual agenda and provide input. After reviewing the proposed agenda, it was approved unanimously.

Judicial Technology Advisory Committee also reviewed and ranked technology related Budget Change Concepts (BCPs) for Fiscal Year 2021-22. Ms. Heather Pettit will share in more detail during her report.

Judge Brodie attended the Court Information Technology Managers Forum (CITMF) on January 31. This group of court CIOs meets regularly to discuss common interests and needs. He found it extremely informative with the opportunity to hear first-hand about court IT projects and how they intersect with branchwide IT efforts.

Lastly, Judge Brodie expressed his appreciation for Judge Hanson's updates and the productive work of ITAC, noting that both technology committees must continue to work collaboratively to improve judicial branch technology to promote court efficiencies and improve access to justice for the public.

Item 3

Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program

Consider whether to approve the proposed awards for the Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program for FY 19-20.

Presenters: Hon. Victor Rodriguez, Chair, Language Access Subcommittee
Mr. Douglas Denton, Principal Manager, Language Access Services Program

Action: Judge Rodriguez from Alameda County reported on the Language Access Signage and Technology grant program. In 2018 an ongoing funding per year of \$1 million for signage and \$1.55 million for support and equipment needs was set aside for this grant program. There is \$200,000 per year for the Judicial Council to use for translation and online language access toolkit and other multi-language for limited English-speaking court users. In 2019 Judicial Council approved a grant that disperses the funds on an annual basis. Trial courts were able to apply for grant funding for signage and technology needs. On October 15, a grant funding packet was released for the current fiscal year. The extended application deadline was December 3, 2019. Of the many goals, one was to encourage courts to support language access as a core goal of the court. The draft Judicial Council report is located in the member materials. The final package will be presented to the Judicial Council at the March 2020 meeting. Funding is reimbursed to courts by end of year and courts need to provide a report to the Judicial Council to show how funds were used in their courts to help with future funding cycles. There were 29 courts applying for funding and it appears all can be funded this funding cycle. Of those courts 19 requested signage and technology funding, 5 requested signage only and 5 technology only. A new timeline will be announced for FY20/21.

Motion to Approve the Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Awards.

Approved.

Item 4

Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions: Proposed Amendments to the California Rules of Court

Consider whether to recommend circulating proposed amendments to the California Rules of Court to indicate that an electronic filing service provider must allow the party to proceed with an electronic filing even if the party does not consent to receive electronic service.

Presenters: Hon. Peter Siggins, Chair, Rules and Policy Subcommittee
Ms. Andrea Jaramillo, Attorney II, Legal Services

Action: Justice Siggins presented an amendment to the California Rules of Court, rule 2.255 to clarify that an electronic filing service provider must allow the party to proceed with an electronic filing even if they party does not consent to receive electronic service. This change will be circulated for public comment and ITAC and Judicial Council Technology Committee will review before Judicial Council submission.

Motion to Approve Circulating the Proposed Rule Amendment for Comment.

Approved.

Item 5

Data Exchange Working Group Annual Report

Receive a report on the workgroup's recent progress.

Presenter: Mr. David Yamasaki, Workgroup Executive Sponsor

Report: Mr. Yamasaki reported that this working group is in maintenance mode thanks to the trial court liaisons who are listed in the member materials, the liaisons work closely with the stakeholder community. Of note, the Department of Justice (DOJ) is now requesting all exchanges to be electronic by July 1, 2020, which would put a strain on some trial courts. Ms. Pettit and others are working with the DOJ to ensure there is a consensus on how the trial courts can exchange with them in the future. Innovation Grant funding will be in place shortly to help courts with this issue. Ms. Pettit was able to share an update with the trial court CIOs at their recent meeting.

Item 6

(a) Branchwide Budget Update

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

Presenter: Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Budget Services

Mr. Theodorovic reported that the January budget looked good for the branch and included good investments and structural funding for the trial courts. It includes \$61.7 million that includes a 3% increase for general operating cost, almost \$46 million for the Judicial Council for better equity among the courts. Another good year for IT funding for the branch for IT modernization, video remote interrupting (VRI), digitizing documents, and roll out of the ability to pay tool using technology solutions.

(b) FY 20/21 Technology Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Update

Overview and update regarding the FY 20-21 technology BCPs and their status.

Presenter: Ms. Heather Pettit, Chief Information Officer

Ms. Pettit provided a more detailed update on the BCPs, some of which Mr. Theodorovic mentioned in the previous branch budget report. The branch is pleased that almost all IT BCPs were included in the Governor's budget. The data governance BCP was deferred and she hopes will be resubmitted during the spring BCP process.

The IT modernization funding will include items that ITAC workstreams contributed. They include intelligent forms that will be data driven; court stack that allows for courts to use what they need in a data driven environment; and the next generation hosting and cloud hosting including disaster recovery, as well as allowing courts to evolve as technology evolves.

Phase 2 and 3 of digitizing documents funding. The last BCP included is for remote video interpreting and remote video hearings, they have been combined since they utilize the same technology.

Heather will be speaking at the upcoming Court Executives and Presiding Judges Advisory Committees meeting to discuss the ability to pay tool. There is a lot of material that can be provided to the courts to show what the implementation will look like, how it will work and how the integration will be done as well. This roll out will utilize the IT modernization BCP concepts and innovation grants allowing for the first time using the new productization method for this implementation.

(c) FY 21/22 Technology Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Update

Overview and update regarding the FY 21-22 technology BCP concepts, which precede full BCP development.

Presenter: Ms. Heather Pettit, Chief Information Officer

BCP concepts have focused on critical work for today and future. ITAC suggestions were incorporated and submitted to the Judicial Council Technology Committee who did a great job of combining and shortening for a much better product that will go to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee for consideration. Staff is developing concepts right now and will send to Finance mid-February then a final review by ITAC before going to the Judicial Council to review and prioritize at their July meeting. Finance will finalize and prepare to send to Department of Finance by September. There are 4 concepts: branchwide security operations – cover all critical security needs where there are gaps in current environments; data governance – if not included in current round; digital navigator – a partner to the in-person court navigator, digital allows users to use automated and live chatbots, live chatbots would route user to a county court. Another component of the digital navigator is the branchwide automated email and text reminders, the Judicial Council will fund this product. Final item is the California protective order modernization registry to develop a more mobile friendly application allowing direct access for law enforcement officers, which currently only exists in certain areas. This would utilize new cloud services and integrating with Los Angeles innovation grant statewide justice partner portal for security. This item would help refine integration with the Department of Justice. Hopefully using a two-way integration; however, that may require additional legislation.

Although not yet approved, an Appellate Courts IT modernization BCP is being developed. This will look like the trial court IT modernization BCP and will help with any missing security areas. Heather is working with them to draft the BCP, it will then go to the Court of Appeal Presiding Justices for approval, then to Judicial Council Technology Committee, then to Finance for review.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 AM.

Approved by the advisory body on April 20, 2020.