

Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

Annual Agenda¹—2022

Approved by Judicial Council Technology Committee: February 14, 2022

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Superior Court of California, County of Orange
Lead Staff:	Camilla Kieliger, Sr. Business Systems Analyst, Judicial Council Information Technology
Committee's Charge/Membership: <p>Rule 10.53. Information Technology Advisory Committee of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Information Technology Advisory Committee. The committee makes recommendations to the council for improving the administration of justice through the use of technology and for fostering cooperative endeavors to resolve common technological issues with other stakeholders in the justice system. The committee promotes, coordinates, and acts as executive sponsor for projects and initiatives that apply technology to the work of the courts.</p> <p>Rule 10.53. Information Technology Advisory Committee sets forth additional duties of the committee.</p> <p>ITAC currently has 25 members. The ITAC website provides the composition of the committee.</p> Subcommittees²: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rules & Policy Subcommittee<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Trial court rules and statutes revisions• Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee (JATS) [suspended status for 2022]	

¹ The annual agenda outlines the work a committee will focus on in the coming year and identifies areas of collaboration with other advisory bodies and the Judicial Council staff resources

² California Rules of Court, rule 10.30 (c) allows an advisory body to form subgroups, composed entirely of current members of the advisory body, to carry out the body's duties, subject to available resources, with the approval of its oversight committee

All proposed projects for the year are included on the Annual Agenda, as follows:

Workstreams

- **Tactical Plan for Technology Update:** Update the *Tactical Plan for Technology* for 2023-2024.
- **Identity and Access Management Strategy (continued):** Develop a branch identity management strategy.
- **Electronic Evidence: Rules, Technology and Pilot Evaluation (continued):** Investigate and draft technology best practices, standards, and policies, and propose changes to evidence-based rules and statutes.
- **Statewide E-Filing Program Review/Evaluation (continued):** Review and evaluate the existing statewide e-filing program. Expand the number of e-filing manager (EFM) solutions in the program and standardize electronic filing fees across the state.
- **Advancing the Hybrid Courtroom (continued):** Assess the current implementation of hybrid courtrooms; recommend metrics and data collection to facilitate court compliance with AB 177 and SB 241; develop standards for hybrid courtrooms; assist in developing a Request for Proposal (RFP).

Rules & Policy Subcommittee

- **Amend Electronic Filing Rules:** Amend rule 2.253(b)(7) of the California Rules of Court to remove the requirement that courts with mandatory electronic filing make semi-annual reports to the Judicial Council.
- **Consider Amending Rules on Remote Access to Electronic Records:** Consider amending the California Rules of Court on remote access to electronic records to authorize remote access by appellate courts, appellate projects contracted to run appointed appellate counsel programs, and the Habeas Corpus Resource Center.
- **Consider Amending Rules on Remote Access to Criminal Electronic Records:** Consider amending the California Rules of Court on remote access to criminal electronic records to provide parity between private defense attorneys and public defenders.
- **Review and Provide Input on Legislation:** Review pending legislation related to court technology and provide input on the impact the legislation may have on the courts.

Other:

- **Placeholder for Projects Assigned by the Ad-Hoc Workgroup on Post-Pandemic Initiatives (P3):** The Ad Hoc Workgroup on Post-Pandemic Initiatives (P3) is currently working to identify successful court practices that emerged during the COVID-19 pandemic. P3 recommendations may be referred to specific advisory bodies for development and/or implementation.

III. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

New Workstream (Ending 2022)	
1. Tactical Plan for Technology Update	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approval date:	<i>Scope category(ies): Policy</i>
<p>Project Summary: Update <i>Tactical Plan for Technology</i> for effective date 2023-2024.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Initiate workstream, including formation of membership and conduct orientation/kickoff meeting. b) Review, gather input, and prepare an update of the Tactical Plan for Technology. c) Circulate the draft plan for branch and public comment; revise as needed. d) Finalize, and seek approval from ITAC, the Technology Committee, and the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <p>Origin of Project: Specific charge of ITAC per Rule 10.53 (b)(8).</p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2022</p> <p>Fiscal Impact:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsor: Hon. Sheila Hanson • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> Broad input from the branch and the public 	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2021)	
2. Identity and Access Management Strategy	Priority 1
Workstream membership approved September 25, 2018	Scope category(ies): Possibilities, Prototypes, Pilot, Policy/Procurement
<p>Project Summary: Develop a branch identity management strategy.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <p>(a) Present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, the Technology Committee and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.</p> <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Phase 1: Develop and issue an RFP for a statewide identity management service/provider; identify and select (completed 2018).</i> • <i>Recommend changes to Rules of Court as needed and work with the Rules & Policy Subcommittee to draft them.</i> • <i>Develop the roadmap for a branch identity management strategy and approach.</i> • <i>Determine policies and processes for identity management (including proofing and access management).</i> • <i>Ensure linkage and alignment with other branchwide initiatives such as E-Filing, SRL Portal, Next Generation Hosting, CMS Migration and Deployment.</i> • <i>Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support.</i> <p>Origin of Project: Previously, this was a sub-task of the e-filing initiative. The item was promoted to its own annual agenda initiative given its many touchpoints with other workstreams (including Self-Represented Litigants E-Services, Next-Generation Hosting, E-filing Strategy, etc.). <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-18, 2019-20, and 2021-22.</i></p> <p>Status/Timeline: December 2021</p> <p>Fiscal Impact:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC: Workstream, Sponsor: Snorri Ogata</i> • <i>Judicial Council Staffing: Information Technology, Legal Services, Branch Accounting and Procurement</i> • <i>Collaborations: CEAC, TCPJAC, and their Joint Technology Subcommittee</i> 	

Existing Workstream (Ending 2022)	
3. Electronic Evidence: Rules, Technology and Pilot Evaluation	<i>Priority 1</i>
Workstream membership approved September 25, 2019	<i>Scope category(ies): Policy; Pilot</i>
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Consider existing pilots and court practices along with available technology pertaining to the use of electronic evidence; propose changes to rules and statutes related to electronic evidence; develop a framework for successful possible future pilots.</p> <p><i>Key Objectives:</i></p> <p>Based on findings from Phase 1 and evaluation of existing local pilots and other court practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Investigate and report on existing local pilots and court practices, including policies and standards, for transmitting, accepting, storing, and protecting electronic evidence. (b) Research and recommend available technology and services that would support transmission, acceptance, storage, and protection of electronic evidence. (c) Develop a framework for successful possible future pilots, including use case scenarios, costs and benefits, and success criteria (d) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, the Technology Committee and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream. <p><i>Objectives met or resolved:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Develop and propose changes to Rules of Court and statutes related to electronic evidence in collaboration with the Rules and Policy Subcommittee.</i> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> <i>Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-18, 2019-20, and 2021-22.</i></p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> April 2022</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC: Workstream, Sponsor: Hon. Kimberly Menninger</i> • <i>Judicial Council Staffing: Information Technology, Legal Services</i> • <i>Collaborations: CEAC, TCPJAC, ITAC Rules and Policy Subcommittee, and other advisory bodies as needed</i> 	

Continued Workstream (Ending 2022)	
4. Statewide e-Filing Program Review/Evaluation	Priority 2
Workstream membership approved: June 17, 2021	Scope category(ies): Possibilities; Policies
<p>Project Summary: Review and evaluate the existing statewide e-filing program. Expand the number of e-filing manager (EFM) solutions in the program and standardize electronic filing fees across the state.</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Explore the strengths and weaknesses of current e-filing programs and practices across the state. (b) Explore benefits of statewide EFM solutions inclusive of development opportunities and potential funding sources. (c) Evaluate standardizing e-filing transaction fees across the state. (d) Review e-filing rules and statutes to clarify language and improve consistency across the branch. (e) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, the Technology Committee and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).</i> <p>Origin of Project: Tactical Plan for Technology 2021-2022; branch-identified business need.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: March 2022</p> <p>Fiscal Impact:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC: Workstream: Sponsor: Snorri Ogata</i> • <i>Judicial Council Staffing: Information Technology, Legal Services</i> • <i>Collaborations: ITAC Rules and Policy Subcommittee</i> 	

Continued Workstream (Ending 2022)	
5. Advancing the Hybrid Courtroom	Priority 1
Workstream membership approval date: December 13, 2021	Scope category: Policy
<p>Project Summary: Assess the current implementation of hybrid courtrooms; recommend metrics and data collection to facilitate court compliance with AB 177 and SB 241; develop standards for hybrid courtrooms; assist in developing a Request for Proposal (RFP).</p> <p>Key Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Initiate workstream, including formation of membership and conduct orientation/kickoff meeting. b) Explore hybrid court proceedings involving a combination of in-person and remote participants and their use of technology. c) Assess the differing technology needs associated with supporting in-person, remote, and hybrid services and proceedings. d) Define consistent standards for branchwide solutions, platforms, and programs in support of hybrid courtrooms. e) Review and evaluate the 2020 <i>California Trial Court Facilities Standards</i> to align with hybrid court proceedings. f) Develop and define quantitative and qualitative metrics associated with hybrid court proceedings and remote court services to measure efficacy and areas for improvement, and make recommendations on the collection of associated data by which courts would comply with AB 177 and SB 241. g) Review the California Rules of Court to identify and recommend any potential rule changes needed. h) Assist with development of an RFP to establish branch Master Service Agreements (MSAs) and other procurement vehicles, where needed. i) Finalize recommendations and seek approval from ITAC, the Technology Committee, and the Judicial Council, if appropriate. Formally sunset the workstream. <p>Objectives met or resolved:</p> <p>Origin of Project: Access 3D; California Courts Connected framework; AB 177; AB 716; SB 241.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: June 2022</p> <p>Fiscal Impact:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Workstream, Sponsors: Hon. Samantha P. Jessner and Adam Creiglow • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> Ad Hoc Committee on Civil Remote Appearance Rules, Court Facilities Advisory Committee, Data Governance Group (newly formed) 	

New or One-Time Project	
6.1 Trial Court Rules: Amend Electronic Filing Rules	<i>Priority 2(b)</i> ³
	<i>Scope category:</i> Policy
<p>Project Summary: Amend rule 2.253(b)(7) of the California Rules of Court to remove the requirement that courts with mandatory electronic filing make semi-annual reports to the Judicial Council.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Judicial Council staff.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Project will follow the regular rule cycle in 2022 for a January 1, 2023 effective date for the amendment.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Committee staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Rules & Policy Subcommittee, Chair: Hon. Julie R. Culver • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> Joint Rules Subcommittee of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and Court Executives Advisory Committee 	

³ For rules and forms proposals, the following priority levels apply: 1(a) The proposal is urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) The proposal is urgently needed to respond to a recent law change; 1(c) A statute or council decision requires a doption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date; 1(d) The proposal will provide significant cost savings and efficiencies, generate significant revenue, or a void a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) The change is urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; or 1(f) The proposal is otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement changes in law; 2(b) Responsive to identified concerns or problems; or 2(c) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

New or One-Time Project	
6.2 Trial Court Rules: Consider Amending Rules on Remote Access to Electronic Records	<i>Priority 1(e)</i> ⁴
	<i>Scope category:</i> Policy
<p>Project Summary: Consider amending the California Rules of Court on remote access to electronic records to authorize remote access by appellate courts, appellate projects contracted to run appointed appellate counsel programs, and the Habeas Corpus Resource Center.</p> <p>Origin of Project: Member of the Appellate Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Project will follow the regular rule cycle in 2022 for a January 1, 2023 effective date for the amendment.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: Committee staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Rules & Policy Subcommittee, Chair: Hon. Julie R. Culver • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> Appellate Advisory Committee, Joint Rules Subcommittee of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and Court Executives Advisory Committee 	

⁴ For rules and forms proposals, the following priority levels apply: 1(a) The proposal is urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) The proposal is urgently needed to respond to a recent law change; 1(c) A statute or council decision requires a doption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date; 1(d) The proposal will provide significant cost savings and efficiencies, generate significant revenue, or avoid a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) The change is urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; or 1(f) The proposal is otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement changes in law; 2(b) Responsive to identified concerns or problems; or 2(c) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

New or One-Time Project	
6.3 Trial Court Rules: Consider Amending Rules on Remote Access to Criminal Electronic Records	<i>Priority 1(e)</i>
	<i>Scope category:</i> Policy
<p>Project Summary: Consider amending the California Rules of Court on remote access to criminal electronic records to provide parity between private defense attorneys and public defenders.</p> <p>Origin of Project: California Attorneys for Criminal Justice</p> <p>Status/Timeline: If amendment project proceeds, it will follow the regular rule cycle in 2022 for a January 1, 2023, effective date for the amendment.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: Committee staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Rules & Policy Subcommittee, Chair: Hon. Julie R. Culver • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology • <i>Collaborations:</i> Appellate Advisory Committee, Joint Rules Subcommittee of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and Court Executives Advisory Committee, Criminal Law Advisory Committee 	

Ongoing Project	
6.4 Review and Provide Input on Pending Legislation	<i>Priority 1</i>
	<i>Scope category:</i> Policy
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Review pending legislation related to court technology and provide input on the impact the legislation may have on the courts.</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Judicial Council Office of Governmental Affairs.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact:</i> Committee staff.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ITAC:</i> Rules & Policy Subcommittee, Chair: Hon. Julie R. Culver • <i>Judicial Council Staffing:</i> Legal Services, Information Technology, Governmental Affairs 	

Potential One-Time Project	
6. Placeholder for Projects Assigned by the Ad-Hoc Workgroup on Post-Pandemic Initiatives (P3)	<i>Priority 1</i>
	<i>Scope category(ies):</i> TBD
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> The Ad Hoc Workgroup on Post-Pandemic Initiatives (P3) is currently working to identify successful court practices that emerged during the COVID-19 pandemic. P3 recommendations may be referred to specific advisory bodies for development and/or implementation.</p> <p><i>Key Objectives:</i></p> <p>(a) TBD</p> <p><i>Origin of Project:</i> Ad Hoc Workgroup on Post-Pandemic Initiatives</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> TBD</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</p> <p><i>Resources:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBD 	

IV. LIST OF 2021 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.2	<p>Futures Commission Directive: Voice-to-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom (Completed)—The Voice-to-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom Workstream was asked to explore available technologies to assist limited-English-proficient customers at service counters and in self-help centers. The workstream’s efforts were informed by recommendations of the Commission on the Future of California’s Court System that the judicial branch pilot technology solutions to allow two individuals who speak different languages to converse without the assistance of an interpreter. The workstream presented its final report to ITAC on October 2, 2020, to the Technology Committee on October 9, 2020, and the Judicial Council on January 22, 2021. A branchwide pilot program now has 14 courts enrolled. Judicial Council Report; Presentation Slides; Demonstration; Video.</p>
2	<p>Tactical Plan for Technology 2021-2022 (Completed)—The workstream presented the final Tactical Plan to ITAC on January 27, the Technology Committee on February 8, and the Judicial Council on March 12, 2021. The updated Plan focuses on enhancing electronic access to courts and court services and promoting more efficient business practices. The plan identifies specific initiatives the judicial branch is pursuing, in areas such as case management systems, electronic records, remote video appearances, language access services, online dispute resolution, security, and data analytics. Judicial Council report, presentation and video.</p>
5	<p>Data Analytics: Assessment and Report (Completed)—The workstream was charged with recommending a data analytics strategy for the branch that included developing branchwide data and information governance policy recommendations. The policy concepts detailed in the final report lay the foundation for future policy development and will help execute a new vision for data analytics in the judicial branch: to analyze, use, and share data to inform decision-making in order to enhance and expand vital and accessible court services for all the people of California. The workstream presented its final report and recommendations to ITAC on March 24, the Technology Committee on April 12, and the Judicial Council on May 21, 2021. Report; Presentation; Video.</p>
6	<p>Disaster Recovery to Cloud (Completed)—ITAC formed the Disaster Recovery Phase II workstream to leverage the Court Innovation Grant awarded to the Superior Court of Monterey County to pilot the Disaster Recovery Framework Guide and Toolkit and modernize the approach to implementing disaster recovery using cloud-based technologies. The Phase II Workstream completed its objectives with the approval of the Disaster Recovery to Cloud (DR2C) Roadmap by ITAC on March 24 and the Technology Committee on April 12, 2021. The DR2C Roadmap validates, builds, and expands on some of the concepts and technologies documented in the Phase 1 Disaster Recovery Framework. It is intended to serve as a reference for courts interested in establishing a new disaster recovery program or in refreshing their existing program using emerging technologies, including cloud-based solutions.</p>
7	<p>Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) Research (Completed)—The workstream’s final report was accepted by ITAC on April 28, and by the Technology Committee on June 24, 2021. The Online Dispute Resolution Workstream was tasked with developing a roadmap for courts interested in pursuing online dispute resolution (ODR). Specifically, the workstream’s focus was on researching the ODR landscape nationwide and existing court-offered ODR programs. Based on those findings, the workstream suggested practice areas and potential applications for ODR in the judicial branch, as well as guiding principles and key considerations when making plans for</p>

	ODR.
8	Branchwide Information Security Roadmap (Completed) —The workstream was tasked with defining methods, activities and initiatives for expanding and strengthening branch information security capabilities, and for creating an overarching strategy for educating courts on information security end user education, risk management, and incident response. The workstream’s recommendation to establish a Judicial Council Office of Security to support and implement a variety of security programs was approved by ITAC on June 23, the Technology Committee on August 9, and the Judicial Council on October 1, 2021.
11.1	Rules & Policy Subcommittee (Ongoing) —The subcommittee circulated three proposals for public comment. One rule proposal (amend permissive electronic filing and electronic service rules to reference Penal Code section 690.5) was approved by the Judicial Council on October 1, 2021. One rule proposal (governing “lodged electronic exhibits”) and one legislative proposal (authorize use of vendors to store exhibits and evidence in electronic format) have been deferred pending a recommendation of the Rules and Policy Subcommittee on whether to revise and re-circulate them in 2022.
11.2	Joint Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Remote Video Appearances —ITAC, in collaboration with Civil and Small Claims, Family and Juvenile Law, and Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committees, developed a legislative proposal to enact Code of Civil Procedure, § 367.7, to provide statutory authority for courts to permit remote video appearances in any civil actions or proceedings including trials and evidentiary hearings. SB 241 (which was signed into law) contains language broader in scope than the proposal the joint ad hoc subcommittee developed last year. The bill requires that the council develop rules, a task that was completed by the Ad Hoc Committee on Civil Remote Appearance Rules. The joint subcommittee is therefore sunset as planned.