

Information Technology Advisory Committee Status Report - August 2019

This report was provided at the **August 19, 2019** ITAC meeting. Status updates are submitted by workstream sponsors and subcommittee chairs.

1.1. Futures Commission Directive: Intelligent Chat (Phase 1)



Highlight: Draft Findings and Recommendations report completed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The core team has been formed. It includes: Executive Sponsor, Judge Michael Groch (San Diego); Technical Lead, John Yee, Judicial Council Information Technology (JCIT); Project Manager, Fati Farmanfarmaian, JCIT, along with JCIT technical resources.</p> <p>The full workstream team/membership has been formed. Executive Sponsor, Judge Groch, distributed a branch memorandum inviting nominations for workstream membership. The request called for those individuals with an interest and experience in intelligent chat and the technology to deliver court services. The request also set membership expectations and defined next steps. A final membership list was approved by the ITAC and JCTC Chairs.</p> <p>A workstream kickoff meeting was held on August 28 and included a full team orientation and educational demos of the intelligent chat technology.</p> <p>Ongoing meetings with the core team and full workstream are occurring 3-4 times per month and the workstream model is proving quite effective. The SharePoint site is robust and well populated with tools and data. An example is the collaborative user story sheet which forms the basis of the POC project selected by the team.</p> <p>Additionally, staff has prepared and the Judicial Council approved the submission of a budget change proposal requesting FY19-20 funding to support more formalized piloting.</p>
<p>(a) Identify and monitor a series of court proofs of concepts (POCs) to assess technology readiness for various cases (e.g., Court of Appeal, E-Filing, Self-Help).</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The group has completed its research and conversations into the innovation grant projects related to Intelligent Chat. The workstream will leverage the Innovation Grant Courts as POCs to inform the Findings and Recommendation report.</p>

1.1. Futures Commission Directive: Intelligent Chat (Phase 1)



Highlight: Draft Findings and Recommendations report completed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(b) Identify key performance indicators and benchmark before/after success.	Completed	The group has completed identifying key performance indicators and benchmarks. The workstream will include this deliverable in the Findings and Recommendation report.
(c) Capture learnings and report findings.	Completed	Completed the draft Findings and Recommendation report.
(d) Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results.	Not Started	The workstream will recommend and ask ITAC at its August 19 meeting to sunset the workstream and in lieu of a phase 2, to transition the effort to JCIT.
(e) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; annual agenda accordingly.	Not Started	The workstream is seeking approval from ITAC to conclude phase 1 at their August 19 meeting, and to sunset the workstream. In lieu of a phase 2, the group will recommend a full transition to JCIT.

1.2. Futures Commission Directive: Voice-To-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom (Phase 1)



Highlight: Vendor presentations completed, a demo site is being developed to further test the solutions currently offered.

	Status	Description
Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Completed	<p>The core team has been formed. It includes: Executive Sponsor, Judge James Mize, (Sacramento); Business Lead, Heather Pettit, Judicial Council Information Technology (JCIT); and Project Manager, Rick Walery, (IT Director, San Mateo).</p> <p>In late August, a memorandum was distributed to the branch (appellate and trial court presiding judges, CEOs, and CIOs) seeking nominations for members, and including expectations and next steps. Final membership was approved in September, after which a kickoff meeting was held in October.</p> <p>The project team has been formed. The team includes members from a diverse set of courts and the Judicial Council. Expertise on the team ranges from multiple members with IT-related experience, a member who previously was a translator, and multiple members with first-hand knowledge or working with LEP customers at a court.</p> <p>Additionally, the budget change proposal for FY19-20 was approved to support a formal pilot to further test the technology.</p>
Define the standard of success and how to measure it as well as define the difference between translation and interpretation.	In Progress	<p>The project team has been divided into 2 tracks – a Metrics track, and a Vendor track. The metrics track is meeting regularly to define the specific standards that a solution should include to ensure success, including the response time, accuracy, and ability to translate full sentences (as opposed to word-for-word translation).</p>
Determine how, or if, the work for this initiative aligns with existing work of the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force (LAPITF) and the work of The Legal Design Lab at the Stanford University Law School.	In Progress	<p>The project team attended presentations prepared by students in the Legal Design Lab at the Stanford University Law School. One of the presentations demonstrated text-based translation services, which leveraged Google’s translation API.</p> <p>In addition, the group reviewed the findings and recommendations from the</p>

1.2. Futures Commission Directive: Voice-To-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom (Phase 1) (cont'd)



Highlight: Vendor presentations completed, a demo site is being developed to further test the solutions currently offered.

	Status	Description
Setup a technical lab environment at the Judicial Council or a local court to test the technical recommendations of the Futures Commission for this initiative.	In Progress	The workgroup received presentations from 4 vendors, demonstrating their offerings in this space. The group determined that there was not a current solution offered that fully met their needs, and opted to develop a demo site to test the APIs for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voice to text transcription • Text to text translation • Text to speech output
Pilot various voice-to-text language services in a lab environment, will allow for exposure to more technologies and shorter learning cycles than if a specific technology is deployed at a court for piloting.	In Progress	The workgroup engaged with the Judicial Council to develop a demo site to test the APIs offered by 4 vendors. Once complete, the group will conduct further tests using pre-written scripts, evaluating the accuracy and responsiveness of the transcription and translation.
Capture learnings and draft a white paper report on the lessons learned, findings, and recommendations for next steps.	Not Started	
Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results.	Not Started	
Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; amend the Annual Agenda accordingly.	Not Started	

1.3. Futures Commission Directive: Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings (Phase 1)

 **Highlight:** Draft Findings and Recommendations report completed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The core team has been formed. It includes: Executive Sponsor, Judge Samantha Jessner (Los Angeles); Court Lead, Jake Chatters (CEO, Placer); Project Manager, Alan Crouse (Deputy CEO, San Bernardino), along with support from the Judicial Council Information Technology Office (JCIT), Language Access Plan and VRI programs.</p> <p>The full initiative team/membership has been formed and approved. Eight courts, representing a diversity of size; participants from the VRI Workstream and remote video innovation grant, are a part of the team for this directive—specifically, the Superior Courts of Fresno, Los Angeles, Merced, Mono, Orange, Placer, Sacramento, and San Bernardino.</p> <p>The workstream held its kickoff and meets monthly. It has formed 4 subgroups/subcommittees and assigned a Chair/lead to each - Procedures, Evidence, Rules, and Technology. The subcommittees will develop initial recommendations on topics including but not limited to user technical requirements, evidence exchange, and presentation rules.</p> <p>Additionally, staff has prepared and the Judicial Council approved the submission of a budget change proposal requesting FY19-20 funding to support pilot deployments to the courts.</p>
<p>(a) Identify and conduct a mock remote video hearing using a web conferencing system for a specific hearing type (e.g., Civil – Small Claims) as a Proof of Concept (POC) in a court. Include one or more mock hearings of the selected hearing type.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The Core Team identified a number of recent studies by the Center for Legal and Court Technology, the National Association for Presiding Judges and Court Executive Officers, the State Justice Institute, and the Self-Represented Litigation Network. Thus, an initial set of challenges were explored and developed for further refinement and investigation by the team. (continued on next page)</p>

1.3. Futures Commission Directive: Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings (Phase 1)

 **Highlight:** Draft Findings and Recommendations report completed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) Identify and conduct a mock remote video hearing using a web conferencing system for a specific hearing type (e.g., Civil – Small Claims) as a Proof of Concept (POC) in a court. Include one or more mock hearings of the selected hearing type.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The team progressed through an issue and topic log created from the results of the studies and crafted initial recommendations. These recommendations were used during mock proceedings.</p> <p>The team prepared scripts for the mock hearing proceedings and finalized the location and dates for the mock run.</p> <p>Mock hearings were held at the San Bernardino Superior Court February 15, 2019 via Web Cam – Blu Jeans Video Conference platform. Several participants attended in-person and participated remotely. Case types tested were Small Claims and Civil Harassment. Evidence sharing was tested via Share Point application.</p>
<p>(b) Capture learnings and report findings.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The team completed their draft Findings and Recommendations report.</p>
<p>(c) Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The team is recommending not initiating a phase 2 at this time. Instead, the group recommends that the rule and legislative proposal amendments outlined in the Findings and Recommendations report complete, as well as the innovation grant recipient courts who received grants in this area to finish their efforts, so that their efforts can be leveraged going forward.</p>
<p>(d) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; annual agenda accordingly.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>The core team members will present their final report and recommendations to ITAC on August 19. If approved, the workstream will sunset, and a phase 2 will not begin until those recommendations are completed.</p>

2. Tactical Plan for Technology Update



Highlight: Approved by the Judicial Council at their May meeting.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Initiate workstream, including formation of membership and conduct orientation/kickoff meeting.	Completed	Kickoff meeting held.
(b) Review, gather input, and update the Tactical Plan for Technology.	Completed	Several working meetings held, initiatives drafted and reviewed by workstream members. Remaining sections drafted, reviewed and finalized. Initiative drafts finalized by workstream leads. Full plan submitted to Editing and Graphics Group.
(c) Circulate the draft plan for branch and public comment; revise as needed.	Completed	The plan was circulated for branch and public comment, and feedback was incorporated where appropriate.
(d) Finalize, and seek approval by the JCTC and the Judicial Council; thereafter, formally sunset the workstream.	Completed	The plan was approved by the Judicial Council at their May meeting.

3. Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Pilot



Highlight: Final VRI Pilot report approved by the Judicial Council on March 15, 2019.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Support implementation of the Assessment Period of the VRI pilot program (including kickoff, court preparations, site visits, and deployment), as requested.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> January 2018: Onsite training was conducted at the three VRI pilot courts: Sacramento, Merced and Ventura Superior Courts. The pilot courts went live with VRI events. February 2018: SDSU Research Foundation (the independent evaluator) began collecting data. March-April 2018: SDSU conducted onsite observation in Sacramento to gather additional data. July 2018: The pilot courts successfully shared interpreters from county to county (inter-court). The VRI pilot was completed on July 31, 2018. August 2018: SDSU conducted an online survey with pilot stakeholders to gather feedback and additional data. September 2018: Equipment removal began at the pilot courts.
(b) Review pilot findings; validate, refine, and amend, if necessary, the technical standards.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SDSU submitted their final report in December 2018. A December 14, 2018 VRI Workstream meeting took place to review the pilot findings and the draft guidelines for VRI, including recommended minimum technology guidelines.
(c) Identify whether new or amended rules of court are needed (and advise the Rules & Policy Subcommittee for follow up).	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The VRI Workstream determined that no new or amended rules of court are needed at this time.
(d) Consult and collaborate with LAPITF, as needed, in preparing recommendations to the Judicial Council on VRI implementations.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> January 2019: LAPITF approved the draft JC report and VRI guidelines. February 2019: ITAC/JCTC also approved the draft JC report and VRI guidelines. March 2019: The Judicial Council approved the final report and VRI guidelines.
(e) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	In progress	<p>Note: Need to develop Leveraged Procurement Agreements with the two approved equipment vendors (Paras and Associates and TeleSpace/Connected Justice Consortium). An online VRI Resource Center and best practices document are currently in development with NCSC. Post-pilot staffing for VRI is TBD.</p>
At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.	In progress	<p>Note: ITAC may want to consider a Workstream to help oversee the implementation of the new VRI program for the branch.</p>

4. E-Filing Strategy



Highlight: Continued progress with master service agreements.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Finalize master agreements with the three (3) E-Filing Managers (EFMs) selected to provide services.	In Progress	We have an executed master agreement with 2 of the 3 selected EFM Vendors, JTI and ImageSoft. An agreement has been reached with Tyler Technologies. The JCC Legal Services Offices are updating the EFM Master Agreement with the revised language. Execution of the agreement is expected forthwith.
(b) Develop the E-Filing Service Provider (EFSP) selection/certification process.	Not Started	Once the final master agreement is executed by Tyler we will be in a position to kick-off the program and define the certification process all 3 EFM vendors will use to certify EFSPs.
(c) Monitor the progress of EFSP accessibility compliance.	In Progress	In March 2018, JCIT conducted a survey of the 58 trial courts to determine compliance with AB 103. Based on survey results, currently 24 of the 58 trial courts provide electronic filing and electronic document service either directly, through vendor services, or a combination of vendor and in-house services. We are actively preparing to reach out to all 58 Trial courts to query and document any updates to their CMS and/or E-Filing in the interim.
(d) Develop the roadmap for an e-filing deployment strategy, approach, and branch solutions/alternatives.	In Progress	The E-Filing program provided an in initial presentation of the program for the April CITMF meeting to introduce the team and solicit input from Trial courts seeking to participate in the program. This allowed for the development of the initial roadmap and deployment strategy.
(e) Report on the plan for implementation of the approved NIEM/ECF standards, including effective date, per direction of the Judicial Council at its June 24, 2016 meeting.	In Progress	The Los Angeles Superior Courts recently implemented a JTI E-Filing solution for Civil and Small Claims cases. This solution was developed based on the requirements and standards for the statewide program. This solution will effectively become the baseline California E-Filing Standard. The standard will evolve as additional courts and case-types are included in the program.
(f) Consult and report on the implementation of the court cost recovery fee that will support the statewide e-filing program.	In Progress	We have held a number of discussions with regard to the cost recovery fee. Currently the legal department are reviewing statutes to determine feasibility of implementing the cost recovery fee and distributing the funds collected.
(g) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support of the ongoing e-filing program being funded through the court cost-recovery fee.	In Progress	The 3 JCIT staff positions for the program have been filled. While we await execution of the final Master Agreement with Tyler, we are coordinating with the finance and legal departments on the funding aspects of the program.
(h) At the completion of these objectives and with the approval of the JCTC, formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

5. Identity and Access Management Strategy



Highlight: Policy track recommendations drafted.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Develop and issue an RFP for a statewide identity management service/provider; identify and select.	Completed	Microsoft Azure AD Identity Service acquired under a Leveraged Procurement Agreement (LPA), County of Riverside RFQ #PUARC-1518, Microsoft Master Agreement Number 01E73970.
Develop the roadmap for a branch identity management strategy and approach.	In Progress	Roadmap recommendations are being drafted. Los Angeles will be the first court to deploy applications (Attorney Portal and Remote Hearings Portal) using the Branchwide Identity Management service.
Determine policies and processes for identity management (including proofing and access management).	In Progress	Initial Policy track recommendations are drafted.
Ensure linkage and alignment with other branchwide initiatives such as E-Filing, SRL Portal, Next Generation Hosting, CMS Migration and Development.	In Progress	Sponsors or project managers for the aligned initiatives are members of the workstream.
Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	In Progress	JCIT staff are participating in the pilot at Los Angeles Superior Court and are on the workstream.
At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.	In Progress	Feedback requested from ITAC on draft Policy track recommendations.

6. Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) E-Services



Highlight: The workstream has concluded their efforts, and presented their results at the June ITAC meeting.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Provide input for, and track, a SRL E-Services Budget Change Proposal (BCP) process for FY 18-19 funding.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BCP was approved \$3.2 million in FY 2018–19 \$1.9 million in FY 2019–20 \$709,000 ongoing
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, and vendor resources.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is being done in conjunction with the next line item (c) as part of the development of the RFP (or several if deemed advantageous).
Develop and issue a request for proposal (RFP) or other solicitation, as needed, to support the implementation of the branchwide e-services portal.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In person kickoff meeting held on 7/12/18 RFP scope and initial content outline completed Follow-up meetings begin 7/30/18 Posted to Courts.ca.gov website on April 8, 2019
Determine implementation options for a branch-branded SRL E-Services website that takes optimal advantage of existing branch, local court, and vendor resources.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JCIT is funded a project (Digital Services Self-Help Pilot) as a pre-cursor to the SRL portal project which piloted a small subset of features to get some experience and understanding in this area. SRL E-Services workstream members participated on the Product Council for the Digital Services Pilot
Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate. Note: In scope for 2018 is the submission and tracking of a budget change proposal (BCP) and development of an RFP; out of scope is the actual implementation.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job Descriptions and PARS (Position Action Requests) are in progress for four new positions funded by the BCP. Budget allocations and Project Team make-up are also in discussion JCIT will now own the Project phase of the SRL E-Services Portal. SRL E-Services workstream members participating on the Product Board for continuity.

7. IT Community Development



Highlight: Tracks are documenting their findings, results, and final recommendations.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Initiate new workstream: Identify sponsor and leads; form workstream membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Completed	Orientation and introduction meeting held on July 30, 2018 for members and workstream track leads to review the three workstream tracks (Resources, Education, Tools) and related key objectives. Next steps are for each track to solicit additional workstream participants as needed based on the area of focus and kick off the individual tracks.
(a) Survey the courts to identify (i) their interest in exploring opportunities to share key technical resources and (ii) IT leadership and resource development needs and priorities; report findings.	Completed	(i) CEO survey complete (ii) IT leadership assessment complete, 3 courses delivered based on identified priorities
(b) Assess court CEO/CIO interest in an IT peer consulting program and develop recommendations.	Completed	CEO survey complete with CIO input.
(c) Assess needs and make recommendations for expanded opportunities for technology-related education for judicial officers, CEOs, CIOs, and court staff. Consult with CJER for educational planning considerations.	In Progress	Judicial focus group / assessment complete CEO and Operations focus groups in progress. Documenting recommendations in progress.
(d) Identify, prioritize, and report on collaboration needs and tools for use within the branch.	In Progress	Needs assessment conducted. Documenting recommendations in progress.
(e) Evaluate and prioritized possible technologies to improve advisory body and workstream meeting administration; pilot recommended solutions with the committee.	Completed	Research conducted.
(f) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, as appropriate.	In Progress	Workstream Sponsor and Track Leads are working closely with JCIT to determine inclusive and appropriate workstream track membership and alignment with JC IT resources.

7. IT Community Development



Highlight: Tracks are documenting their findings, results, and final recommendations.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(g) Provide recommendations for Phase 2 based on findings and including updated Tactical Plan for Technology.	In Progress	All tracks have begun discussions regarding their draft recommendations.
(h) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; amend the annual agenda accordingly.	Not Started	

8.1. Digital Evidence: Assessment (Phase 1)



Highlight: Digital Evidence Survey Results Accepted by ITAC and JCTC.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Review existing statutes and rules of court to identify impediments to use of digital evidence and opportunities for improved processes.	Completed	Existing statewide statutes and rules reviewed and documented. Findings summarized in the Digital Evidence Survey Report
(b) Survey courts for existing business practices and policies regarding acceptance and retention of digital evidence.	Completed	Survey completed and findings summarized in the Digital Evidence Survey Report
(c) Survey courts and justice system groups regarding possible technical standards and business practices for acceptance and storage of digital evidence.	Completed	Surveys completed and findings summarized in the Digital Evidence Survey Report
(d) Seek approval on recommendations and next steps from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2.	Completed	Digital Evidence Survey Results presented at ITAC and JCTC and accepted.

8.2. Digital Evidence: Assessment (Phase 2)



Highlight: Proposed Project Manager identified, orientation and kickoff being scheduled.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Investigate and draft proposed best practices, policies, and standards for transmitting, accepting, storing, and protecting digital evidence, and circulate recommendations to the branch for input and feedback.	Not Started	Workstream orientation, knowledge transfer, and kickoff in planning
(b) Research and recommend existing technology and services that would support transmission, acceptance, storage, and protection of digital evidence.	Not Started	Workstream orientation, knowledge transfer, and kickoff in planning
(c) Develop and propose changes to evidence-based rules of court and statutes in collaboration with the Rules and Policy Subcommittee	Not Started	Workstream orientation, knowledge transfer, and kickoff in planning
(d) Review the Trial Court Records Manual for any needed updates to reflect revisions of rules and statutes, and any proposed best practices, policies and standards	Not Started	Workstream orientation, knowledge transfer, and kickoff in planning
(e) Report findings to ITAC and JCTC, providing recommendations on next steps, and formally sunset this phase of the workstream	Not Started	

9. Data Analytics : Assess and Report (Phase 1)



Highlight: Contracted with Gartner to build a branch data governance framework; launch pilot projects with 19-20 BCP funding; seek 20-21 BCP funding for permanent resources for data analytics

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Identify, evaluate and prioritize possible policies, processes, and technologies to help the branch utilize data analytics to improve business effectiveness.	In Progress	Gartner work to build data governance framework kicks off August 29, 2019.
(b) Develop appropriate governance recommendations at the local court and branch level.	In Progress	Gartner work kicks off August 29, 2019.
(c) Assess and report priorities for data collection.	Not started	This work will be undertaken in a second phase, once (a), (b), and (d) are complete.
(d) Identify and evaluate possible data analytical tools and templates.	In Progress	
(e) Identify whether new or amended proposed rules of court and/or statutes are needed and advise the Rules and Policy Subcommittee for follow up.	In Progress	This will be more fully fleshed out once other objectives are complete.
(f) Based on findings and recommendations, scope and initiate Phase 2 of the workstream	In Progress	

10 Disaster Recovery (DR) Initial Pilot and Knowledge Sharing (Phase 2)



Highlight: Vendor engaged; pilot court in discovery phase.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<i>Leveraging the innovation grant awarded to the Superior Court of Monterey County for a Cloud DR Pilot Program, the workstream will:</i>		
(a) Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Completed	Roster approved on February 28, 2019. Workstream kickoff held on March 29, 2019. Biweekly meetings scheduled.
(b) Recommend a list of critical technology services that make business sense for cloud-based recovery adoption.	In Progress	The Superior Court of Monterey County has engaged with the selected vendor, and is in the process of conducting discovery and assessments.
(c) Establish a cloud DR master agreement with a short list of cloud service providers for judicial branch entities/courts to leverage.	Completed	Agreement completed November 20, 2018, with Infiniti Consulting, Inc.
(d) Publish design solution templates from judicial branch entities (JBEs) that implement technologies and solutions from vendors selected in the cloud DR master agreement.	Not Started	
(e) Host knowledge-sharing sessions for interested JBEs (including tools to estimate cost for deploying recovery solution using a particular cloud service provider; and Monterey solution case study).	In Progress	One session - a proposal conference - held as part of the RFP for the Cloud-Based Disaster Recovery project, on May 31, 2018. After the conclusion of the pilot phase, additional avenues for knowledge sharing will be made available to the judicial branch technology community.
(f) Evaluate the need for a BCP to fund a pilot group of courts interested in implementing cloud-based DR for critical technology services (see (a))	Not Started	
(g) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	Not Started	
(h) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	


11 Online Dispute Resolution (ODR): Assessment



Highlight: Solicitation for workstream membership will occur shortly.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Not Started	
(b) Identify and evaluate available ODR technologies.	Not Started	
(c) Review findings from existing court-offered ODR programs.	Not Started	
(d) Evaluate and describe scenarios where ODR might be beneficially deployed in the judicial branch.	Not Started	
(e) Review rules and statutes to identify areas where possible amendments will be needed.	Not Started	
(f) Report findings and recommendations to ITAC.	Not Started	
(g) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

12 Branchwide Information Security Roadmap

 **Highlight:** Solicitation for workstream membership ended August 8, 2019; proposed membership to be submitted to chairs.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	In Progress	Solicitation for membership was released, and closed August 8, 2019.
(b) Define methods and activities for expanding branch information security capabilities.	Not Started	
(c) Create an overarching strategy for educating courts on information security best practices, risk management, and incident response.	Not Started	
(d) Identify resources to assist the courts in developing policies and procedures based on the Judicial Branch Information Systems Controls Framework.	Not Started	.
(e) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream	Not Started	

13.1. Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions



Highlight: Amendments to Code of Civil Procedure sec. 1010.6, Penal Code sec. 1203.01, and rules 2.251, 2.255, 2.257, and 2.540 of the California Rules of Court were circulated for public comment and approved by ITAC and the JCTC.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) Proposals to amend statutes to support e-business. First, amend Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 to allow courts to recover actual costs of permissive electronic filing as they can with mandatory electronic filing, and clarify a provision for signatures made not under penalty of perjury. Second, amend Penal Code section 1203.01 to provide an alternative to mailing certain statements and reports.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>Amendments to Code of Civil Procedure sec. 1010.6 and Penal Code sec. 1203.01 were circulated for public comment.</p> <p>The public comment period ended on June 7, 2019. RPS reviewed the comments and proposals and recommended the proposals to ITAC. ITAC and JCTC reviewed the proposals and has recommended them to the Judicial Council. The proposals will next be considered by PCLC. The Judicial Council will vote on whether to sponsor the proposed legislation at its November meeting.</p>
<p>(b) Proposals to amend the electronic filing and service rules to provide greater clarity and remove paper dependencies. First, amend rule 2.251 to clarify how notice of electronic service is to be given and provide standardized language for consent. Second, amend rule 2.257 to revise language on signatures of opposing parties, and make minor revisions consistent with Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>Amendments to rules 2.251, 2.255, and 2.257 of the California Rules of Court were submitted circulated for public comment.</p> <p>The public comment period ended on June 10, 2019. RPS reviewed the comments and recommended the proposal to ITAC. ITAC and JCTC reviewed the proposal and recommended to it to the Judicial Council. RUPRO will next consider the proposal. The Judicial Council will consider whether to amend the rules as proposed at its September meeting.</p>
<p>(c) Proposals to amend rules on remote access to electronic records. Make minor amendments to rule 2.540 to add more clarity and additional local government entities.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>Amendments to rule 2.540 of the California Rules of Court were submitted for public comment.</p> <p>The public comment period ended on June 10, 2019. RPS reviewed the comments and recommended the proposal to ITAC. ITAC and JCTC reviewed the proposal and recommended to it to the Judicial Council. RUPRO will next consider the proposal before it goes to the council. The Judicial Council will vote on whether to amend the rule at its September meeting.</p>

13.2 Standards for Electronic Court Records as Data



Highlight: The CEAC Records Management Subcommittee has determined standards are not needed at this time.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) CEAC Records Management Subcommittee – in collaboration with the Data Exchange Workstream governance body – to develop standards if needed to allow trial courts to maintain electronic court records as data in their case management systems to be included in the Trial Court Records Manual with input from the Court Information Technology Managers Forum (CITMF). Rules & Policy Subcommittee to review.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The CEAC Records Management Subcommittee planned to add a section to the <i>Trial Court Records Manual</i> (TCRM), “if needed,” to provide standards for trial court records as data. The subcommittee has tentatively concluded it may not be necessary to add such standards. The subcommittee instead is considering expanding and updating the TCRM section that provides general standards for electronic court records. The contemplated revisions, among other things, would acknowledge that electronic court records may include records in the form of data (for example, data submitted using fillable forms). This approach may be simpler, clearer, and less repetitive.</p>
<p>(b) Determine what statutory and rule changes may be required to authorize and implement the maintenance of records in the form of data; develop proposals to satisfy these changes.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Not needed at this time.</p>

13.3. Privacy Resource Guide



Highlight: The Privacy Resource Guide (PRG) has been published.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Continue development of a comprehensive statewide privacy resource guide addressing, among other things, electronic access to court records and data, to align with both state and federal requirements (completed 2018)	Completed	
Continue development of court privacy resource guide, outlining the key requirements, contents, and provisions for courts to address within its specific privacy policy (completed 2018).	Completed	
(a) Circulate the draft guide for branch comment; revise as appropriate.	Completed	
(b) Finalize and seek approval of the guide by ITAC.	Completed	ITAC approved publication of the guide at their April 15, 2019 meeting.
Proposed updated 2019 objectives: (b) Revise and update the Privacy Resource Guide with new privacy related laws, rules, forms, standards and best practices on an annual basis with a projected publication date after January 1, 2020 to allow for inclusion of published rules and law effective as of January 1, 2020. (c) Monitor and analyze how the Privacy Resource Guide is being used for the calendar year 2019, and make recommendations for which Judicial Council entity will be responsible for maintaining and updating the Privacy Resource Guide beyond 2019.	Completed	ITAC approved these proposed updated objectives at their April 15 meeting. The Annual Agenda has been updated.

14.1. Rules Modernization: Uniform Formatting Rules for Electronic Documents



Highlight: Pending the Rules and Projects (RUPRO) Committee approval, the proposed uniform formatting rules will be submitted to the Judicial Council for approval.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Develop uniform formatting rules for electronic documents filed or otherwise submitted to the appellate courts.	In Progress	JATS developed proposed rules for formatting electronic documents filed in or submitted to the appellate courts. AAC and ITAC have recommended that the Judicial Council approve the proposal with changes following public comment. JCTC and RUPRO will consider the committees' recommendation in August. If JCTC and RUPRO approve, it will go to the Council in September 2019, and if approved, go into effect January 2020.

14.2. Modernize Appellate Court Rules



Highlight: Pending the Rules and Projects (RUPRO) Committee’s approval, the proposal to amend rule 8.500 will be submitted to the Judicial Council.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) Numbering of materials in requests for judicial notice. Consider amending rule 8.252, which requires that materials to be judicially noticed be numbered consecutively, starting with page number one. The problem is that such materials are attached to a motion and declaration(s) and are electronically filed as one document, making pagination and reference to those materials in the briefs confusing for litigants and the courts. This project may be addressed by the uniform format rules project.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>This project has been included in the uniform formatting rules proposal.</p>
<p>(b) Method of notice to the court reporter. Consider whether to amend rule 8.405, which governs the filing of an appeal in juvenile cases, to remove or modify the requirement in subdivision (b)(1)(B) that the clerk notify the court reporter “by telephone and in writing” to prepare a transcript. This language may be outdated or inconsistent with other rules requiring notification by the clerk.</p>	<p>Not Started</p>	<p>Work on this project is scheduled for next year; any rule amendment to be effective 1/1/2021.</p>
<p>(c) Clarify the filing date of an e-filed document. Amend rule 8.77 to clarify that an e-filed document received by the court before midnight that meets the filing requirements is deemed to have been filed that day. This project addresses an ambiguity in the rule that has resulted in inconsistent treatment of e-filed documents that are received after business hours.</p>	<p>Not Started</p>	<p>Work on this project is scheduled for next year; any rule amendment to be effective 1/1/2021.</p>

14.2. Modernize Appellate Court Rules (Cont'd)



Highlight: Pending the Rules and Projects (RUPRO) Committee’s approval, the proposal to amend rule 8.500 will be submitted to the Judicial Council.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(d) Court of Appeal service copy of a petition for review. Amend rule 8.500(f)(1) to remove the requirement of a separate service copy of a petition for review. Once the Supreme Court accepts a petition for review for filing, the Court of Appeal automatically receives a filed/endorsed copy of the petition. The filing of the petition satisfies the service requirements for the Court of Appeal. This project is intended to eliminate an inefficiency.	In Progress	JATS developed a proposal to amend rule 8.500. Following public comment, AAC and ITAC have recommended that the Judicial Council approve the proposal without modification. JCTC and RUPRO will consider the committees’ recommendation in August. If JCTC and RUPRO approve, it will go to the Council in September 2019, and if approved, go into effect January 2020.
(e) Amend rule 8.70 to clarify content. Consider amending rule 8.70 to clarify the subdivision (c)(2)(B) definition of a document and make subdivision (c)(2)(D) parallel with the rest of (c)(2).	Not Started	Work on this project is scheduled for next year; any rule amendment to be effective 1/1/2021.

14.3. E-Filing and E-Readers for Incarcerated Individuals



Highlight: A pilot program is being developed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Research and explore options with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) regarding the use of e-readers by incarcerated individuals.	In Progress	AAC and ITAC are developing a pilot program for the electronic delivery of certain filings and communications in inmate civil cases and habeas proceedings. The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation will discuss the proposal at a meeting on April 5, 2019. Justice Mauro will report to JCTC on April 8, 2019.
(b) Potentially recommend to the Judicial Council the development of a pilot program with one prison and one court to test promising options.	In Progress	The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation will discuss the proposal at a meeting on April 5, 2019. Justice Mauro will report to JCTC on April 8, 2019.

14.4. Appellate Document Management System



Highlight: Pilot program training to begin in May.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) Receive status updates and provide feedback to Judicial Council Information Technology (JCIT) staff on implementation of a new document management system in the appellate courts. The Third Appellate District and the Fifth Appellate District are piloting the initial implementation.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>Training for the pilot programs in the Third and Fifth Appellate Districts was scheduled to begin in May 2019. Deployment of the pilot programs was scheduled for July 2019.</p>