



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

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

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))

THIS MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED BY TELECONFERENCE

THIS MEETING WILL BE RECORDED

Date: October 15, 2018
Time: 12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831 Passcode: 3511860

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the September 10, 2018 meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(2))

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), public comments about any agenda item must be submitted by October 12, 2018, 12:00 noon. Written comments should be e-mailed to jctc@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, attention: Rica Abesa. Only written comments received by October 12, 2018, 12:00 noon will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-3)

Item 1

Chair Report

Provide update on activities of or news from the Judicial Council, advisory bodies, courts, and/or other justice partners.

Presenter: Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair

Item 2

Update/Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

An update and report on ITAC will be provided; this will include the activities of the workstreams.

Presenter: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair, Information Technology Advisory Committee

Item 3

Information Security Update (Action Requested)

Review and consider whether to recommend acceptance of the proposed updates to the Judicial Branch Information Security Framework.

Presenters: Mr. Michael Derr, Principal Manager, Information Technology
Mr. Matt Nicholls, Supervisor II, Information Technology

A D J O U R N M E N T

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

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

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

September 10, 2018

12:00 - 1:00 PM

Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair; Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-Chair; Hon. Kyle S. Brodie; Hon. Ming W. Chin Hon. Rebecca Wightman; Mr. Jake Chatters; Ms. Rachel W. Hill; Ms. Audra Ibarra; and Ms. Andrea K. Rohmann

Incoming Advisory Body Members Present: Ms. Nancy Eberhardt

Liaison Members Present: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson

Others Present: Mr. Robert Oyung; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Ms. Heather Pettit; Mr. Michael Derr; Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic Ms. Kathy Fink; Ms. Daphne Light; Mr. David Koon; Ms. Jamel Jones; and Ms. Camilla Kieliger

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order, took roll call, and advised no public comments were received.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the July 9, 2018 open meeting and July 25, 2018 action by email.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Chair Report

Update: Hon. Marsha Slough, Chair of the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC), welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. Justice Slough reviewed the agenda for the meeting, as well as provided updates on recent meetings in which she and other members represented the JCTC or reported on the JCTC activities.

Item 2

Update/Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

Update: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair of ITAC, provided an update and report on the activities of the advisory committee, its subcommittees, and its workstreams. Workstreams with key milestones highlighted included the Digital Evidence, Data Analytics, and Next Generation Hosting.

Action: The committee received the report.

Item 3

Update on the Information Security Framework

Update: Mr. Michael Derr, Principal Manager in the Information Technology office, provided a report on the proposed updates to the Judicial Branch Information Security Framework. The committee also received an update on the establishment of an Information Security Outreach Program. The Information technology office will update the framework to incorporate feedback from the committee and will return to the committee at a future meeting for review and to request approval to submit to the Judicial Council with the committee's endorsement for adoption.

Action: The committee discussed the proposed changes and received the report.

Item 4

Update on the Strategic Plan for Technology

Update: Ms. Audra Ibarra, JCTC and Strategic Plan Workstream Member, and Mr. Jake Chatters, JCTC and Strategic Plan Workstream Member, provided a progress report on the Strategic Plan Workstream's update to the plan, including an overview of changes and invitation to provide input. They explained that the committee and the Judicial Council would receive the updated report in November 2018 for review and consideration for approval.

Action: The committee received the report.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

The background features a large, faint, circular seal of the Judicial Council of Georgia. The seal contains a central figure, likely a personification of Justice, holding a scale and a sword. Surrounding the figure are various symbols, including a ship and a plow. The text "JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF GEORGIA" is visible around the perimeter of the seal, and the year "1926" is at the bottom.

Information Security Update

October 15, 2018

Status Update

- Updating the Judicial Branch Information Security Framework
- Expanding information security resources available to the courts



Proposed Revisions

- Additional guidance has been added on the subjects of standards and how to establish security requirements.
- Policy statements have been transferred to a separate policy manual template.
- Privacy controls have been updated in compliance with National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Special Publication 800-53.
- Requirements have been relabeled as controls to maintain consistency and alignment with federal standards.



Framework Review

- December 2017
 - Initial presentation to ITAC
- August 2018
 - Redlines circulated to CIOs
 - Presented proposed revisions to ITAC
- September 2018
 - Initial presentation to JCTC
- October 2018
 - Court Executives Advisory Committee briefing



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Current Focus

- Updating security framework to incorporate feedback received to date
 - Using the California Judicial Branch template as the initial base for updates
 - Revising our approach to retain the fill-in-the-blank template model that's currently in place
 - Providing an updated redline for review



Next Steps

- November 2018: Presentation to Judicial Council for ratification
- December 2018: Report to the California State Auditor (CSA) on completion of this requirement



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Discussion

- Questions?





JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688
www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on November 29 - 30, 2018:

Title	Agenda Item Type
Judicial Branch Technology: Information Security Framework Update	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
None	December 1, 2018
Recommended by	Date of Report
Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC)	October 9, 2018
Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair	Contact
Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-Chair	Mr. Michael Derr Michael.Derr@jud.ca.gov
	Mr. Matt Nicholls Matt.Nicholls@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) recommends approval of revisions to the Judicial Branch Information Security Framework. The original framework was approved by the Judicial Council in June 2014 with the understanding that it would require periodic updates. This revision cycle is focused on updates to make the document easier to use and on the addition of privacy controls specified in recently updated federal standards.

Recommendation

The Judicial Council Technology Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve revisions to the Judicial Branch Information Security Framework:

1. Additional guidance has been added on the subjects of standards and how to establish security requirements.
2. Policy statements have been transferred to a separate policy manual template. This allows a clear demarcation to be maintained between the framework, which is intended to be a

resource for courts to use in the development of local policies, and the policies themselves (which serve to implement the framework).

3. Privacy controls have been incorporated as set forth in the National Institute of Standards and Technology Special Publication 800-53. These controls provide guidance on the handling of personally identifiable information (PII) and serve as a reference in the development of operational resources such as the Judicial Branch Privacy Resource Guide.
4. Requirements have been relabeled as controls to maintain consistency and alignment with federal standards.

Relevant Previous Council Action

The Judicial Council ratified the adoption of the current security framework at their June 2014 meeting. Subsequently, Judicial Council staff templated the framework and the JCTC published this template to the branch so that courts could adopt locally by filling in court-specific information. In addition, a “how-to-use” guide and an implementation checklist were developed in partnership with the courts and published to the branch.

Analysis/Rationale

In determining the scope of updates to be made to the current Judicial Branch Information Security Framework, it was identified that the updates should be (1) focused on making the document easier to use; (2) evolutionary in nature, vs. a fundamental shift in direction; and (3) of a nature that would permit courts to continue to use the existing “how-to-use” guide and framework implementation checklist.

The proposed updates accomplish these objectives and satisfy requirements to periodically update and maintain this document.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

The proposed updates were developed from applicable federal standards and represent industry best practices that are designed to secure and protect our technology infrastructure. In developing the framework originally, we had the option of aligning with international standards (the International Organization for Standardization, or ISO), or federal standards (National Institute for Standards and Technology, or NIST). It was decided to align with federal standards because of NIST’s predominate focus on government agencies. This update maintains that alignment.

There are no anticipated policy implications, however, as courts work to update existing policies or implement new policies, the revised security framework will provide courts with additional guidance to draw from in that process.

Prior to presentation to the Judicial Council, comments on the proposed updates were solicited from and received by the court information officers, the Information Technology Advisory Committee, and the Judicial Council Technology Committee. In addition, the Court Executives Advisory Committee was briefed. Overall feedback was positive and supportive. In regard to the

proposed changes, thus far, no concerns have been raised from the court CIO community or from ITAC. We have, however, received feedback during the JCTC review raising concerns in regard to the scope of the edits. The proposed framework updates were revised to address those concerns, and the finalized document submitted to the council today includes those revisions.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

There are no anticipated costs related to this update. Once approved, the revised framework will be published to the branch and posted to the Judicial Resource Network, where it will replace the original version that is currently posted. Courts will localize the revised framework by inserting court-specific information in the same manner as the previous edition of the framework.


DRAFT

Information Technology Advisory Committee Status Report - August 2018

This report was provided at the **August 27, 2018** ITAC meeting. Status updates are submitted by workstream sponsors and subcommittee chairs.



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

 **Highlight:** Workstream formed; in person meeting being held August 28—including orientation and technology demonstrations. FY19-20 BCP funding requested.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	In Progress	<p>The core team has been formed. It includes: Executive Sponsor, Judge Michael Groch (San Diego); Technical Lead, John Yee, JCIT; Project Manager, Fati Farmanfarmaian, JCIT, along with JCIT technical resources. 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 is scheduled for August 28 and is anticipated to include a full team orientation and educational demos of the intelligent chat technology.</p> <p>Note that the estimated completion date was based on a start date of January 2018; however, given that the workstream began later, this initial target date is being reassessed and will be updated for the next report.</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>
(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).	In Progress	Staff conducted initial technology research via Gartner on intelligent chat technologies and platforms; also, received vendor demonstration from Nuance Communications. Discovery will continue into the next quarter to help further identify and monitor court proofs of concepts.
(b) Identify key performance indicators and benchmark before/after success.	Not Started	
(c) Capture learnings and report findings.	Not Started	
(d) Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results.	Not Started	
(e) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; annual agenda accordingly.	Not Started	

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



Highlight: In progress of identifying a full workstream team. FY19-20 BCP funding requested.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	In Progress	<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>On August 21, 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 is expected to be approved in September, after which a kickoff meeting will be scheduled.</p> <p>The target timeframe for completion of Phase 1 of this effort is 6-9 months from the workstream kickoff. After that time, it will be determined if a Phase 2 workstream will need to be established.</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>(NEW) Define the standard of success and how to measure it as well as define the difference between translation and interpretation.</p>	Not Started	Once the project team is formed, define what the standard of success is for voice-to-text language services. Part of the comparator for success will be the current level of accuracy for non-machine language services. Part of the definition of success will also need to include definitions of the terms <u>translation</u> and <u>interpretation</u> since the differences may be somewhat nuanced.
<p>(NEW) 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.</p>	Not Started	
<p>(a) 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.</p>	Not Started	


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



Highlight: In progress of identifying a full workstream team. FY19-20 BCP funding requested.


Key Objectives	Status	Description
(b) 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.	Not Started	
(c) Capture learnings and draft a white paper report on the lessons learned, findings, and recommendations for next steps.	Not Started	
(d) Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results.	Not Started	
(e) 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:** Workstream formed and meeting monthly. Divided into subcommittees and is preparing topics list for recommendations. FY19-20 BCP funding requested.

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>Note that the estimated completion date was based on a start date of January 2018; however, given that the workstream began later, this initial target date is being reassessed and will be updated for the next report.</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>In Progress</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 to be explored has been developed for further refinement and investigation by the team.</p>

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

 **Highlight:** Workstream formed and meeting monthly. Divided into subcommittees and is preparing topics list for recommendations. FY19-20 BCP funding requested.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(b) Capture learnings and report findings.	Not Started	
(c) Update Phase 2 of workplan based on results.	Not Started	
(d) Seek approval from ITAC and the JCTC to conclude Phase 1 and initiate Phase 2; annual agenda accordingly.	Not Started	

2. Tactical Plan for Technology Update



Highlight: First working meeting held, resulting in proposed assignments for updating current initiatives and work in progress. Next meeting scheduled for September 7.

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.	In Progress	First working meeting held, proposing assignments for updating current initiatives and work in progress that is not included in the current Tactical Plan. Planning next meeting to review drafts and prioritize new ideas for initiatives.
(c) Circulate the draft plan for branch and public comment; revise as needed.	Not Started	
(d) Finalize, and seek approval by the JCTC and the Judicial Council; thereafter, formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

3. Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Pilot



Highlight: July-2018 - VRI was conducted successfully from county to county (inter-court). The six-month VRI Pilot concluded on July 31, 2018.

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.	In Progress	<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.
(b) Review pilot findings; validate, refine, and amend, if necessary, the technical standards.	In Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> August 2018: SDSU will conduct an online survey with stakeholders (including attorneys) to gather feedback and additional data. SDSU will then begin work to prepare a final report with findings and recommendations, which will be included in a report to the Judicial Council on VRI in early 2019.
(c) Identify whether new or amended rules of court are needed (and advise the Rules & Policy Subcommittee for follow up).	Not Started	
(d) Consult and collaborate with LAPITF, as needed, in preparing recommendations to the Judicial Council on VRI implementations.	Not Started	
(e) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	Not Started	

4. E-Filing Strategy



Highlight: Continued progress on EFM negotiations; and report on progress of EFSP accessibility.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Finalize master agreements with the three (3) E-Filing Managers (EFMs) selected to provide services.	In Progress	We continue to negotiate with 2 of the 3 chosen EFM Vendors Tyler, JTI and ImageSoft. We have an executed master agreement with JTI. We are close to agreement with ImageSoft who still must submit a SOW. Issues remain with Tyler that Snorri will discuss with the other courts using Tyler's Odyssey CMS.
(b) Develop the E-Filing Service Provider (EFSP) selection/certification process.	Not Started	Developing the certification process will require the JCIT staff positions, already identified, be filled. The initial position has been advertised with announcement of the selected candidate expected soon.
(c) Monitor the progress of EFSP accessibility compliance.	In Progress	In March 2018, the Judicial Council Information Technology Office 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. Preliminary feedback from the courts and vendors indicates a substantial level of compliance, with plans for achieving full compliance within the specified time frame of June 2019.
(d) Develop the roadmap for an e-filing deployment strategy, approach, and branch solutions/alternatives.	Not Started	
(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.	Not Started	
(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 JCIT have identified the positions required for operational support of the statewide eFiling program. The initial JCIT position has been advertised with announcement of the selected candidate expected soon.
(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: Phase 2 of the workstream, to identify policy and process recommendations as well as a strategy and roadmap, has started.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) 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.
(b) Develop the roadmap for a branch identity management strategy and approach.	In Progress	Nominations for phase 2, which will address the roadmap, have been received and the roster is being updated for approval.
(c) Determine policies and processes for identity management (including proofing and access management).	In Progress	Nominations for phase 2, which will address policy and process recommendations, have been received and the roster is being updated for approval.
(d) 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.
(e) 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.

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



Highlight: BCP approved; began kickoff for pre-RFP planning.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Provide input for, and track, a SRL E-Services Budget Change Proposal (BCP) process for FY 18-19 funding.	Complete	<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
(b) 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.	In Progress	<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
(c) Develop and issue a request for proposal (RFP) or other solicitation, as needed, to support the implementation of the branchwide e-services portal.	In Progress	<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
(d) Determine implementation options for a branch-branded SRL E-Services website that takes optimal advantage of existing branch, local court, and vendor resources.	In Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JCIT is funding a project as a pre-cursor to the SRL portal project which will pilot a small subset of features to get some experience and understanding in this area. • SRL E-Services workstream members participating on the advisory council for this Digital Services project
(e) 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.	Not Started	

7. IT Community Development



Highlight: Conducted Workstream Kick-off and forming individual tracks.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Initiate new workstream: Identify sponsor and leads; form workstream membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Complete	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. Workstream would like to amend its target end date from December 2018 to end of March 2019.
(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.	In Progress	(ii) At the CITMF July 2018, there was a CIO development introductory session. Following the training, a survey was distributed to CIOs and participants on professional development opportunities for top 5 areas of focus for leadership development.
(b) Assess court CEO/CIO interest in an IT peer consulting program and develop recommendations.	Not Started	
(c) (NEW) Partner with CJER to develop and implement an annual plan for keeping judicial officers, CEO's, and CIO's abreast of technology trends and tools .	Not Started	
(d) Identify, prioritize, and report on collaboration needs and tools for use within the branch.	Not Started	
(e) Evaluate and prioritized possible technologies to improve advisory body and workstream meeting administration; pilot recommended solutions with the committee.	Not Started	
(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 JCIT resources.

8. Intelligent Forms Strategy: Research & Scope (Phase 1)



Highlight: Workstream concluded at April 2018 ITAC meeting; JCIT tasked with identifying path forward.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Evaluate Judicial Council form usage (by courts, partners, litigants) and recommend a solution that better aligns with CMS operability and better ensures the courts' ability to adhere to quality standards and implement updates without reengineer.	Completed	Final recommendation, Target Solutions Two and Five: Create and publish Application Programming Interface (API) that will merge data files with Judicial Council forms.
(b) Address form security issues that have arisen because of the recent availability and use of unlocked Judicial Council forms in place of secure forms for e-filing documents into the courts; seek solutions that will ensure the forms integrity and preserves legal content.	Completed	Final recommendation, Target Solutions One, Two and Five: Identify and deploy resources to certify all Judicial Council forms. Assign version numbering to all forms. Host all forms on a separate "Judicial Council forms server". Populate forms by merging data files with Judicial Council forms. Move away from filling out PDFs to completing web forms instead.
(c) Investigate options for redesigning forms to take advantages of new technologies, such as documents assembly technologies.	Completed	Final recommendation, Target Solutions Two, Six and Seven: The proposed solution will eventually separate the PDF from the data gathering tool, allowing a multitude of ways to populate forms, including third-party app developers. This proposal also recommends creating a clearinghouse for interview-based solutions so that best practices can be shared across platforms.
(d) Investigate options for developing standardized forms definitions and delivery methods that would enable forms to be efficiently electronically filed into the various modern CMSs across the state.	Completed	Final recommendation, Target Solutions Two, Four and Five: Standardize form field naming conventions by extending NIEM/ECF standards, preferably in collaboration with courts and vendors. Assign version numbering to all forms. Design form update governance standard to enable courts and vendors to easily identify changes.

8. Intelligent Forms Strategy: Research & Scope (Phase 1 – cont.)



Highlight: Workstream concluded at April 2018 ITAC meeting; JCIT tasked with identifying path forward.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(e) Explore the creation and use of court generated text-based forms as an alternative to graphic forms.	Completed	Final recommendation, Target Solution Six: Develop pilot project to create truly dynamic forms. Such forms include only mandatory items and any optional items that contain data, but would not display empty fields.
(f) Investigate whether to recommend development of a forms repository by which courts, forms publishers, and partners may readily and reliably access forms in alternate formats.	Completed	Final recommendation, Target Solution Two: Host all Judicial Council forms on a separate “Judicial Council forms server”.
(g) Develop recommendations for a potential BCP to support proposed solutions. (Note: Drafting a BCP would be a separate effort.)	Completed	An Initial Funding Request for three additional positions to support the recommendations in the workstream’s report was drafted and submitted to the JCTC and JBBC for consideration.
(h) Initiate Phase 2 of the workstream, based on the recommendations.	On Hold- Pending JCIT Review	At the April 30, 2018, ITAC meeting, ITAC asked JCIT to investigate the basis for any next steps. Suggestions included developing pilots, a Request for Information (RFI), and seeking funding for development and deployment. JCIT is expected to report back to ITAC on next steps, including if a Phase 2 workstream is needed.

9. Digital Evidence: Assessment (Phase 1)



Highlight: Report on branchwide survey is being drafted. Justice Partner surveys completed.

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.	In Progress	Existing statewide statutes and rules reviewed and documented. Will review survey results for local rules and statutes.
(b) Survey courts for existing business practices and policies regarding acceptance and retention of digital evidence.	In Progress	Report on branch wide survey being drafted.
(c) Survey courts and justice system groups regarding possible technical standards and business practices for acceptance and storage of digital evidence.	In Progress	Justice partner surveys completed
(d) Report findings to ITAC and provide recommendations on next steps.	In Progress	Report on branch wide survey being drafted.
(e) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	Not Started	

10. Data Analytics : Access and Report (Phase 1)



Highlight: Workstream holds in person meeting August 30th to kick off project and review test cases.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Research, scope, and recommend a data analytics strategy for the branch (e.g., this may include gaining case processing and resource data).	In Progress	Members have been identified (E&P is in the process of approving the membership) and will meet in person on August 30 th .
(b) Investigate possible policies, processes, and technologies to help the branch utilize data analytics to improve business effectiveness.	In Progress	The Judicial Council Legal Services Office has and will provide feedback about Rule 10.500 in the context of data analytics
(c) Assess priorities for data collection and present findings to ITAC.	Not Started	
(d) Identify possible data analytical tools and templates.	In Progress	Members will view a data presentation in Tableau (software package for data analytics) at the August 30 th meeting.

11.1. Disaster Recovery (DR) Framework Phase 1



Highlight: Completed Phase 1 workstream deliverables, including Judicial Council approval.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Coordinate with JCIT to define and plan the operational or ongoing support needed to maintain the <i>Disaster Recovery Framework Guide</i> and associated deliverables.	Completed	The final report included the recommendation that Judicial Council IT would update the document on a periodic basis, as needed.
(b) Seek approval of the proposed framework from the JCTC and adoption by the Judicial Council; thereafter, formally sunset this phase of the workstream.	Completed	Framework and toolkit was approved by the Judicial Council on March 2, 2018. Additionally, a presentation was made to the Executive Committees of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and Court Executive Advisory Committee. ITAC formally approved closure of Phase 1 workstream at April 30, 2018 meeting.

11.2. Disaster Recovery (DR) Framework Phase 2



Highlight: Initiating workstream in coordination with Innovation Grant pilot.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Initiate new workstream: Identify sponsor and leads; form workstream membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	In Progress	Sponsor and Project Manager have been identified. Through our collaborative efforts initiated by the Innovation Grants funded Cloud-Based Disaster Recovery project, members representing 26 JBEs have formed two teams with the objective of crafting a branch-wide RFP that serves the majority of the courts. Kick-off meetings were held in November 2017, and the RFP is still in progress. We plan to seek members of the workstream from the RFP strategy and review teams.
(a) Leverage the innovation grant awarded to the Superior Court of Monterey County for a Cloud DR Pilot Program.	In Progress	We expect to have master agreements completed by the end of September 2018. The next phase will include Monterey County Superior Court to select one for the award vendor solution, design and implement recovery for selected systems and programs.
(b) Recommend a list of critical technology services that make business sense for cloud-based recovery adoption.	Not Started	
(c) Establish a cloud DR master agreement with a short list of cloud service providers for judicial branch entities/courts to leverage.	In Progress	Master agreements with three vendors are expected to be completed by the end of September 2018. All three have been found to be capable of developing and implementing Cloud Based Disaster Recovery
(d) Publish design solution templates using technologies and solutions from vendors selected in the cloud DR master agreement.	Not Started	
(e) Host knowledge sharing sessions for interested judicial branch entities/courts (including tools to estimate cost for deploying recovery solution using a particular cloud service provider; and Monterey solution case study).	In Progress	As part of the RFP for the Cloud-Based Disaster Recovery project, a proposal conference was held on May 31, 2018 to build knowledge on leveraging cloud technologies for disaster recovery. After the conclusion of the pilot phase, additional avenues for knowledge sharing will be made available to the judicial branch technology community.
(f) Provide input to JCIT that will be used in drafting a BCP to fund a pilot group of courts interested in implementing Cloud-based DR for critical technology services (see (b)).	Not Started	
(g) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	Not Started	

12.1. Next-Generation Hosting Strategy Phase 1



Highlight: Completed Phase 1 workstream deliverables, including Judicial Council approval.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Coordinate with JCIT to define and plan the operational or ongoing support needed to maintain the <i>Next-Generation Hosting Framework Guide</i> and associated deliverables.	In Progress	
(b) Seek approval of the proposed framework from the JCTC and adoption by the Judicial Council; thereafter, formally sunset this phase of the workstream.	Completed	Framework and toolkit was approved by the Judicial Council on March 2, 2018. Seeking formal approval from ITAC to sunset this phase of the workstream.

12.2. Next-Generation Hosting Strategy Phase 2



Highlight: Surveyed courts assessing hosting status; plan to formally solicit for membership.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Initiate new workstream: Identify sponsor and leads; form workstream membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	In Progress	Continue to work on workstream membership utilizing a survey to courts to gather data and feedback.
(a) Identify and implement a pilot program to test the branch Next-Generation Hosting Framework and report findings. Pilot courts to include those with available funding; also, will include collaboration with courts already in progress of transitioning to next-generation hosting.	In Progress	Investigating current next generation hosting programs throughout the branch, including trial courts and judicial council technology projects.
(b) Establish master agreements for cloud service providers. (Potential shared effort with DR Workstream initiative.)	In Progress	Monterey Court DR in cloud has concluded it's RFP and a Master Agreement with three vendors is in process.
(c) Establish the judicial branch support model for IT services.	Not Started	
(d) Determine funding mechanism to transition courts to new hosting models; this includes exploring a potential Budget Change Proposal (BCP)	Not Started	


13.1. Modernize Trial Court Rules



Highlight: Amendments to title 2, division 3, chapter 2 of the California Rules of Court were submitted for public comment.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) Proposals to create and amend rules to conform to legislation enacted in 2017. For example, new provisions of Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 expressly require the Judicial council to adopt rules of court related to disability access and electronic signatures for documents signed under penalty of perjury. The new provisions also require express consent for electronic service, which will require a rule amendment, and creation of a form for withdrawal of consent.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments to title 2, division 3, chapter 2 of the California Rules of Court are being circulated for public comment. The proposed amendments respond to new requirements in Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6, amend definitions in the rules, and ensure indigent filers are not required to have a payment mechanism to create an account with electronic filing service providers. Proposed Judicial Council form EFS-006, <i>Withdrawal of Consent to Electronic Service</i> is being circulated for public comment. The purpose of the proposal is to comply with Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6(a)(6), which requires the Judicial Council to create such a form by January 1, 2019. This is a joint proposal with the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee. <p>The public comment period ended on June 8, 2018. RPS, ITAC, JCTC and RUPRO have reviewed the rule and form proposals and recommended them to the Judicial Council. The Judicial Council will vote on whether to amend the rules and approve the form at its September meeting.</p>
<p>(b) Proposals based on suggestions from the public such as revising definitions and addressing a barrier to indigent users accessing services of electronic filing service providers.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>(c) Proposals for technical amendments to amend rules language that is obsolete or otherwise unnecessary.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>See above.</p>

13.2 Standards for E-Signature

 **Highlight:** E-signature rule proposal presented to CEAC Records Management Subcommittee and circulation for public comment.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(a) CEAC Records Management Subcommittee to develop standards governing electronic signatures for documents filed into the court with input from the Court Information Technology Managers Forum (CIOs). Rules & Policy Subcommittee to review.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>AB 976 amended Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 to require express consent for electronic service and not allow the act of electronic filing to be deemed as consent to electronic service. The proposed e-signature rule was presented to CEAC Records Management Subcommittee. The proposed rule defines electronic signature as it is defined in California’s Uniform Electronic Transactions Act (UETA) and bases process for using an electronic signature under penalty of perjury on the process in UETA. The subcommittee did not raise any concerns with this approach.</p> <p>The public comment period ended on June 8, 2018. RPS, ITAC, JCTC and RUPRO have reviewed the rule and recommended it to the Judicial Council. The Judicial Council will vote on whether to amend the rules at its September meeting.</p>


13.3. Remote Access Rules for Government Entities, Parties, Attorneys



Highlight: The Joint Ad Hoc Subcommittee reviewed/approved rules proposal, which is currently posted for public comment.


Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Lead the Joint Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Remote Access to amend trial court ruled to facilitate remote access to trial court records by state and local government entities, parties, parties' attorneys, and certain court-appointed persons.	In Progress	The public comment ended on June 8, 2018. The Joint Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Remote Access, ITAC, JCTC and RUPRO have reviewed the rule proposal and recommended it to the Judicial Council. The Judicial Council will vote on whether to adopt the rules at its September meeting.

13.4. Standards for Electronic Court Records as Data

 **Highlight:** Members of CEAC Records Management Subcommittee have started working on this project.


Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) CEAC Records Management Subcommittee – in collaboration with the Data Exchange Workstream governance body – to develop standards and proposal 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.	In Progress	The CEAC Records Management Subcommittee work is in progress.
(b) Determine what statutory and rule changes may be required to authorize and implement the maintenance of record in the form of data; develop proposals to satisfy these changes.	In Progress	Same as above.

13.5. Privacy Resource Guide

 **Highlight:** The draft text of a Privacy Resource Guide (PRG) has been prepared and is continuing to be finalized.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) 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.	In Progress	Finalizing the draft Privacy Resource Guide that will assist the branch in addressing privacy issues; addressing among other things, confidential treatment of court records and data, and administrative records, consistent with statutes and case law. This preliminary draft will be presented to the committee.
(b) Continue development of court privacy resource guide, outlining the key requirements, contents, and provisions for courts to address within its specific privacy policy.	In Progress	The Privacy Resource Guide will include a section on best privacy practices for local courts to refer to regarding confidential treatment of court records and administrative records, and model templates for them to use. Legal staff has contacted various committees and divisions for assistance with this project

14.1. Modernize Appellate Court Rules

 **Highlight:** JATS recommended amended rules proposals following public comment. ITAC and AAC approved; Judicial Council will consider in September. Initiating annual agenda planning for 2019.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Formatting of electronic reporters’ transcripts: Rule 8.144 was amended in the prior rules cycle to provide format requirements for electronic court reporter transcripts consistent with amendments to Code of Civil Procedure section 271. In this rules cycle JATS will consider whether additional amendments to Rule 8.144 are needed.	In Progress-Monitoring	JATS has not received reports of concerns or problems with the rule amendment in practice. The subcommittee will continue to monitor and be responsive to comments or concerns if they are raised.
(b) Sealed & Confidential Material: Rules for the handling of sealed or confidential materials that are submitted electronically.	In Progress	The public comment period ended for the rule amendment proposal. JATS and the Appellate Advisory Committee recommended that the amendments be adopted. The Rules & Projects internal committee will consider the proposal on Aug 23; subject to that review, the Judicial Council will consider the matter at its September meeting. If approved, the rules will become effective January 1, 2019.
(c) Return of lodged electronic records: The trial court rule modernization changes made in 2016 amend rules 2.551(b) and 2.577)d)(4) to give the moving party ten days after a motion to seal is denied, to notify the court if the party wants the record to be filed unsealed. If the clerk does not receive notification in then days, the clerk must return the record, if lodged in paper form, or permanently delete it if lodged in electronic form. JATS will consider whether equivalent appellate rules are desirable.	In Progress	This proposal was consolidated with the proposal regarding sealed and confidential material. See above.
(d) Rule amendments regarding access: JATS will consider possible rule amendments to address online access to trial court records for parties, their attorneys, local justice partners, and other government agencies. The plan is for JATS to review what is ultimately proposed at the trial court level and use that as a basis for developing a companion proposal for access to appellate court records.	Not Started-On Hold	This project is dependent on pending action related to the trial court rules. JATS will review what is ultimately proposed for the trial courts and consider whether similar rules should be developed for appellate court records.

14.1. Modernize Appellate Court Rules (cont'd)



Highlight: JATS will consider whether to pursue these projects in the coming rules cycle. It is initiating annual agenda planning for 2019.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
<p>(e) Bookmarking: The 2016 trial court rules modernization changes include a new requirement, added to rule 3.1110(f), that electronic exhibits be electronically bookmarked. This issue was set aside by JATS for 2016, to permit those appellate courts new to e-filing at the time (or not yet on e-filing at the time) a chance to gain some experience with e-filing before participating in statewide decisions on this topic.</p>	<p>Not Started-Deferred</p>	<p>This subject was consolidated with item (f) below. After discussions and recommendations from JATS, the Appellate Advisory Committee deferred this project in order to expand the scope to develop uniform format requirements for electronic documents in the appellate courts. JATS and the AAC will decide whether to pursue the expanded project this year.</p> <p>In August, Justice Mauro (chair) and staff met with Justice Hull (chair, RUPRO) in a preliminary planning session to initiate the next annual agenda cycle.</p>
<p>(f) Exhibits: Create a requirement that exhibits submitted in electronic form be submitted in electronic volumes, rather than individually.</p>	<p>Not Started-Deferred</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>(g) Numbering of materials in requests for judicial notice: Consider amending rule 8.252, which requires numbering materials to be judicially noticed consecutively, starting with page number one. The materials are attached to a motion and declaration(s) and are electronically filed as one document, making pagination and references to these materials in the briefs confusing for litigants and the courts.</p>	<p>Not Started</p>	<p>This is a two year project. The subcommittee will consider whether to begin this work in the Fall of 2018, based on priorities.</p>

14.2. Rules Regarding Certification of Electronic Records, E-Signature, and Paper Copies



Highlight: The start of this project is dependent upon development of trial court rules proposals.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Provide input on proposed changes to the trial court rules of court governing certifications of electronic records, standards for electronic signatures, and requirements for paper copies of e-filed documents that will impact the appellate courts.	Not Started	JATS is holding on this item while the Rules & Policy Subcommittee develops the applicable trial court rules. It is anticipated that this item will remain on the annual agenda for the coming year.
(b) Consider whether to propose changes to the appellate court rules on this topic.	Not Started	This project is dependent on action related to trial court rules (see above). JATS will review what is ultimately proposed for the trial courts and consider whether similar rules should be developed for the appellate courts.

14.3. Input on Appellate Document Management System



Highlight: JATS is monitoring and providing input.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Monitor and provide input on the implementation of a new document system (DMS) for the appellate courts.	In Progress-Monitoring	Phase 1 of this project has begun. The Third Appellate District and Fifth Appellate District will pilot initial implementation. JATS is monitoring and providing input through its Chair, Justice Mauro.

15. Liaison Collaboration



Highlight: Liaisons assigned; reports to be received at the next ITAC meeting.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Appoint ITAC members to serve as liaisons to identified advisory bodies.	Completed	Members assigned to liaison roles. Eliminated the liaison relationship with the Jury Instructions advisory body, due to a lack of need.
(b) Share ITAC status reports with advisory body chairs and attend liaison committee meetings.	In Progress	
(c) Identify opportunities to collaborate and share liaison feedback to ITAC, the JCTC, the Judicial Council, and the branch, as appropriate.	In Progress	Liaisons are invited to report at the April 30 ITAC meeting.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

MEMORANDUM

Date

October 1, 2018

Action Requested

Please Review

To

Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair
Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-Chair
Judicial Council Technology Committee

Deadline

N/A

From

Kathleen Fink, Manager,
Judicial Council Information Technology

Contact

Kathleen Fink, Manager
415-865-4094
kathleen.fink@jud.ca.gov

Subject

Civil Case Management System (V3)
Replacement Projects: Status August 20 –
September 24, 2018

Project: Civil Case Management System (CMS) (V3) Replacement projects for the Superior Courts of Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura Counties

Status: The monthly Project Status meeting was held on September 24, 2018.

Intra Branch Agreements (IBAs)

The Intra Branch Agreement for FY 2018-19 for Orange Superior Court is in progress.

CMS V3 Support

The courts and JCC continue to reduce the amount of current maintenance and support in order to leverage those savings in the future to fund minimal “keep the lights on” support as a contingency for any potential project delays.

A draft V3 release roadmap to ramp down V3 support was proposed and discussed. A suggestion was discussed to address only critical items rather than major releases. This would reduce the workload on court resources, who are supporting both V3 projects and conversion activities. The courts will review the draft roadmap with their technical teams and provide their feedback.

Impact of JBSIS changes on V3 courts: The V3 team met with our JBSIS contact person to review technical specifications. It appears that the changes to V3 are fairly limited. Some can be completed with configuration changes and the rest with changes to the JBSIS report mapping.

Ventura Superior Court (Journal Technologies - eCourt):

Small Claims go-live target is November 15th. A full mock conversion is planned on Saturday, October 27th.

Conversion tests are scheduled on September 27th (to include financials and trust) and October 9th (to include screen changes).

San Diego Superior Court (Tyler Odyssey):

San Diego is now working on all three case categories: Small Claims, Probate, and Civil, with Small Claims to go live first.

First conversion push went well – most issues were related to configuration. Comparisons between V3 and Odyssey screens is used to validate the data.

Functional validation is planned the week of October 1. 100 test scripts will be executed and V3 data compared with Odyssey.

Work was launched on reports and forms. 100 forms have been identified for initial development.

Sacramento Superior Court (Thomson Reuters C-Track):

Continuing to work with Thomson Reuters on discovery and planning phase. Moving to next steps focusing on fit analysis, gap analysis, and solution options.

Orange Superior Court (Update CMS V3 for supportability and reliability):

Orange development staff have made their first changes to the V3 code and will merge them with release 14.03. Changes to the code will impact only Orange and will not be merged into the V3 code used by the other courts.

An application architecture and component inventory of V3 is being documented.

Onboarding of a V3 architect is in progress and a meeting with the V3 team in San Francisco is planned.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

MEMORANDUM

Date

October 3, 2018

Action Requested

Please Review

To

Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair
Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-Chair
Judicial Council Technology Committee

Deadline

N/A

From

David Koon, Manager,
Judicial Council Information Technology

Contact

David Koon, Manager
415-865-4618
david.koon@jud.ca.gov

Subject

Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement
Projects: Status September 1 - 30, 2018

As requested, this communication provides a written update regarding the progress of the nine courts using the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system which collectively received \$4.1 million in funding for FY 17/18 and \$896,000 in FY 18/19 as a result of submitting a BCP to replace the SJE case management system with a modern CMS platform.

Project: Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement project for the Superior Courts of Humboldt, Lake, Madera, Modoc, Plumas, San Benito, Sierra, Trinity, and Tuolumne counties.

Status: Judicial Council staff and the SJE courts met on September 19, 2018 for the monthly status meeting. During the meeting, the SJE courts reported that each of the nine courts have signed their participation agreements with Journal Technologies, Inc and had scheduled a planning conference call with the vendor to further discuss the deployment project and schedule.

October 3, 2018

Page 2

Next Steps: The next monthly status meeting with Judicial Council staff and the SJE courts is on October 24, 2018. The courts will meet with Journal Technologies, Inc. to discuss the project schedule and planning tasks related to the deployment project.