May 2020 Progress Report

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

> ⭐ **Highlight:** The workstream is drafting their findings and recommendations report.

	Status	Description
Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Completed	**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). 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. **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. Additionally, the **budget change proposal for FY19-20** was approved to support a formal pilot to further test the technology.
Define the standard of success and how to measure it as well as define the difference between translation and interpretation.	Completed	The project team has been divided into 2 tracks – a **Metrics** track, and a **Vendor** track. The Metrics track has chosen a 1-5 scale, with definitions for each number, for both voice recognition/transcription, and text translation. These scores will be used when testing the solutions using prewritten scripts provided by workstream members.
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.	Completed	The project leads 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. The project team will continue to collaborate with both LAPITF and the Legal Design Lab at Stanford for further collaborative opportunities.

May 2020 Progress Report

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

⭐ **Highlight:** The workstream is drafting their findings and recommendations report.

	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.	Completed	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: • Voice to text transcription • Text to text translation • Text to speech output
Test 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.	Completed	The workgroup engaged with the Judicial Council to develop an evaluation site to test the APIs offered by 4 vendors. This site is live for testing, with improvements continuing to be developed. The workstream has assigned members to evaluate the vendor APIs using pre-developed scripts; testing to occur throughout December.
Identify and pursue any possible pilot collaborations with the Legal Design Lab at the Stanford University Law School.	Deferred	JCIT will collaborate with the Legal Design Lab for possible collaborations.
Support implementation of a voice-to-text pilot program (including kickoff, court preparations, site visits, and deployment).	In Progress	The workstream is providing input to this JCIT-managed effort.
Capture learnings and draft a white paper report on the lessons learned, findings, use cases, usage guidelines, and recommendations for next steps.	In Progress	The workstream is drafting their findings and recommendations report, targeting presentation to ITAC in August.
At the completion of these directives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.	In Progress	Once drafted, the findings and recommendations report will be presented to ITAC (targeting August 3 meeting).

Estimated Completion Date: December 2020

2. Tactical Plan for Technology Update

> ⭐ **Highlight:** Initial planning in progress, solicitation to be distributed shortly.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Initiate workstream, including formation of membership and conduct orientation/kickoff meeting.	In Progress	Initial preplanning underway with the Executive Sponsor and JCIT leadership.
(b) Review, gather input, and prepare an update of the Tactical Plan for Technology.	Not Started	
(c) Circulate the draft plan for branch and public comment; revise as needed.	Not Started	
(d) Finalize, and seek approval from ITAC, JCTC, and the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

May 2020 Progress Report

3. Identity and Access Management Strategy

> ⭐ **Highlight:** Policy recommendations were presented at TCPJAC/CEAC and received positive feedback

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.
(a) Develop the roadmap for a branch identity management strategy and approach.	In Progress	Roadmap recommendations have been drafted by the Technical track, and inserted into the draft final report. An initial review was performed by the Information Security workstream, with feedback that the Technical track will address.
(b) Determine policies and processes for identity management (including proofing and access management).	In Progress	Policy track recommendations presented at CEAC/TCPJAC at the January business meeting. Drafting final report to present to ITAC.
(c) 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.
(d) Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support.	In Progress	JCIT staff are participating in the pilot at Los Angeles Superior Court and are on the workstream.
(e) Recommend changes to Rules of Court as needed and work with the Rules & Policy Subcommittee to draft them.	In Progress	Currently researching.
(f) 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.

1

5. Digital Evidence: Rules, Technology, and Pilot Evaluation

⭐ **Highlight:** Workstream kickoff held on January 14; four tracks established.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Investigate and report on existing local pilots and court practices, including policies and standards, for transmitting, accepting, storing, and protecting digital evidence.	In Progress	Business Practices track established. Several meetings have occurred and discussions related to the changes of business practice as a result of COVID-19.
(b) Research and recommend available technology and services that would support transmission, acceptance, storage, and protection of digital evidence.	In Progress	Technology Standards, Practices and Governance Track established Meetings held with vendors NICE, Genetec & Axon
(c) Develop and propose changes to Rules of Court and statutes related to digital evidence in collaboration with the Rules and Policy Subcommittee.	In Progress	Rules and Statutes Track established Documenting COVID-19 Rule changes
(d) Develop a framework for successful possible future pilots, including use case scenarios, costs and benefits, and success criteria.	In Progress	Integrated Justice Governance Track established
(e) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

6. Data Analytics : Assessment and Report

⭐ **Highlight:** Workstream continues building governance framework and piloting technology solution in five courts.

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 kicked off August 29, 2019; workstream members are working on a set of recommended initial principles and policies to present to the Judicial Council.
(b) Develop appropriate governance recommendations at the local court and branch level.	In Progress	Gartner work to build data governance framework kicked off August 29, 2019; workstream members are working on a set of recommended initial principles and policies to present to the Judicial Council.
(c) Assess and report priorities for data collection.	In Progress	This has been initiated as part of the Gartner work as well as the pilot programs.
(d) Identify and evaluate possible data analytical tools and templates.	In Progress	Five pilots are being launched to test a possible technological approach for data analytics, modeled off the Orange Superior Court Innovations Grant. The branch has procured a cloud data warehouse solution and is in the process of procuring an ETL (Extract, Load, Transform) tool. Two different types of data visualization tools are being tested.
(e) Identify whether new or amended 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) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval from ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

May 2020 Progress Report

7. Disaster Recovery (DR) Initial Pilot and Knowledge Sharing

> ⭐ **Highlight:** Feasibility assessments underway, templates being developed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
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.
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.

(a) Recommend a list of critical technology services that make business sense for cloud-based recovery adoption.	In Progress	The Superior Court of Monterey County engaged with Infinity Consulting for Phase I services - infrastructure and critical systems assessment for feasibility and solution recommendations for cloud-based disaster recovery. The focus of the engagement was on the following:
		 1) Assess the court technology environment to document network and server infrastructure that provide essential court services categorized as Priority 1 (P1):
		   Current P1 Services: Odyssey Case Management System, Jury System, Portal Service, Justice Partners Services. Criminal E-filing Services – AutoClerk, Public Website, and Shoretel Telephone System
		
		 2) Recommend pathways and connection options to extend local network and security to create a hybrid infrastructure to the cloud service provider:
		   Potential Pathways: Traditional VPN Connection, Mircosoft ExpressRoute, and custom built high bandwidth option.
		
		 3) Evaluate backup and replication solutions that leverage the Court's investments in technology resources and skills to modernize recovery using the cloud:
		  Evaluated Solutions: Microsoft Azure Site Recovery, Zerto, Veeam, and Rubrik Data Protection.
		
		 Infinity presented its assessment and recommendation report in Sep 2019. The Court is currently in the design and pilot implementation phases to conduct feasibility assessments for its critical systems using the vendor-referred solutions for disaster recovery. We have a successful poof of concept by running Odyssey Case Management System in Microsoft Azure using Microsoft Azure Site Recovery.

7. Disaster Recovery (DR) Initial Pilot and Knowledge Sharing

> ⭐ **Highlight:** Feasibility assessments underway, templates being developed.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(b) Publish disaster recovery to cloud (DR2C) roadmap for judicial branch entities (JBEs) that includes design solution templates from Monterey and other participant courts.	In Progress	We are currently in the process of developing Microsoft Azure Resource Manager(ARM) Templates to be leveraged by other courts when creating infrastructure in Microsoft Azure. Assessment tools and recommendation reports from Infinity were distributed to the court technology community.
(c)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	Infinity presented the disaster recovery solution recommendation based on Monterey's technology environment assessment to the CIO community in Sep 2019. We had 47 participants for this session. We continue to maintain an ongoing dialogue with the DR2C workstream members via biweekly meetings to share knowledge and ideas.
(d)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	
(e)Coordinate and plan with JCIT regarding operational support, if appropriate.	Not Started	
(f) At the completion of these objectives, seek approval of ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council and formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

8. Online Dispute Resolution (ODR): Assessment

⭐ Highlight: Solicitation drafted.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	In Progress	Executive Sponsor is Hon. Julie R. Culver; solicitation drafted.
(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) Survey and document best practices in evaluating feasibility and program design to maximize access to justice.	Not Started	
(f) Review rules and statutes to identify areas where possible amendments will be needed.	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	

9. Branchwide Information Security Roadmap

> ⭐ **Highlight:** Sub-tracks continuing their research.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Identify core team (sponsor and leads); form group membership; hold kickoff meeting(s).	Completed	The membership roster was approved on September 9, 2019, and the kickoff meeting held on October 7, 2019.
(a) Define methods, activities and/or initiatives for expanding and strengthening branch information security capabilities.	In Progress	The leads along with internal JC resources are discussing a new direction with internal communications governance to streamline incoming review requests, internal process, and delivery of request.
(b) Create an overarching strategy for educating courts on information security end user education, risk management, and incident response.	In Progress	Sub-tracks for Incident Response, End User Education, and Risk Management are continuing to research framework and platform options.
(c) Identify resources to assist the courts in developing policies and procedures based on the Judicial Branch Information Systems Controls Framework.	In Progress	The workstream is working with identified resources to develop a security gap analysis and tier list that will allow us to identify security domains in need of the most attention. We will then be able to frame out a strategic plan and road map for both Cybersecurity and Information Security domains.
(d) Consult with other workstreams on individual security recommendations and ensure alignment with ongoing development of Judicial Branch security standards.	In Progress – As requested	Worked with Kathy Fink from the Identity Management Workstream. Developing governance model for interactions between workstreams with security review requests.
(e) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and, if appropriate, the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream	Nor Started	

10. Remote Video Appearances in Criminal Proceedings: Research

⭐ Highlight: Workstream has not started.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
Reviewing outcomes of Video Remote Interpreting pilot and Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings workstream:		
(a) Validate, refine, and amend, if necessary, the technical standards applicable to criminal proceedings.	Not Started	
(b) Identify whether new or amended Rules of Court and statutes are needed and advise the Rules & Policy Subcommittee for follow up.	Not Started	
(c) Define and prioritize use case scenarios and define success criteria for a pilot.	Not Started	
(d) At the completion of these objectives, present findings and recommendations to, and seek approval from, ITAC, JCTC and the Judicial Council. Formally sunset the workstream.	Not Started	

11.1. Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions

⭐ **Highlight:** The rule proposal is circulating for public comment from April 10 to June 9, 2020.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Amend the California Rules of Court to indicate that an electronic filing service provider must allow the party to proceed with an electronic filing even if the party does not consent to receive electronic service.	In Progress	Amendments to the California Rules of Court to indicate that an electronic filing service provider must allow the party to proceed with an electronic filing even if the party does not consent to receive electronic service were approved by the subcommittee and ITAC to be submitted for public comment. The public comment period starts on April 10, 2020 and ends on June 9, 2020.

May 2020 Progress Report

11.2 Remote Video Appearances in Civil Proceedings

⭐ **Highlight:** The legislative proposal is circulating for public comment from April 10 to June 9, 2020.

Key Objectives	Status	Description
(a) Building on the recommendations of the Futures Commission and ITAC Remote Video Appearances Workstream, participate in a joint ad hoc subcommittee with Civil and Small Claims, Family and Juvenile Law, and Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committees to develop legislative and rule proposals to allow video remote appearances in most civil court proceedings.	In Progress	The subcommittee developed a legislative proposal generally authorizing remote video in all civil cases and proceedings. The public comment period starts on April 10, 2020 and ends on June 9, 2020.
(b) Work cooperatively with the ITAC Digital Evidence Workstream, when needed.	In Progress	