April 1, 2016

The Honorable Jorge Labarga
Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Florida
Supreme Court Building
500 South Duval Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1900

RE: Florida Courts Technology Commission Yearly Report

Dear Chief Justice Labarga:

Under the direction of the Supreme Court, the Florida Courts Technology Commission (the Commission) oversees, manages, and directs the development and use of technology within the branch; coordinates and reviews recommendations concerning court policy matters that involve the use of technology; and establishes the technology policies and standards by which all court committees and workgroups must abide.

As Chair of the Commission, I respectfully submit this report on the Commission’s work from April 2015 through March 2016. As you will find documented in this report, the Commission and its subcommittees as a whole have devoted considerable time and effort to governance and improving court technology.

The Commission is not making any recommendations to the Court at this time. However, the chair does wish to commend to the Court OSCA ISS and other staff for their exceptional and diligent work advancing the efforts of the Commission. Without their unwavering effort, much of what is reported below would not have occurred. It has been an honor and a privilege to contribute to these advancements and collaborative accomplishments for the state courts system and judicial branch as a whole.

Sincerely,

Lisa T. Munyon
Circuit Judge
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The Florida Courts Technology Commission was formed pursuant to Rule 2.236, Florida Rules of Judicial Administration, on July 1, 2010. The Commission was established to advise the Chief Justice and Supreme Court on matters relating to the use of technology in the judicial branch. The Commission has staggered, three-year terms of membership to ensure continuity and experience on the Commission.

Florida’s courts have made significant strides in recent years by upgrading case management systems, continuing the implementation of electronic case filing, working with electronic case files, and automating business processes through the use of technology. Florida’s courts are increasingly deploying technology to facilitate the effective, efficient, and fair disposition of cases in a timely manner. Today, technology is an inherent and inextricable component of the daily operations of the judiciary.

As technology advances, the Florida court system strives to find innovative ways to adapt and provide access and services to all Floridians. For many years the Commission has addressed a myriad of issues related to the improvement of technology in the court system, ranging from the access of court records to statewide standards for the development of systems. Additionally, technological advancements are forcing courts to reexamine delivery methods of services to better meet public demands based on changing times.

Six subcommittees and several workgroups have been created to work under the auspices of the Commission to focus on different areas of technology in our courts. Five workgroups were formed in 2015: The Rules of Judicial Administration (RJA) Joint Workgroup, Interpreter Data Workgroup, Department of Corrections (DOC) Joint Workgroup, Judicial Review Workgroup, and the Standards Consolidation Workgroup. The Compliance Subcommittee and Operational Procedure Review Workgroup were placed in an inactive status due to non-activity. Accordingly, the charge of the Technology Rules Subcommittee has been transferred to the RJA Joint Workgroup. The Chair of the Commission prioritized the work assignments of the subcommittees and workgroups in order to enable the Commission and its support staff to perform their functions at a rate that is manageable with the existing constraints of staff and travel. Through the committees, subcommittees, and workgroups, the Commission has taken on a number of projects.
During the course of the year, the Commission has been working diligently to oversee implementation of the counties On-line Electronic Records Access systems in compliance with the *Standards for Access to Electronic Court Records*. In addition, the Commission worked collaboratively with the E-Filing Authority Board and the Florida Court Clerks & Comptrollers (FCCC) to establish a uniform method of electronically filing proposed orders through the Portal, as well as continuing to assist in creating additional filer roles that allow non-attorneys to electronically file through the Portal. The Commission continues to endorse the development of Florida-compliant interview questions using the Access to Justice (A2J) document assembly software in assisting pro se litigants to electronically create and file documents through the Portal. The Commission’s work related to tasks assigned to each group is described in the section entitled Subcommittee and Workgroup Activities.

**Subcommittee and Workgroup Activities**

**A. Appellate Courts Technology Committee**

The purpose of the Appellate Courts Technology Committee (ACTC), which is a standing committee of the FCTC, is to provide technical guidance and consultation to the Commission and the Office of the State Courts Administrator regarding information systems development and operational policies and procedures relating to automation in Florida’s district courts of appeal.

Over the years, the technology vision of the ACTC has guided the direction of appellate court information technology through a number of major initiatives. Some of these include: implementing an appellate court office automation system that allowed for shared document creation and distribution; creating and implementing a standardized appellate court case management system while maintaining the unique processes within each court; and establishing and expanding local area network communications to a shared statewide network that connects all appellate courts. In more recent years, the ACTC has reviewed and approved various other technology initiatives, such as streaming video of court proceedings and pursuing efforts toward implementation of an “integrated” appellate case management system.

Currently, two appellate court e-filing and case management solutions are in use – eFACTS and iDCA/eDCA. The Information System Services (ISS) unit within the Office of the State Courts
Administrator has developed an electronic document, electronic workflow, and case management solution that will interface with the statewide Portal. The Supreme Court and the 2nd District Court of Appeal are using the eFACTS solution exclusively. The 1st, 3rd, 4th, and 5th DCAs are using a hybrid of both eFACTS and iDCA/eDCA.

The eFACTS solution is two-fold. The cases portion closely matches the legacy Case Management System (CMS) interface with the addition of voting management, scanning, task tracking, notifications, correspondence/red folder management, document generation, and electronic filing management. The eFACTS solution includes an OCR (Optical Character Recognition) service for making documents searchable, a stamping service for stamping filed documents with date/time and court, and integration with the statewide e-portal.

OSCA/ISS staff continues to develop the eFACTS solution and is working closely with the eFACTS Change Advisory Board (CAB), this ACTC, as well as with other subject matter experts. During the last year, several modifications were made to eFACTS including making application architecture changes to improve performance, and moving into eFACTS the remaining functionalities from the legacy CMS application. The eFACTS CAB members have discussed the retirement of the legacy CMS application and have decided that the application will be retired when two months elapse from the last CMS based functionality bug is corrected in eFACTS.

All courts require mandatory e-filing by attorneys. The Florida Supreme Court and the 2nd District Court of Appeal continue to accept e-filings, including mandatory clerk-to-clerk transmittals via the statewide e-portal. The e-filing functionality included in iDCA/eDCA is used at the 1st, 3rd, 4th, and 5th District Courts of Appeal.

In October 2015, The eFACTS CAB approved the eFACTS version 2 plan that includes an enriched person management module, enhanced case search and reporting, new recusal tracking feature, new non-case correspondence feature, augmented general docketing, and various analyses to facilitate integration of iDCA/eDCA and eFACTS (common database platform, common file storage, consolidated E-Filing Portal Integration, and tasking and voting enhancements and integration). This plan runs through October 2016.
B. Portal Subcommittee

Since 2011, attorneys filing in Florida courts have been required to electronically file court documents through the Portal, and volumes are high averaging about 54,000 filings a day with 1.1 million submissions per month. As the Portal has evolved, there have been a variety of filer roles added this year, taking the number of registered filers to over 108,000 by the end of February 2016. In September 2015, version 2015.02 of the Portal was released. To better assist filers in their business process, approved filer roles for State Agencies, Local Agencies, Insurance Agencies, Creditors and Media were included in this version. Document types were also developed for the additional filer roles. In addition, the A2J software was added to the Portal to assist self-represented litigants to construct documents suitable for filing, when approved by the Court. In April 2016, Portal version 2016.01 will be released. Further enhancements will include allowing judges to be added to the e-service list with an email specific for receiving service; allowing proposed orders to be filed through the Portal to the judicial circuits; increasing the filing submission size from 25 MB to 50 MB; and increasing the email attachment file size from 5 MB to 10 MB.¹

At the May 2015 FCTC meeting, to resolve the responsibility issue of stripping metadata from documents filed through the Portal, the subcommittee recommended the removal of metadata remain the responsibility of the filer and not the custodian of the court record. The Commission accepted the subcommittee’s recommendation and approved warning language to be added to the Portal, to notify filers that any document metadata remaining may become part of the public record.

In continuing technology strategies in the judicial branch, appellate courts and a limited number of petitioners are required to serve judges in lower trial courts under certain circumstances, but there were no mechanisms or procedures in place for the electronic service on judges. A concept of having judges electronically served through the Portal was debated, and the Commission accepted the subcommittee’s recommendation for each trial judge to provide an eservice address with the Portal, which can be either an individual and or divisional address. Court administration will register the judges on the Portal, thus allowing the judges to efile through the Portal and mandate an eservice address. To resolve any security

¹ On March 24, 2016, the Rules of Judicial Administration Committee filed its Time-Sensitive Out-of-Cycle Report of Judicial Administration Committee, under case number SC2016-529, requesting that these size limits be removed from the Rules of Judicial Administration and be governed by the Florida Supreme Court Standards for Electronic Access to the Court. The Commission recognizes that the Court may not have sufficient time act upon this request before the April release of Portal version 2016.1. Accordingly, the E-Filing Authority Board is prepared to remove these changes from the April release.
concerns, the judge’s name would appear on the service list as being served; however, the email address would not be viewable. In addition, the service would be single use and would not reside on the Portal; the filer would have to add them each time they wanted the judge served.

In establishing uniform naming conventions for documents filed with the court, the Portal Standardization project asks the 67 clerks of court to make their division, case type, and sub type drop down lists the same to allow for standardization statewide. The E-Filing Authority Board approved that all counties work toward standardizing drop down lists on case initiation and existing cases to match the Summary Reporting System (SRS) standards. During the course of the year, a Best Practices Workgroup of the FCCC was created and issued a best practice report that was adopted by the Executive Committee of the FCCC in December 2015. With the subcommittee’s review of streamlining the Portal, a motion was recommended and approved by the Commission to remove the document group and document type drop down lists from the document page in the Portal. To avoid searching the long list of document group/types, a search field was put in place to allow the filer to begin typing the name of the document. This allows the field to match what the filer is typing and negates the need for the document group/types drop down lists. In addition, removing the document group/type drop down lists would make the discrepancy among all the counties less visible. Therefore, with the removal of the drop down menus along with the added search field, the concern with standardized docket codes has been minimized.

In the subcommittee’s review of uniformity throughout the state, the judicial review process for documents held in the pending queue was an area of inconsistency. During the local document receiving process, when a determination is made that the filed document conflicts with any court rules or standards, the clerk shall place the filed document into a pending queue. When a document is placed in a pending queue it will remain there for five business days, after which time the filing will be docketed as filed and processed for judicial review. Once a document is placed in the pending queue for judicial review, it cannot be retrieved and is not physically reviewed by a judge. The filer does not resubmit that same filing, instead a whole new filing is created. In the Standards for Electronic Access to the Courts, 3.1.13 Local Document Receiving, the standard does not address a process for judicial review. The Commission accepted the subcommittee’s recommendation of creating a workgroup to perform an analysis and propose a revised standard on the judicial review process to allow for statewide standardization.
To provide immediate interpreting services and due process to those in need of an interpreter, the subcommittee recognized the necessity of determining what interpreter data information is captured by the Clerk’s CMS and if that information is captured at the earliest stage of case initiation. Several challenges and factors were deliberated on how interpreter data was being captured in the various Clerks’ case maintenance systems. The Commission accepted the subcommittee’s recommendation and created an Interpreter Data Workgroup to better identify foreign language interpreter needs of people accessing the Florida courts.

At the August 2015 FCTC meeting, the FCCC gave an update on the Comprehensive Case Information System (CCIS) version 3.0. The infrastructure is being upgraded to ensure system load of additional data. Improvements have been made to the method in which data is sent to CCIS as it will be more real-time and its quality enhanced. In addition, new security roles are being established and aligned with the Security Matrix. With inquiries on access to juvenile records and how CCIS will affect the Judicial Inquiry System (JIS), it was suggested and approved by the Commission, that a subcommittee be created in conjunction with the clerks, to stay abreast of all the changes occurring with CCIS 3.0.

At the November 2015 FCTC meeting, discussions began on providing a secure method for the Department of Corrections (DOC) to submit items to Florida’s courts, much like the established secure method for transmitting court (sentencing) documents from the clerks of court to the DOC. The subcommittee endorsed, and the Commission approved the establishment of, a Joint DOC Workgroup to research a secure method to electronically file violation documents to the court.

Currently, with the assistance of the FCCC, the subcommittee is reviewing the ability for large law firms to file directly to the Portal from their local computer systems through a batch filing process, much like the State Attorneys and Public Defenders do. To improve efficiencies in State Attorneys and Public Defenders offices, the subcommittee is examining their request for an approval of a method to utilize a web service, in downloading the documents they receive by eservice, instead of receiving the documents via email. Further, the subcommittee will be exploring if police agencies can efile search warrant returns. In conjunction with the Portal User Group, the subcommittee continues to review specifications for diverse filer roles and revisions that are needed to enhance the Portal.
C. Proposed Order Workgroup

Over the past year, in conjunction with the FCCC, the workgroup developed a Proposed Order Change Order for the portal that would allow filers to submit proposed orders to the court. The individual jurisdictions would interface with the Portal to receive and route the proposed order to the appropriate judge in the preferred method of their choosing.

The concerns over utilization in certain jurisdictions led to the request of a survey to determine interest before the change order was recommended. With 14 circuits in favor of adding the proposed order functionality to the Portal, the Proposed Order Change Order was approved by the Commission at the August 2015 FCTC meeting and sent to the E-Filing Authority Board for approval. The functionality of proposed orders will be included in the Portal release 2016.01 scheduled for April 2016. The system is set up for non-mandatory participation, and the individual circuits will have to agree to accept the proposed orders in the same manner.

Currently, the FCCC is developing technical standards to ensure the flow process and statuses are returned. Once specifications are completed and finalized they will be available to all the vendors who want to pull that information into their CAPS viewers. This functionality will allow the circuits to process the proposed orders through the viewers and then send the orders back to the Portal or CMS. Once a circuit or county has requested to utilize the functionality, a demo will be performed at a future FCTC meeting. Presently, CAPS viewers have been implemented in varying degrees in each circuit. Without funding to fully implement the viewers, statewide implementation of the proposed order functionality of the Portal is impeded.

D. Interpreter Data Workgroup

In May 2015, the Interpreter Data Workgroup was formed to identify interpreter data elements for managing the delivery of interpreter services in an efficient manner and the associated costs with each case. The workgroup met and learned the Clerks are adding data fields to the CMS to capture interpreter data related to the need, language and usage of interpreters. The workgroup developed a survey of the various case maintenance systems to determine how the interpreter data information will be submitted into the CMS systems. The workgroup continues to gather survey results to determine which systems can capture the interpreter data information and which systems will require modifications to have the ability to capture the data as well as any associated costs. Members of the workgroup include a court
administrator, judges, a court technology officer, and the portal project manager.

E. CCIS Subcommittee
In August 2015, the CCIS Subcommittee was formed to work together with the FCCC on changes that are occurring with CCIS version 3.0 and oversee the user interface. The subcommittee was further assigned to configure a way to use our current technology to identify related parties on a statewide level. The subcommittee determined CCIS version 3.0 has the greatest potential to provide the related party information on a state wide basis. The subcommittee formed a small sub-group to begin identifying the party information requirements and what is currently being captured in the CMS systems as well as what is available in the current CCIS system. The sub-group is currently working with the Clerks to determine how the required data elements can be captured in the various CMS systems. Once the systems are assessed, the subcommittee will determine how the data in CCIS 3.0 will transport the information to the CAPS viewers for the judge to view the related case information. The subcommittee will be developing recommendations in the future for the FCTC to consider.

F. DOC Joint Workgroup
In November 2015, the DOC Joint Workgroup was formed to determine any benefits of improving efficiencies between the Department of Corrections and the Supreme Court. With DOC in the beginning phases of bringing their facilities into the current era of IT solutions, there are some challenges with the limitation of outdated IT resources and policy issues with the prohibition of inmates accessing the internet. The workgroup has met by teleconference twice with DOC staff, who have agreed to participate in an approach to improve the existing process and make this a part of their strategic plan for moving ahead with technology. Currently, the workgroup is setting up an in-person meeting with DOC IT staff as well as policy staff to explore solutions to some of the constraints within DOC.

G. RJA Joint Workgroup
In February 2015, the RJA Joint Workgroup was formed to review the Court’s technology standards with the Rules of Judicial Administration Committee (RJAC) to identify inconsistencies and make recommendations to harmonize any differences. Over the past year, the workgroup in conjunction with the FCTC’s Standards Consolidation Workgroup have been reviewing and proposing revisions to the
Court’s technology standards to enhance greater collaboration in those areas, in which the RJA overlap the technology standards and eliminate any duplication, to promote the full implementation of a uniform process in referencing rules and technology standards.

In the workgroup’s review, one inconsistency is in the technology standards section that authorizes electronic judicial signatures, whereas the RJA does not. The Commission approved to recommend the RJAC to study the creation of a rule authorizing electronic judicial signatures. Another area of consideration is to modify the paper filing requirements to require e-filing. The workgroup further suggested the RJAC consider eliminating any megabyte limitations in its rules of procedure and incorporate them as a reference to the technology standard. The FCTC believes these technical references are more appropriate in the Court’s technology standards. Whenever the Court’s technology standards are changed, it would be more efficient for the RJAC to refer to the standard as opposed to changing a rule. The workgroup is continuing to review the Court’s technology standards for outdated concepts that are in need of being brought current.

H. Certification Subcommittee
The Certification Subcommittee was established to view demonstrations of judicial viewers and certify vendors in compliance with the Functional Requirements for Court Application Processing System (CAPS). CAPS is a software application that allows court files to be displayed electronically. The judicial viewers are used by trial judges or their staff to access and use electronic case files in the course of managing cases, scheduling and conducting hearings, adjudicating disputed issues, and recording and reporting judicial activity on the bench or remotely.

Currently, there are two vendor-based judicial viewer systems (Mentis Technology Solutions and Pioneer Technology Group) and four internally developed judicial viewer systems (Eighth, Thirteenth, Fifteenth, and Seventeenth Judicial Circuits) in the trial courts. Pioneer, the Eighth Judicial Circuit, and the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit received full recertification in October 2015. The Fifteenth Judicial Circuit received full certification in November 2015. Mentis received provisional recertification, and the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit received provisional certification in October 2015. Their judicial viewers did not meet all of the requirements outlined in Functional Requirements for Court Application Processing System version 3.0. Mentis has a demonstration scheduled for June 1, 2016, to demonstrate full
compliance with CAPS 3.0.

As of February 2016, 53 counties have fully implemented their viewer systems in one or more divisions that allow the judiciary to have online access to their cases. Of the remaining 14 counties, 11 counties anticipate implementation by July 2016 and 3 counties anticipate implementation by December 2016. Although, these systems will be implemented for judges to utilize for case management, a system will not be considered fully “functional” until the judges have the capability to electronically sign and file orders through the Portal.

Funding the CAPS to be fully functional has been challenging. With no funding approved on the comprehensive technology plan in the FY 15-16 Legislative Budget Request (LBR), OSCA staff, under guidance of the Trial Court Budget Commission (TCBC) and Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup (Funding Workgroup), updated the previously submitted technology plan to determine specifically which trial court systems/resources require funding to sustain and to complete the implementation of their CAPS viewers in expanding to all divisions. In addition, OSCA staff worked with Trial Court Administrators and Court Technology Officers to update costs estimates and add issues/move issues to out-years that support the comprehensive Florida Trial Court Technology strategic Plan 2015-2019, for the on-going technology needs for CAPS viewers, Court Reporting and Interpreting, and Support for Minimum Level of Technology. In July 2015, the TCBC recommended and the Supreme Court submitted a comprehensive FY 16-17 LBR to fund the first year of a multi-year comprehensive strategy for addressing statewide technology needs of the trial courts. In September 2015, a 362-page document that provided detailed information and analysis of the many technology projects included in the comprehensive plan was submitted to the Senate, House and Governor. This issue was not funded during the 2016 Legislative Session.

I. Access Governance Board

Over the past year, the Access Governance Board (Board) has been overseeing the online electronic records access pilot programs of the Clerks of Court. The Supreme Court issued Administrative Order AOSC14-19, In re: Standards for Access to Electronic Court Records (amended May 23, 2014). After subsequent feedback from the clerks, private attorneys, representatives of the media, and other interested
entities, the Standards for Access to Electronic Court Records and the Access Security matrix were revised to ensure access to electronic court records is consistent with rules and statutes. The Court approved the recommended changes to the standards and matrix and issued Administrative Order AOSC15-18, In re: Standards for Access to Electronic Court Documents and Access Security Matrix (June 9, 2015). Clerks of Court who wants to provide online access to electronic court records must apply to the Board for approval of their Online Electronic Records Access application; conduct a pilot program of at least 90 days to test compliance with amended AOSC14-19 and AOSC15-18; and submit at least three monthly status reports to the Office of the State Courts Administrator. After completing the pilot, the Clerk of Court is required to submit a certification letter to the Board certifying the clerk is in compliance with amended AOSC14-19 and AOSC15-18; provide a written description of the steps, processes, or tools used to validate compliance with the administrative orders; report all incidents of inadvertent release or unauthorized access to confidential information, if any occurred; certify that the clerk took the appropriate corrective actions necessary to address all reported incidents related to confidential information; and agree to incorporate changes to the Standards for Access to Electronic Court Records and/or the Access Security Matrix into their existing online electronic records access system. The Board received certification requests from 48 Clerks of Court to move their online electronic records access system out of the pilot phase and into production. A packet is being finalized for the Supreme Court’s consideration.

The Board worked in conjunction with a representative from the Florida Public Defender Association to create a public defender user role in the standards and matrix to provide public defenders appropriate level of access to specific case types defined by rules and statute. Additionally, the Board proposed changes to the language in the standards restricting the search of images for internet public access. These recommended changes are also being finalized for the Supreme Court’s consideration.

J. Technical Standards Subcommittee

The Technical Standards Subcommittee is in the process of updating the Integration & Interoperability (I&I) document which was previously updated September 2013. The I&I document is essentially a technical document that court technology officers use and identifies best practices and existing standards regarding hardware and software platforms, network infrastructure, and methods for data exchange.
K. Standards Consolidation Workgroup

In May 2015, the Standards Consolidation Workgroup (SCW) was established to review and update all of the technical and functional standards. The SCW worked with the FCTC/RJA Joint Workgroup which reviewed the RJA rule sets to find technology standards that apply to the practice of law and overlap with rules of court. The ultimate goal is to remove technology standards from the rules and have the rules reference the consolidated technology standards. The SCW combined the standards into a draft format that separated the standards into distinct major parts and renumbered them in a user-friendly way for reference purposes. The combined standards include: Standards for Electronic Access to the Courts (e-filing standards); Standards for Access to Electronic Court Records; Functional Requirements for Court Application Processing System; Integration and Interoperability Standards; and Notification by Clerk of System Modification. Significant changes were made to the e-filing standards, including: language referencing access was stricken as there are currently standards for online electronic access and an access security matrix; language regarding docket numbering was added; language regarding clerk of court signatures was added; and language regarding the electronic signature of a judge was strengthened and requires a watermark which includes a date, time stamp, and the case number. The SCW also plans to add hyperlinks directly to rules or other documents referenced in the consolidated technology standards. In the coming months, the FCTC will submit a packet to the Court for approval detailing specific changes that were made to the consolidated technology standards.

L. Document Storage Workgroup

The Document Storage Workgroup was formed to do strategic planning to determine long-term goals and standards of storing electronic documents. There are a number of document storage methods available; however, after much research and discussion the workgroup decided to recommend PDF/A as the document storage standard. The workgroup has identified different hurdles as it goes through some workflow processes and realizes several parallel tracks need to take place while moving toward PDF/A as the accepted storage standard. The workgroup needs to differentiate between digital and electronic signatures; educate attorneys and the judiciary on what a PDF is and how to produce a PDF document; and educate attorneys and the judiciary on how to create ADA-compliant documents. The workgroup is developing proposed standards for electronic document submissions to include, but not limited to: document file size; embedding images; scanning standards; redaction technology; management of
metadata; and methods to accept subtle changes to documents such as the insertion of electronic notary signature and transaction data. The workgroup distributed a survey to the Clerks to determine potential implementation timeframes and costs associated with storing and using PDF’s. An additional survey is being distributed to the judicial viewer vendors that are CAPS certified, to determine potential costs and timeframes associated with the proposed use of clerk stored PDF/A documents and existing stored TIFF images. The workgroup will discuss redefining the cost of moving from TIFF storage to PDF storage and hopefully will be able to propose standards changes to simplify the processes and make the changes economically feasible.

M. Data Exchange Workgroup
The Data Exchange Workgroup was formed to develop standardized data exchanges between clerk case maintenance systems, circuit court judicial viewers, and state level systems (e.g., Judicial Data Management Services (JDMS) and Comprehensive Case Information System (CCIS)). The workgroup exerted great effort into developing data exchange standards piecing together the data requirements from many different sources into a data model that is mapped to a National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) compliant model, meets the needs of CCIS 3.0, and provides all of the necessary clerk maintained data which can lead to feature-rich, faster, and more reliable judicial viewers. The ultimate goal of these standards is to simplify, reduce costs, and expedite the implementation of court technology systems across the state. Over the past few months, Volusia County served as the pilot county to test the implementation of CCIS 3.0. The draft data exchange standards along with the technical documentation received from Volusia County were provided to different vendors and interested parties for their feedback. Once received, the workgroup will present the feedback to the FCTC. The draft data exchange standards and technical documentation is available for review on the Florida Courts Technology Standards page http://flcourts.org/resources-and-services/court-technology/technology-standards.stml.

The Year Ahead
The FCTC will continue to oversee and manage the development and use of advancing technology within the judicial branch, as well as to keep the Supreme Court apprised of FCTC recommendations for the establishment and promulgation of technology-based court policies and procedures.