

Florida Courts Technology Commission Meeting Summary

August 3, 2018

A meeting of the Florida Courts Technology Commission was held at the Miami-Dade Children's Courthouse in Miami, Florida on August 3, 2018. The meeting convened at 9:00 A.M., Chair Judge Lisa T. Munyon presiding.

Members of the Commission in attendance

Judge Lisa T. Munyon, Chair, 9th Circuit
Judge Martin Bidwill, 17th Circuit
Judge Terence Perkins, 7th Circuit
Murray Silverstein, Esquire, Tampa
Mike Smith, CTO, 4th Circuit
Jon Lin, Trial Court Administrator, 5th Circuit
Matt Benefiel, Trial Court Administrator, 9th Circuit
David Ellspermann, Clerk of Court, Marion County
Leslie Powell-Boudreaux, Legal Aid Services of
North Florida

Judge Ross Bilbrey, 1st DCA
Judge Josephine Gagliardi, Lee County
Judge Scott Stephens, 13th Circuit
Laird Lile, Esquire, Naples
Noel Chessman, CTO, 15th Circuit
Christina Blakeslee, CTO, 13th Circuit
Scott Ellis, Clerk of Court, Brevard County
Karen Rushing, Clerk of Court, Sarasota County
Tanya Jackson, PinPoint Results

Members not in attendance

Judge Robert Hilliard, Santa Rosa County
Judge Stevan Northcutt, 2nd DCA
Sandra Lonergan, Trial Court Administrator, 11th Circuit
Elisa Miller, Akerman LLP

Judge Ronald Ficarrota, 13th Circuit
Lonn Weissblum, Clerk of Court, 4th DCA
John M. Stewart, Esquire, Vero Beach

OSCA Staff in attendance

Tad David
Alan Neubauer
Jeannine Moore
Raja Komuroji

Roosevelt Sawyer, Jr.
Lakisha Hall
Hetal Patel
Rose Patterson

Other Attendees

Robert Adelardi, CTO, 11th Circuit
Craig McLean, CIO, 20th Circuit
Brian Franza, CTO, 10th Circuit
Terry Rodgers, CTO, 5th Circuit
Dennis Menendez, CTO, 12th Circuit
Tom Hall, Florida Court Clerks and Comptrollers
Melvin Cox, Director of Information Technology,
Florida Court Clerks and Comptrollers
Maryanne Marchese, Florida Court Clerks and
Comptrollers

Jim Weaver, CTO, 6th Circuit
Fred Buhl, CTO, 8th Circuit
Sunil Nemade, CTO, 17th Circuit
Robin Kelly, 7th Circuit
Mitch Stanford, 2nd Circuit
Marti Roy, 16th Circuit
Carolyn Weber, Florida Court Clerks and
Comptrollers
Thomas Morris, State Attorney 8th Circuit
Michelle Yodonis, Polk County Clerk of Court

April Biegler, Brevard County Clerk of Court
Dean Tests, Charlotte County Clerk of Court
Robert Rocamora, Hillsborough County Clerk of Court
Brent Holladay, Seminole County Clerk of Court
Doug Bakke, Hillsborough County Clerk of Court
David Winiecki, Sarasota County Clerk of Court
Parik Chokshi, Palm Beach County Clerk of Court
Carole Pettijohn, Manatee County Clerk of Court
Carol LoCicero, Thomas and LoCicero
Steve Green, Equivant
Mary Lynn Sullivan, Tyler Technologies
Sam Harden, Florida Justice Technology Center

Kim Stenger, Polk County Clerk of Court
Tyler Winik, Brevard County Clerk of Court
Laurie Rice, Brevard County Clerk of Court
Doris Maitland, Lee County Clerk of Court
Matt Whyte, Manatee County Clerk of Court
Mike Murphy, Leon County Clerk of Court
Jeff Taylor, Manatee County Clerk of Court
Kevin Karnes, Lee County Clerk of Court
Brian Murphy, Mentis Technology Solutions
Victor Lee, Pioneer Technology Group
Lelyn Tyson, Tyler Technologies
Laurie Reaves, Miami-Dade Clerk of Court

AGENDA ITEM I. Welcome

Judge Munyon welcomed the commission members and other participants to the meeting. She called the meeting to order and advised everyone the meeting was being recorded.

- a. Judge Munyon recognized the Eleventh Circuit's Administrative Judge for the Juvenile Division, Judge Orlando Prescott and Deputy Trial Court Administrator, Sandy Garcia. Judge Prescott welcomed the commission members to Miami and thanked them for the undertaking in bringing the court system throughout Florida to the 21st century. Sandy Garcia thanked the FCTC for hosting the meeting in Miami.
- b. Judge Munyon recognized the newest members of the FCTC, Clerk Scott Ellis of Brevard County, Leslie Powell-Boudreaux of North Florida Legal Aid Services, and Jon Lin, Trial Court Administrator in the Fifth Judicial Circuit.
- c. Lakisha Hall called roll and noted a quorum was present.

AGENDA ITEM II. Approval of May Meeting Summary

Motion to approve the meeting summary from the May 11, 2018 meeting of the Florida Courts Technology Commission.

MOTION OFFERED: Laird Lile

MOTION SECONDED: Judge Josephine Gagliardi

MOTION CARRIED

AGENDA ITEM III. FCTC Action Summary

Motion to accept the action summary from the May 11, 2018 meeting of the Florida Courts Technology Commission.

MOTION OFFERED: Laird Lile

MOTION SECONDED: Christina Blakeslee

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

AGENDA ITEM IV. DIY Florida Implementation Plan

Rose Patterson from the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) discussed the progress of the Do It Yourself (DIY) Florida project and the changes to the implementation plan. Currently, there are 109 pleadings and 13 case types that have been programmed into the Access to Justice (A2J)

software. A2J is a comprehensive resource for self-represented litigants with over twenty-five different proceedings that include areas of Landlord Tenant; Small Claims; and Family Law. The building of the interview process consists of selecting which forms to program the interviews for as well as which documents to generate. This project was an undertaking by the Judicial Management Council (JMC). To ensure there is a rigorous legal review of the interviews, the JMC developed a 12 Step Implementation Plan which included several levels of review that take time and coordination with each step. In April 2018, the Court reassessed the implementation plan in order to streamline the process of completing the test phase as quickly as possible. The revised plan shortens the test phase of the interviews and provides for approval and development of recommendations to the Court by the JMC, rather than the FCTC. Ms. Patterson said the Short Financial Disclosure Form, Parenting Plans, and the Child Support Guideline Worksheets are a few of the complex areas that have made significant progress. The Landlord/Tenant forms packet has gone through the test phase and received positive feedback. Judge Munyon questioned if there was an anticipated date that the Landlord/Tenant forms would go live on the Portal. Ms. Patterson replied no date is anticipated at this time; however, the JMC is supposed to meet in the near future to discuss the recommendation for approval to the Supreme Court.

AGENDA ITEM V. Judicial E-Filing of Orders by Judges

Judge Munyon referred to the previously approved FCTC motion that recommended judicial officers electronically file and serve orders through an electronic means by September 1, 2018. This matter was discussed at the Quarterly Chief Judges meeting in which, Justice Labarga established the Judicial E-Filing Workgroup. The workgroup was tasked with three discrete areas to address: 1) to recommend the process by which orders prepared in court by clerks will be handled; 2) identify the strengths and weaknesses of filing proposed orders through the Portal versus a Court Application Processing System (CAPS); and 3) develop a report on anticipated resources needed to implement judicial e-filing and submit it to the Trial Court Budget Commission (TCBC) for cost estimations. The first two areas have been completed and the workgroup is working on developing cost estimations for TCBC's approval. The FCTC may have to ask the Court for an extension of the September 30, 2018 deadline because the next FCTC meeting is scheduled for November 2, 2018

a. Christina Blakeslee discussed the Orders Prepared in Court report and the survey that was sent to the trial court technology officers in each circuit. With 63 counties responding, the survey determined that 35 counties have some type of electronic processing/signing of orders in some or all of their divisions. There are variations on how the counties are processing the orders. The surveyed showed 17 counties prepare and sign orders via the CAPS, then file the orders from the CAPS to the Portal; 7 counties prepare orders using Word, Adobe, etc., print, manually sign, and then file via the Portal; 7 counties prepare, sign and file orders directly to the clerk via the CAPS; and 4 counties use Word or Adobe to prepare, electronically sign, and file orders via the Portal. The workgroup recommended to have electronically generated orders created and signed electronically within the local CAPS where delivery to the CMS would be at the discretion of the county through the local CAPS or the Portal. Clerk Rushing inquired on creating orders in the CAPS and the criminal orders created by the clerk. Ms. Blakeslee clarified these orders can be uploaded to the CAPS as well. Laird Lile questioned orders prepared by lawyers. Ms. Blakeslee stated proposed orders are a different process and internal court orders is what the recommendation is referencing. Judge Munyon clarified an internal court order is normally prepared by the clerk or judicial staff for the judge's signature.

b. Judge Perkins discussed the Processing Orders via the Portal or CAPS report. The subgroup was charged with identifying the strengths and weaknesses of filing proposed orders through the Portal versus a CAPS to receive, process, and sign orders. The subgroup compared the various options by analyzing setups in a complete written format to a full electronic process. The CAPS system provides the capability to process orders that currently does not exist in the Portal. The Portal is universal around the state where the CAPS has various types of functioning systems. The subgroup recommended to utilize the Portal's consistency in allowing for uniformity and ease of use for the filers in submitting proposed orders. The proposed orders can then be delivered to the CAPS to maintain all of the functionality the systems have i.e., revise, edit, batch sign, etc. Once the proposed orders are processed they would be distributed through the Portal. Clerk Rushing inquired if the hybrid approach considered the design of the distribution through the CMS. Judge Perkins explained it did not. The disadvantage that varies by county, is the Portal maintains a listing of registered email addresses which is a valuable asset; therefore, why duplicate this advantage for distribution purposes. The goal is to utilize the benefit of the systems that provide a statewide level of consistency without defeating the innovations of the CAPS.

c. Roosevelt Sawyer discussed the Funding and Resources subgroup's task of developing a report on anticipated resources necessary to implement judicial e-filing and then submit the report to the TCBC for cost estimation. In consideration of the two previous subgroup reports, surveys were sent out to the circuits to determine their current capability of receiving proposed orders from the Portal to the CAPS and file signed orders through the CAPS, by division of court, and the cost/timeline associated with achieving the proposed order functionality. In addition, the circuits were also asked their necessities for on-going support through FTE's, hardware, software, maintenance and development costs for both the civil and criminal divisions for a better understanding of the total resources to fully implement judicial e-filing. Currently, the subgroup is compiling the results of the surveys and will include the resource requirements for implementing judicial e-filing. Judge Munyon said after these reports are finalized, the Funding and Resources subgroup can began working on cost estimates for implementing judicial e-filing statewide. All three of the subgroup's reports will be discussed by the full Judicial E-Filing Workgroup and presented to the FCTC at the November 2, 2018 meeting. As a timeline perspective for the funding portion, the subgroup will meet on August 14, 2018 to review the draft report. The draft report will be submitted to the full workgroup on August 16, 2018. From there, the Judicial E-Filing Workgroup will submit the final funding report to the TCBC, which meets on August 28, 2018. The conclusion of the TCBC report will be reported on at the FCTC November 2, 2018 meeting for voting. Mr. Lile inquired on the subgroup emphasizing the efficiencies or savings that will result in this expenditure and being mindful of the FCTC expressing the benefit of the investment. Alan Neubauer commented on the previous work regarding legislative budget requests and expressing efficiencies and benefits, whereas expressing a savings is challenging when having to quantify to the legislature. Judge Bidwill agreed but noted some of the beneficial savings could be quantified as in the Portal report reflecting a \$28 million savings in stamp expenditures and could be worth relaying a dividend that will continue to compensate. Judge Munyon added the legislature may determine that they are not required to pay the Court's postage as each individual county does. Clerk Rushing emphasized as a previous Legislative Chair for the clerks, if a savings is relayed, the entity will find a decrease in their budget somewhere. She suggested detailing on an improved service to the constituents along with any cost savings to the user would be helpful. Mr. Sawyer commented on the report coming to the FCTC in November and the opportunity to add any commentary at that time.

Mr. Lile suggested it may be helpful to obtain benefits from the Florida Bar to include in the final report. Judge Bidwill agreed that the Florida Bar may be the advocate in expressing the vast amount of cost savings. Judge Munyon concluded that once the FCTC receives the report back from the TCBC, it will be emailed to the members, to allow time to review before voting on it at the November 2018 meeting. Judge Perkins pointed out the timing delay with missing the legislative cycle and could the report be considered today in concept. Judge Munyon responded she is not opposed to having a telephonic vote if the members feel this is a subject that can be conducted by teleconference; therefore, the report could be delivered to the Court timely for inclusion in this year's legislative agenda.

Motion to accept a telephonic vote on the Judicial E-Filing report, once completed.

MOTION OFFERED: Judge Terence Perkins

MOTION SECONDED: Karen Rushing

MOTION CARRIED WITH 13 APPROVALS

Judge Munyon stated a teleconference will be coordinated in September to accommodate the Court's deadline of September 30, 2018.

AGENDA ITEM VI. Court Application Processing System (CAPS) Update

- a. Alan Neubauer discussed the CAPS report and noted the counties without a deployed CAPS. The Office of Information Technology will work with Monroe and Pasco counties to assist in getting their CAPS implemented. Clay County is anticipated to be implemented by the end of the year. In keeping up with accurate reporting on what is relevant to the Commission, the non-Portal filing system information was revised to reflect only the counties that have the capability to process proposed orders in an electronic environment. The statistics regarding these systems were omitted until judicial e-filing is mandated and becomes a functional requirement or a standard for the CAPS. In continuing to refine the CAPS report, clarification was provided on differences with proposed and judicial orders where it is further defined on the report.
- b. Mr. Neubauer continued the discussion on the CAPS Certified Functionality Map where the updated version takes into consideration the deployed version of the CAPS in each county based on the CAPS Functional Requirements. A link is provided on the map to view the specific details of the functionalities in each of the individual counties. Tom Hall reflected on the proposed order statistics not aligning with the Portal report. Mr. Neubauer stated a percentage of the workload would have been more relevant to report than the previous statistics. Until we can understand and identify what is necessary to capture, we will continue to revise the report with more relevant information. Judge Perkins commented on several counties that process orders without utilizing the Portal but has no reflection on the counties that are *not* electronically processing orders. Mr. Lile added from the lawyer's perspective, the concern of which counties are able to receive and send electronic orders. Judge Perkins emphasized the improved functionality map and the display of a statewide synopsis of the CAPS. As chair of the CAPS Certification Subcommittee that certifies CAPS vendors, there are some systems that are not certified or not keeping up with the functional requirements. He inquired on what steps could be taken with these non-compliant systems. Mr. Neubauer explained currently there is no requirement or administrative order to have a CAPS or to keep a CAPS functional as a lot of the requirements are driven by funding to deploy. Judge Munyon suggested this could be something the CAPS Certification committee could look into. Judge Stephens

commented on the choice of deploying a CAPS before e-filing was mandatory when all of the counties could have deployed a CAPS and now may be the time to revisit the subject. Judge Perkins posed the question to the clerks on participating in a discussion regarding a possible recommendation to mandate the CAPS. Clerk Rushing stated she would assist as there are a lot of factors involved with connectivity costs, method determinations, and challenges with not being able to control the funding resources. Mike Smith suggested consideration of judge's e-filing without a CAPS that is currently set up in the Portal. Judge Munyon stated the concern of the volume issue and the resources that are required elsewhere. Mr. Smith explained the previous interaction with Clay County and losing the argument on funding for judges to e-file in CAPS, where it was indicated that the judges can perform this functionality already in the Portal. Judge Perkins stated the CAPS was designed to achieve a number of functions that the courts perform. Judge Stephens stated, in the design of any system to process proposed orders, it is necessary to distinguish internal orders, as orders that come from a trusted source (Clerk) with more accuracy and can be moved through the system quickly; whereas external orders from the public come from a path that has to be reviewed more closely. Clerk Rushing added decisions are being made in the trial courts on judicial preferences where nuances will be added as long as they are being done in a secure way. Mr. Neubauer commented the CAPS report will continue to be refined with the ability to report on the electronic activity of the non-Portal filing systems without having numerous caveats for each process. Noel Chessman inquired on the number of judges utilizing the CAPS as the metrics used to determine a system is deployed. Mr. Neubauer replied court staff did not want to report on judges not utilizing the CAPS. Ms. Blakeslee stated if it is available, and *some* judges are utilizing the CAPS, it is considered deployed.

AGENDA ITEM VII. Portal Progress Report

- a. Carolyn Weber discussed the Portal usage statistics for the month of June 2018. There were 1,404,036 submissions through the Portal, of which 1,401,447 were submissions to the trial courts; 668 were submissions to the Department of Corrections; 64 were submissions to the Second District Court of Appeal; 1,097 were submissions to the Florida Supreme Court; and 760 were submissions to the Bureau of Vital Statistics. The Portal has over 200,000 registered users. Ms. Weber noted June 2018 had the highest average submissions per weekday at 65,899. Over the past six years, the number of documents filed through the Portal increased from 1,362,567 in 2013 to 2,068,298 in 2018. The Portal received 1,266,765 scanned documents; 695,061 text based PDF documents; 107,750 Word documents; and 61 WordPerfect documents. On average, it takes 1.4 days to docket a filing. Roughly, 1.89% of filings were returned to the correction queue. Attorneys, judges, process servers, and self-represented litigants continue to be the top filer roles in the Portal. The number of self-represented litigants continues to grow where the submissions remain fairly consistent. There are approximately 106,095 registered self-represented litigant accounts. Ms. Weber said the third-party vendor eFileMadeEasy has the highest number of submissions filed in the Portal at 35,259 and 61,720 documents. Ms. Weber briefly discussed the following projects that the FCCC is currently working on: providing technical support to third-party vendors with system-to-system e-filing; working with the FCTC Portal Subcommittee to scope out the process for criminal case initiation; complete the 90 day proof of concept for tenant eviction interviews; working to clean up bad email addresses in the Portal; and testing the maintenance release list in preparation for Release 2018.02 on October 27, 2018.
- b. Carolyn Weber briefly discussed the encapsulated Portal statistics for the period of July 1, 2017 through May 31, 2018 with 14,155,607 submissions; 20,690,537 documents; 89,779,253 pages; and 197,016 total filer accounts. Ms. Weber noted the FY17-18 Portal statistics are available on the

Florida Courts E-Filing Authority's webpage.

c. Carolyn Weber discussed the Portal service desk statistics for the month of June 2018. The service desk takes calls regarding customer service incidents along with technical and system support incidents. The service desk received 3,088 customer service incidents of which 2,653 were attorney incidents; 15 were judge incidents; and 420 were self-represented litigant incidents. On average it took 5 minutes to respond to a customer service incident and 27 minutes to resolve. A total of 337 technical/system support incidents were received. On average it took 16 minutes to respond to a technical/support incident and 3 hours and 19 minutes to resolve an incident. Ms. Weber presented the top 10 types of incidents received from the service desk broken down by filer roles. The service desk continues to work on cleaning up pending filings and performing site visits to provide training and support.

d. Carolyn Weber discussed the HEAT tickets in the Portal Release 2018.02. To name a few, this release will include: ability to file documents to multiple cases and file to multiple cases in one session; the PDF/A enhancement; cease support of older Internet Explorer browsers; implement Google Analytics; and the ability for a filer to opt out of maintenance email notifications.

e. Carolyn Weber presented the Change Advisory Board (CAB) report regarding requests received for enhancements of the Portal that have been approved by the E-Filing Authority Board and recommended for implementing in future releases.

AGENDA ITEM VIII. Appellate Portal Interface Update

On behalf of John Tomasino, Alan Neubauer conveyed the continuing work with the FCCC on integrating with the Portal and the appellant case management systems.

AGENDA ITEM IX. CCIS 3.0 Update

Maryanne Marchese discussed the metrics measuring CCIS use. For the month of June 2018, there were 51,901 active users; 167 agencies using CCIS; 209,947 case searches have been executed; 501,078 person searches have been executed; and 976,772 document image requests. Ms. Marchese went over some of the CCIS initiatives in progress. Implementing AOSC17-47 Access Security Matrix into CCIS in which a statewide standard was approved for User Role 3 and Role 5 regarding the Attorney of Record and the Public in Clerk's Office and Registered User roles. A workgroup has been established to develop these User Agreements in the two new roles. The View on Request (VOR) process development is in progress. Another initiative is SB 1392 which includes the Adult Diversion Programs where Clerks will be required to maintain personal identifying information as a confidential non-court record in a statewide database that provides a single point of access. Another initiative is the MECOM Reporting which is a statewide reporting process to assist the clerks in obtaining this information on a daily basis. Ms. Marchese noted a new Person Search Dashboard on the CCIS Business Analytics Project. The different select category fields will allow for multiple choices for obtaining various reports. Ms. Marchese moved forward with the Data Quality Management (DQM) initiative on errors and warnings which show an average of 7 million records per day while maintaining less than .2% error rate. It is anticipated these numbers will decrease as the other initiatives move forward in the data quality program. The initiative of the Master Data Management (MDM) plan is in the third of the four month engagement. The plan includes implementing a technical framework that automates the implementation of both data mapping and business rule

management; developing a new centralized audit site; developing a long-term plan to define business processes; and implementing a data profiling site that will facilitate data analysis.

AGENDA ITEM X. Rules of Judicial Administration (RJA) Update

Judge Stephens stated there is not a change in the electronic filing rule status since the last FCTC meeting. He noted his RJA term has expired and this will be his last report as an RJA member.

AGENDA ITEM XI. Appellate Court Technology Commission (ACTC) Update

Alan Neubauer gave an update on the status of the ACTC website's redesigns. The Fourth DCA's website redesign is completed and is currently available online. The Supreme Court, and the First and Second DCAs are in the process of having their websites redesigned. The new websites are anticipated to be available online by the end of the year. Mr. Neubauer stated along with these website redesigns, the FL Courts website is being redesigned as well.

AGENDA ITEM XII. Criminal Case Initiation Workgroup Update

Judge Bidwill said the workgroup was tasked with evaluating the viability of using the Portal to initiate criminal cases. In May 2018, it was determined the foundation for this project was a uniform set of data elements. A subgroup was established to compile potential data elements in an attempt to provide a uniform set. The Data Element subgroup met and discussed the potential elements. A draft list was provided on the elements that were required, potential, and could be required if the data is available. Tony Landry volunteered to refine this list and the subgroup anticipates moving forward with a uniform set at the next FCTC meeting.

AGENDA ITEM XIII. Operational Procedure Review Workgroup Update

Judge Gagliardi discussed the Proposed Request to Speak form and the feedback received regarding the form possibly prohibiting individuals from requesting to speak. The purpose of the form was to assist OSCA staff in preparing summaries. The workgroup will further analyze the form and does not seek an approval for a second reading at this time.

AGENDA ITEM XIV. Access Governance Board Update

- a. Judge Munyon noted Judge Hilliard's absence and called upon Christina Blakeslee for the update.
 - i. Christina Blakeslee moved to recommend second reading on the Perpetual Attorney Access.

Second Reading: Motion to update the Attorney of Record User Role in the *Standards for Access to Court Records* to state, "access will be changed to Registered User when the attorney's appearance is terminated in accordance with Rule 2.505."

MOTION OFFERED: Christina Blakeslee

MOTION SECONDED: Judge Scott Stephens

MOTION CARRIED

- ii. Ms. Blakeslee discussed the Guardian ad Litem (GAL) request to have additional access than what they are currently receiving in the Matrix. At the last FCTC meeting, additional information was requested from the GAL Program and was provided to Tad David, OSCA's

General Counsel who was able to research and provide feedback. A new User Role was suggested to provide access for the GAL. With much discussion, the GAL requested time to review and provide any questions or responses at the next FCTC meeting. The second reading request was tabled until the November 1, 2018 meeting.

- iii. Ms. Blakeslee discussed the Legal Aid Services request for additional access. The first reading was tabled until the November 1, 2018 meeting where additional follow-up can be performed to determine the appropriate level of access for this group as well. Mr. Neubauer commented on educating these entities on systemic issues that are preventing them from having access as well. Mr. Lile noted the judges appointing Legal Aid Services as a law firm group and the current user role prevents the proper level of access. He suggests relaying the information to the judges to appoint a *specific person* at a firm or entity and not the firm or entity as a group.

AGENDA ITEM XV. Technical Standards Subcommittee Update

- a. Mike Smith moved for second reading of the Document Filing standard for final approval.

Second Reading: Motion to adopt the Document Filing standard.

MOTION OFFERED: Mike Smith

MOTION SECONDED: Tanya Jackson

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- b. Mike Smith moved for second reading of the Document Storage standard for final approval.

Second Reading: Motion to adopt the Storage of Electronic Court Documents standard.

MOTION OFFERED: Mike Smith

MOTION SECONDED: Tanya Jackson

MOTION CARRIED

AGENDA ITEM XVI. Other Items/Wrap Up

- a. Judge Munyon discussed the newly formed CMS Functional Standards Workgroup with Judge Gagliardi named as Chair. The workgroup anticipates meeting before the FCTC's November 2, 2018 meeting and will provide an update at that time.
- b. Judge Munyon stated she is in the process of forming a Cybersecurity Subcommittee to review and determine if standards should be required in regards to cybersecurity. Judge Stephens has agreed to chair this subcommittee. Judge Munyon requested volunteers for this subcommittee to email Judge Munyon, Lakisha Hall or Jeannine Moore.
- c. Judge Munyon advised everyone the next FCTC meeting is scheduled for November 1-2, 2018 in the Tampa/St. Pete area and details will be forthcoming. With no further business Judge Munyon requested for a motion to adjourn the FCTC meeting.

Motion to adjourn the FCTC meeting

MOTION OFFERED: Judge Josephine Gagliardi

MOTION SECOND: Murray Silverstein

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY