



Judicial Branch Artificial Intelligence Committee Report

July 2024



Background

The Judicial Branch established its Artificial Intelligence Committee in 2023, pursuant to Public Act 23-16, *An Act Concerning Artificial Intelligence, Automated Decision-Making and Personal Data Privacy*, and charged it with:

- (a) Guarding against or being prepared for abuse that will come from artificial intelligence;
- (b) Taking advantage of innovative opportunities that could help with Judicial Branch operations, particularly those that will make the process easier for users;
- (c) Conducting an inventory of any systems that employ artificial intelligence, making the inventory publicly available on the Judicial Branch's website not later than December 31, 2023; and
- (d) Developing and establishing policies and procedures concerning the development, procurement, implementation, utilization, and ongoing assessment of systems that employ artificial intelligence by February 1, 2024.

Completed Tasks

The Committee met three times and completed the following tasks:

- (a) Conducted an inventory and determined that the Judicial Branch does not employ artificial intelligence in its applications as defined in Section 1 of Public Act 23-16 and posted this notice on the [Judicial Branch's website](#).
- (b) Developed a Judicial Branch framework for the responsible use of artificial intelligence and posted this framework on the [Judicial Branch's website](#).
- (c) Collected and distributed articles about artificial intelligence to better inform committee members on how artificial intelligence can be safely used.

Recommendations

The Committee recommends the following:

- (a) To empower Judicial Branch employees to better serve the residents of Connecticut who use the court system, a testing environment should be established where certain employees in each administrative division will be provided with access to Large Language Models and legal tools that employ generative artificial intelligence.
- (b) Human Resource Management, in consultation with the Information Technology Division and Legal Services, should develop an administrative policy and procedure that clearly delineates the Branch's policy with regard to the use of Artificial Intelligence by Judicial Branch employees to replace section 9 of *the Judicial Branch's Administrative Policy and Procedure 1013, Artificial Intelligence responsible Use Framework*.
- (c) The Information Technology Division should assess the safety, security, and impact of Large Language Models such as ChatGPT, Microsoft Co-Pilot and Bing and legal tools such as Lexis+ AI, Thomson Reuters' (Westlaw) CoCounsel Core and SALI Alliance to determine which of these tools employees should be authorized to use.
- (d) The Information Technology Division should work with the Materials Management Unit and Legal Services to procure these tools for the testing environment.
- (e) The Employee Education and Development Unit should recommend training and instruction to employees enrolled in the pilot program to ensure that the employees are using the artificial intelligence (AI) tools responsibly and are prepared for the changing skills demanded of our workforce due to AI.
- (f) Ask the Criminal and Civil Jury Instructions Committee to consider whether to adopt a cautionary instruction for AI-based evidence. Such an instruction should remind jurors that the AI-based evidence is solely one part of the analysis, that the opinions generated are only as good as the underlying analytical methodology, and ultimately, the decision to accept or reject the evidence, in whole or in part, should remain with the jury alone.
- (g) Consider providing judges with a comprehensive education plan so they can address the risks associated with AI using existing laws and regulations, such as education on how the technology works so that they may apply existing law to regulate it. Many of the risks posed by AI are more sophisticated versions of problems that already exist and are already addressed by court rule.

Appendix



Judicial Branch Artificial Intelligence Committee Charge and List of Members

The Judicial Branch Artificial Intelligence Committee is charged with:

- (e) Guarding against or being prepared for abuse that will come from artificial intelligence*
- (f) Taking advantage of innovative opportunities that could help with Judicial Branch operations, particularly those which will make the process easier for users*
- (g) Conducting an inventory of any systems that employ artificial intelligence, making the inventory publicly available on the Judicial Branch's website not later than December 31, 2023, and*
- (h) Developing and establishing policies and procedures concerning the development, procurement, implementation, utilization, and ongoing assessment of systems that employ artificial intelligence by February 1, 2024.*

Members

Tais Ericson, Executive Director of Superior Court Operations Division

Melissa Farley, Executive Director of the External Affairs Division

Paul Hartan, Chief Administrative Officer of the Appellate System

Rhonda Hebert, Deputy Director, External Affairs Division

Brian Hill, Executive Director of the Administrative Services Division

Dibyendu Kundu, Director of Information Systems, Information Technology Division

Ratish Sekharan Nair, Chief Enterprise Technologist, Information Technology Division

Gary Roberge, Executive Director of the Court Support Services Division

Lee Ross, Deputy Director of the External Affairs Division

Cindy Theran, Assistant Director of Program and Staff Development, Legal Services



Meeting Agenda
Artificial Intelligence Committee
December 11, 2023; at 1:30 p.m.
Microsoft Teams

1. Welcome and Introduction
2. Public Act 23-16 requires the Judicial Branch to conduct an inventory of any systems that employ artificial intelligence and to make the inventory publicly available on the Judicial Branch's website not later than December 31, 2023. Discuss divisions' efforts to identify applications that employ AI.
3. If any division is using AI, we will need to post on the website at least the following information:
 - a. The name of such system and the vendor, if any, that provided such system;
 - b. A description of the general capabilities and uses of such system;
 - c. Where such system was used to independently make, inform or materially support a conclusion, decision or judgment; and
 - d. Whether such system underwent an impact assessment prior to implementation.
4. Discuss where on the Judicial Branch's website to post the inventory or the message that no applications exist.
5. Discuss the development of policies and procedures concerning the development, procurement, implementation, utilization, and ongoing assessment of systems that employ artificial intelligence.
6. Next Steps for Group
7. Date for Next Meeting
8. Adjournment



Meeting Minutes

Artificial Intelligence Committee

December 11, 2023; at 1:30 p.m.

Microsoft Teams

In attendance: Maureen DeLude, Tais Ericson, Melissa Farley, Paul Hartan, Brian Hill, Dibyendu Kundu, Ratish Nair, Gary Roberge and Bryan Sperry.

1. Melissa Farley welcomed everyone.
2. Public Act 23-16 requires the Judicial Branch to conduct an inventory of any systems that employ artificial intelligence and to make the inventory publicly available on the Judicial Branch's website not later than December 31, 2023. The committee discussed each division's efforts to identify applications that employ AI. While the bill was pending, the use of AI was discussed and, at that time, no division indicated that it employed AI in its systems. Ratish Nair asked if we need to include on the Judicial Branch's inventory Microsoft and other products that use AI to enhance security features. Ratish gave the example of the software entitled, "Impossible Travel." He and Dibyendu Kundu will consult with the state's Artificial Intelligence Working Group to get some guidance as to whether we should include Microsoft and other such products on the Judicial Branch's inventory. Ratish and Diby will get back to the members of the committee with the answer.
3. Melissa suggested that we could create a new landing page on the Judicial Branch's website entitled Artificial Intelligence from the FAQs on the left-hand navigation panel. On that page, we can post the inventory or a notice indicating that the Judicial Branch does not have any systems that employ AI (based on the answer to the question listed in item #2). Melissa offered to share this suggestion with the members of the Web Board, and the committee agreed with this approach.
4. The public act also requires the Judicial Branch to adopt policies and procedures concerning the development, procurement, implementation, utilization, and ongoing assessment of systems that employ artificial intelligence. Ratish graciously agreed to draft a policy for the committee to review at its next meeting in January.



Judicial Branch Artificial Intelligence Committee

January 23, 2024; at 12:30 p.m.

Microsoft Teams

Agenda

Members present: Lucio DeLuca, Paul Hartan, Rhonda Hebert, Ratish Nair, Lee Ross, Bryan Sperry, Cynthia Theran,

1. Welcome
2. Introduction of new member
3. Approval of the minutes from December 11, 2023
4. Report on the progress of Connecticut's Artificial Intelligence Working Group – Ratish Sekharan Nair
5. Report on the progress of the Executive Branch's Artificial Intelligence Committee - Ratish
6. Gathering articles and other information about artificial intelligence to help the committee members develop policies and procedures concerning the procurement, implementation, utilization, and ongoing assessment of systems that employ artificial intelligence to comply with [Public Act 23-16](#) – Melissa Farley and Rhonda Hebert
7. Next Steps for Group
8. Date for Next Meeting
9. Adjournment



Judicial Branch Artificial Intelligence Committee

January 23, 2024; at 12:30 p.m.

Microsoft Teams

Minutes

Members present: Lucio DeLuca, Tais Ericson, Melissa Farley, Paul Hartan, Rhonda Hebert, Brian Hill, Diby Kundu, Ratish Nair, Gary Roberge, Lee Ross, Bryan Sperry, and Cynthia Theran.

1. Melissa Farley welcomed everyone.
2. Melissa introduced Cynthia Theran, who was recently appointed to the committee.
3. The minutes from the December 11, 2023, meeting were unanimously approved.
4. Pursuant to Public Act 23-16 the Judicial Branch is required, by Feb. 1, 2024, to develop and establish policies and procedures concerning the development, procurement, implementation, utilization, and ongoing assessment of systems that employ artificial intelligence. As such, Ratish Nair prepared a [PowerPoint presentation](#) regarding the progress of Connecticut's Artificial Intelligence Working Group and the Executive Branch's Artificial Intelligence Committee.

Ratish reported that the draft policy contains the following three core principles to strike a balance between policy and innovation: purposeful use; meaningful guardrails; and workplace empowerment and education. He discussed terminologies related to AI, terminologies related to bias and fairness, and AI implementation phases. Additionally, Ratish discussed guidelines for specific large language models and generative AI. Finally, Ratish talked about AI Procedure, Intake and Inventory and the types of AI software and hardware.

5. Melissa reported that Judge Bozzuto has established new guidelines for the gathering of articles and other information about artificial intelligence. The group agreed that the first Artificial Intelligence Information Packet will be available on March 1, 2024, and that the articles should be sent to Rhonda Hebert in External Affairs by February 26, 2024, with a summary of each article.

6. The committee agreed that the next step is to review the Executive Branch's Policy on the Responsible Use of AI to determine if the Judicial Branch wants to adopt the same or similar policy. Ratish agreed to send to the members the draft report as well as his PowerPoint presentation.
7. A date for the next meeting was not selected.
8. Adjournment



Judicial Branch Artificial Intelligence Committee

June 18, 2024; at 9 a.m.

Microsoft Teams

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approval of the minutes from January 23, 2024
3. Charge of committee and final report
4. Review of Senate Bill No. 2, *An Act Concerning Artificial Intelligence* (the bill died) – Lee Ross
5. Are the new articles that your staff gathers, and Rhonda puts together monthly helpful?
6. Discussion of possible changes required to counter the potential negative impact related to artificial intelligence (i.e.: include civil and criminal jury instructions, rules of professional responsibility and judges training)
7. Discussion of ways that each division may use artificial intelligence to enhance efficiency
8. Other business
9. Adjournment