



Final Report
for the
Cameras in the Ontario Court of Appeal Pilot Project (CCAPP)
Evaluation

Prepared by
David Llewelyn
May 2008

For the Ministry of the Attorney General

Version	Primary Author	Description of Version	Date Completed
V1	David Llewelyn	Initial release	2 Apr 08
V1.1	David Llewelyn	Incorporate comments from Linda Kahn	17 Apr 08
V1.2	David Llewelyn	Incorporate comments from CCAPP evaluation committee	6 May 08
V1.3	David Llewelyn	Completed incorporating comments from CCAPP evaluation committee	15 May 08

100 Wells Street
Toronto, Ontario M5R 1P3
email: info@realworldsystems.net
tel/fax: (888) 596-5290



Final Report
for the
Cameras in the Ontario Court of Appeal Pilot Project (CCAPP) Evaluation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... 3
1. BACKGROUND..... 5
2. PURPOSE..... 5
3. METHODOLOGY..... 5
4. FINDINGS..... 7
5. CONCLUSIONS..... 15
6. RECOMMENDATIONS..... 16
7. APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS..... 16



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the final report on the evaluation of the Camera in the Court of Appeal Pilot Project (CCAPP) for the Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General.

Summary of Methodology

This evaluation comprised the following steps:

1. Review of policy documents and briefings related to the justice system and the media
2. Definition of a logic model to show how the CCAPP is related to the key priorities and strategies of the Ministry of the Attorney General
3. Development of 7 research questions and an evaluation framework
4. Review of policies, guidelines, procedures, outputs and financial statements related to the design and implementation of the CCAPP
5. Usability analysis of the CCAPP products
6. Analysis of the Court of Appeal web survey
7. Media analysis of references to the Court of Appeal before, during and after the pilot project
8. Structured interviews with 8 key stakeholders in media, the justice system and government staff
9. A web survey to 28 targeted stakeholders, 13 of whom completed the survey
10. Quantitative and qualitative analysis of the results

Summary of Findings

- All planned CCAPP activities were carried out in full and the processes used to conduct operations were thorough and effective;
- The main constraints on the CCAPP team were the project's cost and schedule allocations and the greatest difficulties they faced were dealing with vendors and fixing operational issues;
- The overall cost of the project was \$325k, with the non-labour portion being \$164k, which is less than 10% cost growth over the original budget of \$150k;
- According to 20 out of 21 people (95%) interviewed and surveyed, the CCAPP enhanced openness and access to courtroom proceedings for the public and the media;
- According to all 21 people interviewed and surveyed, and 80% of 854 Court of Appeal web survey respondents, the CCAPP promoted education and public information regarding Ontario's justice system directly through its webcast; the CCAPP also enhanced and supported education for the legal profession;
- Following the launch of the pilot, it received no media coverage;
- Little media-coverage was given to appeal cases covered by the CCAPP, with the exception of the Mullins-Johnson case. This is related to the lack of newsworthiness of the civil cases that the remainder of CCAPP coverage comprised;



- All those interviewed and surveyed showed great support for the CCAPP and recommended that cameras should continue in the Ontario Courts, with the majority being in favour of expansion to other Courts;
- All those interviewed and surveyed agreed that there are potential negatives to the use of cameras in the courtroom that should be a considered further if a courtroom camera program is to be introduced into Ontario Courts;
- The webcast was readily accessible and easy to use, but since few DVDs were ordered and the audio box was put to little use, there is less evidence regarding these services;
- The pilot project's activities were found to have adequately tested the key elements of the Panel's recommendation re cameras in the courtroom, as validated by 6 out of 7 lawyers who agreed that the pilot clarified that an amendment to the *Courts of Justice Act* would be practical and beneficial; opinion was divided on the key points that should be included in such an amendment, though most agreed that protection must be given to vulnerable parties and sensitive information;
- Participants suggested numerous improvements for a future camera program, including program management aspects as well as operational improvements, such as better image and audio quality, webcast control and connectivity, the naming of courtroom participants and the provision of online case information.

Summary of Conclusions

- CCAPP met its primary objectives;
- The project was well managed within many constraints, the planned activities were carried out in full and the processes used to conduct operations were thorough and effective;
- All 13 of those consulted recommended that courtroom cameras should be continued and expanded to other Ontario Courts; An amendment to the *Courts of Justice Act* is justified; it should protect both the rights of the vulnerable and all sensitive data;
- The numerous improvements suggested by participants may be valuable to future camera system developers, who would be required to balance their value against their cost and complexity.

Recommendations

The Ministry of the Attorney General should consider an amendment to the *Courts of Justice Act* to permit the use of cameras in Ontario Courts.

The CCAPP team is encouraged to write a lessons-learned paper as soon as possible to aid the development of any future camera program for Ontario Courts.



1. BACKGROUND

Panel on Justice and the Media: In August 2006, the Ministry of the Attorney General released the report of the Panel on Justice and the Media that contains a concise and focussed report providing 17 recommendations. Recommendation 3 relates to cameras in the courtroom and reads:

The Panel recommends that:

The Courts of Justice Act should be amended to permit cameras for proceedings in the Court of Appeal and Divisional Court, and for applications or motions in the Superior Court of Justice and the Ontario Court of Justice, where no witnesses will be examined at the hearing, subject to the discretion of the panel or judge, which discretion should be exercised recognizing the primacy of openness.

Further, on those unusual occasions where witnesses are called to testify in any of the above appeals, applications or motions, cameras for such proceedings would be permitted where the presiding judge, the parties and the witnesses agree.¹

Pilot Project: On January 10, 2007, in his Opening of the Courts speech, the Attorney General officially announced a pilot project that would bring cameras into the Ontario Court of Appeal. A Cameras in the Court of Appeal Pilot Project (CCAPP) team was created to develop and implement the pilot project.

The pilot launched on Friday 7 September 2007 with the first transmission of live webcast via the Court of Appeal's Internet website and ended on Thursday 29 November 2007.

Evaluation: In early October 2007, RealWorld Systems was contracted to evaluate the effectiveness of the pilot project and suggest improvements if such an initiative continues post pilot.

2. PURPOSE

This report summarizes the approach, findings, conclusions and recommendations from the evaluation of the Cameras in the Court of Appeal Pilot Project. It is accompanied by an Evaluation Plan that describes the methodology for the evaluation, and a Technical Report that presents the majority of the data and analysis.

3. METHODOLOGY

The CCAPP addressed the following research questions, which were developed with the CCAPP Evaluation Committee:

¹Panel on Justice and the Media, Report to Attorney General for Ontario, August 2006
<http://www.paneljusticeandmedia.jus.gov.on.ca/pjm/en/rpjm-EN.pdf>



1. Did CCAPP carry out its planned activities?
2. What were the constraints on the CCAPP and which of those are likely to persist and apply to future implementations?
3. What were the full costs of the pilot project?
4. What was the impact of the pilot project on participants, including courtroom personnel, Ministry of the Attorney General staff and the media?
 - a. Did CCAPP enhance openness and access to courtroom proceedings by the public and the media?
 - b. Did the CCAPP enhance or support education for the journalism and/or legal professions?
 - c. Did CCAPP promote education and public information regarding Ontario's justice system, either directly through the website or through the media?
 - d. Were there any negative impact or perceptions?
5. How usable were the deliverables of the pilot project (i.e., web streaming, audio feeds and DVDs)?
6. Did the pilot project's activities adequately test the key elements of the Panel's Recommendation regarding Cameras in the Courtroom?
7. What recommendations regarding the improvement of 'Cameras in the Courtroom' arise from the findings?

The principal sources of data used to address these questions were:

- Court of Appeal (COA) web survey
- CCAPP development and operation processes
- Webcast traffic records
- Media scans
- Telephone interviews
- Evaluation web survey²

Because these methods collected large quantities of data, they are described, analyzed and summarized in the Technical Report, which will be drawn on here to address each of the research questions.

² The survey conducted by RealWorld Systems is termed the Evaluation Web Survey to distinguish it from the COA web survey



4. FINDINGS

4.1 Question #1 - Did the CCAPP carry out its planned activities?

As summarized in the Evaluation Framework, the major planned activities are shown below (in bold), with notes on the actual activities as validated by RealWorld Systems:

- The life of the pilot would be for 20 sessions -Table 4-1 shows the 21 cases that were featured in the pilot.
- The camera system would be placed in courtroom #1 of the Court of Appeal and the existing courtroom video conferencing system of fixed cameras, microphones, monitors, audio etc would be enhanced to provide selected views of courtroom proceedings to the public via the Court of Appeal's Internet web site - Courtroom 1 was equipped in 2006 with 4 new cameras (each with fixed focus, pan and tilt) and 16 microphones, for use in videoconferencing. Mid way through the testing phase of the pilot, one additional camera was added to assist with a camera angle that could not be obtained with just the original 4 cameras. An operator was employed to switch the recorded image between cameras to capture the speaker.
- Each session would be streamed live and then archived for a period of 90 days from the date of the court case on the Court of Appeal's website - The website was designed to be able to stream video to up to 5000 users during the launch of the pilot and 1500 concurrent users thereafter. Each session was archived and available for users to view for 90 days after the date of the appeal.
- A live audio feed would be available for the media in courtroom #1 - an audio feed box was fitted at the rear of the courtroom to permit radio reporters to plug in and receive mono feed from all 16 microphones. A sign-in form was placed alongside the box for all users.
- DVDs would be provided daily, upon request, to those authorized by the Court - a DVD recorder and copier were installed so that DVDs could be provided twice daily to accredited media for use in daily newscasters. DVDs were also made available for instructional and educational purposes to academic institutions.
- Processes would be put in place by the Court to formally request consent by all parties (and witnesses if any to the proceedings) as required by the *Courts of Justice Act*. - MAG and COA developed and instituted a thorough set of procedures for all day-to-day operations, including gaining consent from all of the appropriate parties and organizations. These were provided to us, but are too large to be included here and are available upon request.

We conclude that the planned activities were carried out in full and that the processes used to conduct operations were thorough and effective.



Date	File #	Proceedings
7-Sep-07	C46348	Frohlick, Melanie et al v. Pinkerton Canada Ltd et al
10-Sep-07	C45259	Commercial Alcohols Inc. v. Suncor Energy Products Inc.
12-Sep-07	C46053	Bentley, Catherine Anne v. Stone, Terez et al.
12-Sep-07	C46171	Obonsawin, Roger v. Attorney General of Canada et al
17-Sep-07	C45137	J.S.M. Corporation (Ontario) Ltd. v. The Brick Furniture Warehouse et al
18-Sep-07	C44740	Macourtice Developments Inc. v. Corporation of the Municipality of Clarington and Appraisal Group Inc.
1, 2 Oct 2007	C45092	Magnussen Furniture Inc. v. Mylex Limited
3-Oct-07	C46542	Cassano, Paul et al v. The Toronto-Dominion Bank
9,10,100-Oct-07	C46210	Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation v. National Automobile Aerospace Transportation & General Workers Union of Canada
15-Oct-07	C47664	R. v. Mullins-Johnson, William
23-Oct-07	C46653	In the Matter of the Bankruptcy of Perry Francis Murphy
23-Oct-07	C46356	Murphy, Lillian v. McNamee, Renate et al.
25-Oct-07	C46276	Szijarto, Rick v. Densham, Gilray et al
29-Oct-07	C44897	Lanty, Lavina v. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario
30-Oct-07	C44688	Rizzi, Debbie et al v. Mavros, George et al
2-Nov-07	C46028	Lazare, Andrea et al v. Harvey, Danica Louise et al
2-Nov-07	C46483	Fulton, Dianna et al v. The Corporation of the City of Welland
5-Nov-07	C43857	Monks, Suzanne v. ING Insurance Company of Canada
19-Nov-07	C46785	Smith, Stephen et al v. The Toronto Police Association
20-Nov-07	C45514	Lucien Groulx & Son Planning & Saw Mill Ltd. v. Nipissing Forest Resource Management Inc.
29-Nov-07	C45633	Campbell, Melloney Marlene v. Julta, Manpreet

Table 4-1 Court of Appeal Cases piloted by CCAPP

4.2 Question #2 - What were the constraints on the CCAPP and which of those are likely to persist and apply to future implementations?

During telephone interviews, we asked members of the CCAPP development and operations team to describe the major constraints and obstacles that they encountered during the pilot. Their answers were used to develop a multiple-choice question in the evaluation web survey, the response to which is summarized below in table 5-1.



The telephone conversations and the results of the evaluation survey clearly indicate that the CCAPP team found it hard to work within the cost allocation and schedule expectations, and difficult to accommodate vendor timelines and fix last-minute bugs. That they completed the project and incurred only minor cost and schedule variances is a credit to the organizations and the team members who faced many interdisciplinary issues and solved them through determination and hard work.

Introducing new technology into a very formal arena that deals with the most serious and critical aspects of the law, is staffed by judges and counsel, hosted in a historic building and so on, presents a very complex and intricately woven set of challenges. It is very likely that the full scope of those challenges was very difficult to predict at the outset. It is also likely that little or no risk analysis was conducted before the project was announced and that, thereafter, little could be done to influence budget and launch date expectations.

If these assumptions are correct, they would explain why funding and schedule reserves were not available to cater to the emergence of unanticipated events, such as delays in vendors' deliveries and teething troubles with processes and equipment, which are the norm for pilot projects involving unfamiliar technologies and services.

The use of a pilot project to flush out these uncertainties was an effective way to gain insight into the challenges of introducing this technology into the Court. The experience gained and lessons learned will aid in scoping the effort required for any future courtroom camera program, if one were to be implemented. To help cement this experience, we recommend that the team prepare a lessons-learned paper to record the unanticipated issues that they encountered and how they could be prevented in future.



Issue	Score by 10 respondents .					
	not a problem 1	2	3	4	significant difficulty 5	N/A
Lack of budget	0(0%)	2(20%)	1(10%)	1(10%)	6(60%)	0(0%)
Lack of time (i.e. calendar time to launch)	0(0%)	1(10%)	1(10%)	4(40%)	4(40%)	0(0%)
Gaining consensus on design of web cast and/or video/audio system	1(10%)	4(40%)	2(20%)	2(20%)	0(0%)	1(10%)
Gaining consensus on process elements, e.g. consent forms	1(10%)	1(10%)	5(50%)	1(10%)	0(0%)	2(20%)
Getting consent to broadcast each proceeding	1(10%)	1(10%)	2(20%)	4(40%)	1(10%)	1(10%)
Vendor performance	1(10%)	1(10%)	2(20%)	2(20%)	4(40%)	0(0%)
Fixing bugs	1(10%)	0(0%)	2(20%)	2(20%)	5(50%)	0(0%)
Technical complexity of A/V equipment (added during survey)	2(20%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	1(10%)	0(0%)	7(70%)

Table 5-1 Constraints and difficulties

4.3 Question #3 - What were the full costs of the pilot project?

The non-labour estimate shown below was made from an examination of CCAPP project records. The labour estimate was assembled through interviews and fact finding with the project team and is based on a 7.25 hr working day with no allowance for paid or unpaid overtime.

Labour estimate (3000 hrs):	\$161k
Capital purchases:	\$70k
Video streaming service:	\$80k
Subcontract labour:	\$13k
Supplies and consumables:	\$1k
<u>Non labour subtotal:</u>	<u>\$164k</u>
<u>Overall total:</u>	<u>\$365k</u>

Despite their difficulty in working within their allocated budget, the CCAPP team did a commendable job of controlling costs to be close to their allocated budget. They were able to do this by keeping capital expenditures low by sharing existing videoconference equipment in



courtroom 1, a decision that did not significantly impact audio-visual (AV) standards or system availability.

Future cost considerations

If there is a desire to continue the use of cameras in Ontario Courts beyond the pilot, care should be used in extrapolating from the pilot's cost figures because permanent broadcast AV equipment may have different performance requirements and duty cycles from those of videoconferencing equipment, and sharing common use equipment may not be possible. Operating costs, which include the webcast host service, technician subcontract labour and consumables, are an ongoing expense that should be examined for efficiencies. For example, automatic camera switching, which was planned but not implemented in the pilot because of lack of opportunity, may reduce technician time and subcontract costs. Labour costs should also be considered carefully, since these estimates for the pilot did not take into account unpaid overtime that may have been contributed by team members.

4.4 Question #4 - What was the impact of the pilot project on participants, including courtroom personnel, Ministry of the Attorney General staff and the media?

This question was broken into following 4 constituent parts in the evaluation framework:

- a. Did CCAPP enhance openness and access to courtroom proceedings by the public and the media?

In the view of those interviewed and surveyed, the CCAPP enhanced openness and access to courtroom proceedings for the public and the media: 20 out of the 21 people interviewed and surveyed (95%) agreed, though almost 40% of those surveyed thought that more could have been done to improve openness in the pilot. Examples of areas where more could have been done are shown in the evaluation survey report, which is attached to CCAPP Technical Report. They include more publicity about cases, more information about cases, and adherence to accessibility standards for disabled persons.

The usage log revealed that some 18,000 visits were made over the course of the pilot. Even allowing for heavy traffic from the webhost and the coordinators from the Ministry of the Attorney General, this represents a dramatic increase over normal Osgoode Hall public visit rates (according to Court officials), demonstrating substantively increased access. Among the highest viewers were Ontario and Canadian government employees, law firms, and learning institutions.

Media analysis revealed that most coverage regarding cameras in the Court of Appeal was associated with the news release issued in January 2007. Little evidence could be found of the media using the webcast, the DVDs or the audio box for publication purposes. In the case of the *R. v Mullins-Johnson* case, the CBC brought its own cameras to the courtroom,



with all-party consent, and shared the footage with all other outlets. However, Court TV used the CCAPP webcast DVD and live feed, and the Toronto Star also made use of the CCAPP DVDs in their coverage.

b. Did the CCAPP enhance or support education for the journalism and/or legal professions?

Interviewee opinion was that that the pilot had great potential for students, who have access to teachers who can spend some time to edit the footage and explain the procedural context. The 90 day limit on archives is too short to allow students and teachers to use the hearings for educational purposes – teachers need time to prepare and will not invest when video expires so quickly; law schools will be very interested in getting a full set of DVDs however.

We also sought academic advice from Dr. Ratna Rueban Balasubramaniam, who is an assistant professor in the faculty of law at Carleton University and an advisor to this evaluation. His opinion was that video of appeal cases would be a useful adjunct in the formal education of law students, but would not replace the formal court record as a learning tool. As an adjunct, video would provide a useful context for law students who sometimes have little opportunity to visit the Court of Appeal, or could be used to analyze nonverbal information that is not captured in official transcripts. In particular, copies of appeal proceedings on DVDs would be a valuable teaching aid for Canadian colleges and universities because they form a permanent record that can be incorporated into courses.

The Court of Appeal web survey, interviews and the evaluation web survey all suggest that one of the benefits that accrues from cameras in the courtroom is that the record forms a training and preparation tool for legal professionals to enter the Court.

We collected limited data on the subject of how CCAPP supported the education of journalists. The media representatives we talked to were supportive of the pilot and of the presence of cameras in the courtroom. In particular, they stated that A/V recordings promote transparency and reduce errors and bias in reporting. They also stated that the DVD record is a significant improvement on the current tools of the trade, which are limited to notepads, a Blackberry™ and an artist's sketch pad.

c. Did CCAPP promote education and public information regarding Ontario's justice system, either directly through the website or through public media?

The following question was addressed by 854 respondents to the Court of Appeal web survey:

Do you think this webcast was instructional or educational? (1 being not at all and 5 being most definitely).



80% of respondents scored a 4 or 5 for educational value, and the mean (average) score was 4.3.

In addition, informants who were interviewed and surveyed for this study were unanimous in agreeing that the CCAPP promoted education and public information regarding Ontario's justice system. However, 60% of those surveyed believed that more could have been done. Examples are shown in the survey report, which is attached to CCAPP Technical Report. They include providing more information to the public about how appeal proceedings work, more case details and identifying the courtroom participants.

Analysis revealed that the media made little or no use of CCAPP facilities throughout the course of the project. However, Court TV made some use of CCAPP video during the Mullins-Johnson case and, given the importance and popularity of this appeal, this may have reached and informed many members of the public.

d. Were there any negative impact or perceptions?

All 21 of those interviewed and surveyed agreed that there are potential negatives to the use of cameras in the courtroom that must be controlled should a courtroom camera program be introduced into Ontario Courts. High on the list of negatives was the risk of sensitive information being inadvertently released and the potentially high capital costs of implementing the camera system. Notwithstanding the potential negative aspects, all of those interviewed and surveyed recommended that the use of cameras be continued in Ontario Courts.

4.5 Question #5 - How usable were the deliverables of the pilot project (i.e., web streaming, audio feeds and DVDs)?

The following question was addressed by 895 respondents to the Court of Appeal web survey:

Was accessing this webcast easy for you? (1 being very difficult and 5 being very easy).

82% of respondents scored a perfect 5, and the mean (average) score was 4.6, or easily accessed.

Usage logs confirm that both live feeds and archived footage were heavily used, so the above results apply to both. There were some access issues related to Macintosh computers, and any future service should address browser compatibility.

The interview and evaluation survey confirmed the results of the Court of Appeal web survey, verifying that the pilot's facilities were readily accessible and easy to use. However, since few DVDs were ordered and the audio box was put to little use, there is less evidence that these facilities were or were not easy to use.



4.6 Question #6 - Did the pilot project's activities adequately test the key elements of the Panel's Recommendation re Cameras in the Courtroom?

The Panel's recommendation revolves around an amendment to the Courts of Justice Act to permit cameras for proceedings. For the purposes of evaluating whether the pilot's activities adequately tested the Panel's recommendation, the following question was asked of lawyers in telephone interviews and in the evaluation web survey: *"Do you think that the pilot clarified whether an amendment would be practical and beneficial?"* In response, 6 out of 7 lawyers agreed that it would. Opinion was divided on the key points that should be included in such an amendment, though most agreed that protection must be given to vulnerable parties and sensitive information.

4.7 Question #7 - What recommendations regarding the improvement of 'Cameras in the Courtroom' arise from the findings?

There was overwhelming agreement that the use of cameras in Ontario Courts should continue, with 85% of those surveyed saying that the use of cameras should be expanded beyond the Court of Appeal.

The improvements that were recommended by the respondents of the Court of Appeal web survey were tested through the interview and evaluation survey process. The evaluation survey rated the highest priority improvements as:

- allocation of sufficient staffing and funding for the execution of a future camera program (92% agreement)
- provision of on-line material describing the appeal case (85% agreement)
- improvement of miscellaneous audio/video performance (77% agreement)
- implementation in at least two courtrooms in Osgoode Hall to cover criminal and civil proceedings (69% agreement)
- expansion to other Ontario Courts (69% agreement)
- identification of courtroom participants (69% agreement)
- improvement of miscellaneous computer-related aspects (62%)

The CCAPP Technical Report gives the results of the Court of Appeal web survey and the interviews and evaluation web survey and discusses the lists of recommendations and their ratings.

Since no cost evaluation of these improvements has been conducted, we are unable to make individual recommendations for improvements here. However, in section 5 and 6, we comment on the issues of cost assessments and therefore concur with the first bullet and recommend that, for future projects, a detailed estimate be performed, including a risk assessment and mitigation strategy.



5. CONCLUSIONS

CCAPP met its primary objectives, which were to enhance openness and access to the public and the media, promote education and public information regarding Ontario's justice system and prove that cameras in the Court of Appeal are feasible.

All data sources examined in this evaluation provided consistent, positive remarks and support for the work done by the CCAPP team in developing and operating a successful camera pilot project. The project was well managed within many constraints, the planned activities were carried out in full and the processes used to conduct operations were thorough and effective.

The live and archived versions of the webcast were found to be accessible and popular with users, while public media did not make substantive use of the DVD and audio box services.

All of those surveyed agreed that cameras should be continued in the Court of Appeal and 11 of the 13 participants thought that their use should be expanded to other Ontario Courts.

The pilot project tested the key elements of the Panel's Recommendation re Cameras in the Courtroom and justified an amendment to the Courts of Justice Act to permit cameras in the Court of Appeal.

The major constraints on the CCAPP were the project's funding and timeline. While much learning took place on this project to assist in the success of a future courtroom camera program, improved planning is required to prevent cost and schedule issues from occurring. Planning of future implementations should include detail cost estimates and a risk analysis/mitigation strategy.

Overall project costs totaled approximately \$365k, with the non-labour portion being \$164k, comprising material, subcontract and consumables. Only the non-labour portion was budgeted, with the labour being paid for by the Ministry and Court of Appeal from their existing salary budgets. Based on extensive (30 years) experience of development projects, cost performance against the \$150k budget for the non-labour portion was exceptionally good for a pilot with so many constraints, complexities and formal processes with which to interface.

All those surveyed agreed that implementing a courtroom camera system holds potential for negative consequences. However, some recommended tighter controls to prevent negative aspects from appearing and others stated their belief that the benefits of transparency outweigh the risks. All agree that the rights of the vulnerable must be protected and that protective measures should be implemented to prevent the inadvertent release of sensitive data.

Those consulted in interviews and web surveys suggested numerous improvements for a future camera program, touching on program management aspects as well as operational improvements, such as improved image and audio quality, webcast control and connectivity, the



naming of courtroom participants and the provision of online information on appeal cases. These suggestions will be valuable to future camera system developers, who would be required to balance their value against their cost and complexity.

No members of the judiciary or the media completed the web survey.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Ministry of the Attorney General should consider an amendment to the *Courts of Justice Act* to permit the use of cameras in Ontario Courts.

Much was learned about the use of cameras in the Court of Appeal, which will help developers of any future systems should such a program go forward. To cement this learning, and to aid the transition to a camera program for Ontario Courts, the CCAPP team is encouraged to write a lessons-learned paper as soon as possible.

Improved incentives should be considered for future evaluations for involving the judiciary and the media in interviews and surveys.

7. APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS

Title	Version & Date	Author	Purpose
Panel on Justice and the Media - Report to the Attorney General for Ontario	Aug 06	Panel members	Report on Panel's findings and recommendations
CCAPP Evaluation Project Charter	V1, 14 Nov 07	David Llewelyn & Gillian Kerr	Describe customer requirements and expectations, project purpose, key personnel assignments, summary milestone schedule, summary budget, issues and risks.
CCAPP Evaluation Plan	V1, 18 Dec 07	David Llewelyn & Gillian Kerr	Describe evaluation methodology. Deliver the logic model, research questions and evaluation framework.
Technical Report for the CCAPP Evaluation	V01, Mar 08	David Llewelyn	Contains and summarizes the quantitative and qualitative data collected for the evaluation.



--	--	--	--