



Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.: 25-160

For business meeting on October 24, 2025

Title

Family Law: Standards for Computer
Software Used to Assist in Determining
Support

Report Type

Action Required

Effective Date

January 1, 2026

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

Amend Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.275

Date of Report

October 7, 2025

Recommended by

Family and Juvenile Law Advisory
Committee
Hon. Tari L. Cody, Cochair
Hon. Stephanie E. Hulsey, Cochair

Contact

Marina Soto, 916-643-6906

marina.soto@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council amend a rule of court that provides standards for computer software that assists in determining child and spousal support. This action is necessary to conform the rule to current law. The recommended changes also update terminology and requirements related to technology and clarify language related to the Judicial Council's guideline calculator testing and certification process.

Recommendation

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council amend rule 5.275 of the California Rules of Court, effective January 1, 2026, to:

- Bring the standards into conformity with existing law regarding the treatment of subsequent partner income when calculating child support and recent changes to Family Code section 4061 related to the apportionment of expenses for additional child support between parents;
- Update terminology and requirements related to computer hardware, operating systems, and software necessary to test support calculators; and

- Clarify language related to the use of scenarios created to test the accuracy of support calculator software to resolve confusion expressed by developers concerning the certification process, and make minor technical and grammatical changes.

The proposed amended rule is attached at pages 8–11.

Relevant Previous Council Action

Family Code section 3830 prohibits courts from using computer software to assist in determining child support or spousal support, unless the software meets standards set by the Judicial Council to ensure that it performs in a manner consistent with applicable statutes and rules of court for determination of child support or spousal support.¹ In response to that mandate, the council adopted standards under former rule 1258. The standards went into effect on December 1, 1993, and required that the software, among other things:

- Calculate child support within 1 percent of the correct amount for “examples provided by the Judicial Council”;
- Contain written instructions for entry of the income of a subsequent partner as a factor rebutting the presumptive guideline amount; and
- Allocate, in its default setting, one-half of the expenses for additional items of child support to each parent.

These three standards have remained the same since the adoption of the rule. The standards under former rule 1258 also required that the person seeking certification of software make available to the Judicial Council the hardware required to use the software if it did not operate on a “standard MS/DOS compatible or Macintosh computer.”

On November 1, 2002, the Judicial Council reorganized the California Rules of Court under a new numbering format to make them consistent with other Judicial Council rules, reflect changes in law and procedure, and make the rules easier to read and more accessible to court users. At that time, rule 1258 was renumbered as rule 5.275.² The rule was also amended to update the operating systems available for the Judicial Council to operate support calculators submitted for certification.

¹ The Legislature originally enacted the statute in 1992 as former Civil Code section 4395. (Stats. 1992, ch. 1157, § 1.) A year later, the Legislature repealed former Civil Code section 4395 and recast the provision as Family Code section 3830. (Stats. 1993, ch. 219, § 46 [repealing Civ. Code provision]; Stats. 1993, ch. 219, § 129 [enacting Fam. Code, § 3830].) Aside from restructuring the provision into two subdivisions, the language recast in section 3830 has remained substantively the same.

² Judicial Council of Cal., mins. (Nov. 1, 2002), item A32, pp. 17–18, <https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-10/min1102.pdf>.

Analysis/Rationale

The complexity of California's child support guidelines necessitates the use of computer software to assist in calculating child support in accordance with the mathematical formula set by statute.³ Computer software that incorporates guidelines provided by local rules can also be used to assist with calculating temporary spousal support.⁴ Rule 5.275 provides the standards for software used to assist the court in determining child and spousal support.

Under rule 5.275, the Judicial Council is required to test software submitted by developers for certification to ensure it accurately calculates support and otherwise meets the standards set. Once software has been certified for use by the court, developers must annually apply to renew the certification. As part of the renewal process, the Judicial Council reviews and tests the software to ensure it continues to comply with the standards set forth in the rule.

Senate Bill 343 (Stats. 2023, ch. 213) amended Family Code section 4061, effective September 1, 2024, as it relates to the method for apportioning additional child support between parents. Because rule 5.275 provides the standard that child support calculators must meet regarding the apportionment of child support expenses, the amendment made by SB 343 is the primary catalyst for amending the rule at this time. In addition, the rule needs amending to (1) correct an oversight regarding the treatment of subsequent partner income when calculating child support, (2) update terminology and requirements in the rule related to technology necessary for the Judicial Council to use and test software submitted for certification, and (3) resolve confusion expressed by software developers regarding the Judicial Council's testing procedures.

Specifically, the committee recommends amending the following three provisions of rule 5.275.

Rule 5.275(b)(2)

Rule 5.275(b)(2) explains the process used by the Judicial Council to determine whether software to calculate child support is accurate to within 1 percent of the correct amount in its default setting. The committee recommends amending this provision to clarify that the scenarios developed by the Judicial Council are for the council's internal use to assist it in testing software submitted for certification.

The proposed amendment to rule 5.275(b)(2) is necessary because, in recent years, staff have received requests from developers for copies of the "examples" that are to be provided by the council under the rule to assist them in programming their software to calculate support within 1 percent of the correct amount. However, the intended purpose of the examples is for the council's testing the accuracy of the software. It is essential that the examples are not distributed

³ *In re Marriage of Cheriton* (2001) 92 Cal.App.4th 269, 284.

⁴ Courts can use computer programs to set temporary spousal support to maintain the financial status quo of the parties pending trial. (*In re Marriage of Olson* (1993) 14 Cal.App.4th 1, fn. 3.) Courts cannot, however, rely on a computer program to set or modify a permanent spousal support order as such an order requires an exercise of the court's discretion after considering and weighing factors enumerated in Family Code section 4320 (formerly Civil Code section 4801(a)). (*In re Marriage of Olson, supra*, 14 Cal.App.4th at fn. 3.)

to developers prior to testing to ensure the software is programed to accurately calculate support for every possible scenario, rather than just those scenarios developed by the Judicial Council. The proposed amendment would clarify that the scenarios developed by the council are for the purpose of testing software that developers submit for certification, and not for distribution to developers to assist them in programing their software.

In addition, the committee recommends removing any reference to a specific operating system or computer platform to avoid the need for future updates as technology changes. Instead, the rule would require a person seeking certification of software to provide the council with any hardware or operating system required to use the software “[i]f the Judicial Council does not have the computer hardware or operating system necessary to use and test the software.”

Rule 5.275(b)(4)

Rule 5.275(b)(4) requires that software used to calculate support contain, either on the screen or in written form, instructions for the entry of each figure required for the computation of child support and provides a list of four items that must be included in the instructions. Rule 5.275(b)(4)(D) currently provides that software must contain written instructions for entry of two factors rebutting the presumptive guideline amount. The committee recommends deleting the second factor, “4057(b)(3) (income of subsequent partner),” because it is no longer a factor that may rebut the guideline child support amount.

In July 1993, Assembly Bill 1500 (Stats. 1993, ch. 219) added section 4057 to the Family Code, which included a provision providing that one of the factors for rebutting the presumption that the guideline amount of child support is correct was that “a parent’s subsequent spouse or nonmarital partner has income that helps meet that parent’s basic living expenses, thus increasing the parent’s disposable income available to spend on the children.”⁵ A few months later, and before section 4057 became operative on January 1, 1994, the Legislature amended subdivision (b) of section 4057 to remove the income of a subsequent spouse or nonmarital partner as a factor for rebutting the amount of child support calculated under the guideline.⁶

Rule 5.275 as originally adopted in December 1993 incorporated the “income of subsequent partner” language initially contained in Family Code section 4057(b)(3), rather than conforming with the amendment that removed the language from 4057(b) a few months later. Deleting reference to the income of a subsequent partner from rule 5.275(b)(4)(D) will correct this oversight.

Although the income of a parent’s subsequent partner is no longer grounds for rebutting guideline support, Family Code section 4057.5 does allow the court to consider such income when determining or modifying child support in an extraordinary case. The committee is,

⁵ This provision was carried over from former Civil Code section 4721(e), when the section was repealed and reenacted under the Family Code as section 4057(b). (Stats. 1992, ch. 46, § 9 [adding former Civ. Code, § 4721]; Stats. 1993, ch. 219, § 50 [repealing former Civ. Code, § 4721], § 138 [adding Fam. Code, § 4057]).

⁶ Stats. 1993, ch. 935, § 1; Stats. 1993, ch. 1156, § 3.

therefore, also recommending the addition of subparagraph (E) to rule 5.275(b)(4) to require instructions be provided for entry of “[t]he income of a subsequent partner as provided for in Family Code section 4057.5.” Adding the new subparagraph would ensure software continues to provide instructions for entry of this income into support calculators when the court determines it is necessary to compute child support.

Rule 5.275(b)(5)

The committee recommends amending rule 5.275(b)(5) to change the standard that support calculator software must follow, in its default setting, for the apportionment of expenses for additional child support. Currently the rule requires software allocate additional items of child support, one-half to each parent. The software must also provide, in an easily selected option, for the alternative allocation of the expenses as provided for by Family Code section 4061(b).

Senate Bill 343 amended Family Code section 4061, effective September 1, 2024, by changing the method for apportioning expenses for additional child support from one-half to each parent to dividing the expenses in proportion to the net incomes of each parent, unless a party requests or the court finds on its own motion that expenses should be divided in a different manner.⁷ To conform the standard in rule 5.275(b)(5) to current law, the committee recommends amending the rule to provide that expenses for each additional item of child support must be allocated in proportion to the parents’ net incomes. The rule would also be amended to reflect that the software must provide an option for an alternative allocation of expenses as provided for by Family Code section 4061(a), rather than under section 4061(b), so that the rule accurately refers to the renumbered subdivisions of section 4061.

Policy implications

The proposal aligns with the Judicial Council’s policy to have rules correctly reflect the law.

Comments

This proposal was circulated for comment from April 15 to May 23 during the spring 2025 invitation-to-comment cycle. It was circulated to the committee’s standard mailing list for family and juvenile law proposals, including appellate presiding justices, appellate court administrators, trial court presiding judges, trial court executive officers, judges, court administrators and clerks, attorneys, family law facilitators and self-help center staff, legal services attorneys, social workers, and other family law professionals. The proposal also went to the state Department of Child Support Services (DCSS), the Child Support Directors Association of California (CSDA), and the five software developers whose guideline calculators are currently certified for use by the courts: Nolo Press Occidental, Legal+Plus Software Group Inc., Family Law Software Inc., Tolapa Inc., and DCSS’s Policy and Program Branch.

In total, eight organizations or individuals submitted comments. Six commenters agreed with the proposal as circulated; one commenter agreed with certain modifications; and one did not indicate a position. None opposed the proposal. The comments and the committee’s responses

⁷ Fam. Code, § 4061(a); Stats. 2023, ch. 213, §§ 8, 9.

are set out in full in the chart of comments attached to this report at pages 12–20. Two issues raised by a commenter who suggested modifications are discussed below.

Judge Rebecca Wightman, who is a tribal judge and retired commissioner, suggested adding language to rule 5.275(b)(2) that (1) explicitly states the scenarios developed by the Judicial Council for testing are for the council’s internal use only and (2) requires software developers provide the Judicial Council with all licenses necessary to use and test submitted software. The committee agrees with both suggestions. The first suggestion advances the intended purpose of the amendment to rule 5.275(b)(2) and clarifies that test scenarios are not available for distribution to assist developers in programming their software. The second suggestion of adding language to the rule that requires the person seeking certification “grant or obtain all licenses necessary for the Judicial Council to use and test the software” would ensure the Judicial Council obtains permission to access and utilize all components of the software being tested as an end user, as well as any operating system that may be provided by the developer for testing purposes. Requiring the person seeking certification to provide the Judicial Council with a license for any software furnished for the testing process is therefore an essential component to the testing and certification of guideline calculators and within the scope of this proposal. The committee therefore recommended adding both suggested amendments into revised rule 5.275(b)(2).

Alternatives considered

The committee considered whether action to amend rule 5.275 is necessary. The committee concluded that, because the existing rule’s standards for computer software that assists with calculating support do not accurately reflect the requirements of Family Code sections 4057 and 4061, it is essential that action be taken to amend the rule.

The committee also considered making only the changes needed to bring rule 5.275(b)(4)(D) and (b)(5) into conformity with the law. However, after being made aware of inquiries received from developers, reviewing the rule, and considering the comments received on the proposal, the committee has concluded that clarifying the responsibilities of both the Judicial Council and software developers under rule 5.275(b)(2) is necessary to avoid confusion, provide greater transparency, and promote public trust in the procedures used to test and certify guideline calculators.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

Most of the amendments proposed are necessary to conform rule 5.275 to the law and are, therefore, the result of legislative action. The committee anticipates that courts will incur some costs to train court staff on the updates made to guideline calculator software used by the court.

Attachments and Links

1. Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.275, at pages 8–11
2. Chart of comments, at pages 12–20

3. Link A: Fam. Code, § 3830,
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=FAM&division=9.&title=&part=1.&chapter=9.&article=
4. Link B: Fam. Code, § 4057,
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=4057
5. Link C: Fam. Code, § 4057.5,
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=FAM§ionNum=4057.5
6. Link D: Fam. Code, § 4061,
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=FAM§ionNum=4061

Rule 5.275 of the California Rules of Court is amended, effective January 1, 2026, to read:

Rule 5.275. Standards for computer software to assist in determining support

(a) * * *

(b) Standards

The standards for computer software to assist in determining the appropriate amount of child or spousal support are:

(1) * * *

(2) ~~Using examples provided by the Judicial Council, The software must calculate a child support amount, using its default settings, that is accurate to within 1 percent of the correct amount. In making this determination To determine the accuracy of the software, the Judicial Council must will develop scenarios for internal use to test the software, calculate the correct amount of support for each example scenario, and must then calculate the amount for each example scenario using the software program. Each person seeking certification of software must supply a copy of the software to the Judicial Council. If the software does not operate on a standard Windows 95 or later compatible or Macintosh computer, Judicial Council does not have the computer hardware or operating system necessary to use and test the software, the person seeking certification of the software must make available to the Judicial Council any hardware or operating system required to use and test the software. The person seeking certification must also grant or obtain all licenses necessary for the Judicial Council to use and test the software.~~ The Judicial Council may delegate the responsibility for the calculation and determinations required by this rule.

(3) The software must contain, either on the screen or in written form, a glossary defining each term used on the computer screen or in printed hard copy produced by the software.

(4) The software must contain, either on the screen or in written form, instructions for the entry of each figure that is required for computation of child support using the default setting of the software. These instructions must include but not be limited to the following:

(A) The gross income of each party as provided for by Family Code section 4058;

- (B) The deductions from gross income of each party as provided for by Family Code section 4059 and ~~subdivision (b)(1)~~ of this rule;
- (C) The additional items of child support provided for in Family Code section 4062; ~~and~~
- (D) ~~The following factors~~ factor rebutting the presumptive guideline amount under Family Code section 4057(b)(2) (deferred sale of residence) ~~and 4057(b)(3) (income of subsequent partner); and~~
- (E) The income of a subsequent partner as provided for in Family Code section 4057.5.
- (5) In making an allocation of the additional items of child support under ~~subdivision (b)(4)(C)~~ of this rule, the software must, as its default setting, allocate the expenses ~~one-half~~ for each additional item of child support to each parent in proportion to the parents' net incomes, as adjusted under Family Code section 4061(c) and (d). The software must also provide, in an easily selected option, ~~the an~~ an alternative allocation of the expenses as provided for by Family Code section ~~4061(b)~~ 4061(a).
- (6) The printout of the calculator results must display, on the first page of the results, the range of the low-income adjustment as permitted by Family Code section 4055(b)(7), if the low-income adjustment applies. If the software generates more than one report of the calculator results, the range of the low-income adjustment only must be displayed on the report that includes the user inputs.
- (7) The software or a license to use the software must be available to persons without restriction based on profession or occupation.
- (8) The sale or donation of software or a license to use the software to a court or a judicial officer must include a license, without additional charge, to the court or judicial officer to permit an additional copy of the software to be installed on a computer to be made available by the court or judicial officer to members of the public.

(c) Expiration of certification

Any certification provided by the Judicial Council under Family Code section 3830 and this rule must expire one year from the date of its issuance unless another expiration date is ~~set forth~~ stated in the certification. The Judicial Council may provide for earlier expiration of a certification if (1) the provisions involving the

1 calculation of tax consequences change or (2) other provisions involving the
2 calculation of support change.

3
4 **(d) Statement of certified public accountant**

5
6 If the software computes the state and federal income tax liability as provided in
7 ~~subdivision~~ (b)(1)(B) of this rule, the application for certification, whether for
8 original certification or for renewal, must be accompanied by a statement from a
9 certified public accountant that:

- 10
11 (1) The accountant is familiar with the operation of the software;
12
13 (2) The accountant has carefully examined, in a variety of situations, the
14 operation of the software in regard to the computation of tax liability;
15
16 (3) In the opinion of the accountant the software accurately calculates the
17 estimated actual state and federal income tax liability consistent with Internal
18 Revenue Service and Franchise Tax Board procedures;
19
20 (4) In the opinion of the accountant the software accurately calculates the
21 deductions under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA), including
22 the amount for social security and for Medicare, and the deductions for
23 California State Disability Insurance and properly annualizes these amounts;
24 and
25
26 5) States which calendar year the statement includes and must clearly indicate
27 any limitations on the statement. The Judicial Council may request a new
28 statement as often as it determines necessary to ensure accuracy of the tax
29 computation.
30

31 **(e) * * ***

32
33 **(f) Modifications to the software**

34
35 The certification issued by the Judicial Council under Family Code section 3830
36 and this rule imposes a duty upon the person applying for the certification to
37 promptly notify the Judicial Council of all changes made to the software during the
38 period of certification. Upon request, the Judicial Council will keep the information
39 concerning changes confidential. The Judicial Council may, after receipt of
40 information concerning changes, require that the software be recertified under this
41 rule.
42

1 **(g) Definitions**

2
3 As used in this chapter:

- 4
5 (1) “Software” refers to any program or digital application used to calculate the
6 appropriate amount of child or spousal support.
7
8 (2) “Default settings” refers to the status in which the software first starts when it
9 is installed on a computer system. The software may permit the default
10 settings to be changed by the user, either on a temporary or a permanent
11 basis, if (1) the user is permitted to change the settings back to the default
12 without reinstalling the software, (2) the computer screen prominently
13 indicates whether the software is set to the default settings, and (3) any
14 printout from the software prominently indicates whether the software is set
15 to the default settings.
16
17 (3) “Contains” means, with reference to software, that the material is either
18 displayed by the program code itself or is found in written documents
19 supplied with the software.
20

21 **(h) Explanation of discrepancies**

22
23 Before the Judicial Council denies a certificate because of failure to comply with
24 the standards in paragraph (b)(1) or (b)(2) of this rule, the Judicial Council may
25 request the person seeking certification to explain the differences in results.
26

27 **(i)–(j) * * ***

Family Law: Standards for Computer Software Used to Assist in Determining Support (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.275)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
1.	Child Support Director's Association of California by Michael Smitsky Executive Director	A	The Committee agrees with the proposed changes.	No response required
2.	Family Law Section Executive Committee (FLEXCOM), California Lawyers Association, by Shanon Quinley FLEXCOM Legislation Chair	A	FLEXCOM agrees with this proposal.	No response required.
3.	Harriett Buhai Center for Family Law by Rebecca L. Fischer Director of Legal Services	A	The Harriett Buhai Center for Family Law ("the Buhai Center") supports the Judicial Council's proposal regarding amending California Rules of Court as to rule 5.275. The proposed amendment allows software to be re-certified on an annual basis without delay. Deleting the operating system required to use the software reflects how quickly technology can change. Section (b)(2) of the rule referenced Windows 95; since Windows 95 was released, there have been 8 more versions of the operating system. The proposed amendment in section (b)(4) helps to promote conformity between California Rules of Court and California Family Code. This helps avoid confusion and more accurately reflects the law. The proposed amendment in section (b)(5) accurately reflects the new allocation of child support add-ons, an important issue for many families.	No response required. The committee appreciates the commenter's feedback regarding each proposed amendment to rule 5.275.

Family Law: Standards for Computer Software Used to Assist in Determining Support (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.275)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			Many litigants, particularly self-represented litigants, rely heavily on these programs to determine support orders and it is critical that the basic requirements of the systems accurately reflect California law.	
4.	Orange County Bar Association by Mei Tseng President	A	The Proposed Forms Appropriately Address the Stated Purpose: Yes	No response required.
5.	Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles by Stephanie Kuo	A	The following comments are representative of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, and do not represent or promote the viewpoint of any particular judicial officer or employee. In response to the Judicial Council of California’s ITC, “Family Law: Standards for Computer Software Used to Assist in Determining Support,” the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles (Court), agrees with the proposal and its ability to appropriately address its stated purpose. The proposal effectively addresses the purpose of updating Rule 5.275 to reflect statutory changes and ensure that certified software accurately calculates child and spousal support under current Family Code provisions. The revisions clarify how calculations should be performed, how default settings are defined, and how certification should be maintained, thereby aligning the rule with legislative intent and practical court use. The proposed inclusion of glossary definitions and the requirement that default settings be indicated on screen and in printouts will enhance transparency and	No response required. The committee appreciates the information provided by the commenter. This comment is beyond the scope of the invitation to comment. Rule 5.275(b)(4) currently requires that software developers

Family Law: Standards for Computer Software Used to Assist in Determining Support (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.275)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			reduce confusion for both legal professionals and self-represented litigants. It may be helpful for the Judicial Council to consider requiring vendors to provide short user guides and visual tutorials as part of certification. Also, establishing a central webpage listing all currently certified software and expiration dates would be helpful. Lastly, encouraging integration with family law facilitators' services to support public users would be beneficial.	provide instructions for the entry of each figure that is required for computation of child support, using the default setting of the software, on either the screen or in written form. While the inclusion of visual tutorials may be helpful to users, such a requirement would likely result in additional cost to developers. The committee, therefore, believes public comment should be sought before the suggestion to require visual tutorials as a certification requirement is considered for adoption. The committee also notes that the Judicial Council's public website, among other things, lists each guideline calculator certified for use by the courts, the dates the calculators were submitted for certification, their current certification status, and when certification is expected to expire: https://courts.ca.gov/programs-initiatives/families-and-children/family-law/ab-1058-child-support-program/guideline. Lastly, the commenter suggests that the rule should encourage integration with Family Law Facilitator's services to support public users. Although Family Code section 3830 requires that the standards ensure software performs in a manner consistent with applicable statutes and rules of court for the determination of child and spousal support, there is no requirement in the Family Code or rules of

Family Law: Standards for Computer Software Used to Assist in Determining Support (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.275)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			The proposal may provide cost savings by reducing the need for staff to verify or correct support calculations manually. Standardizing for software use may also reduce litigation or continuances caused by inconsistent data. Furthermore, user comprehension will be improved with the glossaries and clear default settings. To implement, the Court would need to train its judicial officers, judicial assistants and self-help staff. The Court estimates it would take two to three hours to review the updated standards, default settings, glossary functions, and certification compliance. The Court would also need to update its procedures to reflect default setting checks, glossary availability and verification of certified software use in non-IV-D cases. There would be minimal technology adjustments, since the Court would likely only need to confirm the software is installed and available to the public and staff according to the rule requirements. Three months from Judicial Council approval should be sufficient time for implementation. Courts would also benefit from a Judicial Council-hosted webinar or Q & A sessions early in the implementation period.	court requiring guideline calculators be integrated with the work of the Family Law Facilitator's Office. The committee will consider these suggestions in a future rules cycle as time and resources allow. The committee appreciates the information provided by the commenter. No response required. The committee appreciates the insight and information provided by the commenter. The committee appreciates the feedback from the commentator. The committee notes that, under this year's calendar, there will be two months between Judicial Council approval and the effective date of the

Family Law: Standards for Computer Software Used to Assist in Determining Support (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.275)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			The proposal should scale well across courts of varying sizes. Small courts will benefit from clearer standards, which reduce training and oversight burdens. Large Courts gain efficiency through standardization, reduced disputes over calculation discrepancies and more streamlined support proceedings.	amendments to the rule of court. Other courts have indicated that this lead time is sufficient; the committee hopes it will also work well for the Los Angeles Superior Court. The committee also appreciates the feedback provided by the commenter regarding resources that may be of assistance to courts during the implementation period. No response required. The committee appreciates the insight and information provided by the commenter.
6.	Superior Court of California, County of Orange Family Law and Juvenile Divisions by Katie Tobias Operations Analyst	NI	Comments N/A Request for Specific Comments In addition to comments on the proposal as a whole, the advisory committee is interested in comments on the following: <i>Does the proposal appropriately address the stated purpose?</i> Yes, the proposal appropriately addresses the stated purpose.	No response required. The committee appreciates the insight and information provided by the commenter.

Family Law: Standards for Computer Software Used to Assist in Determining Support (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.275)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
		The advisory committee also seeks comments from courts on the following cost and implementation matters: <i>Would the proposal provide cost savings? If so, please quantify.</i> No, it does not appear to provide cost savings. <i>What would the implementation requirements be for courts—for example, training staff (please identify position and expected hours of training), revising processes and procedures (please describe), changing docket codes in case management systems, or modifying case management systems?</i> Implementation will require providing communication to judicial officers and court staff. <i>Would two months from Judicial Council approval of this proposal until its effective date provide sufficient time for implementation?</i> Yes, two months would be sufficient time for Orange County. <i>How well would this proposal work in courts of different sizes?</i> Our court is a large court, and this could work for Orange County.	No response required. The committee appreciates the insight and information provided by the commenter. No response required. The committee appreciates the insight and information provided by the commenter. No response required. The committee appreciates the insight and information provided by the commenter. No response required. The committee appreciates the insight and information provided by the commenter.

Family Law: Standards for Computer Software Used to Assist in Determining Support (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.275)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
7.	Superior Court of California, County of San Diego by Michael M. Roddy Executive Officer	A	<i>Does the proposal appropriately address the stated purpose?</i> Yes. <i>Would the proposal provide cost savings? If so, please quantify.</i> No. <i>What would the implementation requirements be for courts for example, training staff (please identify position and expected hours of training), revising processes and procedures (please describe), changing docket codes in case management systems, or modifying case management systems?</i> None. <i>Would two months from Judicial Council approval of this proposal until its effective date provide sufficient time for implementation ?</i> Yes.	No response required. The committee appreciates the insight and information provided by the commenter. No response required. The committee appreciates the insight and information provided by the commenter. No response required. The committee appreciates the insight and information provided by the commenter. No response required. The committee appreciates the insight and information provided by the commenter.

Family Law: Standards for Computer Software Used to Assist in Determining Support (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.275)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<i>How well would this proposal work in courts of different sizes?</i> It appears the proposal would work for courts of all sizes.	No response required. The committee appreciates the insight and information provided by the commenter.
8.	Hon. Rebecca Wightman Tribal Judge for Bear River Band Retired Commissioner, Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco	AM	Agree, if modified. I understand the purpose of this rule, among other corrective legislative issues, is to allow for testing for annual certification. The Judicial Council needs to be able to fully test a variety of scenarios for the purpose of testing the accuracy of various developers' programs without fear of running into any obstacles, such as licensing issues. I also think it is important for the Judicial Council to do its internal testing without giving developers advance knowledge of the internal scenarios used solely for testing. I propose the Judicial Council modify subdivision (b)(2) of CRC 5.275 by adding the language added in yellow highlighting below (or similar language, e.g. use "test-only scenarios" vs. "internal"): (2) Using examples provided by the Judicial Council, The software must calculate a child support amount, using its default settings, that is accurate to within 1 percent of the correct amount. In making this determination <u>To determine the accuracy of the software, the Judicial Council must will develop its own internal scenarios to test the software,</u> calculate	The committee agrees with the suggestion to add language to rule 5.275(b)(2) that explicitly states the scenarios developed by the Judicial Council are only for internal use. This change will advance the intended purpose of the amendment, which is to clarify that the test scenarios are not available for distribution to assist developers in programing their software. The committee also agrees that language should be added to rule 5.275(b)(2) requiring the person seeking certification to provide the Judicial Council with any licenses required to use and test the submitted software, as such licenses are necessary for the Judicial Council to use any computer hardware, operating systems, and software provided by the developers for testing purposes. The addition of the suggested language will help avoid obstacles that could delay the certification review process or create potential liability for the Judicial Council when using and testing the submitted software. The suggested changes have been incorporated,

SPR25-16

Family Law: Standards for Computer Software Used to Assist in Determining Support (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.275)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			the correct amount of support for each example scenario, and must then calculate the amount for each example scenario using the software program. Each person seeking certification of software must supply a copy of the software to the Judicial Council. If the software does not operate on a standard Windows 95 or later compatible or Macintosh computer, Judicial Council does not have the computer hardware or operating system necessary to use and test the software, the person seeking certification of the software must make available to the Judicial Council any hardware <u>or operating system</u> required to use and test the software. <u>The person seeking certification shall also grant or obtain the licenses necessary to enable the Judicial Council to use and test the software.</u> The Judicial Council may delegate the responsibility for the calculation and determinations required by this rule.	with slight alteration, into the revisions being recommended for the council's approval.