

**COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY  
MEETING MINUTES**

**January 5, 2007**  
10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

**Arizona Supreme Court**

Conference Room 119 A/B  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
1501 W. Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

---

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Louraine Arkfeld  
Kent Batty  
Michael Baumstark  
Rebecca Berch, *Chair*  
Robert Brutinel  
Christopher Cumiskey (*Dr. Max Ivey, proxy*)  
Peter Eckerstrom  
John Gemmill  
Michael Jeanes  
Gary Krcmarik  
Martin Krizay  
Sheri Newman  
Catherine O'Grady  
Marcus Reinkensmeyer  
John Rezzo

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Jessica Blazina  
Mark Candioto  
B. Robert Dorfman  
Roger Klingler

## GUESTS

Mohyeddin Abdulaziz, *TAC*  
Vicki Aguilar, *Gila COSC*  
Kip Anderson, *CACC*  
Peggy Bair, *Yavapai County*  
John Barrett, *PACC*  
Tom Brady, *Public*  
Cathy Clarich, *CACC*  
Janet Cornell, *Scottsdale City Court*  
Beverly Frame, *Yuma COSC*  
Dr. William Lewis, *ASU*  
Denise Lundin, *Cochise COSC*  
Cary Meister, *TAC*  
Gregg Obuch, *TAC, CACC*  
Michael Pollard, *CACC*  
Rick Rager, *Tempe Muni Court*  
Kyle Rimel, *TAC*  
David Stevens, *TAC/CACC*  
Myrtle Young, *PACC*

## AOC STAFF

Jack Bigwarfe, *ITD*  
Stewart Bruner, *ITD*  
Phillip Ellis, *ITD*  
Jennifer Gilbertson, *ITD/PACC*  
Gary Graham, *ITD*  
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*  
Alma Hernandez, *ITD*  
Diana Jones, *ITD*  
Travis King, *ITD*  
Rob Lubitz, *JJSD*  
Adele May, *ITD*  
Pat McGrath, *CSD*  
Stephanie Nolan, *ITD*  
Pam Peet, *ITD*  
Renny Rapiet, *ITD*  
Maggie Reyes, *ITD*  
Robert Roll, *ITD*  
Carla Tack, *CSD*

## WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Vice Chief Justice Rebecca Berch, Chair, called the Commission on Technology (COT) meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. She welcomed members and the public present then asked members to introduce themselves and share the constituency they represent. Staff confirmed that a quorum existed.

Justice Berch made introductory comments on several items of interest to members:

- Revising lunch procedures to favor those who have RSVP'd. Staff promised to do a better job of publicizing the cutoff date for reservations on the meeting website;
- Providing a backup COT annual meeting date, June 7 – 8, and recognizing Stephanie Nolan's behind-the-scenes work in dealing with meeting logistics;
- Clarifying the COT approach to SB1338, now A.R.S. 44-7501, by directing AOC and individual courts to formulate their notification policies for security breaches and pointing to examples of policies and content from City of Phoenix and the Government Information Technology Agency (GITA);
- Informing members that appointments have been made to the data standards committee and that the committee reports directly to the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC); and
- Wishing Stewart Bruner well on his upcoming seven-court roadtrip to compile their IT strategic plan input – an update on court business trends is expected in March.

**MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the November 3, 2006, Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-01.

## **REQUEST FOR e-FILING PILOT PROJECT**

The Honorable Denise Lundin, clerk of the superior court in Cochise County, informed members of her reasons for requesting the ability to electronically transfer the record on appeal to Division Two, the next step in the clerk's use of electronic document management. She briefly outlined some past projects leading up to the request.

Karl Heckart, AOC ITD Director and CIO, described a meeting held among technical participants in Tucson last week, the next steps, and anticipated timeline for the project. He summarized it as a fairly straightforward and noncomplex process using automation that already exists.

**MOTION: Approve the request for an e-filing pilot for record on appeal between Cochise Superior and Division Two using standard protocols with the stipulation that participants return to share how e-Blueback was modified to accept standard XML output from the collector program and OnBase. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-02**

The chair praised the level of teamwork and communication among the various players in the pilot.

## **FUNDING TO SUPPORT CMS TRANSITIONS**

Karl Heckart, AOC ITD Director and CIO, explained that AOC is required to submit to JLBC two reports a year on the CMS transition as a condition of getting the JCEF sweep reversed. Karl detailed for members the project assumptions made, rollout steps defined, the current thinking about the repeatable process implementation teams will use, likely implementation schedules, and detailed projected costs. These have all been carefully examined in preparing the initial report. The assumed scope of implementation is current AZTEC courts, not all courts in the state.

He showed a likely implementation schedule for the limited jurisdiction system, based on Tempe's current delivery schedule, running from first quarter 2008 to third quarter 2010. The likely schedule for the general jurisdiction system, based on AGAVE's current delivery schedule, runs from first quarter 2009 through third quarter 2010. The cost based on all assumptions is \$8.7M over the period and would leave a surplus of around \$300K at the end of FY11, assuming the time payment fee increase reverts in FY10.

Karl noted ongoing issues with locating technical resources including the resource allocated to learn the details of AGAVE and convey the knowledge to AOC.

Questions were raised about the accuracy of estimating the effort needed to enhance software that is not yet complete. The gap for the general jurisdiction system was based on the functional matrix being detailed in a later agenda item. Karl stated that 5 programmers would have to work about a year to close the gaps to all the functional requirements.

## **PROBATION AUTOMATION UPDATE**

Jennifer Gilbertson, APETS project manager, informed members that APETS went live in the final county in December 2006, making it a truly statewide system. She thanked Maricopa County for its pioneer work with the system over seven years ago, Yuma

County for its leadership role with the rural counties, and COT for kicking the rollout into high gear by including it on the statewide priorities list in 2003. She also praised the APETS team for continuing to make rollout progress while doing county-specific development and supporting existing users. Today, 2200 users are on the system at 40 sites with 40,000 active probationers tracked in a single database having customized views by county.

Jennifer had the APETS team members present stand and be recognized. The chair also thanked the team for helping the state of Arizona immensely.

Myrtle Young, chair of the PACC, brought members a concern from the JOLTSaz team related to integration with the selected case management system. The current development plan requires for the use of a single minute entry system, single calendar system, and single financial system outside JOLTSaz rather than duplicating work in these areas. Users request the functional enhancements that come from a single case management system. A concern also exists that various next-generation systems are not being directed to have a defined, active interface. Myrtle listed APETS, JOLTSaz, and Maricopa's iCIS-Juvenile applications. The development team desires COT's direction regarding the scope of general jurisdiction CMS development to prevent impact to the cost and timeline for JOLTSaz, but the project manager stated that the case management piece can continue to be bypassed until the March COT meeting.

Some members were concerned about the broad motion text suggested in comparison to the specifics of JOLTSaz's immediate concern and counseled to proceed with caution. Two separate issues were defined: a probation-specific one and a broad policy for all next-generation systems. Members favored letting the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) sort out the impacts of the broad, fundamental principle to automation under development and reporting back at the March meeting.

**MOTION: Table the discussion and request CACC to provide a recommendation to members at the March meeting. The motion passed with two nay votes. TECH 07-03**

### **AGAVE STATUS UPDATE**

Phillip Ellis, project manager for AGAVE, delivered another in a series of project updates for members. He compared the pre-AGAVE environment to the current Version 1.0 capabilities and shared specific areas where AGAVE is improving the operation of the court, a prime example is consolidating various disparate operations into a single database by the end of 2007. He described the strategy for reducing project risks identified by the Quantum audit and drilled into his resource utilization assumptions shown last meeting.

Since the previous meeting, the project has

- Focused on rescoring critical "no" items in the functional matrix, with developers considering things that are easy to do or to allow in AGAVE 2.0 versus what exists today;
- Completed the necessary infrastructure, including database replication to balance increasing usage and a flexible rules engine;

- Continued development of the financial module which remains on schedule for a May 1 release date; and
- Continued CACTIS design work, which is currently behind schedule but not anticipated to experience an overall end date slip.

Based on the schedule shared, Phillip suggested May 1 as the date of initial code turnover to the AOC transition team for consideration.

In light of the previous agenda item, Phillip was questioned regarding inclusion of integration points for sharing data with other statewide systems. He stated that the function is not currently in scope, though AGAVE is GJXDM compliant. A question was also raised about the plan for Clerk's Office resources following completion of their tasks for the financial module.

Phillip reminded members of his November request for State JCEF in the amount of \$521K. The project has since completed one of the funding milestones, infrastructure, presented in November, as well.

### **CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM ASSESSMENT AND DECISION**

Karl Heckart returned to further detail how the build, buy, or borrow CMS options fit to the functional matrix of requirements and to respond to questions raised by the presentation made last meeting. The transition team has revalidated the matrix by checking it against the needs of a single rural court, Yavapai Superior. The team has also attempted to associate numbers with the work needed once 2.0 is delivered to get the system to work in the second court. Karl stated that Dr. William Lewis has visited the AGAVE project as an outside consultant and will be asked for his observations.

Mr. Renny Rapier, AOC's transition team manager, provided a history of the scoring of various options against the matrix: AZTEC, iCIS, AGAVE 1.0, a representative vendor system, AGAVE 2.0, an update from the vendor, and another vendor system. AGAVE's number of critical functions addressed increased significantly in the second review, especially in the financial area. The chair clarified that the use of a particular vendor's name in the presentation did not indicate the presence of any agreement with that vendor from a procurement perspective.

Renny detailed the development of the matrix by a cross-functional AOC team with output validated by court users from around the state and then by Yavapai Superior. Several additional requirements grew out of the Yavapai validation – 229 items now exist. The gap with AGAVE 2.0 was determined using the latest, post-Yavapai matrix. the AOC team then estimated the time and cost to close the gaps in a statewide system, using internal resources (\$1.6M and greater than 12 months) or using external resources (\$2.6M and greater than 12 months).

The team's next steps involve undertaking a similar assessment on the Tempe system in spring of 2007 as well as performing user testing to validate the functions of the AGAVE system.

Karl compared AGAVE 2.0, iCIS.NET, and the representative vendor option using the factors of total development cost, likely date software would be ready for statewide

rollout, and likely date statewide rollout would be complete. He also mentioned some other considerations unique to each solution.

Dr. William Lewis, an independent consultant just beginning to examine the AGAVE project, suggested to members that a more in-depth look be taken to alleviate the vagueness that still exists regarding AGAVE and the other systems. He felt that a couple more months' research wouldn't hurt since AGAVE must be completed to address Pima Superior Court's business need, regardless of its selection as the statewide system.

Members asked Karl Heckart the downside of continuing to assess AGAVE while preparing an RFP and obtaining more detailed information the cost of modifying iCIS to be the statewide system. Issues raised were low staffing levels at ITD, low availability of skilled workers in the IT arena, and the wisdom of dedicating resources to an RFP that may not be released. A point was raised about JLBC possibly inquiring what steps COT had taken to ensure the value to taxpayers of CMS-related spending in any scenario.

Discussion revealed members to be divided on the subjects of obtaining further iCIS analysis and pursuing an RFP as due diligence. No one suggested discontinuing support for AGAVE while either of the other two options was pursued.

Karl then informed members that adding two analysis efforts to current workload would require termination of certain projects as well as the help of volunteers outside AOC. He requested the chair conduct a show of hands so he could recruit help from courts whose representatives favored developing an RFP.

**MOTION: Table the decision on the statewide general jurisdiction case management system to a later meeting and direct AOC staff to develop an RFP while further reviewing the cost and details of iCIS and obtaining another update from AGAVE. The motion passed with four nay votes [Kent Batty abstaining]. TECH 07-04**

Discussion then turned to consideration of AGAVE's request for State JCEF tabled at the November meeting. An objection was raised about the lack of integration points for other statewide systems in AGAVE and the perception that it would have to be named the statewide system before the implications of adding those integration points to its scope could be made known.

**MOTION: Approve the use of \$521,000.00 in state JCEF for continued Pima AGAVE development for disbursement according to the milestones proposed by the project (\$140K upon completion of infrastructure, \$159K upon completion of financials, \$123K upon completion of CACTIS design and \$99K upon completion of CACTIS replacement). The motion passed with one nay vote [Kent Batty abstaining]. TECH 07-05**

The chair asked members to please read the draft minutes carefully when staff releases them, due to the complexity of today's discussions, and to review the March meeting website for CMS-decision-related materials as they become available.

## **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Justice Berch made a call to the public. Phillip Ellis requested clarification of confusion regarding funding for the AGAVE project manager. Staff responded that examination of the minutes from the annual meeting revealed no need for a further motion.

**The next COT meeting is scheduled for March 2, 2007,** in Conference Room 119 A/B of the Arizona State Courts Building.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.