

**COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY
MEETING MINUTES**

March 2, 2007
10:00 a.m. – 1:30 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 (*Max Ivey, proxy*)
B. Robert Dorfman (*Tim Lawler, proxy*)
Peter Eckerstrom
John Gemmill
Michael Jeanes (*Chris Kelly, proxy*)
Roger Klingler
Gary Krcmarik
Martin Krizay
Sheri Newman
Catherine O'Grady (*present via telephone*)
Marcus Reinkensmeyer
John Rezzo

GUESTS

Cathy Clarich, *CACC*
Beverly Frame, *Yuma COSC*
Margaret Guidero, *CACC*
Donald Jacobson, *CACC*
C. Steven McMurry, *CACC*
Gregg Obuch, *TAC, CACC*
Michael Pollard, *CACC*
Rick Rager, *TAC, CACC*
David Stevens, *TAC, CACC*
Carl Ward, *Maricopa COSC*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jessica Blazina
Mark Candioto

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
William Earl, *ITD*
Phillip Ellis, *ITD*
Jennifer Gilbertson, *ITD, PACC*
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*
Pat McGrath, *CSD*
Stephanie Nolan, *ITD*
Pam Peet, *ITD*
Renny Rapier, *ITD*
Robert Roll, *ITD*
Carla Tack, *CSD*
Paula Taylor, *APSD*

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

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. Staff confirmed that a quorum existed.

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

- **Audit Update** – Information technology (IT) processes and projects were examined by the Auditor General last year. At the conclusion of that audit, AOC agreed to a set of recommendations, some of which involved oversight of projects. As a result, COT needs to define formal agreements with courts undertaking major projects. COT must also formalize risk assessments and then ensure that the risks identified are being managed throughout the project. In September of 1999, COT adopted a statewide, process-oriented project management methodology. The document was included in members' packets for reference. The chair directed staff to suggest ways to better formalize project scope details and track risk for member's review, using the already adopted document as the starting point. She asked members to review the document in preparation for more in-depth discussion at the annual meeting.
- **Remote Court Reporters Project** - Five private court reporting firms in Phoenix have indicated an interest in providing services to rural courts. The Superior Court in Maricopa County is working on an inter-governmental agreement to remotely supply its pool reporters to other counties. The AOC's Court Services Department (CSD) is accepting applications from superior courts for CPAF grant money to procure video conferencing systems for use in this program. AOC's Information Technology Department (ITD) has identified two preferred vendors for courts. Questions should be directed to either Rod Franklin in ITD or Jennifer Green in CSD.
- **Jury+ Web Interactive Update** – JSI, the software vendor, has provided a statement of work and supporting diagrams created in conjunction with Hershey Systems, who will be directly involved in the JURY+ Web Solution implementation. CSD is planning next steps, preparing a detailed project scope statement, and identifying necessary resources. Rhonda Dawson and Tony Sita have been assigned to the project and Melinda Hardman will continue to be involved as the jury content person and liaison to the jury commissioners.
- **E-Court Subcommittee Update** - The Appellate subteam is wrapping up the Yavapai e-ROA pilot, implementing Cochise e-ROA, and preparing to implement OnBase EDMS with integration between Appellamation in Division One and the Supreme Court. The Limited Jurisdiction subteam is working on the sets of standard data in both civil and criminal forms for submission to AOC to approve, construct, and maintain. That team is also overseeing the spread of e-citation with law enforcement handhelds. The general jurisdiction subteam is focused on proving the effectiveness of the multi-vendor model. Justice Hurwitz continues to drive the subteams toward results and will deliver a more detailed report at the annual meeting.

The Chair then asked members to introduce themselves for the record and share the constituency they represent.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the January 5, 2007, Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-06

AGAVE PROJECT UPDATE

Phillip Ellis, Project Manager for AGAVE, presented another update on activities performed against the revised project scope and schedule, as described at the November 2006 COT meeting.

Since the previous meeting, the project has:

- Completed design models for family, civil and criminal court.
- Continued on schedule with the financial database conversion in support of an estimated delivery date in early March.
- Continued CACTIS design work on schedule with a focus on screen layout, prototypes, and coding.
- Completed monetary credit and debit, manual obligation and victim debit, and non-monetary debit, credit, and victim debit functions within the financials module .
- Completed functions within the court module including: advanced search, judge maintenance and assignment, calendaring of cases, calendar code maintenance, charge, disposition and sentence maintenance, attorney maintenance, and attorney database conversion.

Phillip showed various screens associated with the recently completed development work. The focus of the next 90 days will be on the implementation of the finance module. AGAVE 1.5 will then be implemented in parallel with CrimWeb and e-Ledger in May 2007.

The project is being monitored against a milestone payment schedule for release of state funds to complete development, testing, and implementation in the court. Phillip reported that the project completed the CACTIS design funding milestone in February 2007 and that he will be requesting payment for that milestone from COT staff.

Members' questions and concerns centered on current resource levels. Phillip reported that staffing levels are being tracked and maintained at an eighty percent baseline. He also noted that he has been making the project more dependent on court resources and less dependent on consultants. He invited members to attend the upcoming rules engine demonstration to be held March 22 in Tucson.

KEY BUSINESS DRIVERS FROM IT PLANS

Stewart Bruner, AOC ITD Strategic Planning Manager, reported on the findings of his seven county tour to help compile IT plan inputs for the most rural courts in the state. He also presented members with a synopsis of common business drivers received in IT plans.

Arizona court trends shared included:

- Emergency preparedness and business continuity planning,

- Making better use of physical space,
- Making more services available over the Web,
- Obtaining more digital input and integration,
- Providing more digital output,
- Managing the jury experience over the Web,
- Implementing court performance measurements,
- Increase interaction with county automation systems,
- Use court network to connect to scarce resources available elsewhere,
- Develop more specialty courts.

In conclusion, Stewart compared Arizona court trends to national trends identified by National Center for State Courts (NCSC) and reviewed the remaining items on the 2008-2010 plan preparation schedule.

Various members expressed their appreciation for Stewart's travels to rural courts as well as his efforts to relay real-world observations of the state of the most rural courts to the Commission.

INTEGRATION LANGUAGE RECOMMENDATION FROM CACC

Honorable Michael Pollard, Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) Co-Chair, reported on the discussion held by CACC relating to a proposed policy statement regarding data integration. At the January 5, 2007, COT meeting, the Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC) requested that COT require an active interface among APETS, JOLTSaz, Maricopa's iCIS, the eventual general jurisdiction case management system, and the eventual limited jurisdiction case management system.

Judge Pollard explained that CACC members were also concerned with the language specifying real-time interaction among systems. Because courts don't typically receive information in real-time fashion, but generally through a batch transaction at day's end, the committee agreed that changing the verbiage to "timely" made realistic sense, allowing flexibility needed by developers and the underlying system infrastructure. The definition of timely would then be negotiated between the owner of the supplying system and the owner of the receiving system. CACC recommended that COT adopt a motion having "timely" in place of "real-time" wording.

COT members verified that the proposed language was acceptable to representatives of systems currently in development who were in attendance.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded that all next-generation court automation systems adopted for statewide use shall be constructed for timely propagation of data. Any other automation systems used by courts shall still provide integration points for statewide use. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-07

STATEWIDE CMS UPDATES

Honorable Michael Pollard, CACC Co-Chair, then reported on concerns regarding changes in the Tempe CMS project revealed at the last CACC meeting. He conveyed concerns relating to a new "event driven" development focus of the project, the lack of a

clear plan for adding justice court functionality to the Tempe system, and lack of a timeline for performing the eventual statewide rollout.

Renny Rapiet, CMS Transition Manager for AOC, provided the commission with more information on the strategy for compiling a functional matrix of limited jurisdiction court requirements, both municipal and justice. The Tempe system can then be compared to it, much like was done with AGAVE, yielding an estimate of the cost and timeline for meeting one hundred percent of the requirements. Renny also mentioned that the current thinking involves six rollout teams at the limited jurisdiction level to try to shorten the implementation timeline.

Members questioned whether consideration had been given to iCIS's justice court module and whether matrix development would be undertaken by actual court users. . Renny reiterated the development process used for the general jurisdiction matrix where a user group reviewed the matrix and tested against it. He added that further testing would be undertaken by yet another user group consisting of an appropriate constituency.

Changing the focus to the general jurisdiction level, Renny described in detail the recent visits made by an AOC team to evaluate the functional fit of potential vendor systems in general jurisdiction courts equivalent to those in Arizona, as directed by members of the Commission at the January 2007 meeting. All vendor systems reviewed have been scored individually and placed in the CMS summary matrix provided to members. The very tight timeline and limited staffing has resulted in preparation of an RFP's taking priority over obtaining detailed numbers on the effort required to make iCIS fully compliant with the functional matrix, since the same team is responsible for both efforts. Detailed work will resume on estimating the cost to close gaps between iCIS and the functional matrix once the RFP is released.

Renny summarized what the team learned:

- All vendor offerings reviewed meet the functional requirements better than the build or borrow options,
- Current customers are satisfied with the maintenance and support they receive from the vendors,
- Vendors do not have the issues with obtaining and compensating technical personnel that government has,
- Vendors have varying degrees of willingness to partner with Arizona depending on their market penetration, and
- Vendors use varying technology and architecture; one vendor's system already conforms to .NET.

Renny provided details of the team's approach to drafting the RFP so quickly. Justice Berch thanked members of the team for the volume of work they performed during such a short period of time. She directed COT members to review the draft RFP and provide input regarding the approach and completeness by March 9, 2007.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Justice Berch made a call to the public. No questions or concerns from the public were raised.

The COT meeting scheduled for May 4 and 5 has been postponed until June 7 and 8, 2007, and will take place in Conference Room 345A/B. The chair noted that the next meeting will be the annual planning meeting and, as such, will have a very full day-and-a-half agenda.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.