

**COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY
MEETING MINUTES**

November 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
John Gemmill
Michael Jeanes
Roger Klingler
Gary Krcmarik
Beth Lewallen
Sheri Newman
Marcus Reinkensmeyer
John Rezzo
Roxanne Song Ong

MEMBERS ABSENT

Peter Eckerstrom
Martin Krizay
Catherine O'Grady

GUESTS

Janet Cornell, *CACC*
Phillip Ellis, *Pima AGAVE*
Donald Jacobson, *CACC*
Gregg Obuch, *CACC*
Michael Pollard, *CACC*
Eloise Price, *TAC*
Rick Rager, *TAC*
Philip Urry, *COA Division One*
Steve Wetzel, *Maricopa County CIO*

AOC STAFF

Sam Adkins, *ITD*
Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Michael Donnelly, *ITD*
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*
Stephanie Nolan, *ITD*
Renny Rapier, *ITD*
Carla Tack, *CSD*

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Vice Chief Justice Rebecca Berch, Chair, called the Commission on Technology (COT) meeting to order just after 10:00 a.m. She welcomed Commission members and members of the public then asked those at the table to introduce themselves and tell the constituency they represent. Staff confirmed that a quorum existed.

In her introductory remarks, Justice Berch called members' attention to several items:

- 2008 meeting dates for COT and subcommittees have been decided. Members were provided a handout of the dates and locations for upcoming meetings.
- Since the previous meeting, ITAC approved the general jurisdiction (GJ) case management system (CMS) project and the spending cap was increased.
- There seems to be an occasional disconnect between what gets reported at COT and what is heard in the halls following meetings. The CACC chair is adding more discipline to the project reporting process and will begin providing an assessment of each project to COT at each meeting. Project representatives have a duty to inform COT of things that are less than perfect or not going as planned, in addition to report on what is going well.
- Recent rule changes related to electronic records reveal the need to balance the required protection of the court record against the desire to eliminate paper. AOC representatives need to rapidly provide practical guidance for limited jurisdiction courts looking to image closed records before destroying the paper as well as for general jurisdiction courts looking to image open records and destroy the related paper.

Justice Berch then previewed topics of the meeting before turning members' attention to the minutes from the September 7, 2007, meeting.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the September 7, 2007, Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-48

REVIEW OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLANNING APPROACH

Karl Heckart, CIO for the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), reminded members that in reviewing the overall mission, process, and timeline for the next round of IT planning at the September meeting, they had raised concerns about how much effort the current process involves, especially for rural court administrators, in comparison to the value received from it. He summarized various issues, as AOC understands them.

Stewart Bruner, IT Strategic Planning Manager, shared the mandates for planning and his research into the requirements of other strategic plans, highlighting GITA, AZNET, and National Center for State Courts' (NCSC's) recommendation. He reviewed the high level value derived from countywide plans. Stewart went on to detail the specific types of information provided in the plan, start to finish, and the preparation time gathered from last year's effort.

Karl then shared several options:

1. Continue the current process and continue to refine the materials.

2. Eliminate the requirement for local plans and have AOC produce a single branch plan.
3. Retain planning consultants to facilitate the creation of rural counties' plans for them.
4. Divide the courts into two groups and enable small courts to complete a simplified plan.
5. Produce court rather than county plans and change frequency of submittal according to relative volume of court business or presence of IT staff.

Members generally favored combining Options 1 and 4. Discussion focused on the value of enabling small courts to respond to a simplified set of requirements. Such an approach would be less time consuming yet continue to involve them in the process. Members expressed differing opinions on the benefit of "tiering" courts in various ways and of requiring only annual updates to the previously submitted plan.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to maintain the current countywide planning process but allow courts having fewer than two judges or without local IT support to complete a streamlined planning document as developed by AOC staff. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-49

BUSINESS CONTINUITY/RISK ASSESSMENT

Karl Heckart discussed the Commission's role in risk planning. He summarized the general predicament and the critical need for risk planning based on the interdependencies among local courts, local agencies, state courts, and state agencies. He pondered the impacts of a catastrophic event, should one happen. Karl reviewed with members TAC's requirements to compile enterprise risks and mitigation ideas. He then highlighted three easy steps to accomplish this goal: 1) List critical business processes, 2) Identify associated risks and recovery strategies, and 3) Identify the IT dependencies of each critical process.

Although all courts must participate in risk planning, Karl stressed the importance of beginning with superior courts' business processes and related court technology. Karl stepped members through the assessment process, showing relevant portions of the assessment tool before sharing the goal of returning to the COT 2008 annual meeting with a list of most critical technology impact points and identification of their mitigation needs.

Members questioned whether the material requested is already available to AOC from other sources. Stewart Bruner stated that he had met with Niki O'Keeffe at AOC and verified that previous input for "Thinking the Unthinkable" was not at the level Karl described and therefore not adequate for the task of disaster planning. Members were appreciative of the need for risk planning, but sensitive to adding work to existing loads. It was also noted that there may be inadequate communication across branches of state government. Members debated the speed at which risk planning should take place.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to move forward with the risk assessment process, scope, and activities for superior courts as soon as possible. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-50

GJ CMS PROGRESS REPORT

Renny Rapiet, GJ CMS Project Manager, brought members up-to-date with the fast moving efforts related to the GJ CMS project since the last COT meeting. He reported that all project deliverables have been completed on schedule, additional staffing is being obtained, all governing boards and committees are organized and functioning, and communication networks for project information have been launched. He also reported that AmCad completed a minute entry demonstration for clerks, as well as multiple system overview and gap analysis sessions with better than expected results. Gap analysis sessions have not exposed any items that jeopardize the project schedule or budget, thus far.

Renny then reported some details related to data center construction, data integration, and a preliminary limited jurisdiction (LJ) gap analysis underway. The chair reminded members that, contrary to rumors, the AmCad system has not been selected to replace AZTEC in LJ courts, but the task falls to COT to perform due diligence in evaluating it as an option since contract terms do not preclude its use beyond superior courts.

LJ CMS UPDATE

Rick Rager, Tempe CMS Project Manager, asked members to approve some changes in the Tempe CMS project's scope and schedule, leading to a new implementation date of September 2, 2008. He described the need to extend the development efforts to address the complexities of event processing, batch processing, and financials.

Members questioned the cost increase associated with the schedule extension. Rick reaffirmed that the project is committed to ask for no further state funding. Karl clarified that AOC resources assigned to the Tempe project are actually LJ CMS implementation team members so the schedule extension does not add direct cost.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the updated project plan and revised delivery dates for CACC to monitor. The motion passed unanimously (Louraine Arkfeld abstaining). TECH 07-51

AGAVE 2.0 PROGRESS UPDATE

Phillip Ellis, Pima AGAVE Project Manager, reported on some recent struggles the project is experiencing and the proposed solutions. Data reconciliation has proven more difficult than planned and the effort has surfaced an architectural issue within the AGAVE CMS. Response times are proving to be unacceptably long for managing cases. Taking action now will cost less in time and money than waiting until the full release is in production. Phillip proposed a 3-month effort to vastly improve usability and response time. This effort would change the delivery date for Release 2.0 to April 25, 2008, and set back the development work on 3.0 by 3 months. He warned that the result of not changing would be an extremely dissatisfied user community based on Phillip's and Kent Batty's observations.

Members discussed whether 3 months would allow sufficient time to solve the problem and what assurances exist that no other issues will surface. Phillip responded that a buffer has been built into the schedule and that the project includes William Earl from AOC in the design documentation phase. He expressed confidence that the proposed fix can be timely delivered and will resolve the problems he identified.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the updated project plan and revised delivery dates for CACC to monitor. The motion passed unanimously (Kent Batty abstaining). TECH 07-52

MODEL BREACH NOTIFICATION POLICY

Stewart Bruner reminded members of the history of the Security Breach Notification Policy that responds to A.R.S. § 44-7501. The AOC has discussed the draft policy shown in June in accordance with the request to create a model policy for courts throughout the state to use as a starting point for creating their own policies. Stewart briefly reviewed the latest approach to the document with members, noting that AOC discussions have focused on including policies defining ownership of data as well as restrictions about portable storage devices due to the inherent high risk of loss of the device and the data it contains. Likely next steps for the policy involve finalizing the language, creating an administrative order (AO), and creating an eventual code section to implement the AO.

PC REFRESH/VISTA UPDATE

Michael Donnelly brought members up to date and responded to members' questions about the statewide PC refresh and deployment of the Vista operating system. He discussed the validation process, issues exposed, and solutions or workarounds identified, particularly for FTR, Liberty, Jury+, and OnBase.

The overall deployment strategy is to pilot at AOC, then expand to several municipal courts in Maricopa County and to Pinal Probation before rolling out to the GJ CMS pilot courts (Yuma and La Paz) then the remaining six regions. He reviewed the process that will be repeated at each site in the rollout. The anticipated timeline for statewide deployment activities runs from January through May 2008.

The project website for more detailed information is located at <http://supreme22/support/pcrollout2007.htm> and the mailbox for collecting project-related questions and concerns is "Vista_Project@courts.az.gov."

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

After verifying that no further business existed from members, Justice Berch made a call to the public. No members of the public responded.

The next COT meeting is scheduled for January 4, 2008, in Conference Room 345 A/B of the Arizona State Courts Building.

The meeting adjourned at 1:32 p.m.