

# COT MEETING MINUTES

## COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY

Friday, February 19, 2010  
10:00 AM - 12:30 PM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
1501 W. Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

---

### CONFERENCE ROOM 119A/B

#### MEMBERS PRESENT

Kent Batty\*  
Michael Baumstark  
Robert Brutinel  
Andrew Hurwitz, *Chair*  
Michael Jeanes  
Dennis Kavanaugh\*  
Gary Krcmarik (*Jared Nishimoto, proxy*)  
Sheri Newman\*  
Catherine O'Grady  
Marcus Reinkensmeyer  
John Rezzo  
Delcy Scull  
Roxanne Song Ong  
Ann Timmer  
Garye Vasquez

#### GUESTS

Cathy Clarich, *CACC*  
Donald Jacobson, *CACC*  
Jeremiah Matthews, *TAC*  
Michael Pollard\*, *CACC*  
Jamie Ross, *Courthouse News*  
David Stevens, *TAC/PACC*  
Paul Thomas, *CACC*

#### MEMBERS ABSENT

Elizabeth Hegedus-Berthold

#### AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*  
Jack Bigwarfe, *ITD*  
Jennifer Greene, *Legal*  
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*  
Patrick McGrath, *CSD*  
Teri McHaney, *Finance*  
Adele May, *ITD*  
Jim Price, *ITD*  
Valarie Strayer, *ITD*  
Paula Taylor, *APSD*

\* indicates attendance by telephone

# COT MEETING MINUTES

## WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Hon. Andrew Hurwitz,  
Chair

Vice Chief Justice Andrew Hurwitz, Chair, called the Commission on Technology (COT) meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. He welcomed members and the public present, then asked those calling in and all members in the room to introduce themselves for the record. Staff confirmed that a quorum existed. Justice Hurwitz also briefly discussed some preliminary matters:

- The strategic agenda unveiling originally planned for today's meeting will now accompany the State of the Judiciary address to the Legislature on March 17. Staff member Stewart Bruner will distribute copies to members following the official release.
- Because of the reduction in IT planning burden this year, Stewart will not be hounding the counties for updates but will gladly receive any updates sent his way.
- The focus of budget cuts is switching to next fiscal year as this fiscal year winds down. Mike Baumstark outlined the differences between the governor's plan and legislators' "trigger" plans for enacting deep cuts. From COT's standpoint, priority projects will continue to move ahead.
- The CACC status report shows the RFR Replacement project in yellow status, based on the project's request for a later implementation date.

He then called members' attention to the minutes from the November 6, 2009, meeting.

## MOTION

**A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the November 6, 2009, Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously.**

**TECH 10-01**

## REVISED IMPLEMENTATION DATE FOR RFR REPLACEMENT SYSTEM

Mr. David Stevens

Mr. David Stevens, CIO for the Superior Court in Maricopa County, provided members with a brief history of the project underway to replace the clerk's financial system with a newer technology that also integrates with the cash receipting system recently implemented. Detailed analysis and a project plan recently completed by Court Technology Services (CTS) indicate the earliest implementation date for the project to be August 1, 2011, an 11-month slip from the previous COT-approved date. David added that the earlier implementation date was a "best guess" prior to completing any detailed design activities. Clerk Michael Jeanes shared his praise for the methodical analysis and design effort completed along with his belief that spending extra time on analysis pays dividends by saving time in the construction phase of the project.

In response to a question, David described the meaning of "60 percent staff loading" used in determining the length of the project. His detailed plan takes into account that up to 40 percent of the time of those staff members assigned to the project will end up being used for other initiatives, building additional margin into the effort beyond the typical 80 percent loading. Justice Hurwitz and Michael Jeanes reminded members that the existing system continues to function acceptably using old technology, following some refurbishment a few years ago, so extending the projected delivery date is not critical to the business.

## MOTION

**A motion was made and seconded to approve the change in delivery date for the RFR Replacement System to August 1, 2011. The motion passed unanimously with Michael Jeanes and Marcus Reinkensmeyer abstaining.**

**TECH 10-02**

## XML FORMAT FOR E-FILED DOCUMENTS

Mr. Karl Heckart

Justice Hurwitz set the stage for Karl Heckart's discussion by recounting the history of the decision about an XML format and the various bodies that have considered it to date. He detailed eCourt's determination of the official record versus a convenience copy of the record. Karl described the impact of eCourt's decision on TAC's comfort with using XML for outgoing documents. He compared sizes of text files in PDF format to those in XML format. He also informed members that Word 2007 produces an ISO standard XML format by default and is the court-standard word processor. TAC agreed that clinging to PDF as a protection from unauthorized revision of a document provides false confidence. In response to a question, Justice Hurwitz clarified that the rules do not require return of a conforming copy and that filers will view filed documents in AZTurboCourt. He also clarified that PDF format is still acceptable for text documents and that mass conversion will not be required, but that AZTurboCourt will stipulate XML format for text-based filings, should TAC's proposal be accepted. A question was raised about the ability of BriefTools to operate with documents stored in open formats.

## MOTION

**A motion was made and seconded to accept both Open Document Format and Open Office XML as the XML formats for e-filed documents, as presented. The motion passed unanimously.**

**TECH 10-03**

## E-FILING/PUBLIC ACCESS PROJECT UPDATE

Mr. Karl Heckart

Justice Hurwitz introduced the topic by praising the flexibility of eCourt members who have figured out ways of resolving policy issues to further e-filing efforts thus far. Karl Heckart described the ripple effect of assumptions derived from a century of paper-based processing in courts. He reminded members that the e-filing project glues together many other projects, business units, and technology units. He provided item-by-item updates on the key facets of e-filing, including:

- development of TurboCourt intelligent forms and recent increases in volume of usage,
- infrastructure deployments and enhancements at AOC to support the statewide e-filing environment,
- case initiation and CMS integration progress being made at Pima Superior Court,
- the vendor's approach and timeframes for appellate e-filing,
- integration efforts with standard CMSs and specification development efforts for the "one-off" CMSs around the state,
- progress toward full e-filing at Maricopa Justice Courts and the possibility of contracting Intresys to construct the integration between AZTurboCourt and the iCIS CMS,

- progress with testing AZTurboCourt at the Maricopa Clerk's Office for civil case subsequent e-filing, and
- marketing and publicity efforts focused on attorney adoption that include a major presence at the State Bar convention in June.

Justice Hurwitz praised Judge Orr and Terry Stewart for their efforts in raising the enthusiasm levels of Justices of the Peace in Maricopa County for e-filing.

Karl also shared a set of issues including:

- Insufficient number of subject matter experts for domestic relations intelligent forms development,
- The AOC Customer Support Center's ability to support to calls from attorneys and the public as full e-filing kicks off, and
- Revenue generation becoming sufficient for the project to support itself,

Sheri Newman raised concern on behalf of the other superior courts using forms modeled on and hosted by Maricopa Superior Court. They fear that once that court makes the switch to AZTurboCourt, all support from the old forms will be terminated even though the client courts are not yet prepared to accept the newer forms. Staff will investigate the situation and report back.

## BUDGET IMPACTS TO TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS

Mr. Karl Heckart

Karl Heckart reminded members of the need for both sufficient fund balances and sufficient spending authority to be able to complete ongoing technology projects. He displayed the list of strategic projects prioritized at the 2009 annual meeting last June, then walked through the assigned priorities. He indicated projects already complete or that would likely complete by the end of the fiscal year, focusing members' attention on the remaining projects and their priorities. He proposed that Priority 1 and 2 projects should be maintained at the expense of Priority 3 through 5 Projects, but he sought members' comments and questions.

Concern was raised about the implications for JOLTS of the proposed shutdown of Dept. of Juvenile Corrections as well as the number of staff required to train and transition to new systems while continuing day-to-day business: personnel cuts can make it impossible to implement the very systems that will improve productivity of remaining staff. There was some concern about Karl's proposal to sacrifice the LJ CMS rollout leaving a high number of case management systems needing to be supported. A byproduct of AZTEC's remaining in the field even longer than currently proposed is that non-AZTEC courts will seek non-LJ CMS replacements or upgrades in the interim. Members also desired to see the LJ CMS effort progress to enable the efficiencies of disconnected scanning and e-filing.

## ANNUAL MEETING SCHEDULE CONFLICT

Hon. Andrew Hurwitz

Justice Hurwitz raised the potential for conflict between the State Bar convention and the June alternate dates for COT's annual meeting. He described the vital importance to the e-filing project of showing a strong presence at the convention. The experience of the past few years indicates that no budget will be in place before the June dates. He also announced his intention to reduce the length of the annual meeting from two days to one by authorizing written updates

# COT MEETING MINUTES

from the subcommittees and directing Stewart Bruner to present technology plans only for counties submitting complete updates. He asked Stewart to find the single day when the greatest number of members would be available. A possibility was suggested of splitting the content between the June and September meetings.

## CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Hon. Andrew Hurwitz

After hearing no request for further discussion from members or the public in response to his call, Justice Hurwitz entertained a motion to adjourn.

## MEETING ADJOURNED

11:45 A.M.

### Upcoming Meetings:

May 6 & 7, 2010	AOC – Conference Room 119 A/B	<b>OR</b>
June 10 & 11, 2010	AOC – Conference Room 119 A/B	
September 3, 2010	AOC – Conference Room 119 A/B	