

COT MEETING MINUTES

COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY

Friday, June 5, 2015

9:30 AM - 3:30 PM

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

CONFERENCE ROOM 119

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kent Batty*
Michael Baumstark
Raymond Billotte
Bennett Cooper
Chris Hale
Michael Jeanes
Diane Johnsen (*Michael Brown, proxy*)
Gary Krcmarik
John Lucas*
Michael Miller
John Pelander, *Chair*
John Rezzo
Tivo Romero
Virlynn Tinnell

GUESTS

Tom Moseley, *Maricopa Superior Court*
Alexis Allen, *Tempe Muni Court*
Jaime Ross, *Courthouse News*
Michael Pollard, *CACC*
Debi Schaefer, *Tempe Muni Court*
Matt Tafoya, *Mesa Muni Court*
Paul Thomas, *CACC*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Randolph Bartlett
Thomas L. Schoaf
Roxanne Song Ong

AOC STAFF

Randy Baxter, *ITD*
Ken Bennett, *Exec Office*
Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Dave Byers, *Exec Office*
Eric Ciminski, *ITD*
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*
Kevin Kluge, *Finance*
Denise Lundin, *CSD*
Adele May, *ITD*
Bob Macon, *ITD*
Jim Price, *ITD*
Steele Price, *ITD*
Renny Rapier, *ITD*
Marcus Reinkensmeyer, *CSD*
Jason Shumberger, *ITD*

* indicates appeared by telephone

COT MEETING MINUTES

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Hon. John Pelander, Chair

Vice Chief Justice John Pelander, Chair, called the Commission on Technology (COT) annual meeting to order just after 9:30 a.m. He welcomed members and the public present. Staff then provided an overview of the topics being discussed in the meeting and the progression of discussions through the day.

Justice Pelander then asked members in the room and on the phone to introduce themselves for the record confirmed that a quorum existed. He then updated members on several items, including:

- The overarching goals for the annual planning meeting,
- News of a cyberattack against the federal government involving employee information of up to 4 million people and the importance of the new COJET requirement for one-half hour of cybersecurity training each year for court employees.
- Recognition of COT and subcommittee members for their continued service and guidance.

The chair then called members' attention to the minutes from the November 21, 2014 meeting.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the November 21, 2014 Commission on Technology meeting, as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

TECH 15-01

IT STRATEGIC ROADMAP

Mr. Karl Heckart

Justice Pelander introduced Karl Heckart, chief information officer (CIO) for the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), to set the stage for the planning effort. Karl began by showing a video of what Microsoft's technology will likely do just a few years from now. At the conclusion, Karl emphasized that most items shown either exist in an early form today or are in development –many of the items in the video depend on Windows 10. The software by subscription model is clearly here to stay, fueling an increased the pace of software change. Cloud computing is replacing on-premises ownership of IT infrastructure and applications. All devices are becoming intelligent and interconnected in the Internet of Things (IoT). Karl described how personal wearables and background computing are revolutionizing customer service. He also predicted that the workforce of the future will switch to more of an on-demand model, brining huge social services ramifications.

He then highlighted certain technology items plotted on the Gartner Hype Cycle and warned members that the planning cycle is long enough that projects to take advantage of the new technology have to be planned now. He described the courts as incredibly conflicted about change with a need to become more agile. With that background, Karl shared a list of major changes made in the past year and described a few significant programs implementing statewide in the fiscal next year or two.

Karl then argued that technology investments should change to focus more on public- and partner-focused services in order to dramatically improve productivity. He reviewed the public

COT MEETING MINUTES

interactive/self-service products available to Arizona’s courts and integration projects with justice partners. He also introduced the notion of our growing “technology debt” that requires increasing amounts of capital investment to address as the vendors shorten support timeframes before their products are deemed end-of-life. Karl described the AOC’s server reduction plan and a possible “cloud-first” strategy designed to reduce technology debt. He concluded with brief updates on total process re-engineering versus skeuomorphism or “paving the cowpath,” cyber security education efforts on multiple levels, and the progress of relocating the courts’ disaster recovery facility in the short term.

STRATEGIC PROJECTS REVIEW/UPDATES

Subcommittee Chairs

UPDATE

COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Hon. Michael Pollard

Judge Michael Pollard, chair of the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC), briefly described various projects that have completed over the past year as well as key projects that are planned for completion within the next year, especially Mesa’s and Tucson’s new case management systems. Judge Pollard indicated the vital role judges play in adoption of new CMSs. He emphasized the need for continued funding to see current projects through to completion, most notably AZTEC replacement at over 100 courts, eBench, JOLTSaz, and getting the final courts on FARE. In response to a member’s question, Judge Pollard indicated that general jurisdictions enhancements, as recommended by the user group and steering committee, are contained in the CACC funding recommendation. Karl described the AOC’s limited resource pool and added priorities are key to tacking the list of requested enhancements, apart from obtaining additional funding and hiring more people.

UPDATE

PROBATION AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Mr. Bob Macon

In the absence of Ms. Rona Newton, chair of the Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC), staff member Mr. Bob Macon listed accomplishments in automation from the past year and anticipated progress for next year in the juvenile justice arena. He focused attention on AZYAS 2.0 and the JOLTSaz statewide rollout. Mr. Randy Baxter, adult probation automaton manager for the AOC, covered accomplishments and anticipated progress for the statewide adult probation area. Mr. Tom Moseley, Deputy CIO for Maricopa Superior Court, briefly covered both juvenile and adult probation automation for that court. He mentioned the ongoing work being accomplished under a federal block grant.

UPDATE

e-COURT SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer

Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Director of AOC’s Court Services Division, introduced various project managers involved in the eCourt / eServices program and provided the progress of related projects over the previous year. He emphasized the overlap among the three major projects and two newer, ancillary projects. Marcus shared some interesting statistics about cases filed by jurisdiction and holiday filings. He focused on upcoming activities and dates associated with the

next-generation eUniversa e-filing product being piloted in Yavapai County. eBench has now been enhanced to facilitate work with large civil filings while Pima Superior Court is poised to load historical documents into the product and add more judges in a phased approach. eAccess is nearing completion as is pre-disposition payment processing integrated with AJACS for piloting in Tucson City Court. In response to a question, Marcus stated that eAccess is intended to provide documents from all courts, beginning with Maricopa Superior Court.

UPDATE

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mr. Karl Heckart

Karl Heckart, chair of the Technical Advisory Council (TAC), used his update to inform members in detail about several key items involving court technology, including:

- The necessity of accurately populating central repositories for data and documents – CCI and CDR -- to provide a single view of the courts to the public and justice partners and to replace the outdated data warehouse with a “web services” approach.
- The huge challenges and high costs of integrating non-standard automated systems into central repositories, adding time and cost to large projects.
- The need for increased coordination and change control with local systems that feed data to the central repositories.
- The vital necessity of secure coding and system administration practices by local IT professionals around the state
- The never-ending growth in demand for network capacity, fueled by additional business uses for videoconferencing equipment.
- Ongoing technical staffing challenges beyond the courts at a national level, even affecting vendors, that reduces our ability to maintain infrastructure and continue customizing applications.

Karl then listed TAC’s key priorities for FY 2016, including the update of all architectural standards, a Windows 10 and Office upgrade cycle, working out the details of a “cloud-first” strategy. He closed with a review of the most discussed item at TAC in FY 2015: creating a formal recommendation for changes to the ACAP subscription model and usage-based fees for specific items beyond PCs, printers, and laptops. . Karl provided the history of the current ACAP funding model and security changes made with the recent technology refresh, the impetus for a formal pricing proposal that will be reviewed later in the meeting.

UPDATE

OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL REVIEW

Mr. Kevin Kluge

Mr. Kevin Kluge, chief financial officer for the AOC, shared the financial status of the Judicial Collections Enhancement Fund (JCEF) and showed a projection of actual revenues against predicted revenues, revenues against expenses, and the projected remaining fund balance at the end of FY2016. Kevin provided some larger context for the diminishing revenues following the recession and showed how legislative fund sweeps have also affected the balance over the past several years. He described the strategies for handling expenditures in FY16 predicated on projected revenues remaining unchanged for the current year. In preparation for discussion about the TAC pricing proposal, Kevin detailed the total cost of automation in the branch divided among three major categories of spending. The remaining balance is projected to be only \$400K, but Kevin felt the amount is sufficient to cover the usual fluctuations during the year.

COT MEETING MINUTES

IT STRATEGIC PROJECT PRIORITIZATION FY16-FY19

Mr. Karl Heckart

Karl reviewed competing projects from various courts and statewide groups along with some considerations for setting priorities among them, including continually aging systems, the need for security, interdependencies, resource levels required to complete them, impact of multiple changes on resources and staffing, and the ability of any individual project to generate rather than consume revenue. He briefly reviewed the list of priority projects from last year's annual meeting before unveiling a brand new list of conceptual priorities taking into account the type of work being performed regardless of the project to which it relates. He then displayed last year's priority project listing with some very minor changes.

Members shared their opinions of the relative value of Karl's new approach to priority and the practical impact it would have on projects underway. Others shared their sense of the appropriate order of items on the first list and whether production support should even qualify as a priority item. Mike Baumstark proposed melding the two lists to filter work on the current portfolio of projects (list two) by the concepts or values on the new list. John Rezzo further defined the complementary relationship between the two lists, providing assistance with prioritizing upcoming work. Dave Byers added that the new list is just too vague to be useful in managing technology projects at his level. Karl clarified that the new list is merely a decision-making matrix rather than a formal project management document.

GJ court representatives requested that the priority level of enhancements to AJACS be elevated. Karl explained that funds are already earmarked for enhancements as prioritized by the GJ Steering Committee. Other members explained their reasons for keeping replacement of aging systems at a higher priority than enhancements.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to adopt both presented lists of priorities as complementary in function and to remove the titles from the second list. The motion passed with 8 aye votes and 3 no votes.

TECH 15-02

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to elevate Item 8 on the first priority list to become Item 3 on the list (renumbering subsequent items). The motion failed to carry with 5 aye votes and 6 no votes.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to elevate Item 8 on the first priority list to become Item 5 on the list (renumbering subsequent items). The motion passed with one no vote.

TECH 15-03

In response to a member's question Karl stated that he would consider whether the removal of certain projects from the priority list would speed the completion of other projects on the list.

FINANCIAL AND TACTICAL DECISIONS

Mr. Karl Heckart

COT MEETING MINUTES

Karl refreshed members' memories about the purpose of ACAP subscription fees. He shared the current annual revenue amount and the actual portion of costs per device as calculated by Kevin Kluge. He mentioned issues about networked versus local printers and the increased device counts that emerged following the recent equipment refresh. He reviewed each category of new pricing in TAC's proposal and the potential impact to counties. He also showed the impact of taking no action, billing each network-attached device at \$750. The change would be delayed until FY17, due to the estimated 1.3 percent impact on local budgets. Karl explained that the ultimate value is providing a model to offset the resource cost of new items placed on the network.

In answer to questions, Karl clarified that \$35 printers do not touch any statewide application while \$750 printers do, that Probation PCs are not included in the model, and that COOP laptops and training PCs remain under the pricing scheme under which they were acquired.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to approve the TAC recommendation for ACAP subscription prices beginning in FY 2017. The motion passed unanimously.

TECH 15-04

Karl then repeated Kevin Kluge's numbers from earlier in the meeting, resulting in a total JCEF budget for FY 2016. He reviewed the breakdown of costs across categories leading to a balanced budget with contingencies of about 3 percent. The budget continues to include about 2600 hours of new development work on AJACS and the field trainers.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to fund operation of existing statewide systems and continued development of previously authorized statewide systems. The motion passed unanimously.

TECH 15-05

FY2016-2018 INDIVIDUAL COUNTY AUTOMATION PLANS AND TRENDS

Mr. Stewart Bruner

Mr. Stewart Bruner, Manager of IT Strategic Planning for AOC, shared the larger context of the strategic business planning, IT planning, and COT's direction regarding the frequency of plan updates, including the "lite" process employed for urban counties this year. He highlighted the prominent business trends emerging from plans this year, including

- Increasing operational efficiencies, cybersecurity, and business continuity planning;
- Recruiting and maintaining a well-qualified, motivated workforce;;
- Expanding integration and the sharing of court information; and
- Repurposing facilities to better align with the functions of the court;
- Expanding use of video for proceedings, training, and customer service;

He then highlighted several prominent technology themes running through plans this year, including

- getting and sharing more digital information at all levels of court and with it increased reliance on workflow software;
- the near saturation of digitization at all levels of court;
- growth of remote resource video projects and resultant need for increased bandwidth;

COT MEETING MINUTES

- out-of-support, retirement category software persisting for multiple plan cycles;
- persistent use of outdated consumer financial programs for juror check printing and bank reconciliations, including MS-Money; and
- continued movement toward local solutions and resources crafting ad hoc reports

He reminded members that his presentation details certain accomplishments and concerns from the individual plans; that those concerns are conveyed to the presiding judge of the county in a letter from the COT chair; and that, while he makes suggestions, the choice of motion text related to any individual plan is ultimately theirs. Stewart then launched into his whirlwind, county-by-county, strategic plan summarization effort.

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to withhold approval for Cochise County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2016-2018, until a plan is shared with COT for replacement of unsupported MS-Money, SQL 2000, and WordPerfect software, creating business risk. The motion passed unanimously.	TECH-15-06
---------------	---	-------------------

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to approve Graham County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2016-2018. The motion passed unanimously.	TECH-15-07
---------------	---	-------------------

Stewart thanked John Lucas, Graham County CIO, for facilitating the move away from GroupWise to address a concern raised by COT members two years ago.

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to approve the Greenlee County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2016-2018. The motion passed unanimously.	TECH-15-08
---------------	---	-------------------

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to approve La Paz County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2016-2018. The motion passed unanimously.	TECH-15-09
---------------	---	-------------------

Stewart commended Clerk Megan Spielman for her efforts to broaden the number of courts included in the La Paz plan this cycle, in response to COT's previous concern.

Stewart explained his motivation for treating Maricopa as two separate plans by level of court.

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to approve Maricopa County Courts' GJ & MCJC Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2016-2018, with concerns noted for the wide range of commercial technology products/solutions in retirement status but still in production use, posing increasing business risk as the targets move forward, production data/functions residing in MS-Access used by the Clerk of the Superior Court, posing	TECH-15-10
---------------	--	-------------------

COT MEETING MINUTES

business risk, and for lack of project scope and timeline for iCISng, a major undertaking for the court. The motion passed unanimously with Michael Jeanes and Ray Billotte abstaining.

He passed along AOC's concern that little detail exists in the plan updates concerning end-of-life CMSs for numerous LJ courts in Maricopa County. He offered to hold an AJACS summit to obtain input from court leaders about their replacement plans prior to the September COT meeting. In answer to a question, Stewart clarified that letters would be sent to the individual presiding judges rather than the presiding judge for the county.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to withhold approval for Maricopa County LJ Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plans for FY 2016-2018, pending receipt of a plan for replacement of all end-of-life and vendor CMSs by September 1, 2015 to be compiled by staff. The motion passed unanimously.

TECH-15-11

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to approve Mohave County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2016-2018, with a concern noted for pursuit of a local workflow solution without evaluating AJACS functionality and lack of participation in the OnBase Central Document Repository. The motion passed unanimously with Virlynn Tinnell abstaining.

TECH-15-12

Virlynn Tinnell indicated that the local workflow project is presently not a high priority for the court. AOC has requested that the workflow requirements be formally documented so that AJACS developers can leverage Mohave's business requirements for the benefit of other courts.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to withhold approval for Navajo County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2016-2018 until a plan is shared with COT for replacement of the retirement Kofax scanning solution. The motion passed with 10 aye votes and 1 no vote.

TECH-15-13

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to approve Pima County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2016-2018, with a concern noted for various commercial technology products/solutions in retirement status but still in production use, posing increased business risk as EA targets advance. The motion passed unanimously.

TECH-15-14

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to withhold approval for Yuma County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan

TECH-15-15

COT MEETING MINUTES

for FY 2016-2018 until a plan is shared with COT for replacement of unsupported MS-Money and Windows 2000 server software, as well as retirement WordPerfect Office software and use of OoVoo, an unregulated video--conferencing product in LJ courts. The motion passed unanimously.

Due to the lateness of the hour, discussion about the “lite” update process and materials for the next planning cycle was postponed until the September meeting. Stewart closed with a timeline of major milestones in the planning process and described the impact of late plans on the analysis and summary processes.

MEETING REVIEW/WRAPUP

Hon. John Pelander

Justice Pelander reminded members of the decisions made during today’s meeting and the next two COT meeting dates.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Hon. John Pelander

After hearing no further discussion from members or the public, the chair then entertained a motion to adjourn at 3:33 p.m.

Upcoming Meetings:

September 11, 2015	AOC – Conference Room 106
November 20, 2015	AOC – Conference Room 119 A/B

MEETING ADJOURNED

3:33 PM