

**COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE  
A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**January 24, 2008**  
9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

**Arizona Supreme Court**

Conference Room 230  
Arizona Supreme Court  
1501 W. Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Kip Anderson  
Cathy Clarich  
Margaret Guidero  
Joan Harphant  
Donald Jacobson\*  
Patrick McGrath  
Gordon Mulleneaux  
Patricia Noland  
Gregg Obuch\*  
Michael Pollard, *Chair*  
Rick Rager  
James Scorza  
David Stevens  
Paul Thomas

**GUESTS**

Phillip Ellis,\* *Pima Superior Court*  
Jason Epel, *TAC*  
Jesse Hamberger, *PCCJC*  
Douglas Kooi, *PCCJC*  
Rich McHattie, *Maricopa Clerk's Office*  
Chris Stimson, *Maricopa Clerk's Office*  
Becky Williams, *Tucson Municipal Court*

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Phillip Knox  
C. Steven McMurry

**AOC STAFF**

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*  
Jennifer Green, *CSD*  
Adele May, *ITD*  
Stephanie Nolan, *ITD*  
Renny Rapier, *ITD*  
Carrie Stoneburner, *CSD*

\* indicates appeared by telephone

## **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS**

Judge Michael Pollard, Chair, called the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meeting to order promptly at 9:00 a.m. He commended project managers for complying with the more stringent reporting requirements in their latest reports.

Discussion about the minutes from last meeting prompted Rick Rager to recommend changing the wording of the sentence about the intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) to improve the accuracy of the minutes.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes from last month's meeting as amended. The motion passed unanimously.**

## **GENERAL JURISDICTION COURTS CMS UPDATE -- AMCAD**

Renny Rapier, AOC's General Jurisdiction Case Management System Project Manager, reported that the project remains in green status and on schedule. He has added to the dashboard top-level detail about billing milestones, as requested by CACC. Renny described the justification for the split of three payment milestones. The risk section of the dashboard now includes a listing of the specific interface points and an estimate of the percent complete for each. Data conversion remains a risk and Renny described the steps being taken to rapidly speed up work on the strategy and plan. He expects to see the completed plan back from the vendor any day. Latest reports from the vendor indicate the three remaining areas are between 50 and 100 percent complete.

AmCad has agreed to the new project dates approved by the governance board. The application is scheduled to be installed at AOC by February 29 for testing and training in preparation for court rollouts. Staffing for the project is now complete, including two operations personnel assigned to support the project. A dedicated customer support person will be hired in late April to work in the AOC Customer Support Center.

A question was raised about the integration between APETS and the CMS. Renny emphasized that the financial component related to adult probation needs to be synchronized between the clerk's financial system and the probation tracking system. Renny explained why percent complete appears to have gone backwards for training plan and training material tasks this month.

Patrick McGrath briefly described a subset of the code standardization committee that will be working specifically on GJ CMS code issues.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the GJ CMS status report as delivered. The motion passed unanimously.**

In a roll call vote, members present characterized the project's overall health as "green."

## **LIMITED JURISDICTION COURTS TEMPE CMS UPDATE**

Rick Rager, Tempe CMS Project Manger, updated members on some activity that took place since the January 11 dashboard date. Forms generation requires updated documentation and

specifications due to the change from Crystal Reports to the SSRS product. Project staffing is getting caught up. Rick mentioned a recent hire from the private sector working on batch processing, a replacement for a terminated developer, and a plan to replace a migration analyst whose contract is not being renewed by the City of Tempe.

The remainder of Rick's reporting time was given to Paul Thomas who reported on a special demonstration of the Tempe CMS that Mesa Municipal Court was given. Senior technical staff from Mesa informally compared the functionality they observed in the demo to a set of business requirements compiled as part of their own potential CMS rewrite effort. Mesa was impressed by the progress made since the last public demonstration in July 2007. They expressed a high level of confidence that the Tempe system could reasonably meet their requirements as-is or with just a little further development work. Paul contemplated placing some resources at Rick's disposal to speed completion of the Tempe CMS while getting a closer look "from the inside," like Tucson City Court is doing.

Members expressed some concern about the lack of detail for various near-term analysis milestones and whether FARE functionality would be implemented with the application.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the Tempe CMS status report as delivered. The motion passed unanimously (Rick Rager abstaining).**

In a roll call vote, members present characterized the project's overall health as "green."

#### **GENERAL JURISDICTION COURTS CMS UPDATE -- AGAVE**

Phillip Ellis, AGAVE Project Manager, informed members that he has recently placed into production the "optimized" AGAVE. All development milestone dates coming up are on schedule, even though some of them are huge. Other development items are ongoing, though not reported on the dashboard. Data conversion progress was slowed by the recent work on optimization. Phillip also reported that the AZTEC trainer will become the AGAVE trainer (the AZTEC position will be backfilled).

Four data conversion tasks had their projected completion dates slip by a month without an explanation in the issues or changes portions of the report. Some confusion existed regarding the procedure to show revised milestone dates and hide previous dates. Judge Pollard confirmed that a column is only added for formally approved date changes, not each time slippage occurs.

Patti Noland reported on the success of AGAVE 1.0 currently in use and some enhancements underway in the Clerk's Office. She attributed some of the slippage in dates and inexact estimates to the required use of Visible Developer in the past.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the Pima AGAVE status report as delivered. The motion passed unanimously (Gregg Obuch abstaining).**

In a roll call vote, members present characterized the project's overall health as "green."

## **MARICOPA CLERK'S FINANCIAL SYSTEM UPDATE**

David Stevens reminded members that the detailed scope for his portion of iFIS development, (the RFR replacement) which his group has undertaken for the Clerk's Office, cannot be determined until the April-through-July analysis effort is complete. His dashboard will show very few changes until then. Members expressed concern about the lack of continuity of the revised delivery dates in David's report with Gordon's original targets for the project. Lack of target dates makes project monitoring a challenge for CACC.

Gordon Mulleneaux, Maricopa Clerk's Office iFIS Project Sponsor, introduced other people associated with the project: Rich McHattie, Chris Stimson, and Ron Bitterli. After Gordon verbally updated or corrected various task delivery dates on the dashboard, Ron Bitterli presented background information about the Clerk's project management approach as well as the tools and processes used to manage day-to-day project activities, including time recording for project resources, project workspace, and document repository. He displayed various screenshots of the actual detailed project plan for cash receipting replacement as part of the presentation. He also reviewed in detail an organization chart showing project personnel and governance.

Gordon answered a member's question about the priority of the project by stating that the Clerk's Office has two main priorities: the rewrite of the e-filing application and the cash receipting project.

**MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to accept the two iFIS status reports as delivered. The motion passed unanimously (Gordon Mulleneaux and David Stevens abstaining).

In a roll call vote, members present characterized the project's overall health as "yellow," 7 to 5, based on the short amount of time since the project was divided and the perceived need for continued close scrutiny over the next few months.

## **PCCJC TECHNOLOGY STABILIZATION UPDATE**

Judge Pollard thanked the project-team for the effort they put forth to greatly improve their project report. Douglas Kooi, Pima Consolidated Justice Court's Deputy Court Administrator, introduced the project update and recapped their efforts over the past month. IT Manager Jason Epel described the various issues, risks, and staffing details added to clarify things that were previously unclear in the project dashboard. The "newer old" CMS server has been ordered. The slip in overall percent complete is due to hardware delivery dates and introduction of a new Phase 3. Path 3 was also changed to reflect a strategy decision to remove the portion of the project related to porting the existing CMS to .NET in favor of adopting the new statewide LJ CMS. The associated date indicates a decision point, rather than completion of specific activity.

Members asked for details regarding the date by which the "newer old" CMS server would be up and functioning. Jason's best estimate was 30 days for delivery followed by another 60 days for the changeover and testing. PCCJC is enlisting the aid of contractors on both the hardware and software sides of the project, but no contracts have yet been signed.

**MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to accept the PCCJC status report. The motion passed unanimously.

In a roll call vote, members present characterized the project's overall health as "yellow" based on the high number of risks and unknowns that remain, even though the quality of project reporting has been much improved.

### **STANDARDIZATION PROJECT UPDATE**

Carrie Stoneburner, AOC's Code Standardization Manager, provided a brief synopsis of items the committee is focusing on in support of the development of the new GJ CMS. An eight-volunteer workgroup has been formed to address the 678 event codes and 204 case types having no matches in the standardization report. These are AZTEC codes; more will likely surface as individual courts prepare to migrate. An agenda has been issued for the January 30 limited jurisdiction code standardization kickoff. Carrie vowed to apply the knowledge gained from the GJ CMS effort to that LJ team.

### **STAFF UPDATE**

- **Audit Follow-up Answers** – CACC staff member Stewart Bruner reported that the one-year followup to the Auditor General's findings is underway. A question was asked regarding the governance of individual projects. An e-mail on the subject did not reach all the project managers. Stewart will resend it to those who didn't receive it and asked for prompt input.
- **Policies in the Pipeline** – Stewart reported the sudden retirement of Greg Eades in AOC Legal Services and the impact of that loss on two specific items. One is a draft administrative order spelling out requirements for protection of unencrypted or unredacted personal information held by courts and subsequent notification of those affected in the event of a breach in security. The other is a draft of a new code section that tailors document management requirements for the smallest limited jurisdiction courts, previously discussed. Timelines on both documents are being elongated.
- **IT Strategic Plan Update** -- The technology input related to the business trends is due March 14, 2008. Maricopa is running a separate process from the rest of the counties again, as they have the past couple of years. Stewart reported already receiving a complete plan from Coconino.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business presented.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business presented.

With no other items on the agenda for review, the meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.