

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL**  
**A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology**  
**Minutes**

**December 8, 2006**  
**Conference Room 345 A/B**  
**10:00 am to 2:00 pm**

**Members Present:**

**Mohyeddin Abdulaziz\***  
**Lillith Avalon**  
**Ron Beguin**  
**Joan Harphant**  
**Karl Heckart**  
**Randy Kennedy**  
**John King**  
**Cary Meister**  
**Eloise Price**  
**Kyle Rimel**  
**Gregg Obuch**  
**Rick Rager**

**Members Not Present:**

**Correnia Honnaker**  
**Carol Merfeld**  
**David Stevens**  
**Alan Turner**

**Others Present:**

**Stewart Bruner, Staff**  
**William Earl**  
**Gary Graham**  
**Jeff Viemont**  
**Carl Ward**

\* indicates attendance via phone

**Welcome and Introductions**

The December 8, 2006, meeting of the Technical Advisory Council (TAC) was called to order at 10:10 a.m. by Karl Heckart, Chair. He then introduced the meeting subjects by recapping discussions at the court leadership meetings that took place earlier in the week.

**Leadership Meeting Discussions**

The impact of discussions at the leadership conference relate to information technology involves evidence of an ever increasing thirst for information and data mining in support of complex business decisions. IT has to collect the right data with a sufficient level of quality to provide meaningful information to the business. Several IT-related issues were raised to court leaders:

- 1) The need to determine the statewide case management system for the general jurisdiction court. This topic prompted much discussion but no decision. AOC has revised the functionality matrix and approach presented to Commission on

Technology (COT) November 8. Pima has simultaneously had developers compare Agave's planned Version 2.0 features to the matrix and determined that it will yield 83% of the required functionality. A transition team is creating a more detailed cost picture to share with COT in January.

2) Manpower issues for the support of both current statewide systems and the upcoming case management system (CMS) rollouts at AOC. No amount of money can make up for a lack of skilled people available to hire from the marketplace. Leaders were informed that AOC ITD is currently experiencing a 20 percent vacancy rate.

3) An "eye-opening" pandemic planning session prompted discussion of the need for disaster preparedness related to automation in the courts. IT needs the business to determine what functions are critical, not just be handed the ball. Cities are likely to work from the courts' draft pandemic plan in the absence of any other guidance, so courts need to have their plans together quickly.

Members asked Karl about a tie-in between the remote court reporters project and disaster recovery, the status of the impending PC refresh/rollout, and whether WordPerfect would be installed on the new machines to handle forms. Details about image options and the PC refresh project will be provided in TAC's February meeting.

### **e-Court Technology Support**

Staff presented members with the reformatted multi-vendor e-filing specification. It's essentially Maricopa's ECF 3.0 specification described using statewide language. No issues were raised; the document will be posted on the specifications website. The chair asked Carl Ward from the Maricopa Clerk's Office for an update on the progress with proving the multi-vendor model. Carl stated that one vendor has assured that it will be able to file in early February while the other two will come online later. The Clerk's Office is also considering opening the RFP back up to allow other interested vendors to become qualified. The chair questioned how the timetable relates to the Clerk's recent statement about mandatory e-filing in certain judges' courts, especially since only subsequent filings are currently allowed. There was also discussion about the co-existence of Maricopa's own interface for civil filing with the multi-vendor approach.

Members pointed out the local pressure they are under to replicate Maricopa's approach in their county. Both Agave and Tempe CMS representatives stated that electronic civil case/document filing is not a "Day One" feature. Choosing not to wait for the new CMSs means that e-filing functionality needs to be developed outside AZTEC and integrated first to it, then to the new systems.

Karl Heckart then briefly mapped out the integration path for new systems: The limited jurisdiction CMS must fully integrate with FARE and JUSTIS, then handle form-based filing for justice and municipal courts. The general jurisdiction CMS must feed the Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS) and somehow address criminal document filing, since ADRS currently doesn't perform a document transport function and filing vendors won't handle criminal cases. Members were advised to inform their justice

partners of the need to consult the ADRS specifications before they purchase new systems. Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC) publishes GJXDM-related documents for the state.

A second needed area of e-court support remains electronic signature. Karl stated that the current thinking of court leadership is to examine what gets signed today and for documents or transactions deemed “non critical” simply suspend signature for electronic items that originate from known persons and traverse the court network. This approach presupposes that IDs and passwords are not being shared. Any solution outside the courts would be based on the specific partners being communicated with and the strength of their requirements.

Rick Rager pointed out the mammoth opportunity for efficiency that would result from allowing electronic signature on long form complaints. Discussion turned to DPS and what has traditionally been an “all or nothing” security model for criminal data that suffocates integration efforts. One solution mentioned by members was use of a fingerprint device with handhelds and in courts to preclude challenges to electronic signatures. Prices continue to fall and the feature is available on the handhelds under state contract.

### **Brief IT Planning Update**

Karl asked how many present have been pressed into service to compile business input for the IT plans due today. Several members raised their hands. He then gave an overview of a recent meeting between court leaders and county supervisors in which the supervisors stated that they consider the courts’ having a plan to be the reasonable first step in asking them for funding. He clarified that IT people should function as liaisons, not owners of court plans.

Stewart Bruner reminded members of the March 9 due date for the completed plans this cycle and reviewed the workings of the new enterprise architecture table at the end of the plan template. He stated that teleconference meetings will be held in February, but not to wait until then to ask him any questions.

### **Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Framework/Costing**

Prior to the meeting, members were asked to review a disaster planning matrix used by Maricopa Superior. Karl asked if they felt this would be a workable tool for courts to use statewide. He reminded members that the court needs to prove it can function in a disaster and IT is the enabler. The matrix grows out of that goal. Consensus was that AOC’s role in a crisis primarily involves being the hub of court communications. Discussion revolved around the specific categories on the matrix and the process to be used to fill it in.

The agreed approach is to have minimum business functionality defined along with the amount of time the court can live without those functions. Then, applications that enable

those business functions and the human skills required to operate those will be added. These two steps should be facilitated by local IT. AOC will also circulate an add-on set of disaster scenarios for courts to respond to and define their method of restoring service.

Members generally agreed to use the matrix with revised headings, as discussed, in a multi-layer exercise. Stewart will make multiple worksheets in a single workbook to capture the business and technical information. Disaster scenarios from AOC will likely take until after the first of the year to distribute. All work needs to be wrapped up before the COT annual meeting. Progress will be checked at the February 2, 2007, TAC meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

////////////////////////////////////

TAC's next meeting is scheduled for February 2, 2007, in Conference Room 230.

COT's next meeting is scheduled for January 5, 2007, in Room 119A/B.