

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Friday, May 1, 2015
10:00 AM - 12:30 PM

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

Conference Room 230

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mohyeddin Abdulaziz*
Jennifer Gilbertson (*Tom Carroll*, proxy*)
Karl Heckart, *Chair*
Laura Johnston*
Randy Kennedy
Cary Meister (*Nick Felber, proxy*)
Jared Nishimoto
Kyle Rimel
RJ Hurley*
James Towner

GUESTS

Casey Streeter*, *Cochise Superior Court*
Sam Watson, *Yuma Superior Court*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Ron Bitterli
Jackie Barrett
Paul Coulombe
Jay Dennis
Tom Moseley

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Eric Ciminski, *ITD*
John Glowacki, *ITD*
Lou Ponesse, *ITD*
Jim Price, *ITD*
Jason Shumberger, *ITD*

* indicates appeared via telephone

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND OPENING REMARKS

Karl Heckart

Karl Heckart, chair of the Technical Advisory Council (TAC), called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. He conducted a roll call of those present in the room and on the phone, welcoming members. After confirming that a quorum existed, Karl requested discussion or a motion regarding the minutes of the March 6th, 2015 TAC meeting.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the March 6, 2015 TAC meeting as written. The motion passed unanimously.

UPDATE

TECHNOLOGY REFRESH PROJECT

TRP Team Members

Lou Ponesse, Customer Support Center Manager at the AOC, reported that the Technology Refresh Project (TRP) completed on March 30. He described some cleanup activities getting underway to replace 89 PCs left behind until For The Record (FTR) upgrades are performed and the new image for public access PCs is completed and tested. Lou reminded members that only owners of FTR software older than 5.4 not under a maintenance agreement would be charged for the upgrade. Members shared Lou’s frustration with the lack of details and plans coming from Exhibit One to address Windows 8.1 compatibility in specific courts. AOC will therefore be asking individual courts for their upgrade plans in order to schedule the replacement of remaining ACAP PCs.

Lou also reported on research into the high volume of network traffic to and from Akamai.com that was an issue during the refresh. Akamai is a commercial software distribution site contracted to various software manufacturers, so shutting it off stops updates of various software on ACAP PCs. John Glowacki from AOC Network Operations provided more detail on the way Akamai works and informed members that they can contact Akamai with logs when they perceive its communications are out of control.

Lou completed his action item from the March meeting by describing the AOC’s process for granting administrative rights to local users when applications require them on the specific user profile at installation. Members were not opposed to the approach, which requires the AOC to continue monitoring activities after rights are granted then terminate the rights once installation efforts conclude. Karl recommended a trial run within the next few weeks to prove the process. Lou pointed out that regular pushes of third-party software are reducing requests for admin rights significantly. Members pointed out that certain local software requires older versions of third-party software and they would like to be informed before update pushes are performed.

Lou also reminded members that, due to Microsoft subscription implications, the AOC must be informed of every local termination of an ACAP user, even when that user is transferring to a different court or department. Members requested that detailed lists of users by county be communicated with each billing to prompt a periodic cleanup. At the end of the discussion, Karl announced to members that a Windows 10 update is not optional and rapidly approaching.

REVIEW / APPROVAL

IMPACT OF NETWORK-ATTACHED DEVICES

Karl Heckart

Karl recapped his direction from March’s meeting to solidify a TAC recommendation for Commission on Technology (COT) to consider at its annual meeting June 5. He then called attention to a table of updated costs by county under the proposed multi-tier pricing model, following input in the March meeting. Discussion focused on the exploding demand for video in the courts beyond remote interpreters and court reporters and resulting increases in bandwidth costs, AJIN wireless access points in courts versus use of local providers with VPN, the 8 percent or 12 percent financial impact on individual counties when post-TRP device counts are used, and the options for COT to consider. Kyle Rimel proposed alternative tiered pricing that reduces the financial impact to counties by lumping all non-AOC items into a single category and bills them at \$35 per IP address, regardless of their function. He requested the table be redone from that perspective and recirculated to members. John Glowacki from AOC Network Services warned that individual IP addresses can be hidden behind locally installed routers configured to support private addressing, enabling inaccurate counts in the IP-address model.

Karl reminded members that the charges represent a recovery mechanism for the total cost of statewide automation far beyond the device cost and the goal of distributing costs in proportion to usage, something the alternative tiered pricing doesn’t address when it comes to printers. Karl emphasized that COT can decide fundamentally how much of the cost of operations must be recovered from users, so the issue before TAC revolves around the model, not the specific prices. He also stated that no cost increase would occur in the upcoming fiscal year – courts would have a full budget cycle to plan for it, based on his experience with past rate changes.

MOTION	<p>A motion was made and seconded to recommend to COT a multi-tiered pricing model, including the previously proposed pricing, for all AOC-owned items but consolidating all non-AOC-owned items into a single tier having a \$35 charge for each IP address used. The motion passed unanimously.</p>	
---------------	--	--

The chair directed staff to update the table to reflect the motion and recirculate it to members for their review prior to COT.

UPDATE	STATEWIDE ONBASE ADMINISTRATORS’ UPDATE	Stewart Bruner
---------------	--	----------------

Staff Member Stewart Bruner reviewed various topics related to OnBase systems. Jethro Sheridan, the AOC’s OnBase Administrator, was on hand to provide detail about the upcoming middleware changes that necessitate changes to local OnBase systems and the steps necessary to operate a mixed environment throughout the duration of the OnBase 15 upgrade cycle needed to address security issues with previous software versions. Stewart then reviewed the modified timeline for county upgrades, but indicated that AOC has still not tested the upgrade or the mixed environment solution for the OnBase Document Transfer Module (DTM). Karl expressed his disappointment with the vendor’s repeated issues with new software releases. He is scheduling a meeting with Hyland and DataBank to arrive at a solution that at least shares the pain rather than shifting responsibility for solving the vendor’s problems solely onto the courts.

Stewart and Jethro reviewed issues with the DTM local broker service that cannot be replicated at AOC, prompting the distribution of a division of responsibilities handout to members to be shared with OnBase administrators. The issue is significant enough for e-filing that it will be

reviewed at the meeting with Hyland/DataBank. Stewart updated members on the progress of automating case destruction in AJACS and promised a report of deleted cases with sufficient keyword information for use by OnBase administrators in performing document deletions. Members discussed how much data should be allowed to remain after the deletion for audit traceability. And generally agreed that an amount sufficient enough to confirm the existence of the related case was necessary.

Kyle used the opportunity to clarify the hierarchy of rules that govern public access to documents. Eric Ciminski stated that Supreme Court Rule 123 unequivocally denies public access to sealed or restricted case data and documents and that previous technical discussions about a “belt and suspenders” approach was all within the context of implementing the Rule 123 restrictions.

UPDATE**KEY PROJECT UPDATES**

Karl Heckart

In the interest of time, Karl provided members with only brief updates on various high priority projects AOC is involved with including:

- AJACS general jurisdiction (GJ) enhancements to support eUniversa e-filing in the Superior Court followed by another release (6.0) containing additional e-filing functionality and the bulk of remaining enhancements requested by clerks.
- The success of the limited jurisdiction (LJ) codeset (3.9) at Apache Junction Municipal Court. Green Valley Justice Court will be the next pilot site, followed by a full rollout to all LJ courts in Pima County. AOC’s goal is to implement 35 courts each year. In answer to a question, Karl discussed the changes occurring with the data conversion strategy to provide additional data necessary to power AJACS’ intelligent workflow.
- The plan for completing eUniversa testing first with AJACS 3.9 and then with AJACS 6.0 later this year. eUniversa is being connected to nCourt, a payment processing service recently purchased by the AOC.
- Document hyperlinking, which is becoming a hot topic, especially for appellate judges. Karl shared the design parameters for an authoring system that would enable links to official court documents to be embedded in later filings that, in turn, become hyperlinks for the judge to use to call up the specific documents referenced. The authoring tool will need to leverage the central case index (CCI), central document repository (CDR), and the web service that calls non-CDR document repositories.
- The plan for eAccess. Eric Ciminski provided an updated timeline for completion of the application. Maricopa Superior Court will be the initial participant. In answer to a question, Eric emphasized that sealed and restricted values in case management systems will absolutely be respected by the eAccess program, following Supreme Court Rule 123, and that documents will be sold only to registered users and not in bulk.
- Expansion of eBench use by Pima Superior Court judges. Karl posited that the application will be ready before most courts have been able to load their data and documents into it.
- Progress with Online Processing for eCitations (pre-adjudication) being built by Xerox. Members discussed the flat rate convenience fee and the rationale behind it. Karl indicated that the program’s functionality will expand to over time to eventually put adopting courts on the full FARE model.

- The plan to move the AOC’s disaster recovery site to a Maricopa County facility in downtown Phoenix. Karl mentioned an additional, longer-term option being investigated with Luke Air Force Base in West Phoenix.
- The approximate timeline for adoption of Windows 10 and Office 2015. Karl reminded members that Microsoft’s subscription model makes future updates mandatory, though the timing can be delayed somewhat. He also mentioned the likelihood of a future move to Exchange in the cloud, a pending SharePoint implementation for courts, some cool features of Windows 10, and a powerful new product called Delve headed toward courts.

UPDATE

KEY TOPICS FOR COT PRESENTATION JUNE 5

Roundtable

As time wound down, Karl asked for any technical topics members feel are important for COT members to be aware of. Conversation angled toward continuing local budget pressures and the recent actions of the Legislature. Stewart reminded members of the two-year life of the Enterprise Architecture standards table and the need to update the current targets by February of 2016.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Karl Heckart

Stewart mentioned the annual Digital Government Summit being held in Phoenix May 14 and 15, then directed any interested members to view the agenda and register using the link on the TAC meeting webpage. He also mentioned a half-hour 2015 cybersecurity update video now posted on the Education Services video center and also linked from the TAC meeting webpage. After hearing no further discussion from members or the public, the chair entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting at 12:50 p.m.

Upcoming Meetings:

August 7, 2015

AOC – Conference Room 230

October 2, 2015

AOC – Conference Room 230

MEETING ADJOURNED

12:50 PM