

## TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Friday, December 4, 2015  
10:00 AM - 12:40 PM

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

Conference Room 230

### MEMBERS PRESENT

Ron Bitterli  
Jay Dennis\*  
Jennifer Gilbertson  
Laura Johnston\*  
Randy Kennedy  
Cary Meister  
Kyle Rimel  
Jared Nishimoto  
James Towner

### GUESTS

Ken Dewitt, *Navajo County IT*  
Nick Felber, *Yuma Superior Court*  
Casey Furnier, *Cochise Superior Court*  
Nate Marler\*, *Appeals Division Two*  
Rebecca Stanley\*, *Pinal Clerk of Court*

### MEMBERS ABSENT

Mohyeddin Abdulaziz  
Jackie Barrett  
Karl Heckart, *Chair*  
RJ Hurley

### AOC STAFF

Richard Blair, *ITD*  
Stewart Bruner, *ITD*  
Eric Ciminski, *ITD*  
Rod Franklin, *ITD*  
Steve Gavette, *ITD*  
John Glowacki, *ITD*  
Tina Hladik, *ITD*  
Denise Lundin, *CSD*  
Lou Ponesse, *ITD*  
Jim Price, *ITD*  
Steele Price, *ITD*  
Jason Shumberger, *ITD*

\* indicates appeared via telephone

**WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND OPENING REMARKS**

Karl Heckart

Staff Member Stewart Bruner, pinch-hitting for Karl Heckart, chair of the Technical Advisory Council (TAC), called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. He welcomed members and explained that Karl would take over as soon as he finishes some conflicting meetings that he’s been called away to. Stewart conducted a roll call of those present in the room and on the phone. After confirming that a quorum existed, he requested discussion or a motion regarding the minutes of the October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2015 TAC meeting.

**MOTION**

**A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the October 2, 2015 TAC meeting as written. The motion passed unanimously.**

**UPDATE**

**WINDOWS 10 / OFFICE 2016 UPGRADE**

Lou Ponesse  
Tina Hladik

Lou Ponesse, AOC Customer Support Center Manager, and Tina Hladik, Windows 10 Project Manager, provided a brief progress update on the pilot of Windows 10 at the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). Phases of early adopters are being upgraded and testing early 2016. Office 2016 is disconnected from the Windows upgrade due to its dependency on an Exchange upgrade. Microsoft resources will be assisting behind the scenes in support of a mid-year AOC rollout. Members asked questions about the continuation of the 5 licenses per user, the training strategy, and the upgrade testing process for rural courts. Kyle Rimel requested a temporary test PC specifically to test the new Windows 10-compliant FTR in a non-production environment.

**UPDATE**

**INFORMATION SECURITY UPDATE**

Richard Blair

Richard Blair, AOC’s Manager of Infrastructure Operations, reported on the progress of remediating recent vulnerability audit findings at AOC and in several counties. A follow-up audit by the same organization is being scheduled for the January timeframe to verify that new or added controls are working. Other counties will be scanned and remediated twice each year going forward. Yuma representatives volunteered to be first on the list.

Richard provided the context for a set of minimum security controls being compiled by the AOC to help local resources craft proactive security programs that improve audit results, but more importantly, enhance the overall security posture of the courts through being proactive. He summarized the content in four main areas of standards. Members asked clarifying questions and requested inclusion of some specific concepts and wording. The intention is to formulate appropriate detailed requirements within the four broad areas for ratification by Commission on Technology (COT) at its annual meeting and ultimately by the Arizona Judicial Council. Stewart asked members to review the strawman table in the handouts and to return their comments to him or Richard by February 1 so any areas requiring discussion can be placed on the agenda for the March TAC meeting.

Jared Nishimoto questioned how the table related to the discussion about what findings to remediate and what not in the previous meeting. Stewart described the relationship between agreed programmatic controls and making objective decisions about remediation.

DISCUSSION  
/ APPROVAL

## FY16 ARCHITECTURE TARGETS UPDATE

Steele Price

Stewart reminded members of Karl's marching orders from the last meeting: focus on the few items requiring discussion then recommend the updates to COT. A redline of all proposed changes, including updates to the baseline products, was provided as the starting point for members to raise specific controversial items or ones that require more detailed research and discussion. AOC Chief Architect Steele Price discussed various changes he proposed as staff recorded additional changes to the draft table. Kyle also reviewed his proposed additions in the course of Steele's discussion. Steele explained the concept of replaceable databases contained within microservices and the addition of a number of databases to the watchlist to support that strategy, not for standalone use. Kyle argued for inclusion of SAP Reports (formerly Crystal Reports) at Version 15, representing new investment in a product that had been timing out. Members reviewed the history of SSIS reporting on statewide applications. Kyle proposed an exception to the 384 kbps limit for video on any local subdomains of AJIN, sparking detailed discussion about Criminal Rule 1.6 requirements and traffic on local networks not getting passed to AJIN. In the end, no items were identified for more research by staff, but members desired to view a clean iteration of the table finalizing all changes discussed before voting at the next meeting.

## UPDATE

## KEY PROJECT UPDATES

Jim Price  
Eric Ciminski  
Lou Ponesse

In Karl's absence, several project managers from the AOC provided members with very brief status updates on the high priority projects AOC is currently involved with, including:

- Timing of the eUniversa e-filing pilot in the Yavapai Superior Court with a reference to the high number of products that must be tested for proper interoperation behind the scenes to power e-filing. Members requested an end-to-end demonstration of the eUniversa product, including the clerk review and judge review functions at the next meeting.
- The path for completion of eAccess, dependent on loading of Maricopa Superior Court data and completion of all Supreme Court Rule 123 business logic.
- The progress of backfiling in eBench for Yavapai Superior Court followed by gap processing of data/documents created while the 5-week backfile process was running. In response to a question, Eric Ciminski stated that eBench could not operate without documents first being loaded into the central document repository (CDR).
- The progress of online citation payment development to integrate with AJACS, initially at Tucson Municipal Court. The project will eventually integrate post-disposition payments, as well. In response to a question about a list of issues with LJ AJACS that is circulating, Eric stated that none involve the payment interface or affect it timeline, to his knowledge.
- The requirement for non-ACAP courts to complete a plan for automated destruction of records by January 1, 2016, in accordance with the final report of the Electronic Records Retention and Destruction (ERR&D) Committee. AJACS courts will be covered by the AJACS 6.0 release. AZTEC courts will be covered by their eventual move to AJACS.
- The situation with public access data recently disappearing for cases involving local charges in certain non-AZTEC courts as a result of implementation of another ERR&D

requirement. AOC is working to restore the cases to public view and display actual charge titles rather than “local charge” as before.

In addition, Lou Ponesse provided a handout and provided verbal detail about Adobe’s statewide licensing changes and a moratorium AOC has placed on installation of the replacement product for Acrobat Professional, Adobe Document Cloud (DC), while the long-term implications are researched. AOC will soon be issuing a communication to courts about the changes. Adobe Acrobat Reader is still free and managed centrally as part of the ACAP image. Stewart emphasized that the scope of the discussion is only software purchased from the state contract through software vendor SHI – counties or cities may have other purchasing vehicles with different terms.

**UPDATE****STATEWIDE ONBASE ADMINISTRATORS’ UPDATE**

Stewart Bruner

Stewart Bruner, now wearing his OnBase hat, informed members of the detailed progress with upgrades to Version 15 at the AOC and around the state. He informed members of issues related to document transfer module (DTM) outages following the upgrades and process changes to minimize downtime and related metadata mismatches. He also stated that Version 17 will no longer include the OnBase Desktop functionality and gave the AOC’s current thinking about replacing the technology.

Stewart provided background and reviewed the changes he made to the standards for scanning of documents outside of OnBase as a result of Randy Kennedy’s points in the previous two meetings. Scanning settings directly affect sizes of image files produced and no software solution exists to lock the parameters across various scanner brands and models. He requested TAC’s formal approval to take the table to COT for ratification so that clerks around the state could be directed to use the standards to reduce file sizes before the LJ courts begin scanning in large numbers and consuming unnecessary amounts of storage.

**MOTION**

**A motion was made and seconded to recommend to COT for their consideration the non-OnBase scanning standards table as written. The motion passed unanimously.**

Randy Kennedy requested a specification for transfer of documents to the CDR for courts operating non-OnBase document management systems. Stewart relayed Karl’s response that AOC resources are focused on OnBase-to-OnBase system transfers for the moment, since that is the statewide standard for document management.

**UPDATE****INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLANNING CYCLE**Stewart Bruner  
Cary Meister

Stewart briefly recapped dates for the next IT planning cycle then reviewed questions about various aspects of the IT planning process he had received. In answer to the initial question, Stewart presented various requirements in code sections and COT’s practice that affect the details requested in IT plans. He explained COT’s recent decision to reject plans that lack projects to replace retirement technologies mentioned as concerns in the previous approval letter. Cary Meister described frustration over not knowing COT’s approval criteria and not receiving early feedback about issues with a plan. He requested that the letter currently sent only to the presiding judge be sent to the IT plan contact with a copy to the judge and court leadership in the

county. Stewart shared his frustration about the increasing lateness of plans over the years, especially from one particular county, and the direction he has been given to no longer present to COT at the annual meeting plans that miss the deadline. These will now wait for the September meeting so that full analysis can be done. Cary also requested that the preparation cycle begin earlier each year to keep it from competing with the January-through-March budgeting cycle each spring. Stewart will consider how to engineer an earlier start to the process. Cary recommended that IT planning be a topic at the court leadership conference to reinforce the requirements, usefulness of the process, and resulting documentation. Other members mentioned the challenges of participating in the county strategic planning process versus the COT's strategic planning process. Stewart invited planners to participate in the COT meeting in which their plan is considered, confident that COT members would entertain the planner's comments or answers to their questions.

## CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Karl Heckart

Kyle registered his concern about contradictions in recent communications from the AOC regarding charges for local printers on the AJIN network. He maintained that local printers were never contemplated in the TAC motion recommending pricing and should therefore be exempt from any billing. Stewart promised to take up the issue with Karl, since he had never materialized in the meeting.

After hearing no further discussion from members or the public, Stewart entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting at 1:15 p.m.

### Upcoming Meetings:

December 4, 2015	AOC – Conference Room 230
February 5, 2016	AOC – Conference Room 230

## MEETING ADJOURNED

1:15 PM