COT MEETING MINUTES

COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY

Friday, November 5, 2010
10:00 AM - 11:30 AM

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

CONFERENCE ROOM 119A/B

MEMBERS PRESENT
Kent Batty*
Michael Baumstark
Robert Brutinel
Andrew Hurwitz, *Chair*
Michael Jeanes
Dennis Kavanaugh*
Gary Krcmarik
Sheri Newman
Marcus Reinkensmeyer
John Rezzo
Roxanne Song Ong
Ann Timmer
Garye Vasquez (*Peter Eckerstrom, proxy)* *

MEMBERS ABSENT
Anabel Abarca
Catherine O'Grady
Delcy Scull

GUESTS
Steve Ballance, TAC
Rich McHattie, *CACC*
Rona Newton, *PACC/CACC*
Elise Piatt, *Triadvocates LLC*
Michael Pollard, *CACC*
Jamie Ross, *Courthouse News*
David Stevens, *TAC*
Jennifer Woods, *Triadvocates LLC*

AOC STAFF
Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Melinda Hardman, *CSD*
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*
Alicia Moffatt, *ITD*
Pamela Peet, *ITD*

* indicates attendance by telephone

COT MEETING MINUTES

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS	Hon. Andrew Hurwitz, Chair

Vice Chief Justice Andrew Hurwitz, called the Commission on Technology (COT) meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. He welcomed members and the public present, then asked those calling in and all members in the room to introduce themselves for the record. Staff confirmed that a quorum existed. Justice Hurwitz then called members' attention to the calendar of COT and subcommittee meetings scheduled for next year, asking them to reserve those dates on their calendars. He then requested to hear any issues or concerns with the minutes from the September 24, 2010, meeting.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the September 24, 2010, Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH 10-14**

	STRATEGIC PROJECTS UPDATE	Mr. Karl Heckart

Mr. Karl Heckart, CIO for the Courts, provided members with brief updates on progress and issues with priority projects underway including AJACS release 3.5 and the next release, the AJACS-related Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) financial investigation team, data conversion analysis and planning for the limited jurisdiction (LJ) courts, continued enhancements to AZTEC for its remaining life, the beginning of the e-filing pilot in the Appellate Courts, the phase-in plan for law firms making civil subsequent e-filings in Maricopa Superior Court, small claims and limited civil e-filing in the Maricopa Justice Courts, Pima Superior Court e-filing-related integration timeline, and future opportunities for e-filing following the initial round of implementations.

Members questioned Karl about the specific strategy for rolling out mandatory e-filing in Pima County as opposed to Maricopa and shared a concern that demands for e-filing in the rural courts will closely follow mandating it in the urban courts. Karl indicated that the rollout strategy for Pima County would not necessarily be identical to that used for Maricopa County. Discussion focused on the recent attention the probate area is receiving and the role intelligent forms backed by improved automation could play in highlighting those required filings that warrant increased attention.

Justice Hurwitz thanked the appellate e-filing team for their long hours spent ensuring all the moving parts work together. He reminded members that e-filing needs to make as much progress as possible as rapidly as possible in light of potential future budget issues. He urged that we continue to separate the truly required features from the merely desired ones and to ensure systems are not being designed around individual users' idiosyncrasies.

	SUPREME COURT RULE 124 RECOMMENDATION TO AJC	Mr. Stewart Bruner

Staff member Stewart Bruner recapped changes to the existing rule related to e-filing discussed at the September meeting, before members received the revised document to consider. Since that

time, two documents have been crafted, the rule and a more flexible set of technical instructions for use on the AZTurboCourt website. Justice Hurwitz clarified the court's position on housing technical details within a rule that takes a year to amend. Stewart walked through driving influences behind reconsidering the content and its relationship to two code sections. He also reviewed the timeline of review and approval activities leading up to changes taking effect January 1, 2012. Following Stewart's review of the several major areas of policy contained in the documents, members provided their input about the relationship between the timing of AZTurboCourt development and the exclusive wording in the rule, especially related to criminal e-filing in Maricopa; the risk of removing the current restriction on hyperlinks and ways to manage that risk, the strategy of codifying a paper-based fee waiver process into perpetuity; as well as awkward or confusing wording related to "acceptance" and "clerk or court."

The chair reminded members that changes in wording can be accommodated right up to the Court's review in August 2011, so the concept is really the focus of consideration today. Stewart will serve as the collection point for wording changes throughout the review process. He will circulate any updated language to COT and e-Court members.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to recommend that AJC submit the revisions to Rule 124, Rules of the Supreme Court for Electronic Filing, to the formal rules comment process, as presented. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH 10-15**

UPDATED JUDICIAL PROJECT INVESTMENT JUSTICATION DOCUMENT	Mr. Karl Heckart

Karl reminded members about discussion at the September meeting and the need to decide on the proposed changes in today's meeting. He walked members through a table correlating projects of various sizes to documents and review processes. The point of the Judicial Project Investment Justification **(**JPIJ) is to make the manager of a costly project aware of various critical risks and to communicate the approach being followed to COT. Karl detailed the changes being proposed and the motivations for those changes.

Comments involved the language of the question about business continuity planning, the definition of the review cycle, a missing requirement to notify the submitting court of staff's recommendation at the end of the review cycle, the use of quantified justification for certain projects, language related to replacing a standards, as well as a burdensome level of detail required for project resources and steering committee members.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to adopt changes to the Judicial Project Investment Justification document in concept, with wording changes that address the issues raised. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH 10-16**

Stewart will circulate the wording changes to members following the meeting.

	PLAN FOR UPDATES TO IT STRATEGIC PLANS	Mr. Stewart Bruner

The chair introduced the subject of changing the frequency of IT plan submittals in order to provide some relief to smaller courts that have less technology activity. Stewart Bruner, in his role as Manager of Strategic Planning for the Information Technology Division (ITD) of the AOC, reviewed the value of the countywide strategic plans. He described three criteria for determining frequency of plan submittals: number of dedicated court IT staff, presence or absence of local application development efforts, and volume of local projects. He ranked counties according to the criteria and showed two lines of demarcation, one for courts having multiple IT departments and one between courts performing local development and courts that don't. Based on the ranking, he proposed that plans be submitted every year from Maricopa and Pima, every other year for counties that perform local development and every third year for the remaining counties.

Members were not in support of the three-year category. They directed Stewart to recast counties into just two tiers, then alternate the years in which counties other than Maricopa and Pima submit plans. Members suggested various strategies for determining which counties should submit plans next year. Stewart will communicate the strategy and requirements for specific reporting counties to presiding judges as the kickoff for the 2012 planning process.

Justice Hurwitz clarified that the set of counties reporting next year should consist of those identified by Stewart and that any counties requesting to defer their submittal another year could make their case to COT.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to revise the requirement for submission of countywide IT strategic plans from annual to biannual, except for Maricopa and Pima. Specific counties under the biannual requirement reporting each year shall be determined at the discretion of the AOC. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH 10-17**

CALL TO THE PUBLIC	Hon. Andrew Hurwitz

Justice Hurwitz briefly recapped the various action items from the meeting. After hearing no request for further discussion from members or the public in response to his call, he then entertained a motion to adjourn.

MEETING ADJOURNED	11:50 A.M.

Upcoming Meetings:	February 11, 2011	AOC – Conference Room 119 A/B
	May 5 & 6, 2011	AOC – Conference Room 119 A/B
	-- OR --	
	June 9 & 10, 2011	AOC – Conference Room 119 A/B