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Executive Summary

The Arizona Judicial Branch is using technology to reach its goals of connecting with and protecting the community. Having built the basic infrastructure to support information gathering and sharing, the judiciary is now working to provide the public, the media, law enforcement, and the legal community convenient access to court functions online as well as appropriate court information, especially on such sensitive topics as criminal case dispositions and domestic violence matters as well as general case information.

Chief Justice Scott Bales provides direction for both the courts' business and technology efforts. His vision for the Arizona Judicial Branch is embodied in the publication *Advancing Justice Together: Courts & Communities 2014-2019*.

Having built a robust infrastructure and key “back-office” functions, Arizona court automation continues making major improvements through implementation of “second-generation” automated systems, continuing the journey to exploit process efficiencies and economies of scale to better serve citizens.

- At the state level, the supporting infrastructure includes the Arizona Judicial Information Network (AJIN), various database and application servers, and the attached PCs with desktop productivity software.
- Back-office functions at the state level include the limited and general jurisdiction case, cash, jury, juvenile and adult probation and other record management systems statewide, email, Internet/Intranet access, and the central data repositories that support public access, statistical reporting, and analysis.
- For larger courts, especially those jurisdictions having their own self-contained tracking systems, back-office functions include continued maintenance, enhancement, and development of local systems, networks, and desktop environments.

Maintaining, operating, and enhancing this infrastructure and back-office functionality remains a priority to allow courts to keep better records, perform case management functions more efficiently and effectively, and promote greater accountability. Some of these back-office applications have reached the end of their useful life and require replacement. A continued focus in this plan is to replace those systems and expand from back office to front office automation while increasing public access to justice-related processes and information.

Arizona courts will continue to improve their business practices, especially ones to better serve the participants in the judicial process, including law enforcement, the legal community, jury members, victims, self-represented litigants, the media, and the public at large. To that end, the *Arizona Judicial Branch Information Technology Strategic Plan: 2019-2021* aligns with the judiciary’s business goals found in the Arizona Judicial publication *Advancing Justice Together: Courts & Communities 2014-2019*, which defines its vision for connecting with and protecting the community.
SERVING THE PUBLIC

Public safety remains a key governing principle that directs automation. Where more complete and timely information is available about criminals, the public is better served. Integration of justice information, especially among criminal justice agencies, supports this goal. The courts continue working for better, closer, and more automated interaction with law enforcement, the Department of Corrections, prosecution and defense agencies, as well as social services agencies, integrating with those systems to the extent possible. Criminal justice agencies are able to respond in the best interests of the public when they have ready access to probation information, orders of protection, arrest information, and pending DUI cases. The courts continue building their processes and infrastructure to record this information electronically and are now focusing, in cooperation with other criminal justice agencies, on sharing information in real-time, especially warrant information and relevant data for instant background checks associated with firearms purchases.

Being responsive to the public is a key initiative. With enhanced public safety and public service as goals, initiatives include providing for public information access; enhanced “self-service” support for the self-represented, including interactive and Spanish-language forms accepted statewide; improved interaction with potential jurors; technological improvements in courtrooms; and an improved ability to provide court functions and interact with the courts remotely. This complements the State of Arizona’s initiative for e-government. The Judicial Branch will continue to use technology to improve its ability to offer service in the e-government arena.

IMPROVING EFFICIENCY WITH NEW TECHNOLOGIES

Improving the efficiency of Judicial Branch processes is an important goal. Several technologies are being implemented to support it. Electronic document management, electronic filing, and judge automation can help the courts to digitize and manage records more efficiently. The use of audio and video to record court proceedings is another technology solution that is proving both cost-efficient and effective. Use of video conferencing for remote hearings and appearances saves time and transportation costs, and contributes to public safety. Several rural superior courts are continuing to expand its use to address chronic court reporter and court interpreter shortages.

Efforts to address the records management challenges of the court system are maturing. The acquisition of electronic document management systems (EDMS) that include abilities for imaging, electronic filing, document storage, and document archiving for long-term preservation is complete at the superior court and appellate court levels. Several of the largest limited jurisdiction courts have also selected and implemented electronic document management systems. The focus on providing a centralized EDMS along with procedures and processes for more than 120 smaller limited jurisdiction (LJ) courts that lack the local resources to manage a standalone system continues with more than 80 courts already using the facility. EDMS forms the vital foundation for accepting electronic documents from the public and legal community (e-filing) as well as for providing remote access to case documents. Automated systems and processes have matured to the point where a paper “safety net” may not be as vital as it once appeared to be. Since no paper exists for e-filed documents, technical requirements have been communicated to courts desiring to substitute an electronic record for paper “originals.” Business continuity solutions are being examined to ensure that multiple copies of electronic court records are stored in geographically diverse locations to make certain they remain available when needed.

With e-government, integration, electronic documents, and other remote electronic access services comes the need for security and authentication. The Judicial Branch continues stepping up its emphasis on the availability of electronic records as paper becomes less prevalent. As mentioned above, the business continuity critical to preserving the electronic supply chain of justice is being put in place. A statewide approach for electronic authorizations and electronic signatures using a systemic, “simplify and unify” approach is still needed. The interactions with state and local agencies, their needs, and technological capabilities are being reviewed along with internal branch needs to ensure the appropriate controls are in place for different types of filings.

Maintaining a systemic view continues to be a philosophical foundation that requires adoption of a broader perspective, looking at ways not just to meet an immediate need but also examining and revising business processes for global improvements and solutions. The approach encourages questioning structures, terminology, processes, and procedures, as they exist. It promotes solutions that simplify and bring standardization and uniformity to court interactions statewide. It
also complements a heightened awareness of our interdependence – among courts and with other government agencies or justice partners.

ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE AND STANDARDS

For more than a decade, the direction of technology in the courts has been towards shared resources, standards, and elimination of duplicate efforts and systems. The 2019-2021 Information Technology Strategic Plan continues projects that foster cooperation and leveraging. Leveraging has become institutionalized as a process, yielding a standards-based technology environment. At the recommendation of the Commission on Technology (COT), a statewide committee providing technology oversight, and its subcommittee, the Technical Advisory Council (TAC), the Arizona Judiciary has adopted technical standards for automation statewide so that development can be shared, training leveraged, and cooperative projects undertaken. The enterprise architecture includes technical industry standards, protocols, and methodologies, and, where business value can be identified, even products and detailed specifications. Arizona Code of Judicial Administration § 1-505 adopted the architecture. See http://www.azcourts.gov/Portals/87/Archives/FY19/EAS2018.pdf for the details. These detailed standards and specifications provide needed direction to projects conducted at all levels of courts and between courts and justice partners. New procurements of vendor-developed software are also being aligned with the architecture targets.

STANDARDIZING CODES AND PROCESSES

Automation table code standardization supports statewide uniformity of information recorded in case management systems (CMSs). It is difficult to transfer data to other local and state entities, write standardized reports, and aggregate statewide statistics when every court uses different words, abbreviations, or codes for the same thing. This currently presents a problem in the remaining AZTEC courts. Mapping local codes to statewide codes has proven to be very labor intensive with mixed results. Differences from court to court and bench to bench are being resolved as part of the rollout of the AJACS statewide case management system. Superior Court Clerks and limited jurisdiction court representatives are well into this standardization effort and have delivered both standard codes and associated terms for use with the statewide case management system. The COT maintains and governs these standardized codes and terms for all levels of courts through a code standardization subcommittee.

Creation of standardized processing workflows that take into account the size and level of a court is also a COT recommendation. The approach enables more standardized training and less complex automation since fewer unique practices have to be addressed. “Best practices” for courts’ workflow processes are contained within the second-generation case management systems, a direction approved by the Arizona Judicial Council (AJC) several years ago.

NEW SYSTEMS BECOMING REALITY

The drivers for projects to develop and implement second-generation automated systems include:

- Outdated technologies
- Business process inefficiencies
- High maintenance costs and complexities

In the fast-paced world of technology, it is an extraordinary accomplishment to sustain and support an automation system for 10 to 15 years. Many of the courts’ systems are this old or older and now well beyond the end of their life cycles, making technical support very expensive or even impossible. They must be replaced.
AZTEC, a statewide case management system (CMS) developed in the late 1980’s and implemented in Arizona courts beginning in the early 1990’s, is currently in the process of being replaced. After one final set of changes for continued supportability of its ageing infrastructure was completed in FY16, other enhancement requests have been carefully weighed against the estimated return on investment over the diminishing lifetime of the program while the multi-year roll out of AJACS to over 100 limited jurisdiction courts completes.

AJACS implementation in the 13 rural general jurisdiction courts completed in 2010. Now, development of a general-jurisdiction-focused version of AJACS needed to consolidate onto the very same codeset as the limited jurisdiction courts has completed and the project is transitioning into testing/pilot/implementation mode.

Several of the larger municipal courts and consolidated justice courts in the state not using AZTEC also find themselves with end-of-life CMSs and the need to undertake expensive, complex development projects to replace them. Adoption of a statewide limited jurisdiction case management system provides the most economical solution to their technology dilemma. Those courts were represented in the governance, gap analysis, development, and testing efforts, and are now monitoring the health and remaining functional life of the legacy systems.

Appellamation, the appellate court CMS developed in the mid 1990’s, is also at the end of its design life and will be replaced during the plan period. A study of possible alternatives, taking into account the lowest risk and overall lowest cost replacement solution available, led to a decision to release a request for proposals (RFP) to enable evaluation of systems that are available today, from which a replacement selection will be made.

Simplifying and making more uniform the financial rules and fund allocation procedures remain an important priority. The complexity of the distribution of funds collected by courts increases the challenge of implementing any off-the-shelf vendor software package and makes the maintenance of existing financial systems costly and resource consuming. The judiciary continues to examine financial procedures and statutory requirements to identify ways in which the financial business of courts could be handled more easily. Realistically, courts will not be able to effect change of all the complexity at once. This will be a long-term effort to reduce complexity while resisting efforts or legislation that might introduce additional complexity into the system.

FARE COLLECTIONS

One hundred seventy-five courts in all fifteen counties have now implemented the unified Fines/Fees and Restitution Enforcement Project (FARE) process whereby all citations and payments entered into their case management system are automatically passed to a collections agency that will:

- Send a reminder notice before the court date (Phoenix only)
- Set up a Web and interactive phone payment service
- Send out delinquency notices
- Perform skip tracing
- Interact with MVD to suspend drivers’ licenses and vehicle registration renewals (TTEAP)
- Automate the TIP interface
- Set up, bill, and track payment contracts
- Provide outbound calling for further collections effort after noticing has completed.

FARE has collected over $701 million to date on outstanding local debts, disbursed to statutory funds at the local, county, and state levels. Of that amount, over $148.6 million has been collected via electronic media, the Web, and telephone IVR. Nearly 1.1 million TTEAP holds have been placed with just over 641,000 releases, thus far, a release rate of 59 percent.
CONTINUED FUNDING CHALLENGES

The judiciary faces many challenges in pursuit of these strategic initiatives. Perennially among the greatest challenges, appropriate funding looms even larger in light of multi-year statewide deployments that continue for a new case management system in limited jurisdiction courts and electronic case filing statewide with ancillary projects for electronic access to case-related data and documents, as well as deployment of judge automation tools necessary to enable decision making in an all-electronic environment. In addition, ever increasing technology debt necessitates changes in the acquisition and licensing model for servers, client access device (PC) operating systems, and software used to support courts. New centralized solutions continue to come online, increasing the vital importance of providing necessary business continuity. Achieving justice integration and statewide electronic access to critical court information requires coordination of efforts, detailed standards, and funding. This is difficult when funding is so limited and dispersed among so many different entities statewide. Worse, planned funding for various initiatives has been interrupted by the continued decrease in JCEF (a state-level automation funding source) revenues of over 20 percent since FY11, removing over $13.2 million in funding from statewide automation initiatives. Courts continue working to enhance both local and centralized pools of automation funding to leverage the success of what has already been built and carry the judiciary forward in a consistent way to support its goals of improving public safety and public service. Although funding streams currently in place are projected to be sufficient for development, testing, and implementation of currently committed projects, no funding exists for any additional statewide automation system. Without an increase in revenue over time, courts are limited to only maintaining the current automation systems on their current platforms within the current environment.

TECHNOLOGY PRIORITIES

The Arizona Judicial Branch’s information technology initiatives support its strategic agenda outlined in *Advancing Justice Together: Courts & Communities 2014-2019*. At its June 2018 strategic planning session, the Commission on Technology continued its previous approach of establishing overarching strategic priorities that transcend any specific project. The priorities were affirmed in the order indicated below:

1. Production Support
2. Manage & Improve Security
3. Deploy New Core Systems
4. Mitigate Aging Technology Risk
5. Increase Revenue Flow (FARE, eAccess, eFiling)
6. Public Facing Services (eFiling, eAccess, eNotification)
7. Enhance Core Systems with New Functionality
8. Integrate Systems to Improve Productivity and Capability

COT members also reaffirmed the importance of existing strategic projects while clarifying the names of a couple of projects. Projects were reviewed and placed in the priority set indicated below:
• Deploy New eFiling Case Types
• Deploy LJ Judge Automation
• Launch eAccess
• Expand Automated Notification Capability
• JOLTSaz Dependency & Officer UI
• AJACS – AZTEC Replacement
• eCertification
• Justice Court eFiling
• Public Safety Assessment Automation
• FARE – Infrastructure Port
• Online Dispute Resolution
• eWarrant System
• eDocument Hyperlinking
• New Appellate CMS Setup
• CPOR 2
• FARE Implementations for Non-Standard Courts
• Move AJACS Superior Courts to Version 6.1

The *Advancing Justice Together: Courts & Communities 2014-2019* reflects technology planning for all Arizona courts. Typically, State Appellate Courts and the Superior Court in each county, on behalf of their general and limited jurisdiction courts, prepare or update their information technology strategic plans as the foundation for the statewide planning process. Due to the continuing economic challenges government is facing at all levels, the Commission on Technology voted to require formal plan input from rural courts only every other year. Those accomplishments and directions received in the current planning cycle have been incorporated into the statewide technology activities coordinated by the Administrative Office of the Courts. The most recent individual plans or updates received by county appear in Appendix D.
I. Introduction

BACKGROUND

The Arizona Judicial Branch consists of the Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals, the Superior Court, Justice of the Peace Courts, and Municipal Courts. The Supreme Court has administrative supervision over all courts in the state and the authority to make rules governing all procedural matters in any court.

The Arizona Judicial Council (AJC), established in 1990, assists the Supreme Court in developing and implementing policies that will provide central direction for court management, consistency in court operations, and coordination of services within the courts. Under the direction of the Chief Justice, the Administrative Office of the Courts provides the necessary support for the supervision and administration of all courts.

The Commission on Technology (COT), under whose auspices the Judicial Branch Information Technology Strategic Plan is developed, is a standing committee of the Arizona Judicial Council. The Commission plays both an advisory and a review role with respect to statewide technology policies, standards, and applications. The Information Technology Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts staffs the Commission and its subcommittees, and typically provides the majority of technical resources for statewide technology projects.

Both the AJC and the COT are statewide, multi-disciplinary, governance groups having representation from all levels of the judicial branch, as well as the executive branch, the State Bar, local government, the legal community, and the general public.

The Arizona Judicial Branch has turned to technology as one means to meet its goal to provide an independent, accessible, and integrated judicial system in accordance with constitutional mandates. There are many compelling reasons that the court is looking to automation to meet today's demands for information and efficient processing. The following strategic plan maps out the future direction of Arizona’s Judiciary in information technology architecture and projects for the three-year period including Fiscal Years 2019 through 2021.

The Arizona Judicial Branch is proud of its accomplishments in information technology over the 28 years since statewide efforts towards technology planning and statewide systems and standards began in earnest.

- Most juvenile court-related functions are automated on JOLTSaz and integrated with a youth assessment tool to implement evidence-based practices. Work continues on collecting all juvenile case information into a single, statewide repository.

- All superior courts are automated using the same, centrally supported and managed system, AJACS, apart from the high volume courts in Maricopa and Pima counties. Only a handful of limited jurisdiction courts continue to use legacy case management systems. Enhancements to AJACS needed to meet limited jurisdiction court requirements are now implemented in nearly 70 justice and municipal courts, about 50 percent of the target population.

- Adult probation offices in all 15 counties continue to use the same statewide reporting and statistical data collection system and a second-generation adult probation tracking system. APETS, initially developed and implemented in Maricopa County, is implemented statewide, placing all adult probation information within a single database.

- A training program to support common court “best practices” processes and procedures has been developed and implemented. It addresses the automation training needs of the courts, providing both partial funding to staff a training function in each county court system and also statewide training programs.

- A centralized repository of all court protective orders is available for query by law enforcement. A similar path is continuing to be pursued for arrest warrants throughout the state.
• Public access to case information consolidated from 153 Arizona courts is available via a central Internet location for lookup of cases by name or case number. In addition, certain courts in the state provide Internet access to information about cases within their jurisdiction. A subscription feature also exists for public case information. Efforts to enable public access to case-related documents online to the extent allowed by court rule are currently being thoroughly tested for adherence to court rules before opening the service to the public.

• All clerks of the superior court continue digitizing paper filings using electronic document management systems. Several prominent limited jurisdiction courts have implemented standalone electronic document management systems as well. Because document management is a key enabler for electronic case filing, the AOC operates a central document repository for both public access and enhancing courts’ business continuity. More than 60 smaller, limited jurisdiction courts are employing the central electronic document management system (EDMS), enabling their paper documents to be disposed of after quality assurance steps have been taken.

• Efforts to meet judges’ needs for decision making using electronic documents are nearly complete for superior court locations. As the digital tipping point is reached, judges now have the tools necessary to track and perform their vital work within the all-digital ecosystem.

The Fiscal Year 2018 Accomplishments section provides a detailed listing of last year’s major information technology accomplishments.

The demands of the public to access court records, information sharing among the courts and other criminal justice agencies, plus the sheer volume and complexity of justice transactions are focusing the Judiciary on modernizing the courts’ use of technology. The court continues addressing technology-hostile court rules and inconsistent local practices, especially in the arena of electronic case filing/access. In this era of reduced revenues, Court leadership continues to use technology to improve the effectiveness of court business processes as well as to improve the entire criminal justice system.

The Arizona Judicial Branch recognizes its role in the enhancement of the criminal justice system as a whole in the state. While much progress has been made within each criminal justice function to improve operational effectiveness, it is now widely acknowledged that criminal justice agencies must collaborate to bring about much needed systemic improvements. The first project to address the justice integration initiative was the electronic reporting of criminal dispositions to the Department of Public Safety (DPS). Related projects are planned to improve the exchange of accurate data among the various criminal justice functions before submittal to the common criminal justice history files. Being central to the criminal justice system, the courts play a critical part in the successful accomplishment of local integration initiatives.

Electronic Document Management (EDM), which includes electronic filing, document imaging, and the integration of documents with other applications, remains an important initiative of the chief justice. An EDM project addresses both back- and front-office functions. Without a basic infrastructure made up of document repositories, software to manage them, and sufficient network bandwidth to support document transmissions, courts cannot begin to accept electronic filings from other agencies. Now that the basic infrastructure is in place, along with a systemic analysis to alter existing document handling and filing processes, courts are able to respond to requests to accept electronic filings from the law enforcement, prosecution, and legal communities. Efforts continue to enable process and technology changes that provide judicial officers with access to electronic documents from the bench, in chambers, and from remote locations.

New case management system implementation projects address replacement of one remaining first-generation system, AZTEC, long at the end of the automation life cycle. Next-generation systems significantly reduce the level of clerical effort needed for data entry and update functions by enabling automated exchange of data among criminal justice agencies. Rather than placing all functionality within a single enterprise system controlled by the court, the integration model being pursued calls for loosely coupling disparate systems using defined standards for data exchange like GJXML and the NIEM as well as an enterprise service bus (ESB) for transaction-based services. A managed services layer is being constructed to provide added flexibility for integration and data sharing along with added protection to back-end applications.

The 2019-2021 Information Technology (IT) Plan continues to support the core functionality of the existing statewide applications. In particular, the AZTEC case management system will be maintained and modified, as required, to provide its remaining user courts with benefits that will exceed the level of effort necessary to maintain it as it approaches the very
end of its long life. The new AJACS CMS is being maintained and continuously enhanced to address legislated changes as well as critical business needs raised by using courts.

The Arizona Judicial Branch’s IT Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2019-2021 offers a strategic direction for the information technology resources and activities in the Judiciary. It results from a formal planning process, which began with updates to various IT plans at the county level. These supporting plans are included in Appendix D. Rural courts’ plans are now updated only every other year, following a decision by the Commission on Technology several years ago.

This plan first presents the Judiciary’s business strategic initiatives. Those initiatives are defined in Sections III and IV. Then, the IT initiatives supporting these business needs are outlined.

The IT strategic initiatives are:

- Promote a Systemic Thinking Approach to Problem Solving with Technology
- Provide Infrastructure that Facilitates Effective Communication and Integration
- Enhance Security and Disaster Recovery to Protect Court Technology-Related Assets and the Reputation of the Judiciary
- Standardize Processes and Solutions to Improve Efficiency and Effectiveness
- Complete and Enhance Second-Generation Statewide Automation Projects
- Improve Data Exchange, Communications, and Public Access
- Digitize the Court Environment
- Provide Divisions of the Administrative Office of the Courts Solutions for Internal Support

Finally, major IT strategic projects are outlined.

The Commission on Technology and its subcommittees provide a strong, active force for directing technology efforts and funding. Its members deserve special thanks for the fine job they are doing in providing leadership in technology to the Arizona Judicial Branch. Members of Commission on Technology and its standing subcommittees, Court Automation Coordinating Committee, the Technical Advisory Council, and the Probation Automation Coordinating Committee are provided below.
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<td>Superior Court of Mohave County</td>
<td>Maricopa County Clerk of the Superior Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JULIE DYBAS</th>
<th>CHRISTOPHER HALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Court Administrator</td>
<td>Court Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scottsdale Municipal Court</td>
<td>City of Tucson Municipal Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONALD JACOBSON</th>
<th>DIANA HEGYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Administrator</td>
<td>Deputy Court Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Flagstaff Municipal Court</td>
<td>Superior Court in Maricopa County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAUL THOMAS</th>
<th>CASSANDRA URIAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Administrator</td>
<td>Deputy Court Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Mesa Municipal Court</td>
<td>Superior Court in Pima County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JONATHAN BEARUP</th>
<th>VALERIE WYANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Administrator</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court in Gila County</td>
<td>Superior Court in Coconino County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>STEWART BRUNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Planning Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona Supreme Court, AOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PROBATION AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE (PACC)  
## 2017-2018 MEMBERSHIP LIST

| **KIP ANDERSON**  
Court Administrator  
Superior Court of Mohave County | **TIM HARDY**  
Director  
Yuma County Juvenile Court |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| **DAVID F. SANDERS**  
Chief Probation Officer  
Superior Court of Pima County | **MIKE CIMINO**  
Deputy Chief of Administrative Services  
Maricopa County Adult Probation |
| **BRANDELYN JACKSON**  
Division Director  
Maricopa County Adult Probation | **TINA MATTISON**  
Deputy Court Administrator  
Pima County Juvenile Court |
| **STAFF**  
**BOB MACON**  
Probation Automation Manager  
Arizona Supreme Court, AOC |
II. Planning Method and Participants

The Judiciary’s planning process is a major Judicial Branch activity involving many people and organizations. It includes:

- The Chief Justice
- The Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)
- Division Directors of the AOC
- The Arizona Judicial Council and its subcommittees, which includes the Commission on Technology
- Members of the public
- Presiding judges
- Clerks of the court
- Judges
- Court administrators
- Chief probation officers
- Court staff throughout the state

The planning process emphasizes the alignment of business goals and the IT strategies and projects.

Building on the foundation of former Chief Justices Ruth V. McGregor and Rebecca White Berch, who targeted five main business goals through the Judicial Branch's strategic agenda, *Advancing Justice Together: Courts & Communities 2014-2019*, adopted in June 2014 with the ascension of Chief Justice Scott Bales, identifies the following as the Judiciary’s goals:

- Promoting Access to Justice;
- Protecting Children, Families, and Communities;
- Improving Court Processes to Better Serve the Public;
- Enhancing Professionalism within Arizona’s Courts; and
- Improving Communications and Community Participation.

The process by which the goals were updated involved stakeholder collaboration as well as meetings with presiding judges, clerks of court, members of the Arizona Judicial Council and key court staff throughout the Judiciary. This agenda focuses on collaboration between courts and communities in the effort to increase public trust in court systems and to sustain confidence that individual rights are being protected and all Arizona citizens are being treated fairly.

This is the twenty-second year that the Judiciary has published a formal information technology plan; each year the strategic IT initiatives have been reassessed and re-prioritized to assure they meet the stated mission and strategic organizational initiatives of the Judiciary. IT initiatives were crafted to support business goals that appear in *Advancing Justice Together: Courts & Communities 2014-2019*. The timeline for the development of this IT strategic plan was as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEP 2017</td>
<td>Commission on Technology continued its requirement for only biennial updates from the rural counties and for separating the business drivers update process from the technology updates. COT directed a “full-effort” update process for Maricopa and Pima courts for use in the plan cycle, coordinated by staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT 2017</td>
<td>Previous plans were distributed to the six counties not updating their strategic plans last year. Maricopa and Pima courts were instructed to perform a full update to the “lite” plans they submitted last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAN 2018</td>
<td>Business input from counties was reviewed and prepared for presentation to Commission on Technology. In addition, project and technical portions of the document were distributed to contacts in the counties for update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR/APR/MAY 2018</td>
<td>Six updated County Court Information Technology Strategic Plans were submitted to AOC for review and analysis, along with the Maricopa and Pima full updates. Staff prepared summaries of the plans for the use of COT members in the annual planning meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN 2018</td>
<td>Commission on Technology members identified project priorities for FY2019. COT also reviewed the updated County Court Information Technology Strategic Plans submitted. AJC subsequently reviewed the project priorities and approved funding for the strategic priorities recommended by COT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 2018</td>
<td>Commission on Technology approved the Arizona Judicial Branch Information Technology Strategic Plan for 2019-2021 at its September meeting. Following final edits, the plan was submitted to ADOA-ASET and JLBC as required by A.R.S. 18-104(A)(1)(f).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1 below illustrates the typical processes and timing of the Arizona Judicial Branch Strategic Planning effort.

**FIGURE 1. ARIZONA JUDICIAL BRANCH STRATEGIC PLANNING**
III. Judicial Branch Vision

The Honorable Scott Bales assumed the leadership of the Judiciary in June 2014, becoming Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court. He has provided direction to the Arizona Courts with his statement of Judicial Branch strategic initiatives in *Advancing Justice Together: Courts & Communities 2014-2019*, released in June 2014. The vision encompasses five broad goals, each associated with several key strategic business needs. This agenda is a road map to increasing the public's trust in and access to the court system.

**PROMOTING ACCESS TO JUSTICE**

Arizonans look to our courts to protect their rights and to resolve disputes fairly and efficiently. To serve these ends, Arizona’s judicial branch must work to ensure that all individuals have effective access to justice. This goal is advanced not only by examining legal representation for moderate and low-income persons, but also by helping self-represented litigants and others navigate the judicial process and by using technology to make courts more accessible to all.

**PROTECTING CHILDREN, FAMILIES, AND COMMUNITIES**

The Arizona Judiciary has long made it a priority to protect our state’s most vulnerable populations. We have reformed our juvenile courts to provide timely hearings and due process in child neglect and dependency cases. We have reformed our probate rules and laws to ensure our elderly have adequate protections against exploitation and abuse. Every day, we protect our communities by holding juvenile and adult probationers accountable and providing the treatment and rehabilitative services they need to once again become productive and law-abiding members of the community.

While continuing our commitment to protecting the young and elderly, we also should expand the use of problem-solving courts to better serve individuals who may have specialized needs. Our communities look to courts not only to decide cases, but also to solve problems.
IMPROVING COURT PROCESSES TO BETTER SERVE THE PUBLIC

Providing access to justice requires our courts to continually strive to maintain and improve upon existing processes and systems which ensure effective and efficient case management and use of information and resources. Judges and court staff need the appropriate resources and training to ensure all cases are heard in a timely manner and processed efficiently. Also, our justice system partners and the public should be able to access courts and court information in the most efficient ways possible. While implementing planned technology improvements, we must also find ways to improve existing practices and policies to further ensure that public resources are used effectively, efficiently, and accountably.

ENHANCING PROFESSIONALISM WITHIN ARIZONA’S COURTS

Judicial excellence, staff competency, and professionalism are critical to maintaining Arizona’s national reputation for innovation and leadership within its judiciary. Court personnel at every level must maintain the high level of service and professionalism exhibited daily in courts across the state.

IMPROVING COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Public awareness of the role of the judicial branch and what courts do on a daily basis is essential to ensuring trust and confidence in a judicial system that seeks to provide fair and impartial access to all. With so many media and social networking choices available today, courts can improve how they inform the public about court events and opportunities to serve as volunteers.
IV. Judicial Branch Strategic Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL 1</th>
<th>PROMOTING ACCESS TO JUSTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizonans look to our courts to protect their rights and to resolve disputes fairly and efficiently. To serve these ends, Arizona’s judicial branch must work to ensure that all individuals have effective access to justice. This goal is advanced not only by examining legal representation for moderate and low-income persons, but also by helping self-represented litigants and others navigate the judicial process and by using technology to make courts more accessible to all.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-A: Access to Justice</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our courts should work with others in government and our communities to assess the legal needs of modest to low-income individuals and to develop strategies to better serve those needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTION PLAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create a statewide commission, including members of the public, to study and recommend ways to promote access to justice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify ways to promote participation by lawyers in access to justice initiatives and recognize them for their professional and financial contributions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify ways to improve funding for the judicial branch and the courts’ ongoing ability to provide access to court services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-B: Services for Self-Represented Litigants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many people cannot afford or choose not to obtain legal representation in court proceedings. Consequently, the courts must be prepared to assist self-represented individuals in understanding court processes and legal procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTION PLAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expand access to web-based forms, e-filing, and information describing legal terms and court procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure court forms and information, whether in electronic or paper form, are easily understandable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborate with legal services agencies and the Arizona Foundation for Legal services and education to develop strategies to expand legal and other self-help services for modest- to low-income litigants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide front-end triage and referral services to assist self-represented litigants in identifying and obtaining appropriate services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explore programs to recruit and train college students and other volunteers to work in legal self-help centers to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Assist with legal workshops,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Help complete legal forms, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Provide information and referrals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explore the use of technology-based access to justice solutions being developed in other courts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limited English language skills should not be a barrier to accessing justice. Arizona’s courts have significantly expanded access to interpreter services and translated forms, instructions, and court information. Work remains to be done, however, particularly given our evolving and diverse population and changing technology.

**ACTION PLAN**

- Develop strategies for increasing the availability and quality of court interpreters and interpreter services, including:
  - Expanding the remote video interpreting project, and,
  - Identifying other opportunities to use technology in providing language assistance services to litigants, witnesses, and others.
- Develop strategies to expand the use of alternative language court forms, instructions, and information both at courthouses and online.

Technological change provides ongoing opportunities for the court system to enhance and increase access to courts, court proceedings and court information. Previous strategic agendas have set Arizona courts on a path to increased electronic access for the public and court community alike. This agenda continues those efforts and seeks to further advance the ability for court users to locate information, file documents and receive court notifications electronically, and remotely participate in court proceedings.

**ACTION PLAN**

- Expand electronic access to court documents and data with appropriate protections for security and privacy.
- Extend e-filing to courts statewide.
- Establish a web-based online payment system for drivers wanting to plead responsible and pay civil traffic tickets and minor misdemeanor charges.
- Create an electronic noticing system to remind parties, probationers, and other court participants of upcoming court dates.
- Identify other opportunities for video hearings and other remote electronic court appearances.
## GOAL 2
### PROTECTING CHILDREN, FAMILIES, AND COMMUNITIES

The Arizona Judiciary has long made it a priority to protect our state’s most vulnerable populations. We have reformed our juvenile courts to provide timely hearings and due process in child neglect and dependency cases. We have reformed our probate rules and laws to ensure our elderly have adequate protections against exploitation and abuse. Every day, we protect our communities by holding juvenile and adult probationers accountable and providing the treatment and rehabilitative services they need to once again become productive and law-abiding members of the community.

While continuing our commitment to protecting the young and elderly, we also should expand the use of problem-solving courts to better serve individuals who may have specialized needs. Our communities look to courts not only to decide cases, but also to solve problems.

### 2-A: Center for Evidence-Based Practices

“Evidence-based practices” are identified by rigorously studying the effects of different policies and processes. Important research regarding evidence-based practices in the legal system is underway throughout the nation. Although the Arizona judiciary has successfully incorporated evidence-based practices in probation services, Arizona’s courts must stay current with this research and remain a leader in implementing successful approaches. The Arizona Center for Evidence-Based Practices will support these efforts. The Center will bring together judicial leaders, researchers, and practitioners to design the best programs to promote juvenile and adult offender accountability, rehabilitation, crime reduction, and community protection.

**ACTION PLAN**

- Improve and expand the use of evidence-based practices to determine pre-trial release conditions for low-risk offenders.
- Evaluate and, as appropriate, implement new or expanded evidence-based programs for Arizona’s Adult and Juvenile Probation services. Programs to evaluate include:
  - Supervision of the seriously mentally ill,
  - Positive adult mentoring of juvenile probationers,
  - Effective practices to reduce the risk of violence, especially gun violence involving probationers,
  - Effective community re-entry for adults and youth after incarceration or detention,
  - Family inclusive probation supervision and services, and
  - Effective community supervision programs to reduce adult and juvenile recidivism.
- Encourage and support the use of evidence-based services and interventions for children and families for reunification and permanency in dependency cases.
- Encourage and support the educational needs of all youth under court supervision as a critical factor in future well-being.

### 2-B: Problem-Solving Courts

Problem-solving courts must also follow evidence-based practices to succeed. Although some Arizona courts have implemented problem-solving courts, there is a continuing need to create courts designed to serve the distinct needs of certain individuals, such as homeless courts, drug courts, veterans courts, and mental health courts.

**ACTION PLAN**
- Collaborate with justice partners, treatment providers, and other community service entities to expand problem-solving courts including drug, homeless, veterans, mental health, and domestic violence courts.
- Develop evidence-based practices bench books, training, and other information for judges assigned to problem-solving courts.
- Identify strategies, including statutory changes, allowing multi-court collaboration and use of technology to establish and expand problem-solving courts across jurisdictional boundaries.

The Supreme Court regulates the practice of law in order to protect the public. Litigants and other represented parties expect competency and professionalism from their lawyers. The Supreme Court promotes these goals by establishing and enforcing standards of competency and ethical conduct and by taking disciplinary action against those who violate these standards.

**ACTION PLAN**
- Review attorney admission requirements and protocols to determine if changes are needed to promote higher standards of lawyer competency and professionalism.
- Review the current Supreme Court Rules establishing the State Bar to assess how well the current governance structure allows the State Bar to fulfill its mission of protecting the public and improving the legal profession.
- Review rule changes proposed by the American Bar Association’s “Commission on Ethics 20/20” to determine if changes to the ethical rules for Arizona attorneys are desirable.
- Continue to evaluate the Arizona Bar examination requirements to ensure that the exam is evidence-based, tests lawyer competency, protects the public, and improves the legal profession.
- Develop best practices training for parents’ counsel in juvenile dependency cases.
- Explore ways to enhance mentoring for new attorneys.

Human trafficking, often referred to as modern-day slavery, is commanding increased attention from courts and communities across the nation. Trafficking threatens some of our most vulnerable individuals, including young people who have been involved in the foster care system or juvenile courts. Human trafficking raises many challenges for state courts, which need to better identify human trafficking crimes and victims, develop strategies to handle such cases, assist persons who are victimized, and protect those at particular risk of becoming victims.

**ACTION PLAN**
- Collect and analyze information on the scope and impact of human trafficking-related cases in Arizona courts and develop recommendations on the appropriate role of the state court system in addressing this issue.
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**GOAL 3**

**IMPROVING COURT PROCESSES TO BETTER SERVE THE PUBLIC**

Providing access to justice requires our courts to continually strive to maintain and improve upon existing processes and systems which ensure effective and efficient case management and use of information and resources. Judges and court staff need the appropriate resources and training to ensure all cases are heard in a timely manner and processed efficiently. Also, our justice system partners and the public should be able to access courts and court information in the most efficient ways possible. While implementing planned technology improvements, we must also find ways to improve existing practices and policies to further ensure that public resources are used effectively, efficiently, and accountably.

### 3-A: Judicial System Process Improvement

As case filings increase and more people interact with the courts each day, the court system must continue to identify ways to improve judicial system processes. This effort requires that judges, clerks, court administrators, and staff have the tools needed to timely and efficiently process cases.

**ACTION PLAN**

- Improve timeliness and efficiency of civil, criminal, juvenile, family, and probate case processing in Arizona courts by:
  - Adopting case processing time standards,
  - Revitalizing caseflow management efforts statewide, including principles of differentiated case management, court control over the pace of litigation, and compliance with rules governing case processing time requirements,
  - Providing case management system enhancements, including reporting capabilities,
  - Implementing e-bench tools that allow judges to more efficiently manage and resolve cases,
  - Providing judicial workload tools to assist presiding judges when making case assignments, and
  - Implementing relevant performance, customer service, and case management measures.
- Identify and implement ways to improve the process of jury selection and service.
- Review certain Arizona Rules of Court to restyle, simplify, and clarify the rules. Identify and implement case management and judicial officer assignment practices for commercial litigation to timely resolve cases and reduce costs to litigants and the court.

### 3-B: Courthouse Facilities and Security

Arizona’s courts are forums for resolving difficult issues that affect people in vital aspects of their lives, including cases involving domestic relations, parental rights, and individual liberty. Emotions can run high in court proceedings. Our courthouses must be a safe place for all who enter their doors.

**ACTION PLAN**

- Establish courthouse and courtroom security standards.
- Conduct a needs assessment for courthouse security infrastructure.
- Develop training standards and skill development opportunities for court security officers.
### 3-C: Next Generation Case Management Systems

Case management systems support the work of the courts and probation services. Many of these systems have been in place for more than a decade and require updating or replacement. This effort will take time and considerable investment of human and financial capital.

**ACTION PLAN**
- Implement Arizona Judicial Automated Case System (AJACS) in limited jurisdiction courts.
- Fully implement Juvenile On-Line Tracking System (JOLTSaz) in juvenile courts.
- Integrate Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System (APETS) with AJACS.
- Enhance or replace appellate case management systems.

### 3-D: Court Data Repositories and Justice System Data Exchanges

Technology has enabled the court system to vastly improve court processes and provide quick access to court information. New technologies and data exchange protocols create new opportunities for data sharing among justice system entities. The judicial branch must continue initiatives to provide criminal justice system participants access to accurate and complete data needed to perform their duties.

**ACTION PLAN**
- Implement the Central Case Index system to enable the flow of critical court data to and from federal, state, and local justice system entities.
- Collaborate with other justice system entities to develop and implement data collection and exchange strategies that leverage technology, including:
  - Expanding e-warrants project to other justice system entities,
  - Modernizing the state’s warrant repository system,
  - Making mental health court orders available to appropriate criminal justice and treatment officials,
  - Making condition of release information available to appropriate criminal justice officials, and
  - Improving accuracy and completeness of the state’s criminal history repository and National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS).
## GOAL 4
### ENHANCING PROFESSIONALISM WITHIN ARIZONA’S COURTS

Judicial excellence, staff competency, and professionalism are critical to maintaining Arizona’s national reputation for innovation and leadership within its judiciary. Court personnel at every level must maintain the high level of service and professionalism exhibited daily in courts across the state.

### 4-A: Judicial Excellence

A highly respected judiciary is at the core of judicial excellence. The judicial branch must continue the professional development of new and veteran judges to ensure they adhere to the highest standards of competence, conduct, integrity, professionalism, and accountability.

**ACTION PLAN**
- Examine current systems for ensuring new and veteran judges are well-prepared for the courtroom, including but not limited to:
  - Assessing new judge training and orientation,
  - Establishing a skill enhancement program for experienced judges based on mentoring and education services, and
  - Ensuring an efficient and effective judicial oversight process exists to monitor judges’ performance and to address public concerns.
- Expand educational opportunities for appellate judges.
- Collaborate with the State Bar on educational programs of mutual interest to judges and lawyers.
- Conduct a judicial education needs assessment to identify new or enhanced training for judges including, but not limited to:
  - Cultural competency and implicit bias,
  - Procedural fairness,
  - Forensic science,
  - Delinquency case processing, and
  - Effective use of technology on the bench, in chambers, and remotely.
- Develop web-based training on best judicial practices for protective order procedures and criminal case proceedings involving child victims.

### 4-B: Judicial Branch Leadership

Developing effective court leadership is essential to maintaining a high level of professionalism and competency within the judicial branch.

**ACTION PLAN**
- Develop judicial leadership and leadership team programs.
- Prepare court leadership for next generation case management systems and technology.
  - Provide resources for presiding judges and other court leaders to effectively plan for succession in court management.

### 4-C: Workforce Development

Judicial branch employees who are not judges must possess the tools and skills needed to properly and timely process cases, accurately maintain court records, and properly supervise juvenile and adult offenders in the community. Our workforce development plans must include training methods that are convenient, timely, and relevant.

**ACTION PLAN**
- Enhance the use of web-based video/audio conference capability to train court employees.
• Develop guidelines on the use of social media by court employees in the workplace.
• Continue efforts to recruit and retain a culturally diverse workforce at all levels within the judicial branch.
• Evaluate the need for wellness initiatives for judicial and other court staff.
GOAL 5

IMPROVING COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Public awareness of the role of the judicial branch and what courts do on a daily basis is essential to ensuring trust and confidence in a judicial system that seeks to provide fair and impartial access to all. With so many media and social networking choices available today, courts can improve how they inform the public about court events and opportunities to serve as volunteers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-A: Volunteerism</th>
<th>Arizona’s courts at all levels depend on volunteers to assist in fulfilling the judiciary’s many functions and responsibilities—from judicial selection and performance review, to foster care review boards and CASA volunteers, to providing community outreach. While each component of the judiciary continually seeks out a talented and diverse volunteer base, the judicial branch as a whole can do more to enhance the importance and reward of serving as a volunteer in court programs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTION PLAN</strong></td>
<td>• Establish public service recruitment and recognition programs to further engage community participation in our judicial system. • Identify ways to enlist the help of retired judges and lawyers to provide community outreach and to act as ambassadors for the judiciary. Continue efforts to recruit volunteers who reflect the diversity of our communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-B: Communication with the Public and Education Communities</th>
<th>In a world of nearly instantaneous access to information, Arizona courts must be proactive in communicating with the general public, elected officials, and other government entities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTION PLAN</strong></td>
<td>• Communicate effectively with the public about the role of courts in a free society, how courts serve our communities, and progress in achieving this agenda’s goals. • Promote civic education by supporting programs such as “We the People,” mock trial, and iCivics; partnering with teachers and others in the education community; and conducting appellate arguments in local schools and other community locations. • Use juror “downtime” to provide prospective jurors with information about the role of courts and public involvement in the justice system. • Update speaker’s toolkit for judges and other court leadership to use when making presentations. • Increase use of social media to improve communications with the public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-C: Communications within the Branch and with Other Branches of State and Local Government</th>
<th>The judicial branch has many components. Although increased integration and technology have improved communications, Arizona courts should strive to further enhance communications across programs, jurisdictions, and branches of government.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTION PLAN</strong></td>
<td>• Reinstitute the “View from the Bench” program for the Superior Court and limited jurisdiction courts and invite local and state policy makers to participate. • Publish an electronic newsletter and identify other ways to improve communication within the branch regarding projects and important events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Use juror “downtime” to provide prospective jurors with information about the role of courts and public involvement in the justice system.
• Identify ways to improve communication among the branches of county and city governments.
V. Technology Governance, Initiatives & Alignment

BACKGROUND

The Commission on Technology (COT) has identified information technology goals, strategic initiatives, and strategic projects that support the vision and strategic initiatives of Advancing Justice Together. Together, they set technology direction for the Judiciary and the Information Technology Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts, which staffs and supports statewide projects.

The Commission on Technology’s authority and responsibility for the identification of the information technology priorities for the Judiciary are outlined below.

COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY: BACKGROUND

The Commission on Technology, established in 1990, a standing committee of the Arizona Judicial Council (AJC), has identified the strategies for automation statewide to support goals aligned with the overall vision and goals of the Judiciary. The Commission was charged with "providing strategic leadership for the successful application of information technology to improve access, efficiency and the quality of justice of the Arizona Court System." The Commission's charge to oversee the application of technology in the courts is consistent with the strategic initiatives and priorities of the Judiciary.

The Commission typically meets five times per year; subcommittees meet more often. Members include judges, clerks of court, court administrators, a State Bar representative, a Legislative Branch representative, a Governor's Office representative, a League of Cities and Towns representative, a County Supervisors’ Association representative, and the public. Commission subcommittees provide technical advice and counsel to Commission members. A list of the Fiscal Year 2018 Commission on Technology membership and that of its subcommittees is included in the Introduction.

COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY: AUTHORITY

The Commission on Technology is similar in function to the Arizona Executive Branch’s Information Technology Authorization Committee (ITAC). For instance, it reviews and approves Judicial Collections Enhancement Fund (JCEF) grant requests for automation projects. The Commission approves funding requests and provides support for projects that further the goals contained in this document. The Commission’s authority and responsibility are to:

- Establish the goals, policies, and priorities for the statewide Judicial Information Technology Plan.
- Determine the allocation of available Judicial Collection Enhancement Funds for automation grant requests and projects consistent with the direction, standards, and priorities of the Judicial Strategic Business and Information Technology Plans. The Arizona Judicial Council determines the amount of funds available for this purpose.
- Oversee the statewide judicial branch data communications network, including establishing security standards and procedures.
- Develop and submit for approval statewide technical standards, which shall be used in all court automation projects, including security, disaster recovery, and communication standards.
- Oversee the selection, development, and support of automation systems used by multiple courts and supported by the Administrative Office of the Courts.
- Encourage projects which utilize technology to increase accessibility to the courts, improve court efficiency, and improve court management.
• Review and approve countywide court information technology plans for consistency with the Judiciary’s Strategic Business and Information Technology Plans.

• Review and approve or disapprove court technology projects that exceed a cost of $250,000.

• Monitor the progress of all court automation projects pursuant to countywide court information technology plans.

The Commission also establishes the policies and procedures for the submission of project plans.

COMMISSION SUBCOMMITTEE: TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

The Technical Advisory Council (TAC) is a subcommittee of the Commission on Technology whose members provide a technical perspective and expertise to the Commission. They are charged to respond to Commission requests to recommend specific standards and technologies needed to carry out statewide policies and priorities. They may also be requested to review technical aspects of automation plans and grant requests and make recommendations regarding technical standards and approaches. Technical standards, minimum security standards, technology architectures, and recommendations for specific technology solutions come from this group.

COMMISSION SUBCOMMITTEE: COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

The Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) is charged with coordinating the automation initiatives and integration efforts that affect the trial courts, including the dependence of any statewide project on other local projects and construction of local interfaces to statewide automation functions. It oversees development of statewide automation systems to ensure they can be implemented in other Arizona courts as well as local technology implementations to ensure COT’s goals are being met.

COMMISSION SUBCOMMITTEE: PROBATION AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

The Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC) functions as a conduit between business users of probation automation and the technologists who provide and support that automation. Probation automation tools include the statewide records management systems for adults (APETS) and juveniles (JOLTSaz).

COMMISSION: SUPPORT STAFF

Staff in the Information Technology Division (ITD) of the Administrative Office of the Courts serves as support to the Commission on Technology, much the way the Arizona Strategic Enterprise Technology Office (ASET) performs the staffing function for ITAC. Beyond staffing, ITD provides development and support as well as vendor management resources for many of the statewide initiatives currently in process. ITD personnel, under the direction of Mr. Karl Heckart, CIO, plan to continue to staff the implementation, support, and enhancement of such statewide activities as replacement of case and financial management systems, the Arizona Judicial Information Network (AJIN), the Judicial Intranet, the customer service center, and all other centralized services. ITD staff members also provide support to ad hoc subcommittees created by a motion of the COT.
COURT STRATEGIC INITIATIVES (GOALS AND INITIATIVES NAMES)

COMMISSION IDENTIFIED STRATEGIC BUSINESS NEEDS

In the fall of 1993 during a strategic planning retreat, the Commission on Technology identified the following strategic business needs related to automation. These needs support the overall mission and goals statement of the Judiciary. (For the purposes of this plan “effectiveness” is defined as including both quantity and quality.)

In order of the Commission’s assigned priority, they are:

- Improved effectiveness in the maintenance of court records.
- Improved effectiveness in case management.
- Improved effectiveness in courts’ communications among themselves and with other justice and law-enforcement agencies.
- Improved effectiveness in the courtroom by employing technology in courtroom activities.
- Improved effectiveness in the business functions of court operations.
- Improved effectiveness in the enforcement of court orders, including collections.
- Improved effectiveness of probation tracking.
- Provide education to court staff and the public regarding the justice system and technology as used in the courts.
- Improved effectiveness in the maintenance of official appellate court records.
- Improved effectiveness in jury management.
- Improved effectiveness in juvenile court and juvenile detention records and case management.
- Improved effectiveness of facilities management.

In September of both 1996 and 1998 at its second and third strategic planning retreats, the Commission identified and reaffirmed information technology automation goals for the Judiciary and the strategic IT initiatives to support them. In its April and May 1998 meetings, the Commission on Technology reviewed the strategic initiatives in published IT Strategic Plans and reaffirmed them, adding Year 2000 readiness which was removed following completion of Y2K activities.

The Commission has recently reaffirmed these goals and strategic initiatives yet again. The initiatives have been aligned with and in support of Advancing Justice Together’s goals, and with the previously identified business needs of the court.

The information technology automation goals are:

STATEWIDE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AUTOMATION GOALS FISCAL YEARS 2019 – 2021

1. Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.
2. Improve information access and communication from and to judicial entities as well as the other criminal justice system functions.
3. Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.

To achieve these goals, the Commission on Technology has identified the following broad strategic initiatives. This strategic agenda is both consistent with previous years’ IT Plans and with the updated focus provided by Chief Justice Bales in Advancing Justice Together: Courts & Communities 2014-2019.
The information technology strategic initiatives are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIC INITIATIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISCAL YEARS 2019 – 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Promote a *systemic thinking* approach to technological solutions.
2. Provide infrastructure (including the network, data center, centralized help desk, field support, training, and distributed systems management capabilities), processes, and procedures to support statewide court communication, automation, and integration.
3. Enhance information security and disaster recovery policies, procedures, and technology to protect statewide court technology-related assets and the reputation of the judiciary.
5. Complete, maintain, and enhance second-generation statewide automation projects.
6. Improve data exchange and communications with the public, the other criminal justice functions, and outside agencies while appropriately safeguarding confidential information.
7. Digitize the entire court environment.
1. Provide divisions of the Administrative Office of the Courts with automated solutions to meet internal goals and objectives.
Given the information technology business needs, goals, and strategic initiatives, the Commission has elected to give high priority to several strategic technology projects. The strategic technology projects, aligned with the strategic business initiatives, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS</th>
<th>Alignment with “Advancing Justice Together: Courts and Communities 2014-2019”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology Strategic Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alignment with “Advancing Justice Together: Courts and Communities 2014-2019”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronic-Filing-Related Projects including eServices</strong></td>
<td>Expand access to web-based forms, e-filing, and information describing legal terms and court procedures. Extend e-filing to courts statewide. Explore the use of technology-based access to justice solutions being developed in other courts. Expand the electronic noticing system to remind parties, probationers, and other court participants of upcoming court dates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration-Related Projects</strong></td>
<td>Modernize to improve court processes and information gathering, tracking, and sharing. Expand use of e-Citation to electronically transfer citation information from law enforcement to the courts. Modernize the state’s warrant repository system. Expand e-warrants project to other justice system entities. Improve accuracy and completeness of the state’s criminal history repository and National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS). Expand the web-based online payment system for drivers wanting to plead responsible and pay civil traffic tickets and minor misdemeanor charges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New &amp; Enhanced Case Management System</strong></td>
<td>Implement Arizona Judicial Automated Case System (AJACS) in limited jurisdiction courts. Enhance or replace appellate case management systems. Improve timeliness and efficiency of civil, criminal, juvenile, family, and probate case processing in Arizona courts by: Providing case management system enhancements, including reporting capabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Standards Reporting</strong></td>
<td>Improve timeliness and efficiency of civil, criminal, juvenile, family, and probate case processing in Arizona courts by: Adopting case processing time standards, Providing case management system enhancements, including reporting capabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probation Automation Development / Enhancements</strong></td>
<td>Enhance the Juvenile On-Line Tracking System (JOLTSaz) in juvenile courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Strategic Projects</td>
<td>Alignment with “Advancing Justice Together: Courts and Communities 2014-2019”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System (APETS) with AJACS. Evaluate and, as appropriate, implement new or expanded evidence-based programs for Arizona’s Adult and Juvenile Probation services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Notification Capability</td>
<td>Create an electronic noticing system to remind parties, probationers, and other court participants of upcoming court dates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a judicial education needs assessment to identify new or enhanced training for judges including, but not limited to effective use of technology on the bench, in chambers, and remotely. Prepare court leadership for next-generation case management systems and technology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the Central Case Index to enable the flow of critical court data. Increase use of social media to improve communications with the public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the use of technology-based access to justice solutions being developed in other courts. Expand electronic access to court documents and data with appropriate protections for security and privacy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve timeliness and efficiency of civil, criminal, juvenile, family, and probate case processing in Arizona courts by - Implementing e-bench tools that allow judges to more efficiently manage and resolve cases, - Providing judicial workload tools to assist presiding judges when making case assignments. Conduct a judicial education needs assessment to identify new or enhanced training for judges including, but not limited to effective use of technology on the bench, in chambers, and remotely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the Central Case Index system to enable the flow of critical court data to and from federal, state, and local justice system entities. Collaborate with other justice system entities to develop and implement data collection and exchange strategies that leverage technology, including: - Expanding e-warrants project to other justice system entities, - Modernizing the state’s warrant repository system, - Making mental health court orders available to appropriate criminal justice and treatment officials, - Making condition of release information available to appropriate criminal justice officials, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS**

**FISCAL YEARS 2019 – 2021**
### INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS
**FISCAL YEARS 2019 – 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Strategic Projects</th>
<th>Alignment with “Advancing Justice Together: Courts and Communities 2014-2019”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving accuracy and completeness of the state’s criminal history repository and National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Video Solutions</strong></td>
<td>Expand the remote video interpreting project. Identify other opportunities for video hearings and other remote electronic court appearances. Enhance the use of web-based video/audio conference capability to train court employees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Fiscal Year 2018 Accomplishments

Below is a summary of the accomplishments of the Arizona Judicial Branch with respect to its information technology efforts during the 2018 fiscal year. Considerable progress was made on statewide strategic projects, despite continued budget and staffing challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC Support and Maintenance</td>
<td>The modification project is enhancing AZTEC, the statewide ACAP software, to provide for enhanced functionality and usability, balanced with end-of-life considerations.</td>
<td>Performed 3 table updates, and 235 violation code changes to AZTEC databases as a result of legislative changes. Continued maintenance activities including 131 setups of local ordinances in court databases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC Court Support</td>
<td>Provide reporting and support to AZTEC courts.</td>
<td>2244 Remedy tickets were resolved and 198 ad hoc reports were provided upon request to assist courts in their daily activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Citation</td>
<td>Opening court cases automatically using ticket data from law enforcement.</td>
<td>Continued support for existing e-Citation implementations. Total e-citation projects in production is 169. Continue to prepare and support courts using AJACS LJ e-Citation through training on processes and reports. At this writing, 63 courts have transitioned from AZTEC to AJACS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process and Code Standardization</td>
<td>Support CMS transition by standardizing court processes and case-related codes then mapping the standard set of event, activity, and other codes.</td>
<td>Continued to establish and maintain standard code sets for AJACS GJ and LJ CMS projects. Standardization workgroups met monthly to add or modify codes for statewide use in both GJ and LJ environments. 29 new codes were approved and added to LJ AJACS, and 11 to GJ AJACS. Updated the GJ AJACS Automatic Event Code table, which allows courts to automatically change the case and/or party status of a case via use of a specific event code. Updated and published the Statewide Standard Violation Code Table, which standardizes codes prosecutors use when charging defendants with violations of statute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines, Fees and Restitution Enforcement (FARE)</td>
<td>The Fines, Fees and Restitution Enforcement (FARE) program and the Debt Set-Off (DSO) program are the current automation portions of the Penalty Enforcement Program (PEP).</td>
<td>FARE is implemented in 175 courts statewide, including all 13 General Jurisdiction AJACS courts and 26 Maricopa County Justice Courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life-to-Date Program Statistics (2003 – 2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of backlog cases submitted to FARE for collections: 3.05 million.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total amount of recovered fines, fees, and victim restitution: $701.06 million.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Ticket Enforcement Assistance Program (TTEAP) registration holds: 1,082,446 with 641,043 releases (59% release rate).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total amount of payments processed via the FARE website: $148.6 million.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscal Year 2018 Highlights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total amount of recovered fines, fees, and victim restitution: $59.5 million dollars (Backlog: $45.2 million/DSO: $14.2 million)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total FARE backlog case submissions: 113,106 cases worth $81.7 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidated Collections Unit fielded 1,851 FARE/DSO second-level Remedy incidents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Services fielded 33,702 public inquiries on the TTEAP program in FY2018. Another 71,396 calls were handled by automated front-end messaging that explained how to handle common end user issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Intercept Program (TIP)</td>
<td>TIP sends courts’ and other DSO participants’ accounts receivable data electronically to the Department of Revenue and the State Lottery via a centralized clearinghouse at the Supreme Court. Any lottery or tax refund money for those who owe court fines is intercepted and paid to the courts.</td>
<td>Calendar Year 2018 Highlights as of July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debt-Set-Off program has collected $14.2 million dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The highest single interception totaled $7,595.00 from the Arizona Lottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Processed 67,613 tax intercepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Processed 78,048 tax intercept payments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Maintenance &amp; Upgrades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACAP</td>
<td>This includes the maintenance and upkeep of the equipment in 147 ACAP courts and 65 JOLTSaz sites across the state as well as a centralized data center with AS/400, RS/6000 and Windows servers supporting statewide AJIN, ACAP, APETS, JOLTS, TIP, and the Supreme Court.</td>
<td>Upgraded the Supreme Court/AOC phone system infrastructure to new hardware and updated firmware. Decommissioned 28 physical server systems as part of the AOC system consolidation and security projects. Increased number of VM environments from 235 to 279, an increase of 44 environments, for OS upgrades and new applications. Upgraded numerous Microsoft 2003 servers to Microsoft 2012 and 75 SQL 2008 databases to Version 2012 to keep various applications within vendor requirements for maintenance and support. Implemented a new HP high capacity tape backup robot and migrated off of the legacy IBM tape unit to improve backup performance and reduce maintenance costs. Upgraded 6 AIX Unix systems from Power5 to Power7 units in support of Appellamation, MQ, Tivioli and DCATS. Upgraded MQ software on 6 systems from Version 7.5 to 9,0 in support of AOC’s internal application messaging platform. Upgraded the firmware and patches on 3 HP 3Par SAN storage units to remain in vendor support and take advantage of newer storage media. Upgraded all 18 VM host servers from VMware Version 5.5 to 6.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJIN Enhancements</td>
<td>Implement router-based software to maintain a database of previously seen traffic, provide compression, and aggregate multiple video streams into a single link at remote sites, thereby greatly accelerating network transport speed.</td>
<td>Installed a second Internet connection for the AJIN network to provide automatic failover and internet access to all cloud-based applications should the primary connection fail. Upgraded Cisco core router at Glendale Muni to keep the system in manufacturer warranty compliance as well as improve performance and reliability. Replaced Cisco core switches (9 of them) within the AOC data closets throughout the State Courts Building to keep the systems in manufacturer warranty compliance as well as improve performance and reliability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Installed network connectivity for new Holbrook Probation location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Split Douglas Justice/Probation into two separate network circuits/connections, thus providing increased network performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Installed wireless network connectivity in Apache Superior, Coconino Superior, Gila Superior and Santa Cruz Superior locations to provide easier network connectivity to mobile computing devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased network performance and throughput at the following sites by increasing existing bandwidth, converting circuits to QMOE, or employing GovNet microlink technology:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Avondale Muni Court;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Casa Grande JC, Annex, and Probation locations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Casa Grande Muni Court;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Surprise Muni Court;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sedona Muni Court;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pinal Justice Youth Center;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Williams Justice and Muni Courts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Peoria Muni Court;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• San Luis Complex;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Welton Justice Court, Juvenile Center, and Adult Probation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• San Luis Muni Court;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Glendale Muni Court;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pinal Superior Court;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Coconino Superior Court;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• AOC host circuit;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pinetop/Lakeside Justice and Muni Court;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sierra Vista Service Center;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Santa Cruz Annex, Detention, and Probation centers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gila Superior Probation, Detention, and Justice Court locations,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cochise Superior, Justice, and Probation locations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Greenlee Superior Court; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mohave County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Installed new core WAAS and router infrastructure to 78 court/probation locations statewide to provide better performance and reliability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Security and Disaster Recovery | This threefold project will:  
Provide for statewide automation and network security,  
Develop disaster recovery strategies and acquire resources to implement them.  
Provide IT building security for the State Courts, JEC, and Tucson FCRB locations. | Completed and passed a DPS 5-year security audit, proving compliance with all DPS network, system, and security requirements.  
Upgraded security vulnerability scanning/auditing tool from Nessus Professional to Tenable Security Center. This upgrade gives greater scanning capabilities and reporting options to provide to AJIN leadership.  
Enhanced and streamlined bi-annual security scanning process as well as enhanced executive and technical reporting format and content.  
Completed two annually required security scans and audits.  
Communicated results to local court leadership as well as the COT Cybersecurity Subcommittee. Results indicated that AJIN “Critical” and “High” vulnerabilities were reduced by 86.0% over last year’s annual audit results.  
Installed new Firepower intrusion detection system for improved network security.  
Continued review of options to reduce overall implementation cost of disaster recovery for statewide systems.  
Implemented Microsoft Multi-Factor-Authentication (MFA) to all ITD Infrastructure user/devices as POC for additional security. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Maintenance</td>
<td>This support activity encompasses the many projects required to support the shared judicial branch infrastructure.</td>
<td>Upgraded Microsoft SCCM application, from Version 1610 to 1706 in support of continued Windows 10 and Office 365 upgrade rollouts as well as improved system patch management. Completed numerous Windows, Office, and third-party security/product updates. Upgraded Data Center SAN storage controllers for performance and maintainability. Worked with the AOC developers and business teams on deployment of eBench and eUniversa across the state. Converted 22 additional LJ courts’ data from the legacy AZTEC CMS application and integrated them into new AJACS CMS, bringing the total converted to date to 59. Tested and applied numerous software application updates including AJACS GJ, LJ, APETS, JOLTSaz, NICS, Defensive Driving, CCI, eBench, and eUniversa. Continued working with the AOC business team on all technical aspects of the deployment of AJACS LJ to more courts. Deployed the automated upgrade of Office 2010 to Office 2016 statewide on all desktop devices. Provided 2nd and 3rd-level technical support for the deployment of Microsoft Office 2016 software upgrades across the state. Successfully completed numerous Windows server OS updates to systems in the AOC Datacenter, including all development, test, and production environments. Converted remaining AZTEC courts from Disconnected Scanning to new Unity Client due to end-of-life support for old Desktop and WOB applications. Assisted various implementation teams with the conversion from AZTEC to LJ AJACS/OnBase integration (4 counties done, 1 in progress), eFiling to GJ courts, and continued rollout of eBench to AJACS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statewide Automation Training</strong></td>
<td>This program includes all activity to provide training in statewide automation software and related business processes. It includes training on site at courts or AOC, at Judicial and ACA conferences, and via WebEx.</td>
<td>The program for funding a field trainer in each county court system received continued funding. Most counties have a field trainer, which improves the volume and frequency of local training on AZTEC and AJACS. Three counties are currently without trainers: Maricopa, Graham, and Greenlee. Field trainers have become more involved in AJACS support and training. Automation Services continues to be fully engaged in AJACS implementation and advanced training. For AJACS, 166 classes were held with 616 participants. AOC continues to build a library of training videos and clips to supplement live training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juvenile Online Tracking System (JOLTS)</strong></td>
<td>Since the AS/400 platform has reached an ‘end of life’ status and is no longer supported by IBM, once a web-based app is built to access juveniles over the age of 23 that were not converted to JOLTSaz, the legacy JOLTS system will be decommissioned.</td>
<td>Following the JOLTSaz statewide rollout, legacy JOLTS data was moved to a SQL server to ensure the data was saved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arizona Youth Assessment System (AZYAS)</strong></td>
<td>The Arizona Youth Assessment System (AZYAS) is a web-based application that provides case management, assessment, and data tracking tools. Needs assessments and case plans can be completed and updated by probation officers and supervisors for all assigned juveniles. The system generates notifications and reports to assist with caseload management and compliance tracking. In addition, AZYAS stores accessible information on juveniles, previously completed assessments along with case plans, treatment providers, and user information. The application is currently used by Maricopa and the Rural Counties.</td>
<td>An upgrade to AZYAS, developed by the University of Cincinnati, was deployed in May 2018. Justice Tools software was loaded on a machine at AOC and made available as a ‘demo’ in March/April to Maricopa and the Rural Counties. Justice Tools is in production in Pima County and is now being considered for deployment statewide. If selected, Justice Tools will eventually replace AZYAS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOLTSaz</strong></td>
<td>JOLTSaz is a fully functional juvenile probation tracking system, including both delinquency and dependency, for Pima and the 13 rural counties. It was written in VB.net, a single, centralized SQL database, hosting a 3-tier open architecture design that best suits the organization’s future needs. It currently contains 511 screens, 525 tables and 34 reports. Centralized support is provided by AOC.</td>
<td>Completed the data conversion from Legacy JOLTS to JOLTSaz and the rollout/training for Pima and the Rural Counties. Since June 2013, 156,164 juveniles, 342,042 complaints, and 202,460 petitions were converted. Also, 505 training classes were conducted in 15 locations for 789 state employees. Completed enhancements to Forms &amp; Letters Module in JOLTSaz and redesigned the Petition, Complaint, and Financial Assessment screens to improve functionality and response time. Completed a POC for the iCIS data feed to JOLTSaz project. An iterative model will be used to break down a total of 36 XML messages into logical and sequential groupings for development, testing and deployment over the life cycle of the project. The goal is ultimately a real time, single statewide repository of juvenile data. Completed the rollout of CASAaz to Pima and the Rural Counties. In addition, started work on a new VOCA (Victims of Crime Act) grant to further enhance the CASAaz web application for coordinators, volunteers, and victim advocates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System (APETS)</td>
<td>APETS is a fully functional, adult probation tracking system statewide. The application is written in PowerBuilder and contains 484 screens, 712 tables, and 89 reports. Centralized support is provided by AOC. APETS was originally developed by Maricopa County and implemented there in 2000. The rollout to the other counties began with Yuma County in 2004. The application was statewide by 2006. In 2011, APETS was upgraded from Informix to a SQL Server database.</td>
<td>Completed the first annual build to rewrite the APETS PowerBuilder application in C#. Completed critical PowerBuilder enhancements in the current APETS application that cannot wait for the C# upgrade. Completed a ‘service’ to provide Public Access and JWI criminal history data for a defendant when a search is conducted using JWI applications statewide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Architecture</td>
<td>This project focuses on developing enterprise wide software, methods, standards, guidelines, and expertise for the development, support and maintenance of technology solutions.</td>
<td>Continued development work on prototype for embedding hyperlinks into electronic court records and created specifications for AOC e-filing vendors that outline requirements for security, indexing, and embedding of the hyperlinks. Completed and successfully implemented new Administrative Case Event System (ACES) to facilitate unification of court case information received from disparate case management systems each designated as the source of truth. ACES provides a communication gateway with an immutable, “eventually consistent” model of data shared among systems structured in a service-oriented architecture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automation Training and Desktop Support</td>
<td>This includes the many activities required to support existing applications and desktops statewide. It includes training, help desk, and field support staff activities and projects.</td>
<td>Successfully upgraded all AJIN devices statewide to Windows 1703 Build as well as Microsoft Office 2016. Installed Adobe Reader DC 2017 on all AJIN devices for improved software security. Upgraded RemedyForce for Summer and Winter 2018 Builds for all 150 licensed users without issue. Recouped another $3000 dollars in labor costs for devices being repaired under the HP System Maintainer program. Converted Wendell from AJIN web only access to a SharePoint access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Public Interactive Service</td>
<td>The Public Access to Court Case Information is an Internet site for the public to look up case information from 153 Arizona courts. It includes most criminal, civil, and traffic cases.</td>
<td>Public access to court case information showed a slight decrease over the previous year in page views but an increase in visitor sessions. In FY18, public access statistics are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Page Views</strong> 56,370,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Visitor Session</strong> 2,470,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average Visitors / Hr</strong> 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Supreme Court’s web site had 8,687,563 page views* generated by 1,659,504 visits during the fiscal year. Statistics for the AJB Web site for the year are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Page Views</strong> 8,687,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Visitor Session</strong> 1,659,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average Visitors / Hr</strong> 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The three most popular areas on the web-site remain Defensive Driving, the Child Support Calculator and Court of Appeals Division 1 pages. Additional functionality was also developed and implemented during the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Page Views are the standard for measuring web activity. One page view will generate approximately 15 to 50 “hits.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellate Court Automation</td>
<td>Appellamation is the state standard appellate case, calendaring, and financial management system, providing electronic filing (case initiating and subsequent filings with fees) for all case types, electronic case record transfer from lower courts, document management integrated with OnBase, document production, automatic case statistics and appellate CourTools. Appellamation was designed to replace three separate and incompatible systems previously used. The Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals Division One use Appellamation.</td>
<td>Provided operational case management, document management, and electronic filing support to the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals Division One. This included the development, testing and deployment of multiple CMS software patches which included bug fixes and minor enhancements. Designed and developed, the next major version of Appellamation (v 6.3) which provides Multi-Session Planner enhancements, At-Issue Manager enhancements, Work Product Manager enhancements, AppellaMail and Dockets on the Web support for DocLink, Judicial dashboards, SharePoint integration, e-Agenda Notices, and many other improvements. User acceptance testing and deployment is anticipated for summer 2018. Provided requirements for the Appellate Case Management System RFP 17-03, produced the RFP document, and subsequently reviewed RFP responses, performed analysis, reference checking, and product evaluation, then made recommendation. Continued participation in the development of international electronic filing standards through OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing Committee. Provided key committee working draft standards review, providing 25 written review feedback documents, multiple examples, and use cases. Each review cycle has resulted in a new revision of the committee working draft. Completed Phase I of a multi-phase electronic filing document purge function freeing up over 225 GB of storage space. This purge function removes electronic document files that are no longer needed in the electronic filing system. The goal is to retain document files for six months before purging. Participated in DocLink and SharePoint integration efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certification &amp; Licensing</strong></td>
<td>CLD Online is an Internet application created for the AOC’s Certification &amp; Licensing Division. It works in conjunction with CLD business applications to process certification renewals and fee payments via the Internet.</td>
<td>Performed annual maintenance to online renewal application for licensed document preparers, fiduciaries, court reporters, and defensive driving schools and instructors. Migrated database and application to new servers to support ITD Infrastructure Operations' end-of-life server project. Enhanced to include document storage functionality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Various AOC Internal Accounting, Finance and Payroll Applications</strong></td>
<td>The AOC maintains budget, accounting, and personnel records for the AOC and the Supreme Court.</td>
<td>Implemented enhancements to AFIS interface to enable invoice processing for new ACH payment requirements in compliance with GAO’s Statewide Warrant Reduction Project. Maintained 150 previously created ad hoc reports to enhance the reporting functionality of the New World financial management system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AOC Project Management Office</strong></td>
<td>The Project Management Office (PMO) provides best practices and oversees project-related processes with a goal of delivering automation improvements within scope, on time, and on budget.</td>
<td>Continued tactical and strategic planning model for project milestone and resource management planning, providing for a regular review of an enterprise-level project impact analysis. Improved project management process, guidelines, and templates as processes matured. Continued project portfolio reporting necessary to obtain an integrated perspective of project management capability. Continued monthly, all-day planning meeting to coordinate project resources. Provided leadership and direction in the area of contract management. Provided project manager role for certain enterprise projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statewide Case Management Systems</strong></td>
<td>Develop and implement new case management system (CMS) to replace AZTEC for limited jurisdiction (LJ) courts. Maintain and enhance existing CMS that supports general jurisdiction (GJ) courts.</td>
<td>Continued writing and running mission-critical test scripts along with test scripts for all new business requirements. Continued statewide training and implementation of LJ AJACS to ACAP/AZTEC courts following detailed data cleanup, data conversion, data conversion testing, and extensive functional testing for each court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- By end of August 2017 Maricopa County was 100% complete.
- By end of February 2018 Yavapai County was 100% complete.
- By end of April 2018 Yuma County was 100% complete.
- By end of June 2018 Coconino County was 50% complete and Mohave County was 22% complete. Remainder of Coconino County will be complete by end of August 2018.
- Total LJ courts converted from AZTEC to AJACS to date is 68 (of 132) which is 51% overall project completion status.

Continued to enhance AJACS through bug fixes, change and enhancement requests, as well as thorough functional testing.

Continued to partner with Tucson City Court to assist with database upgrades, system configuration, table code updates, etc. with their standalone version of AJACS. AOC staff also continued to assist with troubleshooting issues and have provided additional training for Tucson City Court staff.

Began working with LJ ACAP courts in La Paz and Santa Cruz Counties to begin data cleanup and pre-implementation tasks for their AJACS adoption scheduled to begin in October 2018.

General Jurisdiction AJACS continues to be maintained as a production application in all 13 counties outside of Maricopa and Pima. Since March of 2017, eFiling has become an interface to the CMS and as of May 1, 2018, 5 GJ courts are fully functional for eFiling for Civil Cases. The deployment schedule calls for completion of the initial eFiling rollout to be completed by July 2018.

Work continued on the AJACS 3.9 to 6.0 migration for GJ courts forecast to begin in the fall of 2018.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDMS</td>
<td>Electronic Document Management includes the processes and environment where documents are created, stored, managed, located, retrieved, and viewed electronically. Electronic documents and records replace traditional media (paper). Electronic documents are and will be used in the day-to-day business of the court, by court staff, other justice-related agencies and the public.</td>
<td>Supported upgrades of OnBase systems at rural courts to remain in vendor support, receive solutions to previously reported technical issues, and address security concerns. Continued to replicate documents from local systems into statewide repository for disaster recovery and public access. Continued tracking and reporting transfer metrics. Developed Unity integration method to replace disconnected scanning used by AZTEC courts statewide. Developed new WOB.exe for eventual use following replacement of OnBase Desktop Client and implementation of Unity integration. Crafted detailed plan and timeline for next OnBase statewide upgrade, beginning with AOC-hosted systems. Drafted extensive checklist for paperless court operations to make local court leaders and OnBase administrators aware of their responsibilities now that e-filing is rolling out across the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICS Mental Health Repository</td>
<td>Allows courts to comply with the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) reporting requirements by entering qualifying events and orders into AJACS and other case management systems, which will be stored in AOC-housed repository and sent to the NICS database.</td>
<td>Senate Bill 1157, approved by the Governor on 3/14/17 with an effective date of 8/9/2017, amended A.R.S. 13-4503 to require that a Justice of the Peace or Municipal Court Judge that exercises jurisdiction over a competency hearing must meet the NICS reporting requirements under A.R.S. 13-609A and 13-609B. Due to the changes in the legislation, Rule 11 Competency Hearings for Glendale City Court are now submitted electronically to NICS through the AOC’s process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Document Repository (CDR)</td>
<td>An enterprise-centric repository of court case-related documents collected from independent document management systems throughout the state in a federated approach.</td>
<td>Crafted plan for upgrading key production server supporting CDR. Began day-forward transfers of court documents and loaded documents from July 2010 to present for Coconino, the final rural superior court to contribute to CDR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTurboCourt Electronic Filing</td>
<td>A e-filing application through which court users create and submit case filings to a growing set of Arizona courts.</td>
<td>AZTurboCourt had a total of 264,413 e-filed submissions. AZTurboCourt had a total of 5,104 print forms completed. All 15 counties are now live with Family Law print forms. Support Services handled 8,969 calls regarding e-Filing (TurboCourt &amp; eFileAZ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eUniversa Statewide e-Filing</td>
<td>A central online portal through which court users create and submit case filings to a growing set of Arizona courts using a number of qualified vendor service providers.</td>
<td>Continued deployment of civil case e-filing (initial and subsequent submission support) in the Superior Court. At present, Yavapai County, Mohave County, Santa Cruz County, Pinal County, Yuma County, Gila County, and Greenlee County all support case-initiating and subsequent civil case e-filing. Work is underway to enable case-initiating and subsequent civil case e-filing in Graham County, La Paz County, and Coconino by the end of FY18. Enabled e-filing for Judicial Officials (Arbitrators, Mediators, Special Masters, Judges, Judges Pro Tem) in AJACS-GJ courts. Implemented subsequent civil case type support in the Superior Court in Maricopa County. Continued system integration and user acceptance testing with the Superior Court in Pima County. Completed the development of business requirements for AJACS-LJ and Maricopa County Justice Courts to support case-initiating and subsequent small claims case type e-filing. Preparing the software design specifications to support small claims e-filing. Began the development of business requirements for AJACS-LJ and Maricopa County Justice Courts to support case-initiating and subsequent limited civil case type e-filing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Automation</td>
<td>Judge Automation provides a judicial decision support system designed to automate paper processing in a manner that will enable judges to review and create electronic case documents and</td>
<td>Judge Automation has been deployed to all superior court locations using an application called eBench. Work is underway to determine best solution for limited jurisdiction court judges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Access to Case Data and Documents</td>
<td>Public access maximizes efficiencies offered by technology to reduce demands on court resources, permit court staff to concentrate on core functions, and improve customer service system-wide by making access to case information more convenient for attorneys and other individuals and organizations, including government users. The AOC will provide an online public access web portal to Arizona court case documents, information on individual court cases, bulk court data, and customized court data reports on a subscription or per-transaction fee basis.</td>
<td>Identified, coded, and tested business logic for Supreme Court Rule 123 which appropriately limits access to certain document types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Fingerprint Identification</td>
<td>The two-fingerprint identification (2FID) mobile device electronically validates existence of a defendant’s fingerprints in the Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) and whether an AFIS Record Number (ARN) exists. A positive response indicates to the court that the defendant’s fingerprints were taken previously. A negative, “no ARN hit,” response informs the court the defendant must be sent for fingerprinting at a booking facility. Phase 1 standardizes the last page on the sentencing order for the fingerprint enabling all AJACSs courts to submit high quality prints to Arizona Dept. of Corrections following sentencing.</td>
<td>The following counties have opted in for 2FID device implementations managed by the AOC: Apache, Cochise, Coconino, Gila, Graham, Greenlee, La Paz, Mohave, Navaho, Pinal, Santa Cruz, Yavapai, Yuma, and Maricopa. Completed Implementation Phase 1 - Replaced the existing “Ink and Roll” process in AZ superior courts used to identify if a person has 10 prints on file with DPS at the time of sentencing. - All AJACS superior courts and Maricopa Superior court were completed. - Trained 176 court employees. Began Planning for Phase 2 - Verify the person being sentenced is charged correctly and has 10 prints on file for the charges being sentenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>FY 2018 ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Order Repositories (CPOR/LPOR)</td>
<td>Court Protective Order Repository (CPOR) collects protective orders filed from various courts around the state for transmission to LPOR. Law Enforcement Protective Order Repository (LPOR) currently supports four counties (Coconino, Gila, Navajo, and La Paz) apart from the Superior Court in those counties.</td>
<td>Received NICS Act Records Improvement Program (NARIP) grant and conducted a study that reviewed issues with the current CPOR/LPOR system. Planning is underway to develop an end-to-end, electronic process for all protective orders. A fully functioning protective order solution must be ready to go live on January 1, 2020. AOC began conducting a study with stakeholders from various Arizona agencies to address current issues and determine next steps for future project phases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Case Index</td>
<td>The central case index (CCI) will become the State's central repository of case management system data to be used by many business applications, both external and internal to the courts and the justice community. CCI is not a complete copy of each local case management system's (CMS) data structures, but rather a de-normalized structure containing the most important data elements of court case data.</td>
<td>Maricopa Superior Court and MCJC were implemented in CCI production. Work includes feeds that are on the critical path for the eAccess project. Reloading refactored stored procedures for Pima Superior Court got underway. Planning has begun for populating CCI with data from AJACS 6.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Notifications</td>
<td>Reduce failures to appear and delinquent obligations by issuing automated reminders to court users, triggered by events in the case management system.</td>
<td>Completed requirements and design documents for e-notification text messages used by standard AJACS courts. Complete development of Phase I functions and successfully deployed to 53 AJACS courts statewide. Designed, developed, and piloted voice notification requirements and in three AJACS courts: Buckeye Municipal, Apache Junction Precinct 7 Justice, Prescott Justice. Began requirements and design work for the non-ACAP courts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCAL COURT ACCOMPLISHMENTS – CY2016/17

This is a summary of the accomplishments provided in each county-level IT plan that was updated during this planning cycle. In an effort to reduce workload and impact to court staff in the continuing difficult economic climate, rural Superior Court Administrators have been allowed to provide updates every other year. Please refer to the most current individual plans in Appendix D for more detail.

| APACHE COURTS | • Expanded network connections in training room to improve training environment.  
• Enhanced Probation Department access to needed case information in AJACS.  
• Replaced outdated scan station and upgraded operating system.  
• Supported video classroom participation for area high schools.  
• Secured funding to purchase new security camera system in superior court courthouse. |
|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COCONINO COURTS | • Expanded Wi-Fi for the public and employees within Superior Courthouse.  
• Implemented encrypted e-mails to and from mental health institutions.  
• Provided Probation resources with read-only access to needed AJACS records.  
• Piloted statewide eWarrant approach.  
• Began transmitting OnBase documents to Central Document Repository in support of eBench implementation in 7 superior court divisions.  
• Added second local court IT resource |
| GILA COURTS | • Relocated Globe Probation Office to new facility.  
• Updated all courts to nCourt payment processing.  
• Replaced legacy calendar software with AJACS capability and decommissioned outdated servers.  
• Became early adopters of CASAaz in statewide rollout effort.  
• Began rollout of OneDrive, starting with senior management. |
| MARICOPA COURTS | • Continued development of various modules for the ICIS Next Generation case management system, implemented application interface for court reporter notes/documents, automated data removal in accordance with retention policy.  
• Completed numerous infrastructure enhancements, integration projects, and administrative projects for various departments of the superior court. Implemented System Center monitoring and configuration management features. Virtualized database servers addressing many legacy support issues.  
• Created video appearance calendar for in-custody arraignments and piloted new iCIS “ScreenCreate” interactive feature for pending cases at justice courts.  
• Upgraded media carts for the 26 justice courts to keep pace with changing technology.  
• Clerk’s Office accomplished numerous technology upgrades and enhancements including e-filing of referrals and temporary orders from iCIS as well as eFileAZ and central case index integration. Completed deployment of 800+ refreshed workstations in conjunction with Maricopa County IT.  
• All LJ Courts addressed Rule-16-mandated changes to bonds and release orders; began work on new AOC monthly statistical reports; conducted and remediated security scans as outlined in the Judicial Branch Minimum Security Standards. |
Chandler fully automated eCitation and photo enforcement, completed database upgrade for CMS, installed a local firewall to comply with Security Standard 4.14, and implemented nCourt online payments.

Gilbert upgraded FullCourt CMS; implemented paper on demand processing in courtrooms; put local firewall in place to comply with Security Standard 4.14.

Glendale converted to AJACS and modified AZTEC bolt-ons to work with AJACS, completed infrastructure rewiring and upgrades to servers and databases to meet architecture targets, and implemented new defendant check-in system and courtroom calendar displays.

Mesa made progress in restoring eServices to the level prior to CMS conversion; continued FARE-related development and testing; began gathering requirements for enhanced bench automation product.

Phoenix continued JAM-to-Panther code migration multi-phase project, upgraded Q-Matic product and FTR in all courtrooms, and consolidated all tape backup systems into a single library shared by multiple teams.

Scottsdale migrated CMS database from Informix to SQL and revised statewide data feeds; enhanced data and services available online; set up warrant validation query for police dept.

Tempe created new CMS events and processes related to compliance assistance program, implemented Office 365; implemented a process to recall all cases from the existing collection vendor and assign to city’s new collection vendor; put local firewall in place to segregate Court assets from rest of city network.

Completed Agave 2.8.3.2 software releases and Windows 10 testing; upgraded FTR to V6.0 compatible with Windows 10; completed 90 percent of Windows 10 upgrades and refreshed 460 PCs not meeting minimum requirements for Windows 10.

Moved court e-mail front door to Office 365 eliminating outdated spam filter. Began migrating users to the cloud.

Upgraded numerous infrastructure items and perimeter security devices and designed a new Agave authentication architecture to accommodate requirements in Branch security standards.

Clerk implemented public access website, upgraded EDocs for Office 2016 support, virtualized additional outdated servers, and migrated all equipment to new clerk-specific domain behind firewall.

Juvenile implemented GPS-based tracking, video court for Ajo, and a data visualization tool.

Tucson participated in extended hours court with PCCJC, implemented electronic daily calendar display, and continued to improve FARE reporting and collection practices.

PCJCC continued to increase services available via court website and began supplying law enforcement with electronic warrant copies; developed integrated application for Initial Appearance Court.

ACAP LJ courts all implemented AJACS and enhanced local processes supported by AJACS, made web page enhancements, and implemented various other local initiatives.

Expanded into west wing of Superior Court Courthouse; implemented Wi-Fi, case docket displays, and audio/visual upgrades; created express check-in for jurors using kiosks.

Adopted JOLTSaz, 2FID, eBench, eFiling, and LJ AJACS statewide applications.

Clerk opened satellite office in City of Maricopa and remodeled existing Apache Junction satellite office.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANTA CRUZ COURTS</th>
<th>YAVAPAI COURTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Upgraded phone system and routed inquiries to county’s central customer service center.  
• Revised keywords and document types on more than 2 million electronic documents to facilitate synchronization with the central document repository at AOC.  
• Upgraded OnBase, Jury+, Q-matic, and local Windows version, continued ongoing projects to address architecture changes as targets move forward over time. | • Revised rules for viewing documents in OnBase to improve performance.  
• Migrated from JOLTS to JOLTSaz.  
• Upgraded and improved courtroom audio/visual systems at superior court.  
• Improved sound quality for public in various courtrooms.  
• Obtained GovNet network connection to address AJIN slowness. |
| • Upgraded audio/video capabilities in numerous courtrooms; enabled remote IA and arraignments for some LJ courts.  
• Adopted mandatory civil case e-filing at superior court. Continued website updates and addition of forms for use by public.  
• Improved both infrastructure security and physical security for numerous sites across the county.  
• Completed OnBase upgrades and numerous other technology upgrades/enhancements for greater functionality and local supportability, including virtual servers, local cloud, and backup solution.  
• Juvenile Probation converted to JOLTSaz; all AZTEC courts converted to AJACS and implemented online payments for the public.  
• Camp Verde Municipal Court relocated to new building in April 2017, enabling audio/video improvements. |
VII. Current Environment Analysis

HARDWARE ENVIRONMENT

The Arizona Judicial Branch continues to have a diverse mix of hardware, reflecting the various projects and programs that have evolved over the years, as well as the diverse funding model that supports the courts. This diversity stems from new applications, either acquired and/or developed, in support of an increasing need to track, manage, and report on judicial information. As we continue to evolve, the hardware implemented is of the newest architectures and technologies, designed to support the complexity of these applications and the large geographical area served by the Judicial Branch. At the local level, statewide ideals are subjected to the realities of local funding bodies’ priorities, availability of grant funds, and differing funding cycles in play.

FY18 showed a continued reduction in the overall number of Windows legacy systems hosted in the Administrative Office of the Courts’ (AOC’s) Data Center. Windows NT systems have been reduced to one remaining support system in operation. The Windows 2000 environments have been eliminated and Windows 2003 systems dropped by 62 percent. Windows NT and 2003 environments are planned for elimination in FY19 or with the completion of the AZTEC-to-AJACS migration. Work is already underway to upgrade the Windows 2008 systems to Windows 2016 ahead of the 2020 end-of-life date for Windows 2008. Continued advancements are being made in the data center to reduce the number of physical computing systems and expand our virtual environments. The physical system footprint was reduced by 28 servers while our virtual system environments grew by 44. This continues to reduce the ongoing expense of system maintenance and promote removal of EOL servers, while providing improved uptime and failover capabilities. As part of the ongoing SAN improvements, all three HP 3Par SANs were upgraded to the latest firmware and patches. A new SAN controller was installed on the environment in the AOC Data Center.

See Appendix A for current hardware and platform inventory numbers.

Several server environments are hosted at the AOC’s Data Center:

- IBM AS/400s for legacy JOLTS and general administrative operations of the Administrative Office of the Courts;
- IBM AIX systems for operating the remaining LJ ACAP courts using AZTEC, the appellate courts, Data Warehouse, Datamart, IBM MQ Messaging infrastructure, and Tivoli backup technology; and
- Windows servers for JWI, NewWorld, AJACS GJ, AJACS LJ, Adult Probation, AZYAS, OnBase EDMSs, Internet, Intranet, DocLink, eCitation, eNotification, Team Foundation Server and Microsoft Project, Jury Plus, ROAM, Defensive Driving, AZTurboCourt, JOLTSaz, Central Document Repository (CDR), CCI, SWID (Juvenile Statewide ID), NICS, eFiling, eBench, eAccess, Tax Intercept Program, desktop deployment, SQL Server Reporting Services (SSRS), statewide remote on-line training, as well as file and print sharing. New applications due to be released into the Windows environment in FY19 include, at a minimum, the replacement for the old data warehouse and the first phase of the CPOR replacement.

The desktop environment includes a variety of PCs. AOC/ITD, under COT’s direction, has undertaken a remote desktop management and software subscription approach designed to enable current client hardware to last 8+ years and ensure the technology needed to support the evolution of statewide applications and projects remains in place. The courts are currently in Year 4 of that lifecycle.

The following are the most recent PC models deployed as courts progress through the technology lifecycle.
Desktop:

HP EliteDesk 800 G2 Small Form Factor – L1G76AV
Intel Core i5-6500 Processor (3.20 GHz, 6MB Cache), Intel HD Graphics 4600, 8GB DDR4-2133 DIMM (2x4GB) RAM, 500GB 7200 RPM 3.5 Hard Drive, Intel® I219LM Gigabit Network Connection, Intel Core i5 vPro.

Laptop:

HP EliteBook 850 G3 Notebook PC
Intel i5-6300U/UMA Graphics – L3D24AV, i5-6300U (2.4 GHz w/ Turbo, 3MB Cache) Processor, and Intel HD Graphics 520, Intel Core i5 vPro, Integrated camera, Integrated HD.

Printer:

E6B9A#ABA HP LaserJet - HP Laser Jet M605n/M608n.

Note that hardware items listed in Appendix A are generally housed and supported centrally as a part of statewide or state-level projects. Individual courts often have additional hardware and/or software beyond these items. Equipment acquired and supported locally, as well as both ACAP- and JOLTSaz-supported desktop devices, are listed in the individual courts’ IT Strategic Plans which are attached. Please refer to individual county court plans for additional specifics at the local level.

SOFTWARE ENVIRONMENT

There remains a persistent diversity of software throughout the courts. As the Judiciary moves to centralized support and standardization with a centralized Customer Support Center, the set of products used becomes increasingly standardized. However, industry trends being as fast-paced as they are, and unlikely to slow down, there will always be a three-tiered software offering.

- On the first tier are the old or legacy applications.
- On the second tier are the standard applications which are stable and for which training and some Support Center assistance is available. Office 365 and Adobe Acrobat Pro are examples of that type of application.
- In the third tier are the pilot users of what will likely be the next version, release or product. The new statewide LJ CMS system, JOLTSaz, eBench, and eUniversa are examples of third-tier applications.

The list of software products shown in Appendix B is divided into two categories.

The first category includes the products in use statewide in courts for which the Support Center provides assistance. There are many other products in use in the Superior, Justice, and Municipal courts statewide, most often supported by the IT staff of the local court, city, or county government. At the state level, however, these are not supported and not included in the list.

The second category includes those products in use at the Supreme Court and the Administrative Office of the Courts.
ARIZONA JUDICIAL BRANCH
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

FOR FISCAL YEARS 2019-2021
VIII. Information Technology Strategic Initiatives

ALIGNMENT

The Information Technology Strategic Initiatives are aligned with initiatives in *Advancing Justice Together: Courts & Communities 2014-2019*. This section provides information on each Information Technology Strategic Initiative and its alignment with business needs of the Judiciary.

THE CURRENT IT STRATEGIC INITIATIVES ARE:

1. Promote a Systemic Thinking Approach to Problem Solving with Technology
2. Provide Infrastructure that Facilitates Communication and Integration
3. Enhance Information Security and Disaster Recovery to Protect Statewide Court Technology-Related Assets and the Reputation of the Judiciary
4. Standardize Processes and Solutions to Improve Efficiency and Effectiveness
5. Complete and Enhance Second-Generation Statewide Automation Projects
6. Improve Data Exchange, Communications, and Public Access
7. Digitize the Court Environment

Through first-generation automation efforts, the Arizona Judicial Branch has become dependent upon technology to facilitate its record keeping and communications activities. Information technology initiatives enable the Judiciary to better use dependable technologies and related processes to enhance and support their business needs.

An initiative to "Promote a Systemic Thinking Approach to Technological Solutions" was first introduced in the FY 2002-2004 plan and has only grown more important over time. Many initiatives continue to focus on long-term changes of business practices to improve public safety and service. The approach has always been supported, but as increasingly interdependent projects are undertaken, it seems prudent to highlight this very important perspective. Its intent is to encourage both the business leaders and technologists to more thoroughly examine the impacts of their automation undertakings and to consider business process reengineering a key element in the process. When undertaking a project, technologists and their business leaders need to balance the immediate need with the long-term impacts, recognizing the increasing interconnectedness of courts and justice partners.

The Judiciary depends on electronic communications via email, instant messaging, the Internet, and the Intranet (which resides on the Arizona Judicial Information Network) to communicate with each other, the public, and with other justice agencies. Therefore, enhancing and securing the infrastructure is critical to implementation of judicial strategic business projects. Information technology strategic goals encompass an approach; building a foundation through infrastructure, security, and statewide applications; integrating with justice partners, and constructing an information supply chain that ends with appropriate public access during the retention period.

Establishing basic case and cash management systems, having common data definitions, standard codes, and consistent data recording practices in courts across the state supports the need of the Judiciary to gather, track, and analyze information.
The information technology project to create a central data repository to provide for data analysis, for instance, is predicated on all courts’ case and cash management data being in electronic form.

A more accessible court system is a focus of the Judiciary’s strategic initiatives. Technology initiatives and their related projects support that with the introduction of electronic filing and electronic forms via the Internet. A focus on security, business continuity, and disaster recovery necessarily accompanies the courts’ transition to a digital environment as well. Population of a central repository to store copies of court documents geographically separate from the courts themselves and provide appropriate access is also foundational to the various “e” projects being undertaken.

An integrated justice system is also a priority. Given that there is a single court organization in the state versus multiple other agencies involved in law enforcement, the Branch is in a unique position to bring together the other functions to improve the manner in which justice is administered in the State of Arizona. Technology projects to participate in data exchanges and sharing of information with local and state agencies support this. And, of course, having a reliable and secure network is critical to such electronic sharing.

For ease of reference, the IT strategic initiatives aligned to meet the Judiciary’s business needs have been numbered as follows:

1. systemic thinking/approach
2. provide a robust infrastructure
3. enhance security and disaster recovery
4. standardize processes and solutions
5. complete 2nd generation automation
6. improve data exchange and communications
7. digitize the court environment
8. provide administrative support

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC INITIATIVES SUMMARY

The following sections detail each of the eight information technology strategic initiatives.

The Background section includes a description of the initiative, its background, and the elements of the technology environment included in the initiative.

The Strategic Alignment section aligns the initiatives with the Commission on Technology’s strategic automation goals.

In the Business Value section, the benefits that will accrue to the Judiciary and to the general public are identified. They include such things as improved quality of case and cash management, enhancing access to the courts, and reducing or avoiding costs.

In the Dependencies section, other activities, projects, and groups upon which achieving this initiative depend are listed. This section will highlight the relationship of the strategic projects to one another.

Finally, in the Impacts section, each strategic project associated with the initiative is identified.
BACKGROUND

The Judicial Branch is directing its efforts to “front-office” solutions, offering improved public access, internal and external integration, and better customer service. As we address such systems as jury management, online courtrooms, e-filing, and justice integration, we must take a systemic approach. We are in danger of either not meeting the demand or building unique solutions for every problem or commitment, increasing both cost and complexity. We can respond with a piecemeal, reactive approach or we can:

- Understand and Automate the Supply Chain
- Understand and Automate Judicial Business Process

The supply chain is made up of all our business partners, including law enforcement and prosecuting attorneys. If the judiciary doesn’t respond in an organized fashion, it could use ineffective or incompatible tools and approaches to address interdependence, integration, and other process challenges. For instance, supporting multiple processes, protocols, and systems in our integration with other agencies, especially criminal justice agencies, will increase both complexity and cost. The solution is to:

- Acknowledge process interdependence as the guiding principle for judicial planning.
- Study, document, and then automate the judicial system supply chain in a uniform manner.
- Build an infrastructure for integration of information among courts and between courts and other agencies.
- Identify a “best practices” approach to judicial business processes, then document and automate them.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 1: SYSTEMIC THINKING/APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALIGNMENT WITH COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY STATEWIDE AUTOMATION GOALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUSINESS VALUE

- Improved responsiveness and productivity of court staff.
- Reduced risks in and complexity of systems development by reducing the number of process, systems, and protocols/standards requiring support.
- Improved overall quality of processes by using a “best practices” approach.
- Improved rural court productivity by providing them with the same level of processes supported by technology afforded to large, metropolitan courts.
- Reduced costs of resources by centralizing and eliminating, where feasible, duplicate procedures, forms, processes, and structures.
- Reduced training and support resources by standardizing the processes and procedures as well as the applications software, systems software, and hardware deployed to support them.

DEPENDENCIES

All strategic projects are dependent on this initiative. The systemic thinking approach should and will be applied to projects. An analysis and documentation of the supply chain, as well as the underlying business process, will assure that a technology implementation is supporting a “best practices” solution.

IMPACTS

The impact is widespread. Each IT project should implement a solution that is not skeuomorphic or just “paving a cow path.” As interdependency increases, projects must also consider impacts on other systems and on business processes. This includes secondary impacts outside the immediate sphere of the project, potentially including other agencies. The judiciary must now examine the entire context, since technology has changed the environment and enabled so many interdependencies. Solutions must be designed with the understanding that there may be entirely new and better ways of doing business using the new tools.

This initiative has an impact on all IT projects.
BACKGROUND

The Judiciary has been deploying and supporting automation statewide since 1990. A sophisticated and extensive infrastructure is required to support this effort. Most important to communication and coordination is a network connecting courts to one another and to the Supreme Court. There are two divisions of the Court of Appeals, 15 Superior Court locations, 81 Justice of the Peace Courts, and 84 Municipal Courts. There are over 375 judges and more than 9,300 employees of the Judiciary statewide.

The Arizona Judicial Information Network (AJIN) is a dedicated DS-1 MPLS and Ethernet network extending to all courts as well as standalone probation and detention sites statewide. As the demand increases for functionality such as electronic document management systems, interactive Web-based training, videoconferencing, disaster recovery hot sites, and information sharing among courts and agencies, the network must correspondingly increase throughput and flexibility. The Judiciary has responsibility for the expansion, enhancement, and maintenance of the network to meet bandwidth requirements, and for working with communications providers to assure uninterrupted system availability.

A centralized customer service center staffed by specialists in desktop software, court applications software, and desktop hardware fields all help calls from sites. It uses problem and change tracking software as well as call tracking software. The scope of operations has been expanded over time from support of the AZTEC statewide case management and financials application only to include all statewide automation products. This effort is critical to maintaining on-going operations in each Arizona court and probation department site.

First-level support assists court personnel statewide in resolving problems. Second-level technical support personnel install and upgrade systems and respond to critical systems problems. They also proactively maintain equipment for almost 3800 users statewide. While it is most desirable to have onsite or regional technical personnel to provide the most immediate and timely support, deployment of dedicated AOC field support personnel remains cost prohibitive. Deployment of a distributed systems management system was undertaken in FY 2004 to reduce field support travel requirements. The Microsoft System Center software used today not only enables a technician located in Phoenix to remotely assist users throughout the state, but also deploys software upgrades and security updates on PCs and laptops to ensure they remain within support and security patch requirements.

In FY 2001, the centralized support center and second-level support functions were combined to form ITD Central Support Services. Second-level support personnel were cross-trained in the statewide applications in order to address more than one application during a site visit. This move improved assistance response time, reduced field support costs, and brought about a more systemic perspective among support personnel.

To support training needs statewide, a local automation trainer/business analyst continues to be funded. State funding matches local contributions to create this position which provides training on centralized automation systems and “best practice” court processes. The position addresses training of new employees, introduction of new processes, new court software release training support, and generally works with centralized state trainers to support uniformity and quality in court processing statewide. This program has been very successful in past years and will receive continued funding through
FY 2019 as the field trainer position is also key to rolling out the limited jurisdiction case management system in a timely fashion across the entire state.

Historically, not all rural counties have been able to take advantage of the trainer positions, due to local funding constraints. Several years ago, AOC Court Services Division obtained permission from COT to reallocate some funding to address the needs of counties that have never been able to afford the field trainer for which state matching funds had been reserved. This resulted in increased coverage by field trainers to underserved counties.

**STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 2: INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALIGNMENT WITH COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY STATEWIDE AUTOMATION GOALS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.  
- Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions.  
- Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.

**BUSINESS VALUE**

This strategic initiative will create, extend, and support an infrastructure that provides business value to statewide activities, involving the network, centralized help desk support, field support, equipment, and distributed system management. The benefits or business values for each area will allow:

**NETWORK**

- Improved rural court productivity by providing the same level of technology afforded the large metropolitan courts. Improved customer service by providing higher quality of data and case management and greater public access to information.
- Improved, more secure access to the Internet for rural courts with improved throughput.
- Improved centralized access to information, such as criminal history, orders of protection, domestic violence, etc., for law enforcement.
- Improved electronic integration with the legal community and other justice-related departments and agencies.
- Improved responsiveness and productivity of court staff.
- Reduced risks in and complexity of systems development by reducing the number of systems and protocols/standards needing support.
- Reduced reliance on local vendors.
- Improved openness and interoperability of judicial systems with outside agencies.

**CENTRALIZED HELP DESK**

- Improved overall quality of systems by devoting limited resources to fewer of them.
• Improved rural court productivity by providing them with the same level of technology afforded the large metropolitan courts.
• Reduced costs of resources by centralizing and eliminating, where feasible, duplicate support structures.
• Reduced total training and support resources required by standardizing the applications software, systems software, and hardware deployed.

**FIELD SUPPORT**

• Improved responsiveness and productivity of court staff.
• Improved rural court productivity by providing the same level of technology as in the large metropolitan courts.
• Reduced training and support resources required by standardizing the applications software, systems software, and hardware deployed.
• Increased efficiency, accuracy, and effectiveness of support by developing and documenting processes and procedures.
• Reduced costs of resources by centralizing and eliminating duplicate support structures.
• Improved breadth of knowledge and quality of support staff.

**IT EQUIPMENT UPGRADES**

• Improved rural court productivity by providing the same level of technology afforded to large metropolitan courts.
• Reduced risks in and complexity of systems development by reducing the diversity of systems and protocols/standards requiring support.
• Reduced cost of maintenance by routine enhancements, upgrades, and replacements as well as preventative maintenance.
• Improved power consumption/energy efficiency and reduced carbon footprint.

**DISTRIBUTED SYSTEM MANAGEMENT**

• Increased effectiveness of support by automating tracking, distribution, and other routine tasks.
• Increased system availability.
• Improved responsiveness and quality of support staff customer service.
• Reduced travel-related costs for support.

**DEPENDENCIES**

• Continued availability and enhancement of high-speed communications statewide (as courts continue to consume more bandwidth).
• Continued funding availability for field training positions.
• Effective use of remote PC management software in the Windows 10/Office 365 “perpetual update” environment and with any new applications.
• Continued refresh of PC hardware, operating systems, and software in the field to ensure items remain in support by the vendors.
IMPACTS

The infrastructure, along with the applications deployed on state-supported hardware and software throughout Arizona, provides the processing and communications foundation on which the remaining initiatives are built. Such initiatives and projects as justice agency integration, public access, electronic filing, and time standards reporting rely on a robust and well-supported infrastructure.

Nearly all the IT projects are impacted by and aligned with this initiative.
BACKGROUND

The digital world is becoming ever more perilous as computer systems become increasingly interconnected. With the creation of AJIN, the deployment of JOLTS, the centralized Juvenile On-Line Tracking System, and the development of the AZTEC case management system using client-server architecture, the Judicial Branch accepted the major responsibility of safeguarding the data and infrastructure on which courts statewide rely. An information security specialist developed the specific strategies, standards, and policies to achieve this goal and periodic audits ensure their continued effectiveness.

Taking a purely central approach to addressing data security has become insufficient over time as a decentralized environment is constructed. For example, electronic document management and criminal justice data integration projects present increased requirements for data security at the local level as statewide processes grow dependent on feeds from courts. Unfortunately, local courts typically have neither the money nor the equipment to ensure continuation of their business in a disaster. What used to be their isolated risk has graduated to a system-wide risk, as courts become more process dependent on electronic documents and more data gets captured at the source. The Administrative Office of the Courts is working with the Department of Public Safety to address security issues related to criminal justice data. Several committees, most recently the Court’s Electronic Record Retention and Destruction Advisory Committee, have been addressing a variety of electronic recordkeeping issues. The Clerks of Court, as the constitutionally designated keepers of the record, are also involved in various workgroups to develop appropriate standards and consistent processes to provide for secure and reliable electronic data and documents.

COT continues to recognize an increasingly long list of vulnerabilities for courts. Two standing subcommittees of the Commission, CACC and TAC, have been charged with crafting best practices, related procedures, and training sessions to improve the survivability of data at the local courthouse. A business continuity matrix was approved for distribution with the FY 2008 IT planning materials and subsequently became the tool for recording efforts by the general jurisdiction case management system team to quantify local risks and dependencies on statewide systems as part of their pre-implementation efforts. Results of the data gathering effort represented by the matrix are quantifying the business risks courts face and providing perspective on the costs to address those risks. An assessment and planning guide of some sort is also envisioned. In addition, CACC and TAC were directed to examine a variety of options and related costs for protecting data in a distributed environment, and then return to COT with their joint recommendations for financially feasible solutions.

Malicious web content, viruses, and phishing have given way to much more sophisticated attacks that bypass traditional perimeter defenses. Botnet theft of credentials, SQL injection attacks, “ransomware,” and cross-site scripting are only a few recent threats. Various high priority projects and tasks must be accomplished over the coming years to assure the courts’ network and assets remain protected. An example is applying port security on routers to enable more rapid discovery of unauthorized devices and containment of malicious content entering the network from remote points. As more employees’ personal devices begin to make their way onto AJIN with the adoption of BYOD policies, the network requires even more vigilant protection from potential back doors. In 2015, an annual cybersecurity training requirement was added for every judicial employee in the state. Various video and live training sessions have since been developed by ITD to assist employees in meeting the ongoing requirement. In 2016, the Arizona Judicial Council approved minimum security standards for all courts and COT inaugurated a security subcommittee, chaired by the vice chief justice, to oversee the comprehensive,
standards-based, statewide security approach and to evaluate implementation gaps returned by individual courts as well as periodic network vulnerability scan results.

Section O of A.R.S. § 18-552, “Notification of Security System Breaches,” revised in 2018, mandates that courts create and maintain an information security policy that includes notification procedures for a breach of the security system of the court. “Breach” means an unauthorized acquisition of and access to unencrypted or unredacted computerized data that materially compromises the security or confidentiality of personal information likely to cause substantial economic loss to an individual. The scope of personal identification was overhauled to include nine specific items:

1. An individual's social security number.
2. The number on an individual's driver license or nonoperating identification license.
3. A private key that is unique to an individual and that is used to authenticate or sign an electronic record.
4. An individual's financial account number or credit or debit card number in combination with any required security code, access code or password that would allow access to the individual's financial account.
5. An individual's health insurance identification number.
6. Information about an individual's medical or mental health treatment or diagnosis by a health care professional.
7. An individual's passport number.
8. An individual's taxpayer identification number or an identity protection personal identification number issued by the United States Internal Revenue Service.
9. Unique biometric data generated from a measurement or analysis of human body characteristics to authenticate an individual when the individual accesses an online account.

Administrative Order (AO) 2008-68 issued to instruct courts on the minimum content of a local policy that complies with the original legislation is now being amended to include the additional provisions of the revised statute. Mandatory security awareness training has included aspects of AO 2008-68 and informed employees that Microsoft’s OneDrive for Business supplied to ACAP courts encrypts all stored data, exempting it from the breach notification requirement should OneDrive be hacked.

**STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 3: ENHANCE SECURITY AND DISASTER RECOVERY ALIGNMENT WITH COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY STATEWIDE AUTOMATION GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUSINESS VALUE**

Better protect courts’ technology-related assets to reduce the risk of losing court assets or breaching data privacy requirements. Minimize disruption of business or loss of electronic records in the event of a local court disaster. Protect the reputation of the judiciary in the eyes of the public as a trustworthy branch of government.
DEPENDENCIES

SECURITY

- Continued security/disaster recovery of centralized systems and data.
- Cooperative solutions with local governments when developing standards for local data and business continuity actions.
- Layers of security on e-filing and eAccess systems to appropriately protect information and the court record.

PRIVACY

- Rule 123 and legislation-compliant solutions for use with EDMS, CMS, and public access projects.
- Trustworthy redaction techniques for electronic information.

IMPACTS

If not successful, disruption of court business operations will occur, as well as loss of valuable court data and documents. Personal and confidential data, protected by Rule 123, might be available for public view as a result of missing or insufficient controls.

A data breach would prompt initiation of a costly investigation and potentially a trust-eroding public notification process if the data had not been encrypted.

Projects affected include:

- Business Continuity
- LJ CMS (AJACS)
- LJ Electronic Document Management
- Public Access to Case Information and Documents
- Statewide eWarrants
- Statewide Protective Orders
BACKGROUND

As courts enter the realm of e-government and e-records, the importance of having enterprise architecture (EA) and related technology standards cannot be emphasized enough. Around 80 percent of new technology companies go out of business within 5 years of their formation. IT trade publications continue to hype expensive new approaches to age-old business problems every day. The pace of change increases at an exponential rate. New technologies are always accompanied by risks. Courts that make the wrong decisions about technology often find themselves relying on unsupported applications for their day-to-day work, sometimes for many years, an uncomfortable and expensive place to be.

A need exists for a set of cohesive standards to build to that promotes both reuse and sharing of automation systems across many jurisdictions. EA functions as a type of building code across the entire organization, describing a direction for current and future technology activities, supported by underlying product and integration standards that mitigate risk for courts. It acknowledges the interdependence of courts within the supply chain of data as well as the distributed nature of the court system and helps them maximize local investments by selecting products that interoperate, promoting data sharing and citizen access through e-government. EA focuses on the holistic impact to the organization.

EA effectively supports and enhances the business of government and improves the ability to deliver responsive, cost-effective government functions and services. Effective utilization of technology to achieve business functions and services, increasing citizen access to those services, sharing information and resources at all levels of government, and maximizing investment in IT resources are major motivating factors for the development and implementation of EA. Using technologies and products adhering to the “building code” enhances government services as a whole, promotes e-government solutions, improves productivity and performance, and optimizes economies of scale through interoperability, portability, scalability, and the sharing of resources. Standard solutions also eliminate the need to make redundant contracts and purchases. They reduce implementation and support costs by limiting the range of solutions to a manageable few.

All technologies traverse a practical and functional life cycle from emerging to mainstream then, over time, to unsupported and eventually to obsolete. To provide direction regarding the life cycle categories for common court technologies, the Technical Advisory Council maintains a detailed table of EA standards for the branch. The Judicial Project Investment Justification (JPIJ) requires an explanation of the adherence of any new project to the standards. The annual IT plan project detail input sheet requires the same. The table includes a designation of the lifecycle category associated with listed products and technologies: Watchlist, Mainstream, Containment, or Retirement.

COT has designated that all items labeled “retirement” have a replacement strategy identified in the annual IT plan for the courts where they are installed. For reference, the approved table resides at [http://www.azcourts.gov/cot/Enterprise-Architecture-Standards](http://www.azcourts.gov/cot/Enterprise-Architecture-Standards). Any court can request that TAC consider a new standard for addition to the table at any time. There is also an exception process a court may use to request a business-related, one-time waiver to a particular standard.

In addition to general standards contained in the EA standards table, like GJXDM, more specific, pragmatic direction is needed in relation to various projects. A subset of a standard is sometimes necessary to provide direction to court developers. An example is specific XML tags used to communicate specific types of information or transactions, for electronic citations.
In those instances, COT has directed TAC to establish and maintain detailed specifications for various functions or levels of court within the framework of the approved standards. Issues related to specifications may be brought to COT for resolution, if necessary.

Specifications developed so far relate to reporting defensive driving school information, e-filing civil cases, court-to-court record on appeal, and e-citation. Originally based on the Maricopa multi-vendor model, the civil case e-filing specification defines a common tagging scheme that complies with ECF 4.X, an industry standard for e-filing. The record on appeal specification defines tags necessary to electronically transfer a record on appeal, including the index of record, from a trial court to an appellate court, and from one appellate court to the next appellate court. Criminal standards are also being set in conjunction with ACJC and criminal justice partners.

**STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT**

| STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 4:                      |                      |
| STANDARDIZE PROCESS AND SOLUTIONS          | ALIGNMENT WITH COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY STATEWIDE AUTOMATION GOALS |
| • Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure. | X |
| • Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions. | X |
| • Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads. | X |

**BUSINESS VALUE**

**ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE**

- Reduced risks in and complexity of systems development by reducing the number of systems and protocols/standards requiring support.
- Reduced training and support resources required by standardizing the applications software, systems software, and hardware deployed.
- Improved rural court productivity by providing them with the same level of technology afforded the large metropolitan courts.
- Improved responsiveness and productivity of court staff.

**STANDARDS**

- Mitigated project risks, increased project success, and increased interoperability and sharing of information and resources.
- Improved responsiveness and productivity of court staff.
- Improved rural court productivity by providing them with the same level of technology afforded the large metropolitan courts.
- Improved quality of support staff customer service.
**DETAILED SPECIFICATIONS**

- Improved specific direction on application of standards to developers.
- Enablement of interoperability of component-based systems, whether developed in courts or by vendors.

**DEPENDENCIES**

- Continued definition, maintenance, and communication of EA standards as technology products and solutions traverse their lifecycle.
- Most priority projects are either dependent upon or will significantly benefit from the application of standards and related, detailed specifications.
- Every exception approved puts a chink in the armor of a cohesive, statewide, integrated system.

**IMPACTS**

Every project needs to be closely aligned to this strategic initiative. Courts having items listed in the “Retirement” column of the EA Standards Table must identify a replacement strategy in their next IT plan submittal or risk withholding of approval for the plan. Several counties have had approval withheld in recent COT review cycles, effectively increasing the priority of keeping local technology current and vendor supported.
BACKGROUND

The courts embarked on the first wave of statewide automation around 1990 with a goal of implementing a standard case and financial management system to replace manual processes. A juvenile probation system was expanded from Maricopa County to statewide use by the mid-1990s. The AZTEC case management system was deployed to 147 courts by the end of the decade. The hallmark of first-wave automation systems was their standalone approach, targeting specific high-volume areas and incidentally replicating functions of other automation products, e.g., JOLTS and AZTEC both did calendaring, case management, and financials, only for two different populations. They were constructed for a specific level of court absent any overarching direction from branch technology or integration standards and so took on a closed, proprietary flavor, necessitating a back-end data warehouse to accomplish any integration. Sadly, these systems typically only increased the workload of the court, in the end, as personnel entered data into multiple systems in addition to wielding the paper. The systems did not align well with court business practices, being encyclopedic rather than workflow process based.

The second wave of automation is component based and focused on re-use of building blocks that can be modified and flexed across various systems. Doing so requires clear standards in both technology and business processes as well as intensive coordination among system developers and business testers/users. The systems are designed from the standpoint of innovation more than generation; most data courts work with comes from somewhere else. The court acts as a hub of information more than an originator. Second-generation systems pick up information from law enforcement and attorneys’ systems, reducing workload by moving the responsibility for input to the source to get the clerk out of the data entry business. New systems contain workflow right out of the box, providing an inherent standard business process, removing the need for understanding the entire process before being able to perform any part of it. They also are exception based, triggering alerts whenever items fall outside specified parameters.

The Judiciary has several second-generation statewide automation projects underway and completing them remains a top priority. They provide for case and cash management for the various levels and/or departments within the Judiciary, using shared core services that leverage development efforts following standards.

Meanwhile, support and enhancement of existing statewide applications remain a priority, though balanced against the remaining life of the application being enhanced. The Arizona Court Automation Project (ACAP) continues to provide automation to justice and municipal courts. During FY 2000, the Windows version of the AZTEC case management software was implemented in most rural and suburban courts. During FY 2002, a replacement of equipment and a software upgrade was begun for systems deployed in 2000. The next phase significantly enhanced the application in the financial arena and enabled its use in the large metropolitan courts by increasing its case processing capacity. In FY 2006, AZTEC began to be opened to allow e-citation and red light case initiation using an XML data stream, paving the way for electronic case filing while awaiting implementation of a next-generation case management system. Late in FY 2007, COT decided, and AJC concurred, to pursue implementation of a vendor CMS for general jurisdiction courts. Following successful implementation of that CMS in 13 superior courts, development work was completed to apply this same CMS to serve limited jurisdiction courts using AZTEC. Dialogue continues with the largest non-AZTEC courts to determine their current resource needs and possible timelines for adoption. Implementation of the finished system will standardize and significantly
improve the efficiency of all limited jurisdiction courts in the state and enable long-awaited enhancements to customer-facing services provided by courts.

The Criminal Justice Data Integration Project will also significantly reduce levels of court effort by eventually eliminating the redundant data entry now being performed. By 2004, the Judiciary had 64 Arizona general and limited jurisdiction courts operating on the ACAP software solution to pass criminal history data to DPS. Data integration is being further strengthened as courts adopt the new limited jurisdiction case management system statewide as well as with the rollout of the Arizona Disposition Reporting System and NICS reporting facility in conjunction with ACJC and DPS. The ADRS project proved the concept of using an enterprise service bus approach for statewide integration by connecting disparate information systems among justice partners. It provided the technological foundation for several projects that followed.

Appellamation is an appellate court case management system developed for the Supreme Court and both divisions of the Court of Appeals. This system uses a unique appellate information architecture dissimilar to the AZTEC database, but nearly as old as AZTEC. Though integrated with both AZTEC and the AJACS CMS to accept transfers of case information on appeal using the e-ROA program, replacement of Appellamation with more current, supported technology is being targeted within the plan period.

The Juvenile Online Tracking System (JOLTSaz) provides for the automation needs of the juvenile justice community. The first statewide system implemented, the JOLTS statewide juvenile probation caseload management system developed in Maricopa County Superior Court in 1979 has now been fully replaced by a second-generation system in both Maricopa and the other counties. JOLTSaz users number approximately 2,600 statewide and include the following agencies: Juvenile Court Centers, Victim Rights Advocates, County Attorneys, Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA), Public Defenders, Foster Care Review Board (FCRB), Attorney General’s Office, Department of Economic Security, Clerk of the Court, ComCare, Court Administration, Department of Juvenile Corrections, and Adult Probation Departments.

The effort to automate and enhance adult probation tracking functions statewide passed a key milestone in 2006 with implementation of the Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System (APETS) in all counties. All data statewide now resides on a single database – over 475,000 client records and almost 32 million contact records. Periodic enhancements to the software, support, and user training continue, including fundamental programming changes to support a business process change to evidence-based practices (EBP) within the plan period.

Fourteen of the fifteen superior courts use a common jury processing software package. Maricopa Superior Court, formerly operating on an internally developed system, migrated to an off-the-shelf system several years ago, based on their large volume needs as well as extended functionality requirements (like Web and IVR interfaces for the public). The judiciary undertook a study to determine the direction for jury processing software and functionality. That work group reviewed the migration path of the existing software in fourteen courts and determined to remain with that software rather than convert to the package selected by Maricopa. Recent upgrades to that system have enabled a more responsive and interactive interface to the public for jury processing via the Internet as directed by the Commission on Technology. Courts are now in the process of adopting enhanced features offered by the vendor.

Related centralized data repositories, processing and/or standards for second-generation systems include electronic document management systems, electronic filing, collections, automated notifications, legal research/legal portal, data sharing and integration processing, self-service center court forms, authentication and security, and global directories. The COT’s ad hoc committee on centralized processing reviewed these issues during FY 2003 and provided recommended criteria to select the degree and type of centralization for many common court automation functions. Many of these have either been put in place already or are being pursued within the plan period.
STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

### STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 5:
SECOND-GENERATION STATEWIDE AUTOMATION
ALIGNMENT WITH COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY STATEWIDE AUTOMATION GOALS

- Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure. ✗
- Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions. ✗
- Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads. ✗

### BUSINESS VALUE

- Improved effectiveness of the Criminal Justice System through the electronic exchange of court data and documents and the provision of decision-making information to criminal justice administrators.
- Improved rural court productivity by providing the same level of technology afforded the large metropolitan courts.
- Improved consistency in record keeping and case management practices statewide.
- Improved customer service by providing higher quality of data and case management and greater public access to information.
- Improved responsiveness and productivity of court staff.
- Increased productivity of court and support staffs.
- Reduced development costs by reducing the number of systems implemented and supported statewide.
- Reduced maintenance and enhancement costs by reducing the number of systems implemented and supported statewide.
- Reduced cost impact of legislative and judicial administrative changes to processes and procedures requiring changes to application software.
- Reduced training and support resources required by standardizing the applications software, systems software, and hardware deployed.
- Reduced cost of maintenance by routine enhancements, upgrades, and replacements as well as preventative maintenance.

### DEPENDENCIES

- The maintenance and continued upgrading of the computing and communications infrastructure.
- Sufficient resources to complete implementation efforts for limited jurisdiction courts while functionality of the general jurisdiction system continues to be extended and enhanced and e-filing is expanded to more rural counties with more case types over time.
- Continued codeset modifications to ensure both limited jurisdiction and general jurisdiction courts statewide effectively share the case / financial management system.
• Staff resources to perform statewide system development and implementations while still providing legacy support for case and probation management systems statewide. Sufficient resources at technology vendors to complete development and enhancements.

• The establishment of a cross-branch policy and governance structure for the development of the Criminal Justice Data Integration Project.

• Sufficient financial and staff resources to create and support new central repositories of electronic data and documents in support of statewide electronic case filing, eAccess, eWarrants, and electronic orders of protection.

IMPACTS

With several statewide systems all being replaced at nearly the same time, the financial impact is unprecedented. The problem was compounded over several years as the planned funding for the initiatives got interrupted by multiple reallocations of JCEF (a state-level automation funding source) by the legislature. Now, filing numbers continue shrinking year over year and with them available revenue. There is no longer any assurance that sufficient funds will exist to complete the statewide implementations of and requested enhancements to these vital, second-generation systems. In this challenging financial environment, Commission on Technology has inaugurated a funding subcommittee to examine the scope and future needs for statewide automation then recommend a requisite funding strategy.

Court business processes will be affected by the workflow and document processing capabilities built into the new systems, resulting in much greater efficiencies in data entry and reporting. Integration points built into new automation systems will accept digital input from other systems and electronic filings, thereby precluding clerks from having to re-enter data from other sources.

Projects include:

• LJ Case Management System (AJACS)
• Electronic Case Filing
• Public Access to Case Information and Documents
• Statewide eWarrants
• Statewide Orders of Protection
BACKGROUND

The Judiciary provides electronic access to court information via the Internet and uses messaging middleware in order to serve the public better, contribute to the improved effectiveness of the criminal justice system, and make courts more accessible. Information includes general information, case information, and court calendars. Additionally, we continue to foster development of electronic data interchanges between criminal justice agencies and work toward electronic filing in all courts and all case types for both the legal community and self-represented litigants.

During Fiscal Year 2002, the Judiciary launched its Public Access Case Look-Up Web-site. Using the service, the public can access case information with a 24-hour currency by case number or party name. This offering was an immediate and enormous success; in only the first five months of operation (February through June 2002), the site had over 12 million queries. Last year, it had over 56 million queries by over 2.4 million visitors.

The Judicial Branch recognizes and supports the need for improved operational effectiveness of the criminal justice system as a whole. Each criminal justice function must improve not only within itself but also in concert with the other criminal justice agencies. Given that a single court organization exists in the state versus multiple other agencies involved in law enforcement, the Branch is in a unique position to bring together the other functions to improve the manner in which justice is administered in the State of Arizona. The courts, being central to the system, are eager to collaborate in the statewide effort that began in Coconino County in Fiscal Year 2000 to automate the exchange of data used by more than one criminal justice agency. The original project linking the AZTEC CMS application for the Superior Court in Coconino County and the Coconino County Attorney Case Management System continues to be improved and expanded. Having created the Integration System Model, which was made available to the remaining Arizona counties, AZTEC’s ability to collect integration-related data has been expanded to accept an XML data stream. Integration functions using XML interfaces are also being performed “out of the box” by the new, second-generation CMSs.

A previous project provided law enforcement and the public with access to a repository of domestic violence information. That information is currently being standardized nationwide as part of Project Passport, headed by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), allowing protective orders to travel from state to state with easy recognition for law enforcement. More general availability will be subject to the policies contained in the updated Rule 123 that responds to privacy concerns expressed by victims’ groups.

Another data sharing project is electronic disposition reporting. This project provides for electronically sending criminal case dispositions to the Department of Public Safety via a messaging system. Since 2004, 67 courts have been able to electronically report dispositions to the state’s criminal history repository. In concert with ACJC and DPS, AOC has now taken the next incremental step in creating an electronic workflow among justice partners using enterprise service bus (ESB) architecture for exchanging criminal information prior to its inclusion in the DPS criminal data repository. The enterprise service bus acts as a clearinghouse for information independent from the systems that provide or consume its data. This approach will increase the ultimate acceptance rate for data at DPS to above 90 percent and ensure that justice partners are processing the correct charges for the correct suspect.
AOC continues traversing an ESB strategic roadmap that winds through standards, policies, processes, and procedures to foster data exchange among justice partners and to direct future access to Arizona justice data. As part of that strategy, a Central Case Index (CCI) is currently being populated. CCI is composed of an operational data store (ODS) designed to integrate data from multiple disparate sources and a set of managed services used to interact with this data in a secure, standardized way. No direct access is provided to CCI data; rather, access is provided to the set of managed services employing standardized security and a communication structure based on the NIEM, LegalXML, and Electronic Court Filing (ECF) standards. As the demand for CCI grows, these court technology standards will prove to be a valuable tool for facilitating data interchange between the multiple agencies, environments, and devices adopting them.

CCI is being populated with the current information about court case data from the various court systems of record (CMSs) operating in Arizona, thereby enabling a central point of access to case information for enterprise applications that require it from multiple Arizona courts or CMSs in the state. CCI will also contain a reporting environment composed of multiple data marts that are being created on an as-needed basis to serve the internal business needs of individual courts and the AOC.

For Phase I, AJACS, Maricopa Superior Court’s iCIS and Pima Superior Court’s Agave CMSs are in the process of providing the following standardized, case-related data elements: Court, Case, Participant(s), Event, Financial, Hearing, Judgment, Charge, and Sentence.

For almost a decade, the Supreme Court has been broadcasting oral arguments from the courtroom around the world in real time. No special software is required to view the live audio/video footage from the Court’s website and archived proceedings remain available long after the court date.

A 2002 project developed an electronic process for protective orders and created two systems: Court Protective Order Repository (CPOR) and Law Enforcement Protective Order Repository (LPOR). LPOR interacts with both the ACJIS network and NCIC, enabling law enforcement to query protection orders, review the data, and send it to the NCIC system. But only 4 counties make full use of the repository today. Work is getting underway to re-architect the system to ensure participation from all 15 Arizona counties’ courts and law enforcement agencies to provide for better public safety.

Following proof of the technical concept behind automating initiation, recall, and execution of warrants at critical junctures in the justice system (e.g., when a person is arrested, booked, scheduled to appear in court, admitted to the jail or prison, or appears at scheduled probation meetings), the software licensing model was deemed too expensive for statewide adoption. Work is switching to a new approach for a single, statewide arrest warrant repository that enables all criminal justice stakeholders to access all warrant types in a variety of formats with customizable views likely to be more financially feasible.

Given the ARS §13-607 requirement that a defendant’s fingerprint be captured on the sentencing order and the current limitations of “ink and roll” processing, Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC) recommended that Superior Court locations in Arizona implement mobile fingerprinting technology in the courtroom. The mobile device creates a high-resolution image of the defendant’s fingerprint enabling immediate feedback on its quality, ensuring that the fingerprint on the sentencing order will always be usable by prosecutors for future charging purposes, in accordance with the statute. Once fingerprinted, a defendant is assigned an AFIS Record Number (ARN) used to tie the subject stopped by police with the defendant that appears in the courtroom and finally to the inmate that appears for intake at the Arizona Department of Corrections (ADC). Future phases of the project will undertake integration between AFIS and the court CMS.

The Judicial Branch also recognizes that the public will be better served by improving operational effectiveness with outside non-judicial entities. Technology can enable this objective. For example, with the implementation of expedited family court processes, the expanded use of electronic data exchange will support speedier and more accurate processing of these cases by facilitating communication among the various state, local, and judicial entities involved.
STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 6: IMPROVE PUBLIC AND AGENCY ACCESS
ALIGNMENT WITH COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY STATEWIDE AUTOMATION GOALS

- Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.
- Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions.
- Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.

BUSINESS VALUE

- Improved effectiveness of the criminal justice system through the electronic exchange of court data and documents and the provision of decision-making information to criminal justice administrators.
- Improved consistency in record keeping and case management practices statewide.
- Improved customer service by providing higher quality of data and case management and greater public access to case-related information.
- Improved protection for domestic violence victims even in other states though automation of protective orders with Project Passport.
- Improved public safety through improved centralized access to information, such as criminal history, orders of protection, domestic violence records, etc., for law enforcement.
- Improved quality and quantity of data available to the AOC for analysis and research.
- Improved electronic integration with the legal community and other justice-related departments and agencies.
- Improved quality of service to the public by providing other government agencies, such as DES and DOR, with more accessible electronic information to improve and support their processes.
- Increased overall accuracy and timeliness, reduction of processing backlogs, and database completeness.
- Increased transparency and public access to the Supreme Court’s rulemaking process and oral arguments.

DEPENDENCIES

- The Enterprise Service Bus for all data exchange applications.
- Continued development and support of a technical architecture enabling statewide data integration.
- Acquisition of resources to continue developing pilot data sharing projects designed to make use of the integration infrastructure architecture.
- Upgrade / replacement of the judicial data warehouse, JUSTIS, with the central case repository (CCR). Expansion of CCI from an e-filing-specific facility to a true, multi-application case index.
- Cooperation of state and local agencies, especially law enforcement.
- With state and local agencies, development of mutually agreed-upon security policies and procedures.
• Coordinated change management to assure that interdependent infrastructures continue to function together.
• Replacement of any remaining “ink and roll” fingerprinting with LiveScan throughout the state.
• Installation of videoconference equipment in courtrooms of rural superior courts.
• Sufficient network bandwidth to carry increased video and data integration traffic.
• Continued capabilities of the Supreme Court’s video streaming outsource partner and network to carry live video.

IMPACTS

With the Judiciary focusing on “front office” functionality, public and agency access becomes a primary concern for every project. Development projects will need to incorporate information and functionality to address this initiative. For instance, the domestic violence repository required that AZTEC add certain information not collected at the time in order to fulfill the electronic reporting requirements as well as provide sufficient information to law enforcement. Videoconferencing initiatives will need to focus on improving access to courts, in most cases by providing for hearings and arraignments and other court processes without the need to be physically present in the courtroom. Even infrastructure maintenance, which is generally perceived to be internal, will need to build capacity to serve the information distribution needs of this initiative as more data/video traverses the network over time.

Projects include:

• 2FID Implementation
• Electronic Document Management Systems
• Electronic Case Filing
• Public Access to Case Information and Documents
• Statewide eWarrants & Statewide Protective Orders
BACKGROUND

Courts are following industry’s lead to “digitize everything,” placing a focus on information systems to make it easier for people to get their jobs done and done well. When caseloads grow, so does related data entry, and, unfortunately, the harsh reality is that clerical positions are not added at a rate anywhere near the caseload growth rate. The solution is to increase the productivity of existing workers through technology, taking a holistic approach to arrive at a standards-based, integrated system comprised of various disparate parts. This path can invite creative destruction, however, wherein the old way of doing something declines then disappears, resources are re-deployed, institutions and people adapt, the new way grows, and overall benefits are recognized. The problem with creative destruction is its pain for anyone involved in the old technologies and old ways of working. Though courts will take an evolutionary rather than revolutionary approach, in the midst of digitization lie some changes in the way courts conduct business, both from the bench and in the back office.

Fundamental to increasing productivity is a mindset that views the court system as an information supply chain — a network of courts at all levels collectively responsible for dispensing justice within the state. Its goal is to deliver the right information to the right place at the right time. Because data created at or for lower courts may eventually end up at the Supreme Court on appeal, a chain relationship exists between law enforcement, municipal or justice courts, the superior courts, the courts of appeal, and the Supreme Court. This supply chain considers all the individual links leading up to the final one as essential functions within the overall value equation.

As mentioned in “Second-Generation Automation Systems,” legacy case management systems necessitate keying and re-keying case information. Second-generation systems will pick up information directly from law enforcement and attorneys’ systems, reducing workload by moving the responsibility for input to the source, removing the clerk from the tedious data entry and validation business. The new statewide CMS forms the foundation of the “Digitize Everything” approach, on which are layered imaging, EDMS, backup/data recovery, court-to-court case transfer, electronic access to records, electronic case filing, central repositories of electronic documents, electronic notifications, electronic archiving, and judge/bench automation activities. In addition, courts are beginning to grasp the magnitude of digital evidence headed their way (18 percent compound annual growth of surveillance video footage in addition to rapid adoption of law enforcement body cameras) following recommendations of the chief justice’s Digital Evidence Task Force being shared in 2017.

All courts face paper records management and case file storage challenges today. The Judiciary continues to implement technologies such as imaging and electronic filing to address document management requirements. Electronic filing also supports courts’ migration to more streamlined processes and workflow management, which imaging was originally begun to facilitate. This initiative has been a high priority each year since the first IT strategic planning session in 1990, as courts have scanned paper filings they receive as a prerequisite to getting rid of paper altogether. But pure imaging provides no metadata, making storage easy but retrieval very difficult. Strategic projects relying on electronic document management continue to be among the Commission on Technology’s priorities. These projects rely not only on imaging but also on metadata and case management system integration for efficiently storing and retrieving true electronic documents. All superior court clerks have now implemented a full-featured EDMS and the largest limited jurisdiction courts have already followed suit. Smaller LJ courts are receiving centralized EDMS services with the implementation of AJACS.
A June 2000 EDMS study recommended centralized document repositories for jurisdictions lacking technical resources, but legislation requiring the storage of superior court records within each county blocked the approach. That initial EDMS approach was revised to a federated model and efforts were directed at selecting a standard application for superior courts to reduce the number of system interfaces that would be built and maintained. Today, many limited jurisdiction courts still lack the technical resources required to operate a robust EDMS over the long term, safeguarding all original electronic records for significant retention periods, and providing timely disaster recovery. A review of business continuity requirements as courts depend increasingly on paperless e-records led to revisiting the approach.

As electronic records exist within lower courts they can be re-used for appeals in higher courts. Technical specifications for data and document transfer have been defined to seamlessly move case information and related documents from limited jurisdiction to general jurisdiction courts and then on to appellate courts within the state – the supply chain of justice. Use of a central document repository will alternatively provide judicial officers a point of access to relevant case documents without requiring additional steps to transfer data and the overhead of re-saving them on the receiving court’s EDMS and backup systems. Work is underway to enable filers to insert hyperlinks to other filings already stored in the CDR, thereby eliminating duplicated attachments among case filings.

Public information from the set of digital case information is being collected in a central repository as the intended source for public inquiry. Public users will be able to “subscribe” to selected cases and receive updates based on changes to specific case information. Pro per se filers will increasingly use interactive, intelligent forms that output a stream of digital data. An e-filing portal provides standard court forms online and leads users through the process of filling out forms and printing them or eventually even e-filing them. PCs deployed at many county, court, and municipal sites across Arizona make public access to electronic resources increasingly available to court users.

The vast majority of case-related documents begin life on a computer, either in law firms, at parties’ homes, or on court websites. With a growing number of EDMS file rooms in existence and second-generation CMSs online, electronic case filing will enable courts to efficiently consume this digital source data directly. The courts’ enterprise service bus provides a logical location for storing and forwarding electronic filings through a single “front door” to the court system. Law enforcement will continue to expand use of handheld citation devices, photo radar, and red light cameras which output validated digital data. Mass filings, like metropolitan eviction actions originating within the same law office, are also slated for e-filing. Once these projects are implemented, the tipping point will be reached – digital data will be the norm while paper becomes the exception. No plan exists to totally discontinue paper filing at the court counter, but the practice should become obscure over time as the breadth and convenience of electronic filing increases.

Solving the electronic identity riddle as part of e-filing will allow courts to provide trustworthy case-related notifications of warrants, orders, or judgments, further reducing the production of paper within the court but also increasing reliance on electronic systems and processes. Procedural solutions within the Judiciary like “/s/ typed name” or a simple technical solution, like active directory authentication, may relegate need for a costly and complex technical signature solution to only those items originating or transmitted outside the courts. AOC is investigating a product for “signing” documents originating in courts for use by others in a manner that could be checked for validity against a log maintained by or on behalf of the issuing court.

Following publication of a report issuing a call to action for digital evidence policies and practices by the National Center for State Courts and the subsequent recommendations of the Digital Evidence Task Force, the judiciary is preparing to meet the technical and business process challenges associated with acceptance of digital evidence at all levels of courts. A roadmap of potential approaches will give way to specific standards for courts to employ in managing digital evidence in a consistent manner throughout the state.

Finally, an electronic archiving and destruction strategy must be addressed for records that were only ever digital (“born digital”). AJC has adopted the recommendations of the Electronic Records Retention and Destruction (ERR&D) Committee that all electronic records be automatically destroyed at the very end of their approved retention periods, unless designated as having historical value. With that direction in mind, published retention periods have been re-examined for all levels of court. State Library Archives and Public Records (SLAPR) is the eventual owner of permanent or extremely long retention records under the retention schedules and continues to be a partner in crafting the statewide solution that takes into account the end-state of electronic court records. Currently, SLAPR requires records to be transmitted on paper or microfilm,
regardless of their storage medium at the court, though ratification of the PDF/A format as an international standard may enable a change to electronic archiving over time.

**STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 7: DIGITIZE THE ENVIRONMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALIGNMENT WITH COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY STATEWIDE AUTOMATION GOALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads. x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUSINESS VALUE**

**IMAGING/EDMS**

- Reduce cost of records storage.
- Provide simultaneous access to the same document.
- Lay foundation for electronic case filing.
- Drastically reduce record on appeal transfer time.

**BACKUP/DATA RECOVERY**

- Reduce the risk of losing court assets.
- Reduce time to restore business information following a disaster.

**COURT-TO-COURT CASE TRANSFER**

- Eliminate re-keying of case information.
- Improve electronic integration with the legal community and other justice-related departments and agencies.

**ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO RECORDS**

- Improve access by the public to court records.
- Improve access by justice partners to court records.

**ELECTRONIC CASE FILING**

- Extend filing hours and increase access to justice.
- Reduce paper costs.
**ELECTRONIC NOTIFICATIONS**

- Simplify court communications processes.
- Reduce paper costs.

**DIGITAL EVIDENCE**

- Improve electronic integration with the legal community and other justice-related departments and agencies.
- Simplify court communications processes.
- Preserve needed case-related documents and data.
- Reduce the risk of losing court assets.

**ELECTRONIC ARCHIVING AND DESTRUCTION**

- Improve the accessibility of archived court information following approved retention schedules, especially at the superior court.
- Preserve needed electronic case-related documents and data.
- Remove electronic case-related documents and data once no longer needed.

**DEPENDENCIES**

- Transferring increasing numbers of imaged and electronic documents as well as digital evidence files may require upgraded network capability.
- ACAP desktop PCs need to be able to function as scan stations in limited jurisdiction courts for the central EDMS model to work.
- Funding for maintaining all hardware and software required to operate the federated EDMS model, both at AOC and the local courts.
- Software development will be required to provide access to electronic documents through and integration with developing case management systems.
- Authorization, verification, and signature technologies and policies must be established for certain situations.
- Systemic thinking needs to be applied to this entire process, as business process reengineering and standardization are absolute requirements when creative destruction is involved.
- Public, commercial, and government agency needs for court documents online must be balanced against privacy interests. Stakeholders must be comfortable with policies and practices for data/document security classification and resulting levels of access.
- Periodic media and format updates are required to ensure continued accessibility of lengthy- or permanent-retention files. Automated destruction requires further case management systems development and effective training of court clerks.
- Detailed technical requirements and safe business practices must be clearly defined and adhered to before paper is removed from the court environment.

**IMPACTS**

Simply put, digitizing the courts provides the foundation for e-government. It enables "born digital" content from litigants' systems to be filed into court (including evidence) and judgments/minute entries to be rapidly communicated from court to affected parties (getting clerks out of the labor-intensive minute distribution business).
Digitization also makes a tremendous dent in the courts' paper records storage challenges since disk space is far cheaper than shelf space and has a far smaller footprint. It enables increased justice partner and public access to information (within the bounds of privacy) since multiple individuals can view the same electronic case file at the same time. And, through metadata and full-text searchability, it provides for almost instant location of the needed portion of a particular record without reading page after page of a paper file.

Behind the counter, digitization streamlines caseflow by enabling an electronic workflow in which records are intelligently routed to the next functional area and workers see a queue of records that await their action. This keeps the focus on value-added work, allowing more cases to be processed with the same resource level.

But all this doesn't come without the stress of a paradigm change — the current workforce is paper-centric and current rules, work processes, and access controls were all developed in a paper world. Processes and related court policies have to be reconstructed around working "digitally" over time. As industry has proven over the past decade, the rewards of digitization far outweigh the risks.

Specific projects include:

- Electronic Document Management
- Public Access to Case Information and Documents
- Business Continuity
- Electronic Filing
- Judge/Bench Automation
- Electronic Document Hyperlinking
- Statewide eWarrants
- Statewide Protective Orders
BACKGROUND

In addition to supporting statewide technology projects, the Information Technology Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts is responsible for development and support of a variety of automated systems for AOC divisions. These divisions are supporting courts in the pursuit of the goals outlined in *Advancing Justice Together: Courts & Communities 2014-2019*.

The Administrative Office of the Courts’ mission is to assist the chief justice in carrying out the constitutionally prescribed responsibility for providing administrative supervision over the integrated Arizona court system and to support the chief justice and the Supreme Court in providing quality administrative leadership and assistance to Arizona's courts.

Further, legislation has often charged the Supreme Court with administering certain programs in support of justice-related activities, for instance, Foster Care Review Board (FCRB) functions, certification of private fiduciaries and process servers, the confidential intermediary program, defensive driving school certification, legal document preparer certification, court reporter certification, and grant tracking. These activities often require automation in order to perform the data collection and tracking needed. Several programs of this nature are supported and/or in development.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 8: AOC AUTOMATION</th>
<th>ALIGNMENT WITH COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY STATEWIDE AUTOMATION GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve information access and communication from and to the judicial functions.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUSINESS VALUE

CERTIFICATION AND LICENSING DEPARTMENT (CLD) ONLINE RENEWAL PROJECT

- Performed annual maintenance to online renewal forms application for licensed document preparers, fiduciaries, court reporters, and defensive driving schools/instructors.
- Migrated database and application to new servers as part of ITD Infrastructure Operations’ end-of-life server project. Enhanced architecture to allow document storage.
- Began re-engineering Process Servers Tracking System to convert from classic .asp to .net platform required by architecture standards.

AS/400 END OF LIFE PROJECT APPLICATION REWRITES

- Re-engineered the Defensive Driving Management System (monitoring module) database and application onto a SQL Server and .net platform.
- Continued re-engineering the Certification Management System database and application used by various CLD functions onto a SQL Server and .net platform.

FINANCE PROJECTS

(The Administrative Office of the Courts maintains budget, accounting, and personnel records for the AOC and the Supreme Court.)

- Enhanced AFIS interface to accommodate new ACH payment requirements that comply with ADOA GAO’s Warrant Reduction project.
- Maintained 150 ad hoc reports for New World financial management system.

AZTEC ERR&D

- Completed ERR&D data purge from data warehouse for 30 AZTEC courts.
- Began efforts to make required legislative changes in AZTEC.

eNOTIFICATION

- Implemented text message reminders for payment due date and appearance date for defendants in all LJ courts using the AJACS CMS.
- Piloted voice notification feature in two AJACS courts; plan to expand service to all AJACS courts in early FY19.
- Began efforts to expand notification functionality to requesting non-ACAP courts.

HR – CORP

- Implemented modifications to track new contribution option for CORP members, in response to a legislative change.

OTHER PROJECTS

- Developing interface to supply out-of-home petitions from JOLTSaz application to FCRB.
- Developing new FARE CAP enhancements for AJACS and non-standard courts and making related programming changes in data warehouse.
PROJECT MANAGEMENT OFFICE (PMO)

- Provided management-level project milestone reports;
- Facilitated project reviews of strategic projects;
- Provided counsel on common project methodology model, based on project size;
- Provided leadership and direction for consultant contract management and handled the most complex contracts;
- Provided guidance and scheduling of technical testing in support of ITD staffing needs;
- Provided mentoring/advising on issues related to project risk, issues resolution, and conflict management;
- Facilitated project requests and scope approvals by the ITD core management team;
- Maintained a master status list of all enterprise projects and provided reports to senior leadership;
- Directly managed various projects for which other project managers were not available; and
- Coordinated external agency or vendor-related project needs.
ARIZONA JUDICIAL BRANCH
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
STRATEGIC PROJECTS

FOR FISCAL YEARS 2019-2021
IX. Information Technology Strategic Projects

This section contains a description of the statewide or state-level strategic projects undertaken by the Judicial Branch for Fiscal Years 2019 through 2021. These projects arise from the strategic initiatives above and support *Advancing Justice Together: Courts & Communities 2014-2019*’s business goals as well as the Commission on Technology’s goals for court automation. Most are on-going projects focused on attaining the objectives of a more responsive and accessible Judiciary.

At its June 2009 strategic planning session, the Commission on Technology revised their groupings from affinity areas by impact and timeline to a funding-based priority list, pared considerably from past years in response to reductions in budgets. At the June 2015 strategic planning session, Commission members removed the previous general tiers of priorities in favor of a single, more general listing along with a set of agreed projects requiring resources, listed in no specific order.

The Arizona Judiciary’s strategic information technology projects for 2019-2021 are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deploy New eFiling Case Types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy LJ Judge Automation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch eAccess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Automated Notification Capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz Dependency &amp; Officer UI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJACS – AZTEC Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eCertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Court eFiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARE – Infrastructure Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Dispute Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Standards Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eWarrants System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDocument Hyperlinking Deploy/Expand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellate New CMS Setup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rearchitect Protective Order Repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARE Implementations in Non-Standard Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move AJACS Superior Courts to Version 6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Assessment Automation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These technology projects address five main objectives. Below the projects are listed by these objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using Systemic Thinking</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Serving the Public and Public Safety | JOLTSaz Dependency & Officer UI  
New eFiling Case Types  
eAccess  
Automated Notification Expansion  
Justice Court eFiling  
eWarrants System  
Rearchitect Protective Order Repository  
Public Safety Assessment Automation |
| Improving Core Applications        | AJACS - AZTEC Replacement  
FARE – Infrastructure Port  
JOLTSaz Dependency & Officer UI  
eDocument Hyperlinking  
Automated Notification Expansion  
eCertification |
| Standardizing for Leveraging       | AJACS - AZTEC Replacement  
Multi-Vendor e-Filing (all case types)  
Time Standards Reporting  
FARE Implementations  
Superior Courts to AJACS V6.1  
Public Safety Assessment Automation |
| Transforming Technologies          | LJ Judge Automation  
Multi-Vendor e-Filing (new case types)  
eWarrants System  
Appellate New CMS Setup  
Online Dispute Resolution |

In addition, there are many technology-related activities and projects within the judiciary that support day-to-day operations. Staff must, for instance, provide continued support for the existing core applications and infrastructure. Existing projects need to be completed or supported with required or mandated enhancements.
While the mix of projects would ideally be balanced, the Judiciary continues to expand the reach of electronic filing and the services it enables to include remote document access and electronic warrants, tilting the mix slightly toward the categories of “Serving the Public and Public Safety” and “Improving Core Applications.” Several of these projects involve standardizing, reengineering and collaborating to find, automate, and train on best practices, thus leveraging judicial resources statewide.

Further, upwards of three-quarters of court technology spending remains dedicated to refreshing and supporting the existing infrastructure, applications, and staff. Project work (CMSs, document access, judge automation, integrated justice applications) represents less than one-eighth of the overall spending this year, a continued reduction from previous years as the results of earlier projects transfer into the support category of spending.
* Chart does not include local court costs even if related to a statewide goal.

For each project’s alignment with business strategic initiatives and automation goals, refer to the Strategic Plan Analysis section where this is detailed in several charts.

- Alignment with Advancing Justice Together: Courts & Communities 2014-2019
- Alignment of Strategic Projects with Automation Goals
- Portfolio Analysis: Projects by Class

For each project listed in the detailed strategic projects section, the following information is included:

- The project’s goals are provided. They are stated in terms of milestones planned to be completed by the dates, which may be noted.
- The Snapshot provides a very brief characterization of the project. Included are the project’s class and status. Also, an assessment of the degree of risk associated with successful completion of the project is included.
- A Description section describes the project and can include general information, a report of the existing situation, an outline of proposed changes and objectives, and description of technology used or technical environment.

STRATEGIC PROJECT ANALYSIS

The Commission on Technology has different perspectives from which to view projects to assist it in analyzing proposed strategic information technology projects.

ALIGNMENT OF BUSINESS GOALS AND IT PROJECTS

The first view aligns technology projects with the strategic business initiatives of the Arizona Judicial Branch. Projects are undertaken only when they support the business goals and initiatives of the judiciary. Below is a table depicting the various business initiatives that each technology project supports.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS</th>
<th>ALIGNMENT WITH “ADVANCING JUSTICE TOGETHER COURTS &amp; COMMUNITIES 2014-2019”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronic-Filing-Related Projects including eServices</strong></td>
<td>Expand access to web-based forms, e-filing, and information describing legal terms and court procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extend e-filing to courts statewide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explore the use of technology-based access to justice solutions being developed in other courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create an electronic noticing system to remind parties, probationers, and other court participants of upcoming court dates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration-Related Projects</strong></td>
<td>Modernize to improve court processes and information gathering, tracking, and sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expand use of e-Citation to electronically transfer citation information from law enforcement to the courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modernize the state’s warrant repository system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Case Management Systems</strong></td>
<td>Implement Arizona Judicial Automated Case System (AJACS) in limited jurisdiction courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide case management system enhancements, including reporting capabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance or replace appellate case management systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Time Standards Reporting**                                       | Improve timeliness and efficiency of civil, criminal, juvenile, family, and probate case processing in Arizona courts by:  
   - Adopting case processing time standards,  
   - Providing case management system enhancements, including reporting capabilities.                                                                                                                       |
| **Probation Automation Development / Enhancements**               | Fully implement Juvenile On-Line Tracking System (JOLTSaz) in juvenile courts.                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|                                                                  | Integrate Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System (APETS) with AJACS.                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|                                                                  | Evaluate and, as appropriate, implement new or expanded evidence-based programs for Arizona’s Adult and Juvenile Probation services.                                                                                                                                     |
| **Automated Notification Capability**                              | Create an electronic noticing system to remind parties, probationers, and other court participants of upcoming court dates.                                                                                                                                             |
| **Automation Training**                                            | Conduct a judicial education needs assessment to identify new or enhanced training for judges including, but not limited to effective use of technology on the bench, in chambers, and remotely.  
   Prepare court leadership for next generation case management systems and technology.                                                                                                                                             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS</th>
<th>ALIGNMENT WITH “ADVANCING JUSTICE TOGETHER COURTS &amp; COMMUNITIES 2014-2019”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Architecture</td>
<td>Implement the Central Case Index to enable the flow of critical court data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase use of social media to improve communications with the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Document Access</td>
<td>Explore the use of technology-based access to justice solutions being developed in other courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expand electronic access to court documents and data with appropriate protections for security and privacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge/Bench Automation</td>
<td>Improve timeliness and efficiency of civil, criminal, juvenile, family, and probate case processing in Arizona courts by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementing e-bench tools that allow judges to more efficiently manage and resolve cases,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Providing judicial workload tools to assist presiding judges when making case assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct a judicial education needs assessment to identify new or enhanced training for judges including, but not limited to effective use of technology on the bench, in chambers, and remotely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Exchanges</td>
<td>Implement the Central Case Index system to enable the flow of critical court data to and from federal, state, and local justice system entities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate with other justice system entities to develop and implement data collection and exchange strategies that leverage technology, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expanding e-warrants project to other justice system entities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Modernizing the state’s warrant repository system,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Making mental health court orders available to appropriate criminal justice and treatment officials,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Making condition of release information available to appropriate criminal justice officials, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improving accuracy and completeness of the state’s criminal history repository and National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALIGNMENT OF AUTOMATION GOALS AND IT PROJECTS

A second view of technology projects organizes them by their support of one or more of the three Statewide Automation Goals. They are:

- Provide a stable, reliable, functionally rich, extensible, interoperable base of business automation and infrastructure.
- Improve information access and communication from and to judicial entities as well as the other criminal justice system functions.
- Investigate and invest in technology solutions that improve judicial effectiveness in handling growing caseloads.

The following chart also includes the priorities established by the Commission on Technology at its March 2001 and June 2002 planning workshops, as updated at the June 2018 annual planning meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC PROJECTS</th>
<th>BUSINESS &amp; AUTOMATION INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
<th>ACCESS &amp; COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>JUDICIAL EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New eFiling Case Types</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ Judge Automation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Document Access</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Notification Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz Enhancements</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJACS (LJ) AZTEC Replacement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eCertification</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Court eFiling</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARE—Infrastructure Port</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Dispute Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Standards Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eWarrants System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDocument Hyperlinking</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellate New CMS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rearchitect Protective Order Repository</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARE Implementations in Non-Std Courts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Courts to AJACS 6.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALIGNMENT OF STRATEGIC PROJECTS WITH AUTOMATION GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC PROJECTS</th>
<th>BUSINESS &amp; AUTOMATION INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
<th>ACCESS &amp; COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>JUDICIAL EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Assessment Automation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS OF IT PROJECTS

A third view organizes projects by operational type (basic, enhancing) with respect to their support of business goals. Other factors considered are a project’s urgency based upon interdependencies with other projects, operational demands and/or legislative mandates. These views and factors enable the Commission to identify and prioritize the strategic projects.

This reflects an assessment of the level of impact the proposed strategic project will have on the Commission on Technology’s identified strategic business needs. For this analysis, the Commission has adopted an approach developed by Mr. William Rossner, a Gartner Group analyst, as a way of approaching strategic planning for information technology. Application portfolio analysis provides for applications to be categorized into three classes:

- The utility class of applications - which includes the basic applications required to be in business.
- The enhancement class of applications - which includes those that extend the organization’s performance, offering, for instance, faster delivery of information, better service, and higher quality.
- The frontier class of applications - which includes those that represent a potential breakthrough that could make a dramatic improvement in an organization’s efficiency, effectiveness, or competitiveness.

Mr. Rossner noted that balancing each of these areas is the key to planning.

UTILITY CLASS APPLICATIONS

The AOC/ITD planning group believes they have appropriately balanced maintenance, replacement, and upgrades to basic necessary functions with enhancement and “leading edge” projects. Several projects are building incrementally on past efforts that created basic infrastructure and business applications, like the eDocument Hyperlinking and the FARE infrastructure port to transition the central data repository to newer, supported technology.

Not all IT projects are listed below, of course, but the priority projects with state-level visibility and significant resource needs are. Several IT applications are now in maintenance mode and are no longer identified as priority projects. It is expected that these applications will continue to be supported and maintained during the plan period. These include, for instance, AZTEC, the first-generation statewide case management system, the Tax Intercept Program (TIP), and various internal accounting and utility programs supporting the Supreme Court and the Administrative Office of the Courts.

ENHANCEMENT CLASS APPLICATIONS

The enhancement types of projects are directed towards extending the capabilities of many applications – adding, for instance, improved data integration functions to the probation automation and case management systems to support the justice integration strategic initiatives. Enhancement projects also include those new projects that will allow courts to provide a higher quality of service to the public, another goal of Advancing Justice Together.

Constructing additional functionality on top of what currently exists, like JOLTSaz and eFiling Enhancements, Electronic Document Access, eCertification, and Time Standards Reporting, qualifies as an enhancement, as does LJ Judge
Automation. The rollout of the LJ case management system also falls in the category of an enhancement since it builds upon the base code of the GJ case management system.

Since return on investment decreases as a function of remaining useful life, AZTEC development efforts were halted as AJACS began to be implemented. AZTEC must continue to be updated for supportability and legislative changes as long as it remains in production use, but any requested enhancements to AZTEC’s functionality are carefully balanced against end-of-life considerations.

In the area of electronic filing, the Judiciary is in sync with the state executive and legislative branches in speeding to accept electronic documents. At its June 2005 annual planning meeting, the Commission on Technology created an e-court subcommittee to drive and coordinate the statewide evolution of electronic filing in Arizona. Predicated on the understanding that e-filing is far more business process dependent than technology dependent, this ad hoc group chaired by then Vice Chief Justice Andrew Hurwitz spurred on the business decisions, change process, and specific plans necessary to:

- Expand court-to-court electronic filings including records on appeal and lower court bindovers;
- Create and leverage a central, electronic clearinghouse for criminal data among justice partners; and
- Create a unified, attorney/public e-filing system leveraging standardized, interactive, statewide forms as its foundation.

The Judiciary continues evaluating its rules for authenticating and accepting electronic documents filed by the legal community and by the public. Current policies related to paper filing are not influencing the crafting of electronic solutions, in order to keep new ideas flowing and progress being made.

**FRONTIER CLASS APPLICATIONS**

In addition, the Judiciary is always engaged in a few significant projects that are on the “frontier” of technology. When complete, these will substantially increase the Judiciary’s technology capability, and significantly modernize it using technology. The criminal e-filing, electronic warrant, online dispute resolution, and Appellate New CMS projects will greatly increase digitization in the courts, speed case processing, and vastly improve the accuracy and reliability of court documents. To interoperate with federal and state justice initiatives as well as to address ever-growing workloads in a time of decreasing levels of staffing, these frontier projects must be undertaken.

**SUMMARY**

It is important to note that each strategic project in the list encompasses more than one major activity. They are related but separate, often with entirely different project teams and user bases. For example, the project titled “Automation Training and Support” includes a centralized support center, field support technicians, and several independent projects developing context-sensitive computer-based training (CBT) and Web-based interactive training on automation applications. Further, it also includes the combined funding and training of the on-site, county-level, automation trainer. Individual technology projects may, therefore, be enhancing, but if the major impact of the strategic project is to maintain basic utility, then the strategic project would likely be classified as utility.

Taking that approach to the Arizona Judicial Branch’s strategic projects, both existing and planned, yields the following overview:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC PROJECTS</th>
<th>UTILITY</th>
<th>ENHANCEMENT</th>
<th>FRONTIER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New eFiling Case Types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ Judge Automation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Document Access</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Notification Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJACS (LJ) AZTEC Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eCertification</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Court eFiling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARE—Infrastructure Port</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Dispute Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Standards Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eWarrants System</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDocument Hyperlinking</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellate New CMS</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rearchitect Protective Order Repository</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARE Implementations in Non-Std Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Courts to AJACS 6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Assessment Automation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Judiciary considers the distribution of strategic projects to be reasonably balanced. Frontier projects can be large in scope and resource demands. Limiting those to significant and “doable” projects is deliberate.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

• Provide desktop, software, and hardware support for ACAP, JOLTSaz, APETS, and AOC users.
• Provide phone support for statewide and AOC applications.
• Provide on-going support for releases of core application software including future rapid release cycles of the Windows operating system, browsers, and the Microsoft Office Suite.
• Add and train resources to support new APETS users statewide.
• Develop an automation-training curriculum.
• Develop computer-based training and online interactive training programs for case management systems and other core application software.
• Develop training programs for automation field trainers.
• Achieve and maintain a service level of 80 percent of all calls answered within 20 seconds.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

TRAINING PROVIDED

• AJACS training was provided in a classroom or online setting on various topics, including Financial Processing, Protective Order Processing, MVD/DDP/DPS interfaces, Legislative Updates, and Statistical Reports.
• In addition to the on-site initial training given to limited jurisdiction court staff upon their transition from AZTEC to AJACS, 149 Advanced AJACS classes were held with 541 participants shortly after their AJACS go-live date.
• Additionally, one-on-one phone training was provided to numerous users as a result of questions/problems submitted through Remedy.

SUPPORT SERVICES PROVIDED

• An average of 331 support calls for AZTEC/AJACS courts received each month (an additional 178 per month for AZTEC and AJACS handled through CSD Automation Services Unit).
• An average of 77 support calls for APETS received each month.
• An average of 88 support calls for JOLTS on a monthly basis.
• An average of 1245 support calls for AOC/Supreme Court on a monthly basis.
• An average of 2839 information calls handled for Public Access and/or FARE on a monthly basis.
• An average of 755 support calls for AZTurboCourt on a monthly basis.
• An average of 5949 calls per month were diverted by TTEAP (Traffic Ticket Enforcement Assistance Program) self-service facility.
• New software releases/updates of Windows 10 and Office 365 as well as, DCATS (Dependent Children’s Automated Tracking System), TIP (Tax Intercept Program), AJACS, and other AOC-sponsored applications continued to be tested then deployed through Microsoft System Center.
• 159 custom reports were also developed for AZTEC courts during the year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going X</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SNAPSHOT**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

This strategic project provides support statewide for automation. It includes:

• a help desk function,
• statewide technical support, and
• automation training.

The requirements for effective application and field support and training have increased with number of statewide applications deployed.

**PHONE AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT**

User phone support and field support functions are consolidated into a single Support Services group that now also includes a SharePoint support component.

AOC Support Services (Customer Support Center and Technical Support) currently supports a total of:

• 3285 PCs for statewide ACAP, JOLTS, and APETS users
• 625 PCs for AOC/Supreme Court users

Support technicians use software tools for the remote control and diagnostics of users’ hardware and software. Since remote tools were implemented, travel has been reduced by a significant amount and staff has provided more timely response to problems being experienced by the users.

Distributed system management is part of the funded ACAP Support effort. The software, Microsoft System Center, is part of the “image” on PCs. This software has established the capability to remotely manage the systems distributed in a variety of locations in Arizona. It addresses two areas of remote management. First, it establishes processes, procedures, and automated solutions to poll, analyze, and report on systems’ status, providing alerts to both existing and pending problems.
as well as an inventory of software on the system. Second, it provides for the automated distribution of both application and system software. This software distribution and remote management package significantly reduces travel expenses and allows the Field Support team to be more responsive to user requests for PC service, software, and assistance.

**TRAINING**

Some of the automation training role for the various statewide applications resides in the user community. They are the experts in the business functions required to do the job and the best way to use the automation tools to achieve their goals.

Therefore, in coordination with Technical Support, development activities, rollout tasks, and help desk access, Automation Process Analysts are available to provide strategies and programs for automation training. In addition, 12 of the 15 counties use grant funding to pay a portion of the salary of a local field trainer to provide local support and training, particularly to new staff. The users have identified this as a very high priority as often court training resources are limited and the effective training of new court staff is critical to on-going court operations.

As new applications like AJACS are implemented, Training Support will collaborate with the responsible software development teams to construct the required training courses. They will also develop training tools on targeted topics that may involve the preparation of recorded training classes and conducting regional training conferences. Further, they will provide the Support Services staff with training to provide needed phone and on-site technical support, as appropriate.

As a result of budgetary constraints and the ongoing projects to implement new case management systems or increase the functionality of the existing systems, the automation training role has been modified somewhat and now includes joint application design sessions. Training staff continued to spend numerous hours involved in design sessions and testing to insure appropriate functionality before changes were implemented in the courts.

To satisfy the need for on-site automation training and assistance, State funds will partially fund an automation trainer in each county. The position’s duties include supporting all the courts (county and municipal, general and limited jurisdictions). These trainers assist users locally in their attempts to better utilize the automated systems. Standardizing business processes and workflow as well as assistance in creating specialized management reports are examples of such improved utilization.

Training is the most critical component in the success of an automation system. This training needs to be readily available to new staff and frequent refreshers must be made available to veteran staff. The AOC, with funding from the Commission on Technology, will be offering a multi-faceted approach to solving this problem:

- **Comprehensive Curriculum** – A training team develops the comprehensive ACAP training curriculum. It provides classes in all aspects of case processing and the use of the case management system.
- **Classroom Training** – The AOC has created a portable, self-contained training lab that allows ACAP training to be hosted on site or at offsite locations throughout the state without requiring dedicated computer training rooms.
- **Computer Based Training (CBT)** – The AOC has the capability to produce and distribute interactive and self-directed computer-based training. Some of the very basic classes will be conducted by a live instructor over the intranet. Most of the training will be made available, in interactive format, across the Court's network (AJIN). These classes will be on most needed topics and context sensitive within each software application.

Video training is now included with the preparation of training documentation. This includes embedding short video clips within PowerPoint presentations and standalone videos to alleviate the time and expense of travel and *per diem* when training new users or when new functionality becomes available.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Automated notifications are a way to reduce failures to appear and delinquent obligations by issuing automated reminders to court users, triggered by events in the case management system. The project has been the initial automation undertaking of the Court’s *Fair Justice for All* initiative.

**PROJECT GOALS**

- Implement an automated system to remind defendants of court dates, missed payments, and other actions to reduce failures to appear and missed payments.
- Provide additional data fields in automated systems and update court processes to both collect and verify multiple pieces of contact information.

**PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018**

- Phase I functionalities were successfully deployed to 53 AJACS courts statewide.
- Completed requirements, design documentation, and initial development for eNotification Phase II that will send notification responses back to AJACS to consume.
- Started testing of Phase II for AJACS LJ courts.
- Successfully completed requirements, design, development, and testing for voice notification and piloted the capability in three AJACS courts: Buckeye Municipal, Apache Junction Justice, and Prescott Justice.
- Buckeye Municipal, Apache Junction Justice, Prescott JusticeBegan requirements gathering and design efforts for non-standard (non-AJACS) courts.
  - Planning discussions with MCJC and Phoenix are underway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNAPSHOT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASS</strong></td>
<td><strong>STATUS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The *Fair Justice for All* Task Force’s published recommendation 15, 16, 17 and 18 specify implementation of an automated, statewide, text notification system. This includes the capture, storage, and retrieval of cell phone number data fields in CMSs along with the appropriate permission and opt-out language. Modifications have been made to the Arizona Traffic Ticket and Complaint (ATTC) that allow law enforcement to capture this information at the outset, or it can be added by court staff at any time. The system will be able to draw cell phone information from case management system databases and send out appropriate text messages for notification regarding appearance dates and times, payment amounts due, or probation requirements.

*Fair Justice for All* Task Force Recommendations:

15. Implement English and Spanish Interactive Voice Response (IVR), email, or a text messaging system to remind defendants of court dates, missed payments, and other actions to reduce failures to appear.

16. Modify forms to collect cell phone numbers, secondary phone numbers, and email addresses.

17. Train staff to verify and update contact information for defendants at every opportunity.

18. Provide information to law enforcement agencies regarding the importance of gathering current contact information on the citation form.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Because courts increasingly rely on automated systems and electronic documents, the Commission on Technology continues its emphasis on business continuity with several diverse areas of emphasis:

- Best practices for business continuity planning and restoration priorities,
- COOP laptops for emergency off-site access by court leaders,
- Minimum security standards and network vulnerability audits,
- Security awareness training, and
- Keeping protective technologies current.

PROJECT GOALS

- Provide specific training to court administrators related to court business continuity of automated systems.
- Develop an assessment and planning guide for court business continuity, focusing on the information technology elements that enable court business.
- Evaluate loss scenarios and mitigation costs to determine appropriate initiatives to fund.
- Educate local courts on the risks associated with creation and maintenance of distributed electronic records.
- Maintain a cost-effective, survivable environment for all court data associated with statewide applications.
- Continue to provide continuity of operations laptops to courts at cost.
- Maintain a comprehensive set of branchwide security controls. Perform periodic audits and network vulnerability scans to ensure controls are effective.
- Make cyber hygiene part of the courts’ culture through ongoing, effective security awareness training that applies to all court employees. Keep content timely.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

- Hired a dedicated resource to manage and oversee the Supreme Court’s security posture.
- Replaced McAfee with Sophos Antivirus and Anti-Malware which includes ransomware protection.
- Installed new Firepower intrusion detection system for improved network security.
- Researched vendor multi-factor authentication (MFA) tools to enhance statewide security posture. Implemented Microsoft MFA in Arizona Supreme Court’s ITD Infrastructure Operations department as a pilot.
• Completed an AJIN-wide computing security audit and assessment, documented the results, and distributed them to local courts for action.
• Completed a Statewide Judiciary Security audit and assessment. Presented results to the COT Cybersecurity Subcommittee.
• Continued to collect and analyze gaps to minimum security standards ratified by Arizona Judicial Council. Continued to collaborate with various courts and Commission on Technology staff on closure strategies/timelines.
• Provided live cybersecurity training for Arizona Courts’ Association Spring Conference. Created “2018 CyberSecurity Update” streaming video and computer-based training for statewide use.
• AOC staff continued to analyze and refine information provided in the risk assessment tools previously returned from the courts, as well as looking into options to reduce the cost of implementing a disaster recovery environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNAPSHOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

In our increasingly interconnected world, business, including the business of government, comes to a standstill without the flow of electronic information. When court data systems or the network that connects them are damaged and processes disrupted, the problem is serious and the impact far reaching. Mistakes lead to public distrust and the erosion of public confidence in the institutions of government. The consequences can be much more than an inconvenience, even affecting life, health, and public safety. Vital digital records must not only be preserved but have at least the same assurance of availability as paper records were perceived to have.

Disaster recovery has always been an issue for courts but it is becoming pervasive as courts increase their reliance on automated systems and electronic documents. Integration also makes an outage in a single court potentially disruptive to their partners throughout the justice system. Fixing a single site, like the data center at the State Courts Building, only addresses a piece of the overall problem, since more of the environment is being distributed among the local courts. Local courts must develop and communicate their own detailed plans for protecting electronic documents, safeguarding criminal data as well as personal information of court users, and meeting security standards that apply branchwide.

Interestingly, a recent study revealed that natural or man-made disasters were actually the least likely cause of system downtime. The wealth of other more mundane contributors to outages includes user errors, application errors, hardware failure, utility outages, and fiber cuts. There is quantifiable risk associated with each of these conditions, defined as the probability of occurrence multiplied by the magnitude of impact. TAC created a survey tool that helps local courts confront their risks from the likely perspectives of

• Failure of a single system or component (disk, switch, power supply),
• Unavailability of staff (pandemic flu)
• Failure of the enabling environment (power grid down, fiber cut)
• Failure of multiple systems or components (water damage, power surge, server room fire)
• Loss of an entire facility (flood, hazardous waste, bombing).

The tool, a business continuity/disaster-planning matrix, used to capture COT’s minimum required artifacts, is divided into two parts. Part 1 asks court business leaders to identify top services and business functions the court can’t operate without — those required by law, rule, or administrative order. Common processes were pre-populated to help the brainstorming process. Part 2 aligns the required business processes with the automation systems that support them. Risk is then identified using a five-point scale for likelihood and a five-point scale for impact. This scoring effort reveals those processes that most need protection or workarounds in place. The amount of unplanned downtime that can be tolerated is also an instructive number.

Completed risk assessments returned to date have identified the following items under the control of AOC as having the highest priority for restoration:

- AJIN connectivity and trust relationships,
- Videoconference network (for remote appearances or hearings),
- Case management system and court database,
- Central Document Repository (CDR),
- JOLTSaz application,
- APETS application,
- e-Mail application,
- Criminal history access (to DPS).

Note that the assessments were completed before the advent of statewide e-filing, NICS, and CCI projects having widespread impact on the rural counties.

Completed risk assessments returned have also identified the following items under local control as having the highest priority for restoration:

- The local area network,
- Court reporting/recording software,
- Local add-on applications to the case management system,
- Any electronic document management system,
- Financial applications outside the case management system (often county or city systems).

Much more analysis is still required to compose an accurate reporting, but work is ongoing.

Media focus remains strong on recent releases of personal information by government entities, most notably the federal Office of Management and Budget hack revealing personal information of over 21 million individuals background checked by the government and their references. Since court business relates to individuals, no court storing electronic information is immune. Arizona’s law mandating notification of individuals whose personal information is inadvertently released was expanded in the most recent legislative session. As a result, Administrative Order 2008-68, issued August 14, 2008, is being amended to ensure it addresses provisions of that expanded law related to courts.

A set of best practices has been developed and communicated to local courts regarding the identification of and mitigation of cybersecurity vulnerabilities. The Security Standards document sets minimum requirements that all statewide judicial agencies as well as outside agencies that connect to the courts’ network must follow. Initial gap assessment documents have been compiled by each court and analyzed. In addition, two rounds of statewide network vulnerability scans have been completed and analyzed. Results of both have been presented to COT’s Cybersecurity Subcommittee. The subcommittee continues overseeing all remediation activities related to the findings.

Recognizing that 90 percent of system weaknesses that are exploited relate to human error or lack of diligence, the judiciary has instituted via written policy an annual cybersecurity training requirement for every employee regardless of job role or...
level of court. New materials are issued frequently to ensure the training topics keep pace with the escalating arms race of cybersecurity. The most recent update via computer-based training provided information about spoofing/e-mail hijacking, the dangers of password/ID combination re-use, and various social engineering techniques used in current phishing attacks with ways to effectively resist them.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

CASAaz, is a web-based case management system used to assign cases to coordinators and volunteers, record actions taken on a case, write court reports, maintain contact logs, track required training hours as well as perform online application certification for volunteers.

PROJECT GOALS

- Complete the rollout of CASAaz to Pima and the rural counties.
- Further enhance the CASAaz web app for coordinators and volunteers, utilizing a new VOCA grant.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

- Continued to roll out CASAaz to Pima and the rural counties.

### SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Court Technology Services (CTS) at Maricopa Superior Court developed and implemented a web-based application for CASA volunteers in Maricopa County. AOC obtained a copy of the source code in May 2014 with the intent of providing its functionality to the remaining counties in the state.

The Maricopa application was then redesigned to meet AOC’s architectural standards and sourced from the JOLTSaz statewide automation system. Along with new functionality and security features, email accounts are also provided to all CASA coordinators and volunteers.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

• Provide AJACS maintenance releases as needed to implement required legislation changes and efficiency enhancements.

• Provide continuing support and maintenance for general and limited jurisdiction court case and cash management automation.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

• Continued planning, developing, and deploying prioritized improvements to AJACS for limited jurisdiction courts including
  o Events/Case processing on closed cases,
  o Enhanced Calendar Report,
  o Enhanced behavioral health case processing workflow,
  o Law enforcement contact interface for Pima County Courts,
  o e-Mail encryption functionality,
  o Improved exhibit tracking,
  o Warrant enhancements,
  o Modifications to eCitation and Citation entry screens to support new ATTC form,
  o OnBase/Document handling enhancements,
  o Additional events to support NICS reporting functionality from AJACS, and
  o Many other minor enhancements and bug fixes to improve the courts’ CMS.

• Continued formal AJACS version control and staging processes for future AJACS releases.

• Continued planning and development activities for AJACS GJ Version 6.0 including analysis on new enhancement requests and bug fixes as a result of upgrade from Version 3.9 to 6.0.

• Established and configured a GJ 6.0 test database in a development environment and repeated the process for a test environment. Performed successful regression testing of the core baseline functionality including FARE and ADRS interfaces and prepared for preliminary user acceptance testing.

• Continued to support AJACS Version 3.9 in all superior courts.

• Continued GJ CMS User Group monthly meetings.

• Continued implementing the AJACS Time Standards Reports throughout all 13 superior courts. Ten new GJ reports were deployed.

• Continued work with the e-Filing team to enhance the 3.9 e-filing interface for the GJ CMS and deployed to the majority of the superior courts.
Began providing NICS information from the LJ AJACS CMS for approved LJ courts.

Implemented the regular release cycle of enhancements and bug fixes to all LJ AJACS courts (3 times per year).

### SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In a strategic planning session for 2004-2006, the court considered the existing case management system for general jurisdiction courts, AZTEC, to be reaching the end of its life cycle because of aging technology. The product had become difficult to support, especially finding staff knowledgeable in the AZTEC development tools. AZTEC was a generalized and parameterized system that provided functionality for both limited and general jurisdiction courts. A separate project addresses the replacement of AZTEC in limited jurisdiction courts.

The Commission on Technology considered and discussed several options available to the court to address replacing AZTEC, including issuing a Request for Proposal for a commercially available court package.

COT members requested a study of the viability of vendor systems installed. Having seen the results of that study, members re-evaluated the build, borrow, and buy options in early 2007. A Request for Proposal was generated and the responses evaluated.

COT members voted to recommend a buy option using the top-scoring vendor, AmCad, to the Arizona Judicial Council. AJC also approved the budget to purchase and implement the vendor CMS in 13 superior courts. The system was officially given the name “Arizona Judicial Automated Case System” or AJACS.

Phase 1 of the contract involved successful completion of the two pilot courts, Yuma and La Paz Superior. Phase 2 covered the deployment of the remaining 11 rural superior courts using a support services arrangement renegotiated upon completion of Phase 1. The GJ CMS deployment phase of the AJACS software to the contracted 13 Superior Courts completed on May 7, 2010. All former AZTEC superior courts are now in full production on the AJACS software.

With the deployment of AJACS completed, resources were redirected to improving the system. The key areas targeted for immediate resource allocation and attention included:

1. Automated validation tables (AVT) corrections and standardization,
2. Next release testing and deployment,
3. Standard reports improvements and enhancements,
4. Data conversion issues resolution, and
5. Production Remedy (issues and defects) management.

All of the above five key areas were accomplished in FY 2011 or are of a nature that makes them ongoing through the life of the AJACS platform.

The GJ CMS Project has proven to be a significant success for the AOC and the Superior Courts of the State of Arizona, creating an optimum platform for standardization, future data integrations, and real-time decision making.
In the aftermath of moving the GJ CMS to a maintenance project, the AOC has installed three complete version upgrades and has applied multiple production patches to bring the software to its current version with the Superior Courts enabled to perform all of their court business processes within the application.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- In addition to supporting the statewide APETS system in production, the priority is to complete the second annual build to convert another portion of the application from PowerBuilder to C#.
- A second PSA (Public Safety Assessment) Automated Scoring project is scheduled for FY19. The objective will be to develop an automated process for determining the answers to all nine questions of the PSA, utilizing data obtained from the Justice Web Interface (JWI). Pretrial staff currently submit a query through JWI and then manually review the criminal records returned. Once this process is automated, the need for manual intervention and subsequent review of each criminal history record returned from JWI should be eliminated or significantly reduced.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

- Scheduled the first annual build to rewrite APETS in C# for implementation on July 23, 2018.
- Completed critical PowerBuilder enhancements in the current APETS system that cannot wait for C# upgrade.
- Completed a Public Access ‘service’ to improve the scoring process for pretrial risk assessments using the JWI statewide. This project provides data through a single source and gives probation officers more complete criminal history information to work with.

SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

APETS is a fully functional, adult probation tracking system for Adult Probation services statewide. The application is written in PowerBuilder and contains 484 screens, 712 tables, and 89 reports. It was originally developed by Maricopa
County and implemented in 2000. The rollout to the other counties began with Yuma County in 2004. The application was statewide by 2006. In 2011, APETS was upgraded from Informix to a SQL Server database.

Beginning with Pretrial, defendants are tracked through initial arrest to supervised release and acquittal or conviction. Pretrial data is retained separately to ensure protection for non-convicted persons. Data includes case status, contact/case notes, and drug testing results.

Presentence support includes multiple assessment tools, full demographic data, abuse history, criminal history, and a standard-format face sheet for court review. Recommendations may be made by the Probation Department, altered by the judge, and outcomes entered for use in supervised probation tracking.

Supervised probation tracking is a fully functional case management system. Functionality includes case initiation, post PSI (Pre-Sentence Investigation) assessments, case plan management, drug court management, contact/case notes, UA (Urinalysis) tracking, petition processing, conditions and addendums of probation management, program and treatment tracking, multi-county courtesy supervision, multiple-client transfer capability, victim tracking, and responsible officer history.

Administratively, APETS allows multiple search capabilities, management-level browse and review engines, caseload management, administrative category management (deportation, prison, specific jail terms and unsupervised status requiring minimal personnel interactions), and Interstate Compact support.

APETS provides service interfaces to share specific adult probation data with DPS, the FBI, and several county systems.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Continue to provide comprehensive case management system software for all state appellate courts.
- Continue to expand the highly acclaimed record on appeal electronic transfer system (eAppeal/C2C) to additional administrative tribunals (e.g., DES Unemployment Insurance, Industrial Commission of Arizona).
- Standardize court operations and procedures across appellate courts, where possible, through the use of automated tools and assistance. Engage in a continuous requirements analysis effort.
- Integrate to emerging court community document management and production systems and standards.
- Continue enhancement and improvement of Appellamation, including workflow management, issue management, work product management, and judicial functions.
- Continue integration with statewide e-filing through AZTurboCourt with expansion to accommodate the judiciary’s newer eUniversa e-filing product. Accommodate the new participant matching capability within the appellate e-filing systems.
- Expand e-filing ingestion support to integrate transcript filings to the transcript module. Explore and evaluate Clerk Review improvements, CMS integration, or replacement with an Appellamation clerk review module.
- Provide support for case management information access and document access through handheld devices and other mobile devices.
- Integrate the appellate case management system with posting and update of case opinions and memorandum decisions to the court’s website.
- Integrate appellate case management systems to each court’s independent SharePoint environment. Assist in establishing SharePoint solutions to business problems.
- Migrate from ROAM to CCI (Central Case Index).
- Continue modernization efforts; maintain current technology in hardware, networking, and software. Identify, explore, and evaluate options.
- Implement electronic record retention and destruction capabilities.
- Integrate to the AOC’s emerging DocLink system which provides secure hyperlinks within legal documents. Extend use of DocLink technology in the electronic dissemination of court documents to filers and the public.
- Continue to provide a leadership role in the continued development and publication of electronic filing standards through continued participation in the OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing Technical Committee (ECF-TC). The ECF-TC is currently finalizing the standards for the next major version of the e-filing standards (ECF 5).
• Address support and staffing needs. Engage succession and continuity planning.
• Continue to evaluate case, court and document management solutions, options and alternatives to best assure appellate automation support and capabilities in future years.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

• Provided operational case management, document management, and electronic filing support to the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals Division One. This included the development, testing and deployment multiple CMS software patches which included bug fixes and minor enhancements.
• Designed and developed, the next major version of Appellamation (V 6.3) which provides Multi-Session Planner enhancements, At-Issue Manager enhancements, Work Product Manager enhancements, AppellaMail and Dockets on the Web support for DocLink, Judicial dashboards, SharePoint integration, e-Agenda notices, and many other improvements. User acceptance testing and deployment is anticipated for summer 2018.
• Had substantive involvement in producing Appellate Case Management System RFP 17-03. Wrote all technical requirements for the RFP document and subsequently provided review, analysis, reference checking, product evaluation, and recommendations from RFP responses.
• Continued participation in the development of international electronic filing standards through OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing Committee. Provided key committee working draft standards review, providing 25 written review feedback documents, multiple examples, and use cases. Each review cycle resulted in a new revision of the committee working draft.
• Addressed requirements and developed prototypes for using SharePoint for judicial chambers workflows with integration to Appellamation-provided information and documents.
• Participated in DocLink and SharePoint integration efforts.
• Completed Phase I of a multi-phase electronic filing document purge function freeing up over 225 GB of space. This purge function removes electronic document files that are no longer needed in the electronic filing system. The goal is to retain document files for six months before purging.
• Continued evaluation of possible technology modernization approaches, tools, and vendor options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SNAPSHOT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Appellamation Project began in 1997 as a joint effort between ITD/AOC, the three appellate courts, and Progressive Systems, Inc. The goal of the project was to build a comprehensive automated system that met the unique case tracking and reporting requirements of the state’s appellate courts and could be marketed by Progressive Systems. The system utilizes modern client/server technology on Windows platforms.
In 1999, ITD/AOC assumed full responsibility for the completion of the system and its deployment. At the present time, the application has been implemented successfully and in use by the Supreme Court and in the Court of Appeals, Division One, for over 17 years.

The application is fully integrated with the judicial branch’s state standard document management system, OnBase, and is fully integrated with the judiciary’s Central Document Repository (CDR). Appellamation is also fully integrated with the judicial branch’s statewide e-filing system, AZTurboCourt, providing e-filing support for all case types, for both case initiation and subsequent filings with support for filing fee collections. The eAppeal/C2C module provides record on appeal assembly and electronic document transfer capability and is deployed statewide in all county courts.

The Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals, and the Appellamation development team plan continued improvement with further development and enhancement of new and improved functional modules. A number of automated interfaces and integration activities continue to further the appellate court’s e-Court initiatives. These include providing enhancements for various forms of electronic filing and management of electronic documents. Other enhancements are planned to improve workflow in the courts and expand public access to court and case information provided over the Internet.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Provide AZTEC maintenance releases as needed to align with legislative changes.
- Provide support and maintenance for automation until AJACS implements in all ACAP courts.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

AZTEC ERR&D

- Completed electronic records purge from data warehouse for 30 AZTEC courts, as directed by CSD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Superior Muni
- Superior/Kearny JP
- Maricopa Muni
- Maricopa/Stanfield JP
- Mammoth Muni
- South Tucson Muni
- Mammoth JP
- Oracle JP
- Green Valley JP
- Sahuarita Muni
- Eloy JP
- Casa Grande Muni
- Wickenburg Muni
- Carefree Muni
- Cave Creek Muni
- Gila Bend Muni
- Surprise Muni
- Goodyear Muni
- Fountain Hills Muni
- Litchfield Park Muni
- Youngtown Muni
- Tolleson Muni
- Avondale Muni
- El Mirage Muni
- Guadalupe Muni
- Peoria MC
- Buckeye Muni
- Oro Valley Muni
- Apache Junction Muni
- Marana Muni
AZTEC is the legacy case and cash management system originally deployed throughout 134 of Arizona’s limited jurisdiction courts. AZTEC software maintenance is an internally supported project. Though development staff and software support were originally provided by a vendor, the Arizona Judicial Branch obtained rights to the software for use in Arizona courts and began directing and performing the development of enhancements and modifications. The remaining AZTEC developer is able to address deficiencies in the system and provide enhancements, balanced by end-of-life considerations, until the next-generation LJ case management system is fully deployed throughout the state.

The Commission on Technology re-affirmed its approach to AZTEC developed during the strategic planning for Fiscal Years 2004-2006. The application long ago reached the end of its lifecycle and has already been replaced by a vendor system at the general jurisdiction level.

The continued operation and maintenance of AZTEC is for support of required needs and functions of the courts during a several-year migration to the new AJACS system. In the meantime, the on-going support and maintenance of the basic case and cash management system for Arizona courts remains a priority. Considerable investment has been made to-date in first-generation systems and now that they are implemented throughout the Judicial Branch and improved for users over time, they must continue functioning fully to support their users during transition to second-generation systems.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Since the AS/400 platform has reached an ‘end-of-life’ status and is no longer supported by IBM, a copy of all Legacy JOLTS data is being moved to a SQL server. Once a new web-based app is built to access juveniles over the age of 23 that were not converted to JOLTSaz, Legacy JOLTS system access will be terminated and data on the AS/400 will be decommissioned.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

- Completed JOLTSaz data conversion, deployment and training for Pima and the Rural Counties.

SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

JOLTSaz, the next-generation application, replaced JOLTS statewide as of December 2017.
PROJECT GOALS

- Move the current Informix Data Warehouse to SQL Server. The replacement SQL Server system will be called Central Case Repository (CCR).
- Base the CCR database design on the current database structure of the Informix Data Warehouse and enhance the final design to include data needs for all eCourt projects.
- Support all priority projects including FARE, Protective Order, Public Access, and MVD in Phase One.
- Replace the current 4GL code from Informix with API services.
- Develop repositories to support each priority project utilizing API service layer to provide both business and data needs.
- Develop and implement a strategic roadmap for the transaction processing and analysis for FARE, CPOR, Public Access, etc.
- Develop a project plan that entails analysis of new business processes, new architecture, and new data technology.
- Continue statewide collection of court data (AJACS, AZTEC, and others) and add other court entities’ data into the CCR.
- Support the interface to public access information and to other interested agencies.
- Convert current data warehouse web applications to the AOC-standard, 3-tier architecture.
- Support ad hoc reporting requests from business-unit-centric data marts.
- Support the central repository as an on-going project.
- Move dashboards (eTrac, iTrac, sTrac, DUI, etc.) to a new technical architecture.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

- Developed a work breakdown structure for planning how to move the current Informix Data Warehouse to SQL Server.
- Performed analysis on the 4GL code for FARE (Fines/Fees and Restitution Enforcement) Program and Protective Orders.
- Began design of the API services for FARE, including support of the current business process and enhancements requested by the FARE business team.
- Designed to allow for support of FARE including:
Interim FARE interfaces with Chandler Municipal, AZTEC courts, and all 26 Maricopa Justice Courts;
- FARE interfaces for AJACS;
- Full FARE interfaces with Phoenix Municipal Court; and
- TTEAP processing for FARE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNAPSHOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

A strategic roadmap specifies the direction and evolution of the JUSTIS Data Warehouse to become the Statewide Central Data Repository. In this roadmap, current technological trends recommend a separation of concerns. Live data, transaction processing, and data analysis are all separated so that business needs can be met on different levels and on separate timelines. Disparate, case-related information held in various courts’ systems of record are transported to centrally located Operational Data Stores (ODS) that provide transactional data to managed services operating across systems. This pattern is then expanded to business-unit-focused data marts for further reporting and analysis. That approach is now collectively known as the Statewide Central Data Repository for the Judicial Branch.

The Central Data Repository functions as the primary statewide interface between the case management systems, other court automation systems, and outside agencies. Interfaces have been created in response to a need to collect statewide data in a central location and provide formatting that enables the data to be used in a consistent, governed manner. Based upon the need of specific projects, specifications have been created to describe the way to transfer information to and from the Statewide Central Data Repository. Transport services have been written to allow the information to be processed and loaded. A statewide view of most court information is now possible and an architectural standard is being developed to access this information through a set of managed services. Some of these interfaces include FARE, CPOR, Public Access, and e-Filing.

The Central Data Repository provides the following court case information/functionality:
- A centralized case and person search capability for court personnel.
- The data collection mechanism for the publicly accessible court information via Intranet (AJIN) and Internet with different capabilities.
- The data collection mechanism for the statistical database needed to respond to both executive and legislative requests for statistical information about court activity.

Maintaining the Central Data Repository provides the following benefits:
- Improved quality of service to the public by providing other government agencies, such as DPS, DES, and DOR with more accessible electronic information to improve and support their business processes.
- Improved centralized access to information, such as criminal history, orders of protection, domestic violence, etc., for law enforcement.
- Improved electronic integration with the legal community and other justice-related departments and agencies.
• Improved quality and quantity of data available to the AOC for analysis, research, and improving services to the courts.

• Improved customer service by providing higher quality of data and case management and greater public access to information.

One of the main benefits of the Central Data Repository is the ability to provide court data for statewide analysis and statistical reporting. All report generation is in accordance with the policies established by the Arizona Judicial Council (AJC).

The Central Data Repository provides the foundation for the development and support of FARE. It also provides the main interface among the courts (AZTEC, AJACS, and other CMSs), external agencies (MVD), and service providers.

Statistical reporting data as well as other aggregates have been built into a data mart infrastructure to support other required analysis and planning. AOC is able to enhance the Central Data Repository as a result of additional research to determine future needs of the public, the requirements of new federal legislation for such things as a domestic violence index, and the needs of local and state law enforcement.
AZ STATEWIDE PROTECTIVE ORDER PROJECT

PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Develop an end-to-end, electronic system that will process all Protective Orders.
- Update the current Court Protective Order Repository (CPOR) and Law Enforcement Protective Order Repository (LPOR) systems into a single protective order system that will increase capacity, accessibility, and reporting capability.
- Construct a web portal where the public can log on and electronically complete a protective order petition.
- Enable courts to electronically retrieve completed electronic petitions.
- After court issues a protective order, electronically prepare it and transmit it for service.
- Develop system for servicing agency to access any unserved order and petition.
- Provide notification to the petitioner via email/ electronic method (to be determined) that the servicing agency has served the order of protection.
- Provide notification via electronic method (to be determined) to the court that issued the order once the servicing agency has served the order of protection.
- Electronically transmit all served protection order data to NCIC.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

- Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC) held meetings with local practitioners from around the state to discuss ways to improve the Order of Protection/Injunction Against Harassment process.
- Legislative changes to A.R.S. 12-1809(L) were made in HB229, authorizing the supreme court to maintain a central repository for injunctions against harassment as of December 31, 2019.
- AOC kicked off the design phase of the project for developing a single Arizona protective order system.
SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A 2002 project developed the original electronic process for protective orders and created two systems: Court Protective Order Repository (CPOR) and Law Enforcement Protective Order Repository (LPOR). CPOR and LPOR were the first in a series of projects to construct a truly statewide repository of protective orders. That effort determined the feasibility of centralizing the processes of protective order data management in Arizona so agencies and courts in the various jurisdictions across the state had equal access to such orders on a consistent and timely basis.

LPOR ultimately populated a law enforcement repository that interacts with NCIC and the ACJIS network, enabling law enforcement to query protection orders, review the data, and accept the data to be sent to the NCIC system. When the record does not pass the edits for NCIC, it becomes “Arizona Only,” allowing ACJIS users to still query and view the data.

Currently only four counties’ justice partners (Coconino, Gila, Navajo, and La Paz) beyond the Superior Court are participating in the full process, but a need exists to have near-real time information available in order to prevent gun sales to prohibited persons. Since civil protection orders served in Arizona are required to be submitted to NCIC, having a single protective order system with participation from all 15 Arizona counties’ courts and law enforcement agencies will ensure individuals restricted from buying guns will be entered into the federal NCIC database more consistently and timely which ultimately provides for better public safety.

Since an integrated electronic system does not currently exist, the public is unable to electronically prepare their paperwork for filing a petition and must physically go to the court during court business hours to fill out a paper petition. This project would enable anyone who is in crisis with the help of a domestic violence victim’s advocate, family/friend, or even by themselves to quickly and accurately submit paperwork electronically to an Arizona court from virtually any location.

Overall, six phases comprise the project:

**Phase 1: Development of Public Web Portal (EFM):**

1. Development of a web portal where the public can electronically complete a protective order petition
2. Development of electronic Protective Order Petition form
3. The Protective Order Petition will be used for the following protection order types:
   i. Order of Protection (see ARS § 13-3602 Order of protection; procedure; contents; arrest for violation; penalty; protection order from another jurisdiction)
   ii. Emergency Order of Protection (see A.R.S. § 13-3624 Emergency orders of protection)
   iii. Injunction Against Harassment (see ARS § 12-1809 Injunction against harassment; petition; venue; fees; notices; enforcement; definition)
   iv. Injunction Against Workplace Harassment (see ARS § 12-1810 Injunction against workplace harassment; definitions)
4. Development of training materials for the public to utilize the web portal

**Phase 2: CMS Integration from EFM (Public Web Portal)**

1. Development to allow a court to electronically receive a completed protective order petition
2. XML schema development to electronically submit a completed protective order petition into a court’s case management system (CMS)

**Phase 3: CMS to Prepare Order/Petition Transmit for Service**

1. Enabling Arizona court CMSs to transmit to the AOC’s Central Case Repository
   a. Currently this is the AOC’s Data Warehouse system which will be replaced by an updated system called Central Case Repository (CCR)
2. Arizona court CMSs will need to determine at the court hearing:
   a. Actual start date for service
   b. Agency that will be providing service, based on defendant’s address
3. AJACS, the Arizona state-standard CMS, already has a protective order module built in while non-AJACS CMSs will need to model and follow standard integration requirements to ensure protective orders can be transmitted electronically to the Arizona Statewide Protective Order System

**Phase 4: LE Service of Order/Petition**

1. Development of a law enforcement interface to allow the servicing agency the ability to:
   a. Access the unserved order and petition and
   b. Enter information for the order that was served

**Phase 5: Notification of Service**

1. After servicing agency has served the order of protection:
   a. Provide notification to the petitioner via email/electronic method (to be determined) that the order has been served
   b. Provide notification to the court that issued the order via electronic method (to be determined) that the order has been served
2. Program protection order system to check in near real time for updates of service to send the notifications

**Phase 6: Transmit to NCIC**

Once service is determined, protection order system will transmit order through ACJIS to NCIC with the AOC ORI.
PROJECT GOALS

• Assist courts in implementing the electronic document management (EDM), imaging, and electronic filing systems that are compatible with adopted standards.
• Provide guidance to courts regarding all aspects of electronic records.
• Identify short- and long-term funding resources to support electronic document management, storage, archiving, and automated removal.
• Support statewide eFiling by creating a central document repository (CDR) for court filings received through an online interface, then replicated following acceptance by clerks. Provide reliable method of exchanging documents from one OnBase system with another.
• Provide a centralized EDMS for use by smaller, limited jurisdiction courts.
• Implement the OnBase imaging solution throughout the Administrative Office of the Courts and in the Supreme Court.
• Integrate OnBase with the records retention function in AZTEC and AJACS to automatically remove records from the LJ EDMS once any case has been completed for the period of time that is required by court records retention policy.
• Integrate OnBase with existing, state-standard case management systems (AJACS, AZTEC, Appellamation).
• Implement Document Transfer Module (DTM) with existing OnBase systems to facilitate the CDR in support of e-filing, judge automation, and public access to court records.
• Automate, where possible, the capture of metadata, form data, and document images with a goal of eliminating manual entry of case file information by clerks.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

• Continued supporting OnBase, the state-standard EDMS, in 14 of 15 Superior Courts and at the AOC.
• Implemented transfer of metadata and document copies with existing OnBase systems in the final AJACS Superior Courts; now all AJACS Superior Courts are transmitting. Continued to track success rate of scheduled transfers daily.
• Investigated, documented, and tracked numerous product bugs and product enhancement requests with the vendor. Met with various representatives from the vendor and local reseller to discuss the scope and impact of various product defects and unresolved issues on the business processes of the courts, especially with the document transfer module.
Accomplished conversion activities for each LJ court formerly using disconnected scanning concurrent with their adoption of AJACS.

Replaced OnBase Desktop functionality with Unity Client in remaining AZTEC courts. Provided performance enhancements in response to user concerns.

Upgraded OnBase systems at AOC to V17 SP1 and supported test/production upgrade activities for eight rural counties, including document transfer functionality among mismatched systems.

Reviewed formal requests from individual courts regarding destruction of paper records where equivalent electronic records exist, pursuant to ACJA § 1-507.

Drafted a detailed checklist for paperless court operations to be used by clerks. Constructed requirements for a daily report comparing docketed items in AJACS to successfully transferred records in the CDR to ensure local and central EDMSs remain synchronized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electronic Document Management (EDM) includes the processes and the environment where documents are created, stored, managed, located, retrieved, and viewed electronically. Electronic documents and records are rapidly replacing traditional media (paper). Electronic documents are now common in the day-to-day business of the court, relied upon by court staff, other justice-related agencies, and the public.

An electronic document management system (EDMS) is generally made up of several different technologies that must be integrated including imaging, electronic filing, workflow management, case management system applications, mass storage, and database management.

The Judicial Branch realizes that the needs and benefits of electronic document management extend throughout the criminal justice system and will collaborate with other agencies to develop a model that satisfies system-wide requirements as well as the requirements of the courts.

The current court strategy is to:

- Assist courts in developing alternatives to their records storage and paper case file routing/tracking challenges.
- Develop documentation and state-level expertise to assist courts in selecting the best model for their environment while remaining non-proprietary and capable of storing and sharing documents between and among courts, other government agencies, the legal community, and litigants.
- Provide guidance to courts having EDMS regarding destruction of paper court records for which digital images exist and the retention of electronic records.
- Provide a central solution that significantly reduces the barrier to entry for limited jurisdiction courts desiring to digitize paper records and accept electronic case filings.
• Provide a central second repository for documents and a reliable transfer method to and from standalone systems to support business continuity, eFiling, public access, and to enable destruction of paper records.

There is a strong interdependence between this and other strategic projects. For example, the electronic filing project requires that an EDMS be present to store filings. The Public Access to Case Information and Documents project relies on the existence of a repository of documents from which to fulfill requests. Electronic authorizations and signatures will also play a role. Certification that the electronic original document is actually the signed and unaltered original document will be important. Technologies and processes to provide this assurance must be put in place.

An ever-increasing number of Arizona courts at all levels are using imaging and electronic document management systems. All Superior Court Clerks and clerks of several larger limited jurisdiction courts have now implemented full-featured EDM. Focus remains on smaller, limited jurisdiction courts that desire to adopt EDMS but have insufficient resources to purchase and maintain a standalone system.

There is clear business need for the EDMS initiative as well as a receptive environment. Because storage and paper handling has reached a critical level, there is a realization of an urgent need in many courts. Both the public (especially the media) and Arizona Bar have expressed interest. A renewed vendor interest in the Arizona market has caused some additional visibility. With the introduction of digital signature legislation in Arizona, the policy environment is in place to support electronic documents.

There are, however, legitimate concerns about privacy. Having all court documents in electronic format and easily disseminated over the Internet, thus making court documents generally accessible, removes the longstanding “practical obscurity” of public court records. The Arizona Judicial Council team reviewed the court’s public records policy, Supreme Court Rule 123, and enacted additional rules to balance demands for increased access to public information with necessary protection of citizen privacy in digital court records. More recently, the chief justice convened a special committee to recommend solutions to problems unique to a completely electronic lifecycle for court case records.

Over the past few years, statewide models for electronic document management and electronic filing have transitioned from design to reality and taken a more federated flavor to spur rapid adoption of a statewide e-filing process in Arizona.

The COT has focused on using vendor solutions to accomplish statewide e-filing in Arizona for all courts and all case types. Arizona Code of Judicial Administration (ACJA) Sections 1-504 and 1-506 have been updated to direct a more uniform approach to document management and e-filing and will continue to be revisited as further technology refinements occur.

With so many courts creating digital records and having the ability to share those records with other courts and justice partners, emphasis is necessarily shifting to protecting the integrity and availability of those records. Many courts employing imaging do not yet meet the requirements of ACJA 1-506 for electronic filing, having neither the funding nor technical know-how required. AOC is undertaking, as a corollary project to e-filing, creation of a central case index (CCI) and central document repository (CDR). For courts supported by the AOC, this environment provides a second copy of electronically filed court case documents and serves as the gateway/repository for public access to court documents, per Rule 123’s criteria. For courts performing their own support, the CCI will catalog the locations of the accepted records on clerks’ systems in order to pass requests directly to those systems for fulfillment.

Since e-filing applies to all case types and all courts, the LJ level cannot be overlooked. EDMS is a pre-requisite to acceptance of electronic documents by LJ courts. The cost of procuring, implementing, and maintaining even a minimal functioning local system in all LJ courts is prohibitive (over $4 million). Waiting for cities or counties to implement digitization efforts for local courts to join will delay implementation of e-filing for years. The solution is to balance use of a central system by over 100 local courts with available bandwidth. Unity integration enables images scanned one at a time to be available to courts immediately. The central system, the CDR, has been constructed and integrated with the AJACS CMS, AZTEC CMS, eBench, AZTurboCourt, and eUniversa e-filing to reduce the burden on local courts.

As imaging processes matured, Clerks became disillusioned because the initial promise of a reduced workload and storage space were not being realized. Through the e-Records Subcommittee of the Limited Jurisdiction Courts Committee they requested clear direction regarding removal of paper records where electronic reproductions of them exist, especially in...
limited jurisdiction courts, since they are not courts of record. That direction has been provided in ACJA 1-507, approved December 10, 2008, and revised January 11, 2012, to include administrative records of the courts.

Activities already completed for this multi-year project include:

- Establishing pilot projects to test the adopted standards and guidelines for electronic filing and electronic document management.
- Establishing electronic document management models for different types of courts.
- Leveraging State support and procurement by identifying a limited product set to be used statewide.
- Identifying potential short- and long-term funding resources to support the project.
- Enhancing the ACAP case management systems (AZTEC & AJACS) to recognize and manage electronic documents.
- Identifying a subscription model for scanning to reduce the barrier to entry for smaller LJ courts.
- Identifying and securing the funding necessary for construction, deployment, and ongoing maintenance of the centralized LJ EDMS.

Activities that must still be undertaken include:

- Organizing resources - human, financial, expertise, etc., to support the completion of the initiative.
- Enabling full e-filing functionality in new CMSs and replacing disconnected scanning with real-time scanning as part of the AJACS LJ rollout.
- Implementing an e-filing model that can be deployed throughout the Judicial Branch for all courts and all case types.
- Publication to clerks of a checklist for paperless court operations now that the scale is tipping away from paper toward e-filed input and digital case records. The absence of any paper backup in e-filed cases requires more scrutiny on the integrity and maintenance of electronic records, including a daily audit of all records replicated to the CDR.

In addition to executing the technical tasks, the Judicial Branch is also continuing to work with courts and the public on the paradigm shift from paper to electronic documents. Education of court staff, the legal community, and the public continues year after year. CIO Karl Heckart has hosted a statewide educational broadcast covering the topic, field trainers have been briefed, and various publicity flyers have been developed and distributed around the state.

The investment is considerable and the judiciary is proceeding deliberately, but EDMS is now clearly a “must have” rather than “nice to have” tool.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

AZTurboCourt was the Court’s first designated statewide e-filing system. eUniversa is the next-generation statewide e-filing system.

The main components of the Court’s electronic filing ecosystem includes, but are not limited to the Filer User Interface (UI), Electronic Filing Manager (EFM), Case Management System (CMS), Online Payment Portal, as well as Clerk Review, and Judge Automation systems. The Filer UI enables e-filers to assemble, pay for, and transmit their case submissions to a court. The EFM facilitates the exchange of case data and documents between the Filer UI and the destination or “target” clerk review systems and or CMSs. The Clerk Review System enables clerks of the court to evaluate and process case file submissions. The EFM also keeps track of e-filer registration profiles and helps manage access to submissions awaiting clerk review, filed documents, and other case information made available for public review. Judge automation support is generally CMS-provided functionality; however, the AOC invested in Mentis’ aiSmartBench, an application that enables judges and their staff to work with electronic documents maintained by CMSs. aiSmartBench is also able to function as a Filer UI, enabling judges and their staff to submit orders, notices, and judgments directly to the court via the eUniversa EFM.

Once eUniversa becomes fully operational, all future electronic filing interactions with the Arizona Judiciary will be facilitated through the eUniversa EFM.

PROJECT GOALS

LITIGANT FILING

• Create a Web-based service through which attorney-represented and self-represented litigants submit Arizona court case files online, thereby eliminating the need for the creation and handling of physical paper.

• Demonstrate ongoing value of a standards-based user interface by which litigants can submit filings using a common facility.

• Leverage the court-defined data standards in all jurisdictions within and between the e-filing system and target CMSs.

• Speed adoption of statewide e-filing by implementing vendor-developed and -supported:
  o Electronic Filing Manager (EFM) capable of supporting
    o Multiple jurisdictions and licensed/owned by the Court,
    o Multiple third-party electronic filing system providers that supply filer support for free-form and forms-based document submissions,
  o Online Payment Portal, and
  o Clerk and Judge Review systems.
CLERK REVIEW / CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (AJACS, APPELLAMATION)

- Implement an embedded and fully integrated Clerk Review function for the AJACS CMS that enables clerks to accept or reject case file submissions and transfer the appropriate data to the CMS for subsequent judge review.
- Enable court users and/or the CMS itself to initiate and/or provide automated responses to filers through the Clerk Review system.
- Develop XML message exchange standards for use between the Filer UI, Clerk Review System, and the CMS.

REGISTRATION SYSTEM

- Create a centrally located registration service that supports the Court’s enterprise public-facing online applications.
- Provide support for self-represented litigants, attorneys, businesses, and government agencies.

MQ INTEGRATION

- Situate IBM MQ as the message transport and exchange mechanism between the statewide e-filing system, specifically the EFM and target CMSs.
- Route e-filing-related inter-system messages through IBM MQ.
- Expose MQ web services for applications that do not interface directly to the MQ system.

ONLINE PAYMENT PORTAL

- Allow payment of filing and application fees to be made electronically.
- Provide reporting that helps law firms with client billing.
- Deliver a common payment processing service that supports multiple vendor providers of the Filer UI.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

- Over 268,000 filings were electronically submitted to the Superior and Appellate Courts engaged in e-filing through the year.
- Delivered support for initial and subsequent civil case submissions in the AJACS-GJ courts: Yavapai County, Mohave County, Santa Cruz County, Pinal County, Yuma County, Gila County, Greenlee County, Graham County, and Apache County.
- eUniversa EFM continues to provide AZTurboCourt, eFileAZ, and aiSmartBench e-filing integration support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNAPSHOT</th>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>X High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>X Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARIZONA JUDICIAL BRANCH | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN: 2019-2021
STATEWIDE E-FILING PROJECT DETAILS

In the spring of 2008, the Arizona Judicial Council and Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court, recognizing the opportunities and need for the next evolutionary step in court automation, directed the Administrative Office of the Courts to initiate a project to develop a statewide electronic case filing system and implement a pilot court by the second quarter of 2009. Supreme Court Chief Justice Ruth McGregor elaborated four key directives to guide this important initiative:

1. The Branch must not create a fragmented system that leaves some courts behind due to their location or volume.
2. E-Filing must apply to all types of cases in the state, including those for which no filing fees exist.
3. Arizona must use a court-powered and court-managed system. No vendor must own or control court documents.
4. The solution chosen must be a first-class system, capable of supplying all the services that court users need, including case initiation and service of process.

In response, the Arizona Judiciary is constructing an Arizona Court Filing Service which will provide citizens of Arizona and clients of the courts a single portal with which to conduct business, no matter the court or type of case. This portal will allow attorneys and parties to cases in the courts to rapidly access and file information pertinent to those cases in any court in a seamless, easy to understand way.

Electronic filing focuses on exchanging case file data and documents, including appropriate and validated indexing information, with case management and other court-critical information systems. The Electronic Document Management (EDM) initiative seeks to supplement these court-critical applications with document storage support. EDM complements the processes associated with document creation, storage, management, retrieval, and archiving. At present, courts use imaging systems to digitize documents received as paper. The digitizing process today typically requires staff to manually feed documents into imaging systems (scanners). The most effective and efficient method over the long term is to implement electronic filing and thus remove the need to manually digitize documents. Rules and guidelines governing electronic filing continue to evolve while existing paper-centric rules continue to be modified one by one.

The historical strategy has been to:

- Assist courts in developing alternatives to their records storage and paper case file routing/tracking challenges.
- Examine and apply the lessons learned from electronic filing pilots and projects to a unified, statewide approach.
- Keep current with electronic filing research and evaluate what is successful nationally.
- Continue to work with the national effort to develop common e-filing message schemas based on Global Justice XML Data Dictionary (GJXDD), Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards (OASIS) LegalXML Electronic Court Filing (ECF), and National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) specifications.

The Arizona Supreme Court, Administrative Office of the Courts, is a member of the OASIS group and has been supporting their efforts towards standardization in the use of XML for court filings nationwide. ACJA § 1-506 directs the courts to embrace Extensible Markup Language (XML), portable document format (.pdf), OpenOffice XML (.docx), and OpenDoc Format (.odt) for electronic filing submissions.

The goals of electronic filing are to:

- Increase the operational effectiveness and efficiencies of the Court and criminal justice system;
- Avoid duplicative costs;
- Improve service to the public;
- Study, coordinate, and plan the transfer of case records electronically to, from, and between courts;
• Craft a unified statewide model for electronic filing; and
• Promote the transition to full production of pilots in different courts to the statewide model.

The introduction of digital signature legislation in Arizona paved the way for an environment to support electronic filing of documents. The courts adopted Rule 124 and related technical standards in the Year 2000 to provide for electronic filing. The Commission on Technology (COT) also approved the standards-based electronic transfer of records on appeal from each Superior Court location to each Appellate Court. COT has since ratified a set of seven general principles to govern eventual e-filing solutions.

The envisioned statewide model for electronic filing responds to several overarching Judicial Branch directives. Inter/intra-court synergy associated with the electronic filing value-chain continues to evolve after years of independent court efforts. The following initiatives have been achieved or are well on their way to completion:

• Completed a statewide electronic document reference model and system implementation in appellate and superior courts.
• Completed the implementation of a development, test, and production message broker, i.e., Enterprise Service Bus.
• Completed and continue to update a common XML message for electronic filing for all court levels and transaction types.
• Completed and maintain production-grade, message broker-supported applications that facilitate the placing and retrieving of case file and citation data, documents, and images into and out of the Enterprise Service Bus environment.
• Continually identifying potential short- and long-term funding resources to support the electronic filing initiative.
• Developing an electronic filing business model that can be deployed throughout the Judicial Branch.
• Continue to convert hardcopy court forms into their online equivalents.
• Continually researching and processing the required changes to paper-based filing-related rules in Arizona courts.
• Continually preparing the courts and the public for a paradigm shift from physical paper filings to electronic document filings.
• Creating “cookbooks” that communicate to business partners what is needed to effectively engage in electronic filing with the courts.

In addition to the various technical tasks, court staff, the legal community, and the public must embrace and are becoming more comfortable with living in an electronic world.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

Conduct analysis, design, planning, and implementation of enterprise standards in order to successfully develop and execute the business strategy of the courts.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

- Continued to enhance Administrative Case Event System (ACES) to be used for consolidation of information between systems routed through the AOC. This moves AOC closer to an architected e-government solution.
- Finished development work and began user acceptance testing for DocLink, a methodology for introducing permanent bookmarks into legal documents for secure retrieval of related documents.
- Continued to deploy production system for eFiling using ACES to retrieve case information and documents for all of the AJACS superior courts.
- Continued to apply automated testing standards through the implementation of well-defined unit testing. These unit tests are now part of the build process for ACES and eFiling services and are run as regression tests on every development change.
- Continued to design a message bridge pattern between ACES and the current IBM WebSphere MQ messaging system. Identified areas that need improvement and designed a subscription model for key messages and began development of an approach to accomplish the improvement starting with NICS.
- Continued training on Domain-Driven Development for use in better integrating court information across the organization. Designed training material for the business teams to utilize this approach in both current and new projects.
- Designed the processes and patterns for an Enterprise Core which defines the methodology to replace legacy technologies allowing them to continue in situ while the new technology such as ACES overtakes them.
- Developed the model for ACES integration with CCI to enhance the enterprise-wide and reusable components for many key applications. Additional components of ACES were implemented to utilize the CCI.
- Continued mentoring and education of court staff on Domain-Driven Development practices and the move towards task-based rather than data-centric enterprise development standards.

Work with Maricopa County progressed and information needed for the eAccess project was loaded into CCI successfully. Planning began for the new test environment that Maricopa is scheduled to implement in 2018.
Cooperative development and resource leveraging have become key strategies in automation development for courts. To facilitate those joint efforts, some standards have been adopted statewide.

The Arizona courts have identified a core set of applications that are maintained and supported at the State level. These include AJACS, AZTEC, JOLTSaz, JOLTSaz, APETS, Appellamation, and other products supported by third-party vendors, such as Jury+ and OnBase (refer to ACJA § 1-501). These software applications are supported centrally and changes are coordinated.

Some courts have technical staff to develop modules that address the special needs of a court. These modules are generally interfaced to the core applications. Often when other courts see these applications, they wish to implement the functionality, too. However, when new releases of the core applications are provided, many times there has been difficulty with compatibility of the locally developed modules and the new release.

To avoid or mitigate the difficulty, the courts have adopted a set of guidelines. Basically, if a local module is developed within the enterprise architecture and is coordinated with the application support staff at the State, vendor, or shared support level, core release developers will make efforts to protect those interfaces. They will, at a minimum, coordinate with technical staff for the change requirements, development, and testing that is necessary for the local module to function in the new release’s environment.

Adopting an IT enterprise architecture, although intuitively a positive organizational direction, is often difficult. Standards are many times perceived as coming at the expense of freedom. However, with today’s fast-paced technology demands, architecture is a strategic necessity. A mature IT enterprise must have the discipline to adopt and follow a consistent set of strategies, reference models, and exchange capabilities.

Per Gartner, the strategic goal of enterprise architecture is to position the entity to leverage technology in support of the business strategy and make technology the proactive enabler of an agile, responsive enterprise that can react in real time to changes. Enterprise architecture will provide standardization and elimination of redundancy and complexity across the Arizona Judicial Branch.

The cross-jurisdictional nature of criminal justice activities supports adopting common architectures to facilitate integration.

The Judicial Branch must avoid being what Gartner Group describes as a “typical unarchitected e-government” where “multiple sets of customer channels, interfaces and systems are independently developed […] and require duplicative infrastructure and forced disparate access experiences for constituents.”

There is a lower cost to buy and support a limited set of products and standards; the judiciary can leverage both volume discount buying and maintain a less complex environment.

The standards, protocols, and products listed are prescribed for core, leveraged activities and applications among the courts statewide. Where there are unique local undertakings that cannot be leveraged, a court is free to go beyond the standards set. If sharable modules related to core applications are developed, then the standards should be followed. Non-standard products and applications are a challenge to support and can be a security concern. The “Distributed Component (Bolt-on) Module,” “Service Strategic Design Document,” “Service Tactical Design Document,” and “AOC Identity Platform Document” outline the approaches to development of local, leveraged and standardized service interfaces to interact with the AOC. To be sharable, supported in the statewide framework, or part of core-standardized applications, services will be developed to the Enterprise Architecture Standards of the Arizona Judicial Branch.
**PROJECT GOALS**

- Continue to expand existing system monitoring capabilities into all application environments to enable nearly immediate notification of application error conditions.
- Continue consolidating legacy server platforms in the AOC Data Center onto Windows-based technology. Continue equipment refreshes and consolidation of older Windows-based hardware environments.
- Begin the multi-year project of upgrading all Windows SQL database (DB) environments from SQL 2012 to SQL 2017. Migrating DB environments to SQL 2017 will improve system availability during application rollouts.
- Begin the migration of all remaining Microsoft Windows 2008 O/S environments to Windows 2016.
- Continue the bi-annual upgrade deployment of the Windows 10 operating system and Office 365 applications to all AOC-supported PCs and laptop systems around the state.
- Relocate the AOC’s Govnet offsite equipment from downtown Phoenix to Scottsdale.
- Continue to review and evaluate high availability options for Windows SQL database environments.
- Continue enhancements to the AJIN network infrastructure, including:
  - Ongoing equipment refreshes at remote locations on the AJIN network to ensure ongoing reliability and increased security functionality.
  - Upgrading network infrastructure for client desktop support requirements, continued expansion of video conferencing, and meeting application growth/bandwidth demands.
  - As requirements demand, and with vendor availability, continue migrating circuits onto Qwest Metro Optical Ethernet (QMOE) and microwave technology. This will improve circuit bandwidth while further reducing cost.
  - Upgrade the Ngenius Probe system for better visibility into local and remote traffic usage and patterns.
  - Implement anti-botnet security software to all edge firewalls.
  - Implement network architecture changes as courts obtain funding and express desire to implement the new dual-connection configuration.
- Continue to support remote site locations in building moves and relocations.
- Continue to expand virtual machine and clustering technologies within the AOC Data Center to obtain cost savings and rapid automated system recovery for greater application availability.
- Deploy all project-related infrastructure required for the support of
  - eUniversa project deployment,
  - the continued AJACS LJ CMS rollout,
• continued e-Filing deployments,
• eAccess project deployment,
• expanded eWarrant pilot project deployment, and
• eNotification project deployment.

• Upgrade statewide OnBase systems from Version 17.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

• Completed the replacement of end-of-life Wide Area Application Services (WAAS) units located throughout the state to remain within vendor support and precluded purchase of expensive or non-existent bandwidth to address the ever-increasing communication needs of the courts over time.

• Implemented Microsoft Exchange e-mail encryption statewide.

• Continued to support remote site locations in building moves and relocations. This includes the new install for Holbrook Probation and the new expansion for Pinal Superior Court.

• Upgraded all but six legacy Microsoft-O/S-based environments to Windows 2012. The remaining environments will be decommissioned based on project timelines.

• Continued to expand virtual machine and clustering technologies by 44 client systems to obtain cost savings and rapid automated system recovery.

• Upgraded six legacy IBM AIX Power5 Systems to new Power7 systems, providing greater performance and keeping them within vendor support.

• Implemented a new HP 3Par SAN and HP tape backup unit. This replaced the EOL legacy environment, improved backup times, and reduced annual maintenance costs.

• Completed the bi-annual upgrade deployment of Windows 10 operating system and Office 365 applications to all AOC-supported PCs and laptop systems statewide.

• Continued enhancements to the AJIN network infrastructure, including:
  • Installing a second internet connection to provide automatic failover capabilities and internet connectivity should the primary circuit fail.
  • Installing a new Cisco Core router in Glendale Municipal Court. This keeps the system in manufacturer warranty compliance while improving performance and reliability.
  • Increasing the bandwidth and performance in numerous courts (superior, municipal, and justice) as well as in probation locations, by upgrading their circuits to either QMOE or microwave technology.
  • Implementing Cisco Firepower to replace existing intrusion detection system, providing additional security to the AJIN network.
  • Installing wireless network connectivity in Apache Superior, Coconino Superior, Gila Superior, and Santa Cruz Superior to provide easier network connectivity to mobile computing devices.
  • Completing installation of 78 WAAS units and Cisco routers across the state in superior, municipal, justice court and probation locations.
  • Designing a network framework and strategy for enhancing the AJIN network capacity and capability over the next 5 to 8 years.

• Completed a multi-year project of migrating all AOC SQL database environments to SQL 2012. This provides improved system availability during application rollouts.

• Completed numerous network and phone modifications in support of staff relocations.

• Assisted various individual courts with server moves and network upgrades.

• Worked with various project teams to roll out/upgrade and support
  • APETS production enhancements,
  • JOLTSaz product upgrades and county rollouts,
  • AZYAS production software release,
- eUniversa product rollout and upgrades,
- TFS (Team Foundation Server) production upgrade,
- Jury Plus application upgrade,
- AJACS GJ and LJ releases,
- NICS production software releases,
- Datamart and Appellamation applications O/S and database upgrades,
- eBench product rollout and upgrades,
- CCI product upgrades, and
- Defensive Driving upgrades.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**INFRASTRUCTURE MAINTENANCE**

Infrastructure Maintenance continues to play a critical part of the overall shared infrastructure and shared services required to support the basic court operations and related programs on a day-to-day basis. Along with “Automation Training and Support” (PC deployment, field support, help desk), it represents the foundation of the Judicial Branch’s automation efforts. The key components include shared communications network and associated services (e-mail, business process workflow, and information access), data center, database administration, security, and disaster recovery. Infrastructure Maintenance primarily involves on-going maintenance and support, through various projects, to upgrade servers and operating systems, database engines, network equipment, and to add communication bandwidth.

The Arizona Judicial Information Network (AJIN) has been established as the means by which court data can be exchanged within and between counties and State-level agencies. As statewide strategic applications have been deployed, the capacity needs placed upon AJIN have risen considerably. Newer applications and devices connected on the network demand more intelligence, requiring upgrades of the established networking infrastructure. Thus, additional investment and planning must continue to be made in AJIN as long as it is to be the Judicial Branch’s enterprise network. Refer to the appendices for an identification of the servers and software (both desktop and server-based applications and server operating systems) that make up AJIN.

Major goals over the next several years include increasing security within the AJIN network environment and increasing capacity to remote locations, continuing to use Cisco’s Wide Area Application Services (WAAS), continuing expansion onto QMOE and microwave technology giving the AOC greater bandwidth and more flexibility to grow the AJIN network, as well as enhancing anti-virus and malware protection to all computing systems residing on AJIN. In addition, services will include growth in server virtualization and virtual machine mobility, server clustering technologies for rapid server recoverability, increased system and application error monitoring and alerting capabilities, and upgraded/expanded storage area networks (SANs) to improve integrated and automated business management performance.

Server virtualization provides the opportunity to reduce cost and energy requirements, increase agility, speed deployment, and leverage data center space because servers no longer need to be procured, installed, cabled up, and connected to the rest of the infrastructure. This enables rapid deployment of a production, development, or testing environment or creation of ‘sandboxes’ to assess specific functions such as load testing. Virtualization also takes into account the larger impacts due to failures of underlying hardware, tracking software licensing compliance, and the unnecessary consumption of server resources for those more lightly used VMs.

**SECURITY AND DISASTER RECOVERY**

Reliability and security of the Arizona Judicial Information Network (AJIN) are of primary importance. As a result, several ongoing statewide initiatives continue to address the maintenance and security of AJIN. As part of these ongoing efforts, network equipment refreshes take place, ensuring the latest technologies, firmware updates, and tools are deployed at each location on the AJIN network. An automated system patch management process has been put into place for all AOC-supported servers and devices, along with daily full antivirus scans, to further secure the AJIN network.
Firewalls and security monitoring equipment are the key technologies to protect the network. Every extended connection to AJIN is protected by a firewall and monitoring probes. These devices prevent attacks from the Internet and outside agencies, and also protect our internal IP addresses from outside sites visited by AJIN users. The devices and tools are constantly being upgraded as part of infrastructure maintenance efforts.

Computing device security audits are performed for both ACAP and non-ACAP courts across the Judiciary twice a year. The results of the statewide audit is then reported to the COT Cybersecurity Subcommittee for use in their security status report to COT as a whole. The results of these audits are analyzed and enhancements are made when necessary, ensuring the continued integrity of the AJIN network.

Formally published minimum security standards that govern security system management across all courts, both ACAP courts residing on the AJIN network as well as non-ACAP courts residing on city and county networks, have been in existence since 2016. Communication of the baseline standards with the various technical groups throughout the state, including the county CIOs, took place during the year following ratification, gaps to the standards were recorded, and the remaining gap closure projects continue being monitored to conclusion.

The AOC standard for remote access continues to be Virtual Private Networking (VPN) via Cisco AnyConnect. This technology allows automatic client installation on first connection and gives access based on rule sets for an individual’s group policy.

AJIN is a very reliable network today. The necessary firewalls, redundancy, and systems management documentation have resulted in high network availability for the users throughout the State. With the growing reliance on the AOC for retention of electronic data and documents, and the continual growth of AOC statewide applications, the need and importance of disaster recovery for the AOC computing environment continues to be re-evaluated for a cost effective solution.
For many people, the cost of legal representation has become prohibitive, as evidenced by the ever-increasing number of self-represented litigants appearing before the courts. Arizona courts are taking steps to provide meaningful assistance to the self-represented so that they are not denied justice because they lack the benefit of legal counsel. Among those steps are to:

- Develop and adopt supreme court guidelines defining legal assistance, as distinguished from legal advice, so that judicial staff can provide appropriate legal assistance.
- Expand the Judicial Branch’s self-service capabilities on the Web to include forms, instructions, and other information helpful to those who appear unrepresented in the limited and general jurisdictions, and appellate courts.
- Develop simple, easy to use, web-based, interactive forms needed for dissolution and other domestic-relations-related cases, small claims, eviction actions, general civil, and probate cases.
- Expand the breadth of the self-service approach for court users through online resources.
- Develop a Web portal that provides a convenient and unified access point for filing court cases as well as viewing case-related information statewide.
- Develop a central document repository as the source for public/party inquiry of court documents.
- Provide marketing support to educate the public about the functionality and convenience of the new electronic access capabilities.
- Provide access through a variety of means to allow litigants from varied backgrounds access to the courts.

**PROJECT GOALS**

- Standardize forms data to reduce duplicate efforts in providing court forms to the public and prepare for statewide e-filing.
- Automate the entire workflow associated with case initiation and subsequent filings for select case and form types in the Superior Court and Justice Courts.
- Deliver self-service forms to the public via the Court’s web portal, based on court rule or statute.
- Sustain the support efforts for the statewide electronic filing initiative.
- Establish resources for access to forms for those individuals who are Limited English Proficient (LEP).
PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

- Completed Limited Jurisdiction Small Claim case type business requirements based on proposed changes to the Civil Rules of Procedure scheduled to go into effect on January 1, 2019.
- Drafted Limited Jurisdiction Civil Claim case type business requirements.
- Observed Limited Jurisdiction Eviction Action case processing to determine if e-filing will aid the court without benefit of judge automation tools that can keep up with the pace of hearings in a live courtroom.

### SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>X High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**AUTOMATED INTELLIGENT FORMS**

Goal 1-B of *Advancing Justice Together* seeks to expand access to web-based forms for self-represented litigants. This technology initiative represents an overarching vision to provide Court automation solutions to the public and government agencies via a common Web portal. e-Filing is the closely related endeavor focused on providing private citizens and government agencies a means to pay for and file court documents in any court in the State and at any time of the day or night. Since the e-filing systems guide filers through the entire case filing process, including capturing data and processing input via each court’s case management system, access to justice will be sped up, the accuracy and completeness of the information entering the court will improve significantly minimizing the amount of re-work typically associated with manual case file processing, court forms will be standardized, and the amount of manual paper handling will be reduced greatly.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Continue with iCIS data feed to JOLTSaz project. The goal is a real time, single statewide repository of all juvenile data.
- Further enhance CASAaz web application for coordinators and volunteers utilizing a new VOCA grant.
- Continue to rewrite JOLTSaz screens outside of the Visible, the code generator, to improve functionality and response time.
- Build web application to access juveniles over the age of 23 that were not converted to JOLTSaz.
- Redesign data extracts now that the JOLTSaz rollout is complete.
- Finalize detailed requirements and start development for DCATS project to build FCRB and CASA functionality in JOLTSaz.
- Continue to develop SSRS core application reports; ensure rural counties have access to all JOLTSaz reports they need.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

- Completed JOLTSaz data conversion, deployment, and training for Pima and the rural counties. During the rollout, 156,164 juveniles, 342,042 complaints and 202,460 petitions were converted from Legacy JOLTS. In support of the deployment, 505 training classes in 15 locations were conducted and 789 state employees were trained on the new system.
- Completed the CASAaz rollout to Pima and the rural counties.
- Completed enhancements to Forms & Letters functionality in JOLTSaz.
- Completed redesign of JOLTSaz Referrals (Complaints) and Financial Assessments screens to improve functionality and response time.
- Completed ‘proof of concept’ for iCIS data feed to JOLTSaz.
## SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>X New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade X Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

JOLTSaz is a fully functional juvenile probation tracking system, including delinquency and dependency, for Pima and the rural counties. It was written in VB.net, an object-oriented programming language. A SQL server platform provides a single, centralized relational database with a 3-tier open architecture design that best suits the organization’s needs. It currently has 511 screens, 525 tables and 34 reports.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

• Streamline and standardize a set of judicial workflows and related business tools and processes to enable judges to be more efficient and productive on the bench and in chambers.

• Interface an automated solution with the statewide CMS application, AJACS, for limited jurisdiction court judges and enable interfaces with other case management systems in the state.

• Eliminate the need for paper files and manual processing, long term, by providing judges the ability to manage their cases electronically from start to finish.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

• eBench has been deployed in 14 of 15 Superior Court locations with over 230 judges using the application.

• AOC continues to provide training and assistance with specific judicial workflow and business process changes.

SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

While digitization has made great inroads in courts’ back offices over the past several years, bringing electronic documents and workflow to the judge represents the “last mile” of the effort. Clerks continue to scan documents filed at the counter and increasingly receive electronic filings, only to routinely print them for the judge’s use in chambers and on the bench.

The purpose of this project is to provide a solution for the judges which will streamline judicial workflows and business processes so judges can be efficient and productive in an all-digital environment on the bench or in chambers.
In mid-2009, judges from various courts and jurisdictions initially met and then traveled to Colorado where they observed
a judges’ automation software product developed by the Colorado State Judiciary. The pros and cons of Colorado’s system
and the current application were discussed and shared with the project’s assigned systems analyst in early 2010. The best
features are being incorporated into the automation effort.

Automation geared specifically towards the needs of limited jurisdiction court judges will interface with the current
statewide CMS application, AJACS, along with all case management systems in the state to automate their interaction with
court cases and parties. These development efforts and the resulting automation tool will virtually eliminate the need for
paper files and manual processing, thus providing judges electronic case management.

While the AOC has begun efforts towards designing and building a streamlined and standardized set of judicial workflows
and business processes, additional work is still required before finalization.

Collaborative efforts are underway with remaining LJ AJACS development both for AZTEC replacement and large volume
LJ court requirements that will bring this automation effort closer to reaching its goals. Additional development efforts to
support e-filing operations are constructing initial clerk review functionality and improving the document management
capabilities in the AJACS application.

Following a competitive procurement process in 2013, AOC awarded a contract to procure a judicial decision support
system designed to reduce the courts’ reliance on paper. The selected system was piloted in Pima Superior Court and has
now been deployed to all 13 AJACS Superior Courts. LJ courts may be implemented in later phases. The vendor provides
a system that eliminates the courts’ reliance on paper and allows for real-time updating and viewing, eliminating the need
for courts to print, sign-by-hand, ink stamp, photocopy, courier, fax, post, file, locate, and manually distribute all
documentation relative to cases handled by each judge.
**PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

**PROJECT GOALS**

- Prepare for implementation of a new case management system (CMS) for limited jurisdiction (LJ) courts.
- Perform a gap analysis of system functions to determine additional enhancements required for statewide distribution.
- Include a case financial system that will handle the complex financial allocation algorithms that currently exist.
- Include a civil case-processing module that will handle all filings and forms utilized by a justice and/or municipal court.
- Provide program interfaces that permit integration with other systems.
- Create an object-oriented structure so that the system and its components are usable for juvenile and adult probation financial activity.
- Oversee application development based on limited jurisdiction court requirements identified during gap analysis.
- Analyze and assess AZTEC data cleanup and data conversion efforts.
- Include a standard library of court forms and reports.
- Prepare and execute a detailed project plan for user training and implementation activities.
- Include electronic document management functionality for all limited jurisdiction courts.

**PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018**

- Continued to enhance AJACS through bug fixes, change and enhancement requests, as well as thorough functional testing. Below are a few highlights deployed over the course of four releases:
  - Enhanced application to allow for certain events to be entered on a closed case
  - Enhanced the calendar report
  - Deployed ten time standard reports
  - Enhanced behavioral health case processing in the application
  - Deployed law enforcement contact interface for Pima County courts
  - Added email encryption functionality to AJACS
  - Enhanced the exhibit tracking module to improve efficiency
  - Made warrant processing enhancements
  - Deployed modifications to support the new fields on the ATTC form
  - Made OnBase/document handling enhancements to prevent bad data
  - Implemented form modifications for Fair Justice Task Force
  - Enabled LJ courts to report to NICS via AJACS
  - Deployed one new LJ statistical report, “Manner of Sentencing”
• Continued to set up and/or modify LJ AJACS-required system configuration including all table codes and system parameters, as necessary.

• Continued efforts to design, develop, and modify LJ AJACS system forms, as necessary, and as brought up by production courts.

• Continued efforts to design, develop, and modify LJ AJACS system reports, as necessary and as requested by production courts.

• Continued creation of test scripts and functional testing of LJ AJACS, specifically in conjunction with new, major releases or product functionality.

• Continued working closely with Tucson City Court to assist with ongoing system configuration, table code setup, and architectural environment support required to operate the LJ AJACS application in a standalone/self-supported environment.

• Continued to update and modify, as necessary, all training documentation and videos.

• Provided AJACS courts a new methodology for scanning and storing electronic documents within AJACS and OnBase.

• Began utilizing digital signatures within AJACS by capturing judge and court staff signatures to electronically sign documents created for AJACS cases.

• Continued statewide LJ AJACS rollout begun in 2015. 68 of 132 LJ courts have converted from AZTEC to AJACS (52 percent overall project completion).
  o Successfully implemented 32 additional ACAP courts in FY18 following detailed data cleanup, data conversion, data conversion testing, and extensive functional testing.
  o Completed 50 percent of Coconino County LJ AJACS rollout (four courts) by end of June 2018 and scheduled remaining four courts for completion by end of August 2018.
  o Completed 22 percent of Mohave County LJ AJACS rollout (two courts) by end of June 2018 and scheduled remaining seven courts for to end of rollout in FY20.
  o Completed all of Yuma County LJ AJACS rollout (seven courts) by end of April 2018.
  o Completed all of Yavapai County LJ AJACS rollout (13 courts) by end of February 2018.
  o Completed all of Maricopa County LJ AJACS rollout (16 courts) by end of August 2017.
  o Completed all of Pinal County LJ AJACS rollout (17 courts) by end of December 2016.

• Completed all of Pima County LJ AJACS rollout (seven courts) by end of April 2017. (Five Pima County LJ AJACS implementations were completed in October 2015, Tucson City Court implemented in April 2016, then Marana Municipal Court, the final location, implemented in April 2017.).

### SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The incumbent case management system for limited jurisdiction courts is AZTEC, originally implemented in 132 justice and municipal courts. It is a generalized and parameterized system that provides functionality for both limited and general jurisdiction courts. In a strategic planning session for 2004-2006, the court determined the AZTEC system to be reaching
the end of its lifecycle because of aging technology. The product has become increasingly more difficult to support since then, especially finding staff knowledgeable in the AZTEC development tools.

The differences in processing workflows and volumes initially prompted the move to acquire separate systems for general jurisdiction courts and limited jurisdiction courts. This approach was especially desirable for the larger metropolitan courts. Rural counties, however, indicated a preference for continuing to use only one system for all levels of court.

Two possible solutions existed for the limited jurisdiction courts statewide: the Tempe CMS application developed by the Tempe Municipal Court or AmCad’s (American Cadastre, LLC.) AiCMS, a vendor-developed, integrated case management system that was previously selected as the second-generation general jurisdiction courts (GJ) case management system (CMS), replacing AZTEC.

Commission on Technology’s final recommended and AJC-approved solution for the LJ CMS is a “hybrid” approach that utilizes AmCad’s AiCMS software as the baseline CMS product and enhances it by incorporating functionality favored in the Tempe CMS product along with AZTEC system improvements developed by Scottsdale Municipal Court called AZTEC Wizard.

This statewide LJ CMS solution takes advantage of a great opportunity to consolidate approximately ten separate case management applications that are currently utilized within the Arizona LJ court community down to four at full implementation. Additional courts could be consolidated into this solution as their current applications age and become unsupportable. Significant, large volume, non-AOC-supported courts are prepared to collaborate with the AOC and the vendor through the provision of resources, funding, and business analysis to build upon the existing AiCMS/AJACS application and develop a solution that meets the needs of all LJ courts, large or small, rural or metropolitan.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Design, develop, and implement a data repository in support of the NICS Task Force, a governance body composed of representatives of Arizona’s criminal justice agencies.
- Provide an automated data feed from the AOC through DPS to NICS for the State of Arizona to replace the current manual, paper process with a data feed from CCI.
- Define and document standard data mapping from CCI for:
  - AJACS data,
  - Maricopa data, and
  - Pima data.
- Continue to develop functional requirements associated with any remaining NICS categories for:
  - AJACS data,
  - Maricopa data, and
  - Pima data.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

- Senate Bill 1157, approved by the Governor on 3/14/17 with an effective date of 8/9/2017, amended A.R.S. 13-4503 to require that a Justice of the Peace or Municipal Court Judge that exercises jurisdiction over a competency hearing must meet the NICS reporting requirements under A.R.S. 13-609A and 13-609B. As a result of those changes, Maricopa Superior Court no longer accepted Glendale’s Municipal Court’s NICS transactions, so Glendale began to electronically transmit NICS Rule 11 Competency Hearing transactions through the AOC’s electronic NICS process as of January 1, 2018.
- The AOC provides Arizona Department of Public Safety an electronic feed of “day forward” felony conviction cases from AJACS superior courts that have been rejected from the Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS). An ADRS rejected case occurs when no PCN number has been provided to a court to associate to a case in the CMS. Whenever a case is rejected from ADRS and no PCN number is associated, the assumption is that the case does not exist in Arizona Computerized Criminal History (ACCH). Only AJACS superior courts who are currently transmitting electronically via ADRS are included in the initial phase of this project. The electronic feed is then transmitted to NICS through DPS.
- AOC continues development work of the Central Case Index (CCI) to support providing case information from each superior court’s case management system to the AOC’s NICS Repository. Currently, only contingency feeds from each superior court’s case management system are available.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) is a national system that checks available records on persons who may be disqualified from receiving firearms. The NICS is a computerized background check system designed to respond within 30 seconds on most background check inquiries so that federal firearms license holders receive an almost immediate response.

The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) awarded the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC) funding for federal fiscal years 2011 and 2012 for the development of the Arizona NICS Records Improvement Program (NARIP). In 2012, ACJC formally established a NICS Task Force. The Task Force is made up of representatives from Arizona’s local, county, and state criminal justice agencies. The goal of this task force is to identify and develop solutions for NICS reporting issues.

Below are the 7 NICS categories that prevent transfer of a firearm:

**Category 1** Felony convictions: records that identify a person who has been convicted in any court of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year (e.g., state ‘felonies’) and of any state misdemeanors punishable by imprisonment for more than two years.

**Category 2** Active indictments/informations/verified complaints: records that identify a person who is under an indictment or information returned or filed with a court, or a criminal complaint issued or verified by a prosecutor, for the crimes described in Category 1.

**Category 3** Active wants/warrants: records that identify a person who is a fugitive from justice, as demonstrated by an active felony or misdemeanor want or warrant.

**Category 4** Unlawful drug use records: records that identify a person who is an unlawful user of or addicted to any controlled substance, as demonstrated by specified arrests, convictions, and adjudications, not protected from disclosure to the Attorney General by federal or state law.

**Category 5** Mental health adjudications or commitments: records not protected from disclosure to the Attorney General by federal or state law that identify persons who have been adjudicated mentally defective, meaning that a court, board, commission or other lawful authority has determined that the person, as a result of marked subnormal intelligence or mental illness, incompetency, condition or disease, (a) is a danger to himself or others or (b) lacks the mental capacity to contract or manage his own affairs. This category also includes records not protected from disclosure to the Attorney General by federal or state law of persons found incompetent to stand trial or found insane by a court in a criminal case, and records not protected from disclosure to the Attorney General by federal or state law that identify persons who have been formally and involuntarily committed to a mental institution. This category of records does not include persons committed to a mental institution voluntarily or merely for observation or evaluation.


See [http://www.azcjc.gov/ACJC.Web/Pubs/Home/AZ_NARIP%20Plan%202020130328%20FINAL.pdf](http://www.azcjc.gov/ACJC.Web/Pubs/Home/AZ_NARIP%20Plan%202020130328%20FINAL.pdf)
Category 6 Protection or restraining orders: records that are electronically available and identify a person subject to an active court order (from criminal or civil court) which restrains a person from committing acts of violence against another person. Both temporary and permanent protection and restraining orders are included.

Category 7 Convictions for potential misdemeanor crimes of domestic violence (MCDV): records that are electronically available and that may identify a person convicted of misdemeanor offenses such as battery, assault, disorderly conduct, breach of peace, family violence/domestic violence, family assault or battery/domestic assault or battery, stalking, harassment, etc.

The goal of the NICS Task Force is to report all 7 NICS Categories in order to prevent transfer of a firearm. Using funding from Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) awarded to the AOC, the initial focus of the project was to report Category 5, Mental Health Event, associated transactions to NICS. This has been accomplished, replacing the following manual processes:

- Maricopa Superior Court currently sends an email with a link to each order. DPS opens the document, prints it, obtains the DOB/SSN info from one of Maricopa’s clerks (via a separate e-mail), and then enters the individual into NICS manually.
- Pima Superior Court currently sends paper copies to DPS. They send a minute entry of the actual order and then, several days later, they send an 'in chambers' order which contains the individual’s DOB/SSN via US Mail. DPS enters the individual into NICS once all information is gathered.
- All other counties currently fax and mail information to DPS.

Developing a solution to automate a manual paper process to an automated data feed for reporting to NICS will have high public safety value to the citizens of the State of Arizona.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Administer a centralized, uniform collections system to:
  - Provide courts with tools to increase compliance with court orders
  - Allow court staff to focus on customer service and other judicial functions
  - Encourage litigant and court re-engagement
  - Provide payment services that allow litigants to satisfy financial obligations

- Employ best practices in making every reasonable effort to enforce court-ordered financial sanctions.

- Maintain effective partnership with collections vendor that provides certain collections and enforcement services including:
  - Automation systems to share new and modified case and payment information, and
  - Website and Interactive Voice Response (IVR) systems to accept and process electronic payment transactions.

- Continue the enforcement provisions provided for vehicle registration holds under the Department of Motor Vehicles’ Traffic Ticket Enforcement Assistance Program (TTEAP) (A.R.S. §28-1631) including:
  - Sustain automation systems to provide near-real-time TTEAP transaction processing to the Motor Vehicle Division (MVD).

- Implement Enhanced FARE and the FARE Compliance Assistance Program (CAP) per §5-205: Collections in partnership with the collections vendor.

- Expand the implementation of the Arizona Department of Revenue’s (DOR’s) Tax Intercept program within the Arizona Judiciary.

- Improve Tax Intercept Program application to reduce manual input time and improve software efficiencies.

- Provide new services to courts to include:
  - New reporting capabilities;
  - Online citation payment on pre- and post-disposition cases;
  - Online payment plan capabilities;
  - Recurring online payment options; and
  - Online Compliance Assistance Program (CAP) portal and
  - Offsite cash payment options.

- Identify the program’s successes and shortcomings by working with the vendor and courts.

- Implement FARE backlog and automatic TIP (Auto-TIP) functionality in all LJ AJACS courts.

- Identify and implement new collection techniques to increase collections and program efficiencies.
• Implement FARE backlog collections in the Superior Court in Pima County and Mesa Municipal Court and continue to engage with courts not currently in FARE.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

From inception to July 2018, overall FARE Program collections have resulted in the recovery of $701.06 million in outstanding victim restitution and debt disbursed to statutory funds at the local, county, and state levels. Other notable facts outlining the overall success of FARE include:

- $148.6 million in payments made via the FARE website and IVR line
- 1,082,446 TTEAP registration holds
- 641,043 TTEAP registration releases (59% release rate)

- FARE Program collections totaled $59.5 million in FY18. The total FY18 collected amount breaks down as follows:
  - FARE Backlog (Delinquency) Collections: $45.2 million
  - Debt Setoff Collections: $14.2 million

- Arizona courts submitted 113,106 new backlog cases worth $81.7 million to the FARE Program in FY18.

- Followed the Yuma County Fine Reduction Program initiative that provided a one-time, 50-percent reduction in fines, penalties and surcharges in eligible, delinquent traffic tickets through its one-year anniversary, including cases put on 12-month payment plans. By the end of April 2018:
  - 731 cases (89 percent) were successful – their balances were paid in full by the one-year mark.
  - $217,256 was collected on these cases by the seven Yuma municipal and justice courts.

- Implemented Online Citation Program (OLCP) in 64 limited jurisdiction courts collecting $2,386,962.41 in payments through the portal since November 19, 2016.

- Provided development support and FARE business and technical processing consultation to two high volume courts: the Arizona Superior Court in Pima County and Mesa Municipal Court.

- Provided implementation and production support for limited jurisdiction AJACS case management system conversions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SNAPSHOT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Fines, Fees and Restitution Enforcement (FARE) Program is an effort by the Arizona judiciary to enforce court-ordered penalties. The program provides civil, parking, and criminal case data to a vendor for collection account processing. The data shared with the vendor includes pre-disposition, post-disposition, and delinquency collections.
This program has provided more consistent court order enforcement on a statewide basis and has also increased revenue due to improved monetary court order collections and additional collection methods. It has provided the public with alternative ways to satisfy court-ordered sanctions.

Administrative Order (AO) 2003-126 established the FARE Program and provided the framework including the mission, goals, and scope of the project. AO 2009-29 codified the FARE collections program in the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration (ACJA) as § 5-205: Collections.

A contract extension for collection services was signed with Conduent (formerly Xerox) to provide collection and payment-related services for the courts of Arizona. The FARE Program was created through this partnership between the judicial branch and Conduent. FARE provides local courts with a suite of services including, but not limited to, the following:

- Noticing
- Web and telephone-based credit card payments
- Referral to the Traffic Ticket Enforcement Assistance Program (TTEAP)
- Electronic address and phone number skip tracing
- Case record data enhancement
- Outbound calling

The program successfully reached the 10-year mark in 2013. Following a competitive procurement in 2012, a new FARE contract was awarded to Conduent for five years with an option to renew for an additional five years. To enhance the program, new services were identified and incorporated into the new contract. The new services included a competitive collections model, a collections call center, payment plans, online citation payment, a mobile payment app, a visual enhancement to the existing website, and sophisticated reporting capabilities.

The FARE Program provides person search services, “skip tracing,” free of charge to participating courts. Prior to 2016, Accurint and Masterfiles were the procured vendors for these services. In 2015, the AOC issued a request for quote and selected TransUnion Risk and Alternative Data Solutions, Inc. as the new service provider. The new service was implemented in June 2016 and offers Arizona courts more comprehensive search capabilities while being very cost effective.

In 2016, the credit bureau reporting service was eliminated from FARE delinquency case processing as the result of a settlement agreement between the New York Attorney General’s Office and the major credit reporting agencies (CRAs). The agreement related to consumer credit reporting practices; specifically, accuracy of consumer credit information, consumer disputes of inaccuracies, and the reporting of medical debt. As a result of the Settlement Agreement requirements and associated initiatives, the CRAs modified their business practices to only accept consumer debt (credit-based transactions) that arise from a contract or agreement to pay by the consumer. This modification eliminated non-credit transaction debt, which specifically includes court fines, fees, parking tickets, traffic tickets, and local ordinance violations as “unacceptable data.”

In November 2016, the Online Citation Payment (OLCP) initiative, a joint effort between the AOC and a contracted vendor to provide online payment of court fines and fees for the Arizona courts that use the AJACS case management system (CMS), was implemented. Apache Junction Municipal Court was selected as the first go-live court and provided valuable feedback on the process. OLCP provides a payment portal on the Internet where citizens can go to pay court fines and fees for cases before disposition (pre-dispo) and cases after disposition (post-dispo). The ability to pay court fines and fees on the Internet reduces visitors, lines, and congestion at the court; reduces the time court staff spends processing mail; reduces the handling of cash and checks; and increases payments because of the convenience. OLCP is fully integrated with AJACS; payments made on the OLCP website are automatically receipted into the appropriate cases in the AJACS CMS.
PROJECT GOALS

- Establish and prioritize workflows and procedures to be standardized.
- Establish and document “best practices” for limited and general jurisdiction courts for selected workflow processes.
- Create and maintain new standard codes based on new legislation, rules, and court requests.
- Develop training programs and deliver training to court staff to support implementation of “best practices.”
- Establish a dictionary of standard codes, descriptions, and definitions for the variety of limited jurisdiction court-related events and functions.
- Maintain a centralized repository of standard codes, descriptions, and definitions for use by Arizona courts and case management system developers.
- Complete standardization of all A.R.S. codes within AJACS to allow for a single master statute table to be utilized by any project or non-AJACS court (i.e., Probation Automation, Pima County Superior Court, etc.). Utilize a workgroup made up of representatives from prosecutors’ offices, law enforcement, and the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission to initiate this effort.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

AJACS workgroups (case/party status and code definitions) continued to address and resolve issues as they arose out of new codes or existing codes. These groups were smaller and thus able to be more focused.

- Work continued on financial and calendar activities and the development of civil and criminal statistical reports for Superior Courts.
- The General Jurisdiction Standardization Workgroup continued to meet to discuss new code requests, business process requirements, and other issues that need to be standard in each of the General Jurisdiction Courts. Eleven new event codes were approved and added to all AJACS GJ databases.
- The Limited Jurisdiction Standardization Workgroup continued working through coding issues in preparation for AJACS implementation in LJ courts, paying particular attention to lessons learned from the GJ effort. Twenty-five new event codes were approved and added to the master AJACS LJ database.
- The Data Standards Committee, approved by COT, meets on an as-needed basis to discuss code standardization matters and disputes. No new issues were brought to this committee. Two new members were added to fill vacancies.
• LJ and GJ CMS teams, along with other IT projects, CSD, and court personnel continue working towards the complete standardization of all A.R.S. codes within AJACS. This is a living document, updated and published annually.

• The LJ CMS team is taking all necessary steps and time to validate all table codes being set up in AJACS for LJ court implementation. This is an extremely important phase of development as this application and all automated workflows, interfaces, reports, and financials are dependent on valid and complete table code setup.

• The GJ CMS Team and the Data Standards Lead continue working to address table code clean-up. This is a necessary step after the conversion process to ensure all of the tables are set up correctly for each court.

• The annual impact report from the 2018 legislative process to the A.R.S. Table was completed in June 2018 and published for statewide use. This update helps all courts identify new and amended statutes, and courts not on the statewide CMS also utilize it to program the changes in their databases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Considerable differences exist from court to court in the way administrative functions are performed. Few workflows, “best practices,” and procedures have been, to date, developed and standardized. The result of these many differences is that automated case management systems require great complexity, with many parameters and options, in order to accommodate the sizeable number of unique local practices.

To minimize complexity, standardize documentation and training, and thus create a more efficient and effective Judiciary, the Commission on Technology recommended that the Judicial Branch undertake a series of projects to identify standard procedures and workflows for similarly sized and staffed general and limited jurisdiction court environments.

In 2005, the Commission on Technology created an ad hoc committee to prioritize and select processes, research “best practices,” and make recommendations on code standardization. This project contributed to the functional specifications for new case management systems for general and limited jurisdiction courts. The development of those specifications for use by the originating court is helping identify key processes that would benefit from being simplified and standardized statewide through the rollout of the new case management systems.

Code standardization and data conversion are not enough. Those business processes and associated workflows that underlie the new case management systems must be adopted by courts as the statewide rollout occurs. Without common processes and uniform processing of case-related data, the efficiencies promised by a statewide case management system will be forfeited. Support of the new systems will be much more complex and costly, as well.

Court business processes must be standardized to match the business process underlying the automation system. This effort involves extensive local process documentation, mapping to the applicable case management system, somewhat customized training materials, and extra training time for local users. All these translate into initial productivity losses, which are being factored into the business case for the CMS transition activities, the rollout timeline, and resource leveling.
Table code standardization supports statewide consistency of information recorded in case management systems. It is difficult to transfer data to other local and state entities, write standardized reports, and aggregate statewide statistics when every court uses different words, abbreviations, or codes for the same event or activity. This remains an issue in AZTEC courts and mapping to AJACS has proven to be a labor-intensive task.

Integration, statistical analysis reporting, and shared information projects have highlighted the need for courts to record, count, and report events in a consistent manner. Even within the AZTEC courts, which are using the same application software, differences in various code table values have made reporting difficult and made integration projects more complex due to data transformation and mapping requirements.

Superior, Justice of the Peace, and Municipal Courts are addressing the need for consistency through the establishment of standardized code sets to be used statewide. The sets include, but are not limited to, standard codes for:

- Case Type,
- Party Type,
- Case Status,
- Party Status,
- Calendar Events, and
- Courtroom Events.

These projects are planned to dovetail with state-level integration projects with other agencies to identify XML tags and valid values/codes for a variety of criminal-justice-related events.

In an effort to create more usability of the calendaring and scheduling functionality in the AJACS system, the General Jurisdiction Steering Committee designated four courts (later to become five) that would represent all Superior Courts in development of improvements. A focus group’s business requirements were delivered in the 3.6 release of AJACS and were subsequently deployed to all 13 courts, OPDJ (Office of the Presiding Disciplinary Judge), and the AVT (Automated Validation Table) master. Ongoing meetings of the Calendaring/Scheduling Focus Group are keeping the functionality in step with the evolving needs of the courts.

To address the problem of non-standard A.R.S. violation codes in use across the state, a workgroup was established to develop and deploy a master charge table for all case management systems used by the charging agencies. The workgroup is made up of two judges, two prosecutors, and two representatives each from ACJC and MVD. The most important titles were completed and ready for use in October 2014. These include A.R.S. Titles 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 28. The table is updated annually or more frequently, as needed.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

• Develop and implement a Public Access Strategic Roadmap that accommodates a new architecture, platform, and analysis.

• Identify business and external users’ needs as well as methods for dissemination of information including court case data, documents, and bulk data downloads.

• Create specifications for interfacing non-standard CMSs to the Central Case Repository (CCR) and for local EDMSs to contribute to the Central Document Repository (CDR).

• Enhance and support the CDR and CCR needed to facilitate access to case data and documents by the public and interested government agencies.

• Migrate the Victim Notification application to a supported platform and enhance it to include all courts available in Public Access.

• Enable the public to obtain copies of publicly releasable court documents, in accordance with Supreme Court Rule 123 and ACJA 1-604.

• Develop the CDR as the source for inquiry of court documents. Assess fees for document retrieval using an eCommerce platform.

• Obtain local court CMS data, document metadata, and document copies or pointers necessary to support all public-facing online services.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

• Planning activities for loading data into CCR, the replacement system for the current Data Warehouse, began. Requirement gathering sessions specific to populating CCR were scheduled for the fall of 2018.

• Completed subscriptions to the CDR from all AJACS Superior Court locations to ensure the future public access site remains up-to-date and provides appropriate levels of document access.

• Continued extensive AOC internal testing and crafted plan for clerks’ internal testing to ensure that requirements of Rule 123 relating to the types of court documents from AJACS courts that can be made public by remote electronic access are reliably enforced.

• Continued development work related to Rule 123 changes and guidance regarding the types of court documents that can be made public by remote electronic access for Maricopa and Pima GJ courts.

• Continued testing the user interface and website functionality as new software releases continued to be received from the vendor.
SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>X High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>X On-Going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The public access web application provides the public a means by which to search for a specific party and any related case information at a statewide level. The application displays basic case information, basic party information, charge information, and case docket (events) information. A victim notification feature allows users to register and select cases they would like to track. Whenever the selected data element (case, charge, disposition, event, minutes, or party) changes on the case, a notification e-mail is sent to the registered user indicating a change on the case. Currently, this feature is available only for Maricopa Superior Court cases displayed in public access. The information on public access is a subset of all data warehouse data; certain information gets filtered from public access, including witness information, victim information, probate case types, adoption case types, and any other restricted case types.

Rule 123 authorizes courts to provide remote electronic access to case records. The types of access include requests for bulk or compiled data and remote electronic access to case records. Procedures for each method of access have been reviewed and approved. A brief description of each access method follows.

ACJA Section 1-605: Requests for Bulk or Compiled Data. A custodian of bulk data may make such data or a portion thereof available through a subscription service and pursuant to the provisions of Rule 123, ACJA Section 1-605, and all other applicable rules and law. The custodian of bulk data will require the requestor to enter into a dissemination agreement containing, at a minimum, the terms set forth in Court policy and pay a fee. Procedures define the “Dissemination Agreement,” e.g., the roles of the requestor and records custodian, the terms that govern how information is created/compiled, and what information can be distributed.

ACJA Section 1-604: Remote Electronic Access to Case Records. While Rule 123 authorizes courts to provide remote electronic access to case records, this code section sets forth the procedure for providing that access. It governs registration and authentication as well as fees and revenue related to remote access. It stipulates that all users shall accept a user agreement before any access is granted.

Following evaluation of proposals to provide remote access to court documents and bulk data using an eCommerce system to provide timely fulfillment of requests for court documents, subscriptions for bulk data, and creation of customized queries/data reports, a contract was awarded to Granicus. The AOC and local courts maintain the information repositories that will feed the online access system. The AOC will provide the standard interface through which Granicus will request and retrieve court documents and case information on behalf of individuals and commercial entities, in accordance with Rule 123.

Because of the sensitivity of certain court data and documents, work continues to extensively test the business rules associated with the access allowed by Supreme Court Rule 123 as necessary to facilitate reliable, accurate, appropriate, remote access to case data and documents.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

• The eWarrant proof of concept (POC) will offer consistent, statewide arrest warrant processes for all Arizona jurisdictions to adopt.

• Establish a single, statewide, arrest warrant repository (for all arrest warrant types) or entry point to enable all criminal justice stakeholders to access all warrants in a variety of formats and customizable views.

• Enable paperless warrants, moving warrant processing into the digital age.

• Automate the processes of initiation, recall, and execution of warrants at critical junctures in the justice system, such as when a person is arrested, booked, scheduled to appear in court, admitted to the jail or prison, or appears at scheduled probation meetings.

• Integrate new statewide warrant system with the NCIC Wanted Person File so that any amendments, corrections, or changes made in one system will also be updated in other relevant systems.

• Determine a solution that is financially feasible for a statewide solution. Conduct a proof-of-concept effort in Glendale Municipal Court to determine feasibility of performing all workflows defined for the project.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

• Continued to foster support and gathered information for the project through cross-agency/cross-jurisdictional focus groups and presentations to various agencies and committees such as the COT Technical Advisory Council, Disposition Workgroup, the ACJC Technical Committee, and the ACJC Policy Committee.

• Continued to work in partnership with DPS and ACJC to facilitate cross-agency support and coordination.

• Following determination that Microsoft’s licensing model for Dynamics Customer Relationship Management (CRM) was too expensive for statewide adoption, ACJC has coordinated meetings to look at other possible solutions for a technical solution for a statewide warrant system.

• Glendale City Court is currently in pilot with an in-house solution that utilizes JWI for processing warrants. ACJC is reestablishing a warrant working group to review Glendale’s solution for statewide use.
### SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Justice practitioners in both law enforcement and the courts are forced to use multiple systems to manually process, comprehend, and act on arrest warrant information. Even then, after all this information has been reviewed, it is still necessary to contact the originating local court agencies to confirm if arrest warrants are actually still active. Time studies indicate that as many as 500,000 person hours are spent every year creating, maintaining, and serving warrants.

Arrest warrants provide the legal authority under which law enforcement can arrest and detain an individual. They are initiated only after probable cause has been established that a crime has been committed and that the subject should stand trial on the allegation(s). As of May 23, 2014, there were 334,764 arrest warrants active and outstanding in Arizona. The majority of these warrants were created in response to one of the scenarios below:

- **Grand Jury Indictment**: When a grand jury establishes probable cause and returns an indictment against an individual, the prosecutor can request that a summons, an arrest warrant, or a Notice of Supervening Indictment (NSI) be issued. The NSI is issued if the defendant is currently in custody. A summons is issued if the prosecutor has a high degree of confidence regarding the current location of the defendant. An arrest warrant will be used if the defendant either did not respond to the summons or if the prosecutor is not aware of their current location.

- **Law Enforcement Investigation**: When law enforcement gathers sufficient evidence to prove probable cause to a judicial officer, an arrest warrant or summons can be issued for arrest.

- **Failure to Appear/Failure to Pay**: If a subject fails to appear at a scheduled criminal court hearing or fails to comply with the terms of their judgment (i.e., fees and fines), the court can order the issuance of an arrest warrant on its own motion.

- **Violation of Probation/Parole**: When a probation/parole officer believes that the supervised offender has violated the terms of their probation or parole, he or she can request an arrest warrant from the court.

Given today’s environment and the need to improve existing arrest warrant processes and procedures, the purpose of the eWarrant proof-of-concept effort is to bring the state forward using automated processes to manage its arrest warrants. Following proof of concept, the ultimate goal is consistent, statewide arrest warrant processes for all other Arizona jurisdictions to adopt. The Arizona eWarrants Project will then fully automate existing warrant processes from end to end in a consistent manner throughout the entire State.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Develop and deploy time standards reports using MS SSRS from the AJACS CMS to assist Superior Courts and Limited Jurisdiction Courts in managing caseloads relative to the published time standards for Civil, Felony, Post-Conviction Relief, Family Law Dissolution, Family Law Post-Judgment Motions, Probate Administration of Estates, Probate Guardianship/Conservatorship, Probate Mental Health, and Protection Orders.

- Develop and deploy time standards reports using Crystal Reports against JOLTSaz to assist Juvenile Courts in managing caseloads relative to the published time standards for Juvenile Delinquency and Status Offense, Juvenile Neglect and Abuse, and Juvenile Termination of Parental Rights.

- Develop and deploy time standards reports using Crystal Enterprise against AZTEC to assist Justice and Municipal Courts in managing caseloads relative to the published time standards for Civil, Misdemeanor, Eviction Action, Small Claims, Civil Local Ordinances, Civil Traffic, and Protection Orders.

- Maintain reports for DUI cases relative to the time standards to assist Justice and Municipal Courts.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

- Developed and deployed six additional dynamic, civil reports for all 13 AJACS superior courts. In addition, accounted for many change requests to existing reports and corrected reported bugs. New reports completed include:
  - Family Law Post-Judgment Motions – Age of Active Pending
  - Family Law Post-Judgment Motions – Age of Active Pending
  - Protective Order Contested Hearing – Age of Active Pending
  - Protective Order Contested Hearing – Time to Disposition
  - Protective Order Ex Parte – Time to Disposition
  - Protective Order Ex Parte – Age of Active Pending
  - In addition, 48 change requests and 13 bugs were also accounted for.

- Developed and deployed ten additional dynamic, civil reports for all AJACS Limited Jurisdiction Courts. Reports completed include:
  - Justice Court Civil – Age of Active Pending
  - Justice Court Civil – Time to Disposition
  - Eviction – Age of Active Pending
  - Eviction – Time to Disposition
  - Protective Order Ex Parte – Time to Disposition
  - Protective Order Pre-Issuance – Age of Active Pending
  - Protective Order Pre-Issuance – Time to Disposition
  - Protective Order Contested Hearing – Age of Active Pending
- Protective Order Ex Parte – Age of Active Pending
- Protective Order Contested Hearing – Time to Disposition
- In addition, five change requests and five bugs were accounted for.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

This project was established to create reports in support of reaching published time standards in Arizona’s Courts. Timely justice promotes public trust and confidence in the courts. In 2011, the National Center for State Courts published “Model Time Standards for State Trial Courts.” These standards for the disposition of cases in the state courts were developed and adopted by the Conference of State Court Administrators, the Conference of Chief Justices, the American Bar Association House of Delegates, and the National Association for Court Managers. With AO 2012-80, Chief Justice Berch established the Committee on Time Standards to review the national case processing time standards with respect to Arizona’s statutes and rules and then establish case processing time standards for Arizona’s courts. The committee gathered input and feedback from all key justice partners for Arizona courts and drafted a provisional set of standards outlined in an interim report to the Arizona Judicial Council.

Data-driven reports need to be developed in support of these standards. The reports illustrate a court’s performance relative to the standards. Nineteen specific case types were identified by the Time Standards Committee, covering municipal, justice, and superior courts. Information will be provided about how the court has performed in the past through “time to disposition” reports. Information will be provided about the age of current cases relative to the standards through “age of active pending” reports. Both summary and detail reports will be provided for all case types.

The data for Arizona’s state-supported courts resides in separate CMSs depending on the case type. For this reason, reports for different case types will be written against different systems.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

- Provide local and statewide solutions that reduce the time and costs associated with court interpreting events while increasing access to interpretation services across the entire state.
- Identify individuals and organizations to provide interpreting services through video remote technology using the Arizona Judicial Information Network (AJIN) in a safe and secure fashion.
- Explore cloud-based technology as a potential solution to offering a portal through which multiple vendors might be able to provide interpreter services.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

- Held 60 interpreted events using the AOC interpreting room. The majority of these involved a Spanish interpreter, followed by American Sign Language, Mandarin, Russian, and Arabic in frequency.
- Completed successful pilot program to provide interpreter services in live court proceedings for both on-demand and scheduled interpreted events through a cloud-based solution with Connected Justice (Cisco, Globo, and TeleSpace).
- Coordinated installation of VRI system in an additional courtroom in Yuma County Juvenile Court.

SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>New X High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Litigants having limited English proficiency enter the court system every day. In order for these individuals to have access to justice and the services of the court system, interpreters are needed. The cost of interpreters, particularly in rural counties, can be exorbitant. For contract interpreters, courts must pay for travel as well as the interpreter’s time. Staff interpreters
spend considerable amounts of time driving between court venues in their counties of operation. This is time that could otherwise be spent interpreting.

Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) allows an interpreter to appear in the court remotely, thereby reducing the associated costs. Video drastically surpasses telephonic interpreting because so much paralinguistic information is conveyed through body language and facial expression. This remote appearance allows two-way communication so that simultaneous interpreting (a requirement in judicial proceedings) can be accomplished. This approach also supports sign language interpreting.

The eventual goal of this project is to allow a suite of solutions for receiving interpreting services in the court through video and to provide interpreting staff as well as multiple vendors and contractors the ability to appear remotely in the courtrooms and court settings around the state.

Use of cloud-based meeting rooms provided by the Cisco Connected Justice Project to replace older point-to-point technology adds versatility and simplifies connections for a wide range of interpretation services. It enables multiple remote appearances simultaneously, not just for courtrooms but even for probation officers to perform remote check-ins with probationers. Being technology agnostic, the solution even connects consumer videoconference products to the virtual meeting rooms.

Courts using this system have gained access to an increased pool of qualified interpreters, as well as increased availability and productivity of existing resources due to decreased travel and wait times, which also lead to reduced costs. This has a positive impact on case processing as continuances can be avoided and time to disposition improved.
PROJECT GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

PROJECT GOALS

• Replace the inaccurate “ink and roll” process at sentencing in Arizona Superior Court locations.
• Identify at the time of sentencing whether the defendant has 10 prints on file with DPS or not.
• Verify the person being sentenced is charged correctly and has 10 prints on file associated with the specific charges being sentenced.

PROJECT GOALS ACCOMPLISHED IN FISCAL YEAR 2018

• Replaced the “ink and roll” process in all superior courts at sentencing by installing digital fingerprint devices and providing training.
• Enabled ability to identify at the time of sentencing if a person has 10 prints on file with DPS by utilizing MOBS application and fingerprint scanning device.

SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>X New X</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Replace/Upgrade</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Mobile devices can be used to capture biometric identifiers such as a fingerprint, providing the capability to quickly verify the identity of an individual. ARS §13-607 requires that every defendant’s fingerprint is captured in court on the sentencing order. However, analysis of records indicates that the current “ink and roll” method used to comply with the statute frequently results in an unusable print. Introduction of the mobile fingerprint device in the courtroom enables immediate feedback on the quality of the fingerprint, ensuring that the fingerprint on the sentencing order will always be usable by prosecutors for future charging purposes, in accordance with the statute. The mobile fingerprint device creates a high-resolution image of the defendant’s fingerprint. After capturing a fingerprint, court personnel can print the image using an...
existing commercial off-the-shelf printer and attach it to the sentencing order in lieu of the current ink and roll 10-finger print.

A “positive” response from AFIS indicates to the court that the defendant’s fingerprints were previously taken. A response from AFIS of “no ARN hit” makes the court aware that the defendant must be sent for 10-print fingerprinting on the originating arrest charges at a booking facility.

While mobile fingerprinting devices cannot be used to create criminal history, the information returned can serve as a mechanism to link law enforcement, prosecution, and court processes through a common, person-based identifier called the AFIS Record Number (ARN). Once fingerprinted, a person is assigned an ARN which will be tied to their identity forever. For example, the ARN can be used to tie the subject stopped by police with the defendant that appears in the courtroom and finally to the inmate that appears for intake at the Arizona Department of Corrections (ADC).

Given the ARS §13-607 requirement that the defendant’s fingerprint be captured on the sentencing order and the current limitations of “ink and roll” processing, from smudged prints to the inability to verify identity in real-time, the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC) recommends that all Superior Court locations in Arizona implement mobile fingerprinting technology in the courtroom.

**BACKGROUND**

The collection of a Type 01 Fingerprint (a 10-finger print), typically through a Livescan booking device, is the only way to initiate the process of creating a criminal history record and identifying the associated charges. Upon receipt of a Type 01 Fingerprint and charges, the Arizona Computerized Criminal History System (ACCH) will either match the fingerprints to an existing identity record or create a new identity record if none exists. The ACCH will then associate that identity record to the new arrest which includes a list of the charges indicated by the arresting law enforcement agency. In either situation, a unique Process Control Number (PCN) is generated and associated with this new arrest record. The PCN will subsequently be used to uniquely identify the arrest segment when the prosecutor or court reports an update to the charges. Since charges very often change throughout the investigative and prosecutorial process, the PCN serves as the unique database identifier to ensure that the correct arrest charges get updated. When a Type 01 Fingerprint is *not* captured, no criminal history record will be created in ACCH, no PCN will be generated, and no arrest record will exist within the system.

Since 2007, the Arizona Attorney General, Department of Public Safety (DPS), and ADC have worked together to implement the Gap Program which encapsulates a process whereby criminal history can be retroactively created should a convicted offender appear at the ADC with no criminal history, indicating no fingerprints are on file. Upon arrival, all inmates are fingerprinted to confirm their identity and determine whether they have a State Identifier.

Some challenges still remain with defendants in custody. Depending on coordination between court and law enforcement, those defendants may still utilize ink and roll. Our overall goal is to determine the specific charges that are being dispositioned at time of sentencing and ensure prints have been obtained for those specific charges.
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Appendix A. Hardware Environment

The Arizona Judicial Branch continues to have a very diverse mix of hardware reflecting the various projects and programs that have evolved and applications that have been acquired and/or developed over the last several years. Note that the items listed here are generally supported centrally as a statewide project; where individual courts have additional hardware and/or software beyond these items, that equipment is listed on the individual court's inventory of judicial equipment and not in this document.

DESKTOP ENVIRONMENT

With the completion of the Technology Refresh Project (TRP) in early 2015, we are now entering year five of a planned eight-year lifecycle, providing the judiciary with robust equipment and a full vendor software productivity suite.

The following are standard PC models currently being placed into service:

**DESKTOP:**

HP EliteDesk 800 G2 Small Form Factor – L1G76AV
Intel Core i5-6500 Processor (3.20 GHz, 6MB Cache), Intel HD Graphics 4600, 8GB DDR4-2133 DIMM (2x4GB) RAM, 500GB 7200 RPM 3.5 Hard Drive, Intel® I219LM Gigabit Network Connection, Intel Core i5 vPro.

**LAPTOP:**

HP EliteBook 850 G3 Notebook PC
Intel i5-6300U/UMA Graphics – L3D24AV, i5-6300U (2.4 GHz w/ Turbo, 3MB Cache) Processor, and Intel HD Graphics 520, Intel Core i5 vPro, D808AV Integrated camera, Integrated HD.

**PRINTER:**

E6B9A#ABA HP LaserJet - HP Laser Jet M605n/M608n.
## SERVER ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVER MANUFACTURE</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER</th>
<th>OPERATING SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IBM i-Series</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>OS/400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM p-Series</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>AIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Proliant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Linux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Proliant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Windows NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Proliant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Windows 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Proliant</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Windows 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Proliant</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Windows 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Proliant</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>ESX Hosts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Proliant</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>VMWare Clients (Various Operating Systems)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The list of software products below is divided into two categories.

First is a list of the products in use statewide in courts to which the Customer Support Center provides assistance. There are many other products in use in the Superior, Justice, and City courts statewide, most often supported by the IT staff of the local court, city, or county government. At the state level, however, these are not supported and not included in the list below. Refer to individual court plans in Appendix D for their lists of local software.

The second list includes those products in use at the Supreme Court and the Administrative Office of the Courts.

**COURTS**

Software in courts that is supported statewide in conjunction with existing programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOFTWARE APPLICATION</th>
<th>VENDOR</th>
<th>NO. USERS</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJACS (GJ CMS)</td>
<td>AmCad, Inc. Herndon, VA</td>
<td>1553 PCs; 13 courts, 1177 users</td>
<td>New Court Case and Cash Management Software for the Arizona Court Automation Project (ACAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APETS (Adult Probation Tracking System)</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>254 PCs; 26 sites, approximately 3500 APD users</td>
<td>Currently installed at all county adult probation departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC</td>
<td>Progressive Solutions, Inc. Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
<td>1828 PCs; 113 courts; 1737 court users</td>
<td>Old Court Case and Cash Management Software for the Arizona Court Automation Project (ACAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZTEC MVD</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>1645 PCs; 88 courts; 1,216 court users</td>
<td>Used by ACAP and large-volume, non-ACAP courts to report motor vehicle convictions and warrants to Motor Vehicle Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case File Tracking</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>683 PCs</td>
<td>Bar code scanning/case file tracking application used by some ACAP courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casper</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>291 ACAP computers</td>
<td>Combined statistical reporting application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Reports</td>
<td>Business Objects</td>
<td>102 statewide users</td>
<td>Web-based ad hoc report writer for case and cash management system used by ACAP, JOLTS and APETS users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Explorer</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>3885</td>
<td>ACAP, APETS, JOLTS users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFTWARE APPLICATION</td>
<td>VENDOR</td>
<td>NO. USERS</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firefox</td>
<td>Mozilla</td>
<td>3885</td>
<td>ACAP, APETS, JOLTS users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSaz (Juvenile Online Tracking System)</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>670 PCs</td>
<td>Software to track juvenile case information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JURY+</td>
<td>Jury Systems, Inc.</td>
<td>13 Superior Courts</td>
<td>Jury management software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Treatment Tracking</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Records and tracks treatment information for juveniles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlook</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>3885</td>
<td>ACAP and JOLTS users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Intercept Program (TIP)</td>
<td>Internal development in PowerBuilder</td>
<td>788 PCs</td>
<td>Software used to collect and transmit unpaid fines information to lottery and DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>Windows 10 - 3885</td>
<td>Operating System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word, Excel, PowerPoint</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>3885</td>
<td>Standard office productivity software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Support Calculator</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>18,800 per month</td>
<td>Internet application that calculates child support payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASA Volunteer Webpage</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>18,800 per month</td>
<td>Secure Internet application that uploads documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOFTWARE APPLICATION</th>
<th>VENDOR</th>
<th>NO. USERS</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Used for a variety of localized databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Acrobat Professional</td>
<td>Adobe</td>
<td>204 PCs</td>
<td>Used for publication of documents to Internet/Intranet as well as interactive forms development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellamation</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>86 Supreme Court users (57 in AOC)</td>
<td>Appellate court software in production in the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals Division One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFTWARE APPLICATION</td>
<td>VENDOR</td>
<td>NO. USERS</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Information Tracking System</td>
<td>Internal development on RS/6000</td>
<td>Web Based</td>
<td>Used by remote Dependent Children's Services offices to create and track budgets and expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centra Symposium and Knowledge Composer</td>
<td>Centra</td>
<td>518 Statewide</td>
<td>This software allows centrally located trainers to provide remote virtual classroom training in all AJIN courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Access</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>471 statewide</td>
<td>Used for terminal emulation access to the AS/400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidential Intermediary Program</td>
<td>Internal development on AS/400</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>Application to track activity related to the Confidential Intermediary Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD Online</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Internet application to process online renewals and fee payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Driving</td>
<td>Internal development on AS/400</td>
<td>66 driving schools</td>
<td>Statewide-centralized database of defensive driving class participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependant Children's Activity Tracking System (DCATS)</td>
<td>Internal on-going support on RS/6000 in PowerBuilder for this system built with a vendor on contract</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Application used to record and track activity related to Foster Care Review Board and Court Appointed Special Advocate programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excel</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>3885 internal computers</td>
<td>Spreadsheet application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlook</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>3885 internal computers</td>
<td>Messaging and group-collaboration software used in conjunction with Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Resource Library</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>AJIN users statewide</td>
<td>Tracking and checkout for educational materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Expressions</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Used to maintain the Intranet and Supreme Court web site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Tracking System</td>
<td>Internal development on AS/400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Application to record and track grants to courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Fiduciary Tracking</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tracks certification of private fiduciaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Explorer</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>3885 internal computers</td>
<td>Used for Internet/Intranet access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFTWARE APPLICATION</td>
<td>VENDOR</td>
<td>NO. USERS</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Contract Tracking</td>
<td>Internal development on AS/400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Used to track juvenile service provider contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Online Tracking System Youth Index</td>
<td>Internal development on the AS/400</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Used for statistical analysis and for sharing high-level JOLTS data among users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logos</td>
<td>New World Systems Troy, MI</td>
<td>AOC: 21</td>
<td>Fund Accounting, Fixed Asset, Contract Tracking, and Budgeting package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Project</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Project planning tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MQ Series</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Server-based message broker software for integration projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MQ Series Integrator</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Server-based message broker software for content-based routing and application development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Assistance Hotline</td>
<td>Internal development Remedy AR System</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Call tracking and referral information database Remedy AR System application was replaced by an in-house custom application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PowerBuilder</td>
<td>Sybase</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Development tool for new applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PowerGen</td>
<td>E Crane, Inc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Developer tool for PowerBuilder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW</td>
<td>Riverton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Case development tool, UML modeling tool; PowerBuilder code generator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PowerPoint</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>3885</td>
<td>Primary presentations application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick Test Pro</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Test script execution product that supports regression testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Center</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Used as part of a structured testing methodology to script and track testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedy</td>
<td>BMC</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Call/service request tracking application used by IT Support Center; cloud-based Web application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFTWARE APPLICATION</td>
<td>VENDOR</td>
<td>NO. USERS</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophos Virus Scan</td>
<td>Sophos</td>
<td>3885 PCs</td>
<td>Virus scanning on all desktops in the AOC, Supreme Court and all AJIN computers (ACAP, JOLTS and APETS sites) statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Server</td>
<td>ThinQ</td>
<td>Internal: 22 Statewide: 2000</td>
<td>A learning management system tracking employee education, enhanced with an internally developed online web registration module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visio</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Diagram/flow charting software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Exception Time Reporting (WETR)</td>
<td>Internal development on AS/400</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>Records leave and weekly time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>3885 computers</td>
<td>Word processing software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WETR Online</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>Intranet Application</td>
<td>AOC Intranet application used for timekeeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Leave Requirements</td>
<td>Internal development</td>
<td>Intranet Application</td>
<td>AOC Intranet application used for leave requests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2FID</td>
<td>Two-Fingerprint Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA</td>
<td>Arizona Courts Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACAP</td>
<td>Arizona Court Automation Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCH</td>
<td>Arizona Computerized Criminal History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACES</td>
<td>Administrative Case Event System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>Automated Clearing House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACJA</td>
<td>Arizona Code of Judicial Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACJC</td>
<td>Arizona Criminal Justice Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACJIS</td>
<td>Arizona Criminal Justice Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADC</td>
<td>Arizona Department of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADOA</td>
<td>Arizona Department of Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADRS</td>
<td>Arizona Disposition Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIS</td>
<td>Arizona Fingerprint Identification System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAVE</td>
<td>The COT-approved CMS used by Pima Superior Court and the Pima Clerk’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJACS</td>
<td>Arizona Judicial Automated Case System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJB</td>
<td>Arizona Judicial Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJC</td>
<td>Arizona Judicial Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJIN</td>
<td>Arizona Judicial Information Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AmCad</strong></td>
<td>American Cadastre, LLC., vendor for the AJACS case management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AO</strong></td>
<td>Administrative Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AOC</strong></td>
<td>Administrative Office of the Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APETS</strong></td>
<td>Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>API</strong></td>
<td>Application Programming Interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARN</strong></td>
<td>AFIS Record Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.R.S.</strong></td>
<td>Arizona Revised Statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS/400</strong></td>
<td>IBM’s midrange business computing platform and operating system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASET</strong></td>
<td>Arizona Strategic Enterprise Technology Office (formerly GITA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTC</strong></td>
<td>Arizona Traffic Ticket and Complaint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVT</strong></td>
<td>Automated Validation Table aka “Added Value Tables”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AZTEC</strong></td>
<td>Arizona Courts’ legacy case and cash management system software being replaced by AJACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AZYAS</strong></td>
<td>Arizona Youth Assessment System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BCDR</strong></td>
<td>Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BJS</strong></td>
<td>Bureau of Justice Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BYOD</strong></td>
<td>“Bring Your Own Device,” allowing consumer mobile devices on a business network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2C</strong></td>
<td>“Court to Court” application sometimes called “eAppeal”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CACC</strong></td>
<td>Court Automation Coordinating Committee, as subcommittee of COT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAP</strong></td>
<td>Compliance Assistance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASA</strong></td>
<td>Court Appointed Special Advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>Computer-Based Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>Central Case Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>Central Case Repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDR</td>
<td>Central Document Repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>Certification and Licensing Division of the AOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Case Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOP</td>
<td>Continuity of Operations Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORP</td>
<td>Correction Officers’ Retirement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Commission on Technology, a committee of AJC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPOR</td>
<td>Court Protective Order Repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRA</td>
<td>Credit Reporting Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>Customer Relationship Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSD</td>
<td>Court Services Division of the AOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTS</td>
<td>Court Technology Services, a division of Maricopa Superior Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB</td>
<td>Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA</td>
<td>Database Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCATS</td>
<td>Dependent Children’s Automated Tracking System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCSD</td>
<td>Dependent Children’s Services Division of the AOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>Department of Economic Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOB</td>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ</td>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>Department of Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS</td>
<td>Department of Public Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Disaster Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSO</td>
<td>Debt Setoff Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTM</td>
<td>OnBase’s Document Transfer Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>Driving Under the Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eAccess</td>
<td>Court program for remote access to electronic case data, documents, and bulk data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eBench</td>
<td>Judge Automation program produced by Mentis, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eFileAZ</td>
<td>Arizona Judicial Branch Statewide eFiling System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-Filing</td>
<td>Electronic filing of case-related information formerly done using paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eNotification</td>
<td>Automated notification of court users about upcoming case and payment dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eROA</td>
<td>Electronic Record on Appeal program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eWarrant</td>
<td>The electronic means of creating, storing, and appropriately sharing a warrant for arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Enterprise Architecture, codified in ACJA §1-505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBP</td>
<td>Evidence-Based Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECF</td>
<td>Electronic Court Filing Specification, managed by OASIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDM</td>
<td>Electronic Document Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMS</td>
<td>Electronic Document Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFM</td>
<td>Electronic Filing Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOL</td>
<td>End of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERR&amp;D</td>
<td>Electronic Records Retention &amp; Destruction Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESB</td>
<td>Enterprise Service Bus (formerly called “data bus”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARE</td>
<td>Fines, Fees and Restitution Enforcement Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCRB</td>
<td>Foster Care Review Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTP</td>
<td>File Transfer Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO</td>
<td>General Accounting Office, a Division of ADOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Gigabyte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJ</td>
<td>General Jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJXML</td>
<td>Global Justice Extensible Markup Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iCIS</td>
<td>Maricopa Superior Court’s and Justice Courts’ case management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Internet Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITAC</td>
<td>Information Technology Authorization Committee, an executive branch committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITD</td>
<td>Information Technology Division, a division of the AOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVR(U)</td>
<td>Interactive Voice Response (Unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCEF</td>
<td>Judicial Collections Enhancement Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJSD</td>
<td>Juvenile Justice Services Division of the AOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLBC</td>
<td>Joint Legislative Budget Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLTSAz</td>
<td>Juvenile Online Tracking System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPIJ</td>
<td>Judicial Project Investment Justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSTIS</td>
<td>Judicial Statewide Information Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWI</td>
<td>Justice Web Interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM</td>
<td>Log and Event Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>Limited English Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>Limited Jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPOR</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Protective Order Repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDV</td>
<td>Misdemeanor Crimes of Domestic Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Multi-Factor Authentication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVD</td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Division (of the Arizona Dept. of Transportation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARIP</td>
<td>NICS Record Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCIC</td>
<td>National Crime Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSC</td>
<td>National Center for State Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICS</td>
<td>National Instant Criminal Background Check System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIEM</td>
<td>National Information Exchange Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSI</td>
<td>Notice of Supervening Indictment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASIS</td>
<td>Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODS</td>
<td>Operational Data Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCP</td>
<td>Online Citation Payment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPDJ</td>
<td>Office of the Presiding Disciplinary Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORI</td>
<td>Originating Agency Identifier, Assigned by the FBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/S or OS</td>
<td>Operating System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACC</td>
<td>Probation Automation Coordinating Committee, a subcommittee of COT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Personal Computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Processing Control Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCCJC</td>
<td>Pima County Consolidated Justice Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>Portable Document Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEP</td>
<td>Penalty Enforcement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMO</td>
<td>Project Management Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>Proof of Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Public Safety Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td>Pre-Sentence Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMOE</td>
<td>Qwest Metro Optical Ethernet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAM</td>
<td>Random Access Memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAM</td>
<td>Rapid Online Access Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN</td>
<td>Storage Area Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCM</td>
<td>Microsoft System Center Configuration Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLAPR</td>
<td>(Arizona) State Library, Archives, and Public Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSIS</td>
<td>SQL Server Integration Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSN</td>
<td>Social Security Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRS</td>
<td>SQL Server Reporting Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWID</td>
<td>(Juvenile Probation) Statewide Identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Council, a subcommittee of COT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFS</td>
<td>Microsoft Team Foundation Server, a suite of software development tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Tax Intercept Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTEAP</td>
<td>Traffic Ticket Enforcement Assistance Program, including penalties for all delinquent court obligations and holds on vehicle registration renewals, as provided by law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Urinalysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>User Interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCA</td>
<td>Victims of Crime Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOIP</td>
<td>Voice Over Internet Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM</td>
<td>Virtual Machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPN</td>
<td>Virtual Private Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRI</td>
<td>Video Remote Interpreting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAS</td>
<td>Wide Area Application Services, a Cisco product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WETR</td>
<td>Weekly Exception Time Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XML</td>
<td>Extensible Markup Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX - D