

FISCAL YEARS 2013–2015

APPELLATE
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
STRATEGIC PLAN



ARIZONA SUPREME COURT



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
<u>A. PLANNING METHOD AND PARTICIPANTS</u>	2
<u>B. JUDICIARY STRATEGIC AGENDA: STATE AND LOCAL</u>	3
B.1. JUDICIAL BRANCH STATEWIDE AGENDA	
B.2. LOCAL COURT AND AGENCY STRATEGIC AGENDAS, INITIATIVES, AND BUSINESS PRESSURES WITH RESPONDING LOCAL COURT AND AGENCY TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVES	
B.3. STATE APPELLATE COURTS TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVES RESPONDING TO AGENDAS, INITIATIVES, AND BUSINESS PRESSURES	
<u>C. CURRENT TECHNOLOGY ENVIRONMENT</u>	10
<u>D. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS</u>	12
D.1. MAJOR STATEWIDE INITIATIVES AND PLANNING/IMPACT INFORMATION	
D.2. LOCAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC RESOURCES	
APPENDICES	
<u>A. CURRENT ENVIRONMENT</u>	17
1. HARDWARE ENVIRONMENT BY COURT	
2. HARDWARE FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS	
3. LOCAL SERVER HARDWARE AND FUNCTION	
4. NETWORK ENVIRONMENT	
5. SOFTWARE ENVIRONMENT	
6. COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENT TO ARIZONA JUDICIAL BRANCH ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE	

STATE APPELLATE COURTS

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN

FOR FISCAL YEARS 2013-2015

INTRODUCTION

This information technology strategic plan for the Arizona Supreme Court and the Arizona Court of Appeals, including Divisions One and Two (the state appellate courts), which covers the period from January 2012 through June 2015, is based on the results of meetings among the judicial, business, and technical leaders of the courts. The Supreme Court provides administrative guidance to the Court of Appeals and also works closely with the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) in the areas of court finance and legislative issues. Each court also works closely with the State of Arizona, which funds the courts.

The following comprise the courts covered by the plan:

Arizona Supreme Court

Court of Appeals, Division One

Court of Appeals, Division Two

Aspects of the automation for the appellate courts are centralized, although each division of the court of appeals maintains its own IT staff. The courts participate in providing direction for the strategic automation projects through a variety of user and other statewide policy groups. These include:

- The Commission on Technology and its subcommittees:
 - The Technical Advisory Council
 - The COT e-Courts Subcommittee and Appellate e-Court Subteam.

A. PLANNING METHOD AND PARTICIPANTS

This section outlines the participants, processes and events that contributed to formulating this iteration of the Information Technology Plan for the state appellate courts.

State Appellate Courts Planning Summits were held to generate information about the business and IT aspects of this consolidated plan. Participants in the March 29, 2012, Business Planning Summit included justices, judges, staff attorneys, and clerks of court from the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals Divisions One and Two, including:

Arizona Supreme Court:

Rebecca Berch	Chief Justice
Andrew Hurwitz	Vice Chief Justice
Scott Bales	Justice
Janet Johnson	Clerk of Court
Ellen Crowley	Chief Staff Attorney

Arizona Court of Appeals, Division One:

Diane Johnsen	Vice Chief Judge
Ruth Willingham	Clerk of Court
Tony Mackey	Chief Staff Attorney

Arizona Court of Appeals, Division Two:

Joe Howard	Chief Judge
Itza French	Deputy Clerk
'Mac' McCallum	Staff Attorney

Participants in the April 24, 2012, technology planning summit included IT leaders from the state appellate courts:

Supreme Court, AOC ITD

Stewart Bruner Facilitator
Jim Price
Gary Graham

Court of Appeals, Division One

James Towner

Court of Appeals, Division Two

Mohyeddin Abdulaziz
Dan Baillargeon

In light of the significant progress made in connection with the comprehensive business strategy and technical road map crafted for the 2007 – 2009 plan, the decision was made to initiate new strategy discussions this year to establish the major efforts for coming years.

B. JUDICIARY STRATEGIC AGENDA: STATE AND LOCAL

B.1. JUDICIAL BRANCH STATEWIDE AGENDA

The courts support **JUSTICE 20/20: A VISION FOR THE FUTURE OF THE ARIZONA JUDICIAL BRANCH 2010-2015** and its vision to increase the public's trust in the court system, to inspire confidence that individual rights are being protected, and to ensure that all citizens are being treated fairly. This strategic agenda was adopted in March 2010 at the direction of the judiciary's then new Chief Justice. It remains consistent with the previous **GOOD TO GREAT** vision and encompasses five broad goals, each associated with several key strategic business needs.

B.2. LOCAL COURT AND AGENCY STRATEGIC AGENDAS, INITIATIVES, AND BUSINESS PRESSURES WITH RESPONDING LOCAL COURT AND AGENCY TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVES

The state appellate courts have identified strategic business goals, initiatives, and pressures as follow:

COURT/LOCAL AGENCY NAME	STRATEGIC AGENDA	RELATED IT INITIATIVE(S)
All	<p>Receive digital input for all case-related filings from all types of filers for all types of filings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attorneys Self-represented litigants Court reporters Lower court records 	<p>Continue to expand electronic filing efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand court reporter transcripts transfer. Manage participant contact information through single repository. Electronic criminal disposition form.
All	<p>Enable public access to all documents not under seal, to the extent legally appropriate.</p>	<p>Construct public access to court documents facility</p> <p>Populate the central case index (CCI) and central document repository (CDR)</p> <p>Create webservice to supply documents from Division Two EDMS</p>
All	<p>Allow litigants and judges to participate remotely in "live" appellate proceedings, including</p>	<p>Enable judges'/ justices' remote participation in</p>

COURT/LOCAL AGENCY NAME	STRATEGIC AGENDA	RELATED IT INITIATIVE(S)
	teleconferences/ videoconferences.	conferences, deliberation, emergency motion consideration Expand video capabilities in courtrooms to accommodate oral argument Provide a mobile solution for oral arguments on the road
All	Shorten overall case processing and decision timeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reach directly into trial court record • Revise time standards for transfer of index of record • Receive timely transcripts 	Continue numbered index of record from trial court with hyperlinks to specific documents Enable hyperlinks in briefs and other filings directly to documents in the record of actions (including the trial court record)
All	Allow entry of limited video record of key testimony, where agreed by parties.	Specify acceptable formats for video record Ensure accurate indexing of video records coming from lower courts
All	Re-engineer paper-based practices and related automation. Re-examine division of responsibilities among all roles in appellate processing. Provide enhanced automation for judges/justices.	Design and construct electronic workflow based on use cases, not paper process, for main work products of appellate courts Enhance caseDocs case processing application used by Division Two
All	Streamline workflow for judges/justices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafting/filing/distributing routine orders • “Fast track” entry of conference decisions • Obtain “real time” transcripts • Provide everything on one screen in one session • Leverage consumer technologies 	Create judge-centric automation to replace clerk-centric automation for judges/justices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form iPad / consumer technologies user group • Investigate Manatee Model

COURT/LOCAL AGENCY NAME	STRATEGIC AGENDA	RELATED IT INITIATIVE(S)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share best practices among practitioners 	for applicable judge requirements
All	Simplify electronic distribution of orders	Enable litigants to maintain e-mail contact information on court system Standardize electronic forms that produce orders Add contact devices to be notified Create “reverse 911” strategy to notify those affected by orders
Division One	Disaster Recovery Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Backups of all court data Working plan on how to recover should an emergency strike 	Complete installation of redundant storage area network (SAN) in Department of Economic Security data center.
Division One, Supreme Court	Ensure remote access to court resources by court staff	Provide Citrix solutions for mobile device users
Division One	Update the court’s electronic communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrade Exchange to 2010 Update courtroom audio to digital equipment Update VOIP system

The theme that emerged from information provided by the teams at the March/April 2012 planning summit was the need to “re-engineer paper-based processing methods” and “re-align automation.” Their vision was to create an efficient and effective electronic environment in which appellate judges are able to perform their work using consumer technologies in concert with custom-developed tools.

Implementing the theme will require, among other things, creating electronic documents or imaging paper documents at lower courts to create the electronic record prior to

appeal, improving bandwidth available on the statewide network to transport electronic documents, conquering issues related to statewide electronic case filing, updating court rules to keep pace with technological changes, and addressing document archival requirements.

The mandate given to IT planners at the Technology Planning Summit held April 2, 2012, was to determine the best way to fulfill the vision of business leadership concerning the future appellate court environment. Since that time, work has focused on determining the appropriate business analysis steps and tactical implementations related to the adopted strategic items. A more specific strategic roadmap will likely be required to chart a course through the complex and lengthy series of projects that will be required. As a consequence, this plan does not yet include a detailed project listing, but will be updated as soon as one exists.

B.3. STATE APPELLATE COURTS TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVES RESPONDING TO AGENDAS, INITIATIVES, AND BUSINESS PRESSURES

The previous six years have provided the foundation for this plan through their focus on digitizing the appellate courts to create an essentially “paper on demand” environment. Concepts initiated in Division Two were expanded to encompass a holistic approach to a standards-based, integrated system, which today is still comprised of somewhat disparate parts. The fundamental approach in the next plan period views the court system as an information supply chain, in which lower courts create information that is ultimately consumed by the state appellate courts.

A supply chain, in the strictest sense, is a network of autonomous or semi-autonomous business entities collectively responsible for procurement, manufacturing, and distribution activities associated with one or more families of related products. The justice supply chain, then, is 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 end up at the Supreme Court on appeal, a chain relationship exists between law enforcement, municipal or justice courts, the superior courts, the court of appeals, and the Supreme Court. A supply chain considers all these individual links leading up to the final one as essential functions within the overall value equation.

As the supply chain becomes digitized and bandwidth increases to carry the digital traffic, the majority of incoming and outgoing documents at State Appellate Courts have become electronic. Attention now focuses on the use of those electronic inputs within the walls of the courts, most notably by judges. Projects will be undertaken in these areas:

1. Improving Electronic Document Usability -- As clerks of court receive and deliver electronic documents to staff attorneys and judges, the usability of those documents comes into focus. Some judges are anxious about being forced to change from reading paper to reading computer screens. Use of consumer technology, like iPads, reduces that anxiety but brings other issues to light. The value added by providing searchability within and across case-related documents will improve the experience for judges. Text searchability must be built into the .pdf when saved at the source or optical character recognition will need to be used with scanning software to provide searchability for paper filings at the time of conversion to electronic records. Individually configurable, meaningful collections of documents need to be presented to judges to speed their work.

2. Enabling Remote Attendance -- As the world becomes increasingly interconnect-

ed and bandwidth continues to increase, the feasibility of judges working from remote locations increases along with the possibility of remote appearances in the courtroom. Audioconferencing and videoconferencing, as well as remote access to networks, are all fundamental to remote operation. Some judges are willing to entertain argument via audio or videoconference and are even interested in participating in oral argument and conferences remotely themselves. Infrastructure and applications must grow to address judges' expectations.

3.. Accommodating a Video Record -- Widespread use of consumer video technology (more content is added to YouTube in two months than was created in the past 60 years of broadcast television) is hastening the creation of a video record at lower courts, parts of which may become relevant to an appeals case. Upon agreement by parties, judges are willing to view a portion of the video record rather than waiting to obtain the written transcript of the proceeding. Video standards as well as indexing capabilities must be sufficient to enable efficient use of the video record by judges. A more creative solution may involve automated creation of a transcript at the appellate court from the raw video or audio record via commercial legal transcription software.

4. Shortening Records Transfer Time – As more clerks store case-related information and documents electronically, the trial court record and the index of record on appeal are routinely transmitted electronically rather than physically. Rules allowing 40 days for the transfer have become outdated. In a short time, the notion of actually transferring electronic records from one system to another will also become outdated, though the need for an index with links of some sort will likely remain. Judges' frustrating "long pole in the tent" is currently receipt of the official court reporter transcript from the lower court proceeding. Work is needed to shorten the time necessary for the transfer or to address the function of that transcript in another way – possibly via video record or legal speech-to-text software.

5. Remote Access to Appellate Case Records – Reviewing case documents and portions of the trial court record remotely is of great benefit to court personnel (justices, judges, staff attorneys), allowing them to view document listings with "hotlinks" to the documents themselves quickly and easily from their desktop at work and from a remote location using only a standard Internet browser. Though the ultimate vision is for attorneys and parties to be allowed Internet access to case documents, in accordance with Supreme Court rules regarding public access to court documents, images will first be made available to authorized judicial staff members remotely via the Internet.

Division Two currently provides registered users remote access to their own case documents through **ODSPlusWebDocs**. All appellate courts make case information (not case documents) available to the public via their respective websites. The public is provided real-time access to case information on Division Two's website, while Division One and the Supreme Court make public case information available on their websites following a nightly refresh. Their static, refreshed-nightly approach will change to

dynamic, on-demand access to electronic documents with the implementation of a remote public access solution backed by the OnBase Central Document Repository managed by the AOC.

The Supreme Court's **e-Briefcase** approach to place case-related electronic documents on a secure, portable flash drive for the use of justices and staff attorneys is giving way to providing a secure, remote login to the court network using the Internet, even for personal devices.

6. Issuing Electronic Notifications – A later phase of e-filing involves expansion of the concept of transmitting court notices and documents electronically to parties. This is an important service with great benefits to both the court and the public. Digitally signed orders, notices, and decisions will be efficiently delivered via Internet e-mail not only to litigants but to all on the case distribution list, leading to substantial savings of time, labor, and money. Electronic distribution eliminates the need to print, copy, collate, stuff envelopes, affix labels, and pay postage. It also reduces delay, improves communication between the court and public, and enhances the efficiency of court operations. Division Two currently operates an XML RSS feed that disseminates opinions linked through the court's website.

The **e-Distribute** program provides an e-mail message containing a digitally-signed copy of the court order or notice to everyone on the distribution list for the case. Communications details are typically stored in the e-filer program. Though the function is available using Appellation (Division One and Supreme Court) and **e-Distribute** (Division Two) today, the appellate courts as a whole have not fully transitioned from paper to electronic distribution. The intent is to complete the transition within the plan period.

The statewide approach and requirements for e-filing and e-signature are being determined by COT's e-Court subcommittee.

7. Electronic Archival – Retention periods apply equally to case records in both paper and electronic form. The challenge of appropriately purging closed case records and archiving them in accordance with the State Library, Archives, and Public Records (SLAPR) statute and rules must be met, as this forms the final step in the lifecycle of a case. Beginning with the end in mind, the state appellate courts will craft a strategy to reliably purge and archive data as well as documents in accordance with published retention periods and guidance from SLAPR.

8. Other Items – In addition to the above:

- a. The Supreme Court will be tackling the proliferation of consumer technology devices within the IT environment and related process re-engineering to accommodate digital workflow.
- b. Division One will be updating its communications applications and phones.

- c. Division Two will pursue enabling hyperlinks directly to documents in the trial court record for judges and staff attorneys.

C. CURRENT TECHNOLOGY ENVIRONMENT

This section describes both the statewide and local hardware and software environment. Hardware includes mainframes, servers, desktops, and other peripherals. Software includes statewide applications, local software and desktop productivity tools.

Hardware

The Arizona Judicial Branch has a diverse mix of hardware used by the various projects and programs that have evolved and applications that have been acquired and/or developed over the last several years. The mix of hardware that the county courts accesses includes the newest architectures designed to support the complexity of these applications and the large geographical area served by the Judicial Branch.

The server environment, hosted at the Administrative Office of the Courts Data Center, includes IBM AS/400s for JOLTS and general administrative operations of the Administrative Office of the Courts. The ACAP courts and the appellate courts are operating on IBM AIX systems. Windows servers provide for Internet, Intranet, e-mail, Statewide Crystal Enterprise/SSRS ad-hoc reporting, and Statewide remote on-line training, as well as file and print sharing.

The desktop environment includes a variety of PCs. AOC/ITD, under COT's direction, has undertaken a four year equipment leasing cycle which is designed to refresh desktop hardware regularly to ensure that it incorporates the technology needed to support the evolution of statewide applications and projects. In the most recent refresh activity, the following models were placed in service for the Supreme Court:

- Desktop: EW290AV hp Compaq Business Desktop dc5700 SFF, Intel Core 2 Duo 2.13GHz, 160 GB, 2 GB RAM, NIC
- Laptop: HP 8540p Elitebook, Intel i7-640M, 2.8GHz, 160 GB, 4 GB RAM, NIC
- Printer: Q5401A hp LaserJet 4015N

The hardware listed in Appendix A reflects equipment used to support the court management system software, the juvenile tracking software, other state-provided applications as well as additional local record keeping functions. Additional hardware beyond these desktop items is also listed.

Software

Appendix A also identifies all the software used in the appellate courts. It includes the state-provided applications, such as Appellamation, and any word processing, spreadsheet, report writing, and other database or other tracking applications.

D. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PROJECTS

This section identifies each statewide and local strategic project in which the appellate courts participate or will be actively pursuing over the next three years. For those projects primarily supported at the state level, it will identify project status and describe the local courts' planned participation and note any related, independent future plans. For independent but complementary local projects, additional details on resources and future plans are included.

This section also includes information for independent technology projects which are not primarily supported by state resources. Information on these projects includes showing alignment with both statewide and local technology strategic initiatives and enterprise architecture standards. Any technologies or products appearing in the "Retirement" column of the Enterprise Architecture standards table have a corresponding migration or replacement project identified.

The statewide strategic technology projects, and their priority as assigned by the Commission on Technology, are as follows:

Top Tier, Category "A"

- AzTurboCourt- Civil
- AJACS- Aztec replace
- AJACS- Mesa
- Reporting- AJACS
- JoltsAZ- Pima

Top Tier, Category "B"

- AJACS-GJ Enhancements
- AzTurboCourt- Criminal
- AJACS- eFiling
- AzTurboCourt- BofA / EFSS
- AzTurboCourt- DR

Next Tier

- ePayment
- eDocs- Fee based
- eDocs- Free
- APETS Integration
- Bench Automation
- JoltsAZ- Rural
- Probate

COURT IT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This section lists the accomplishments of the state appellate courts in information technology projects from the previous plan period.

STRATEGIC PROJECT (State or Local)	PROGRAM / PROJECT	DESCRIPTION	LOCAL ACCOMPLISHMENT
Digitization	EDMS/Imaging	Install State standard EDMS and train users	Completed in Division One and Supreme Court
e-Filing	Electronic Record Transfer	Transfer lower court record electronically	All superior courts now transfer records to appellate courts electronically
e-Filing	AZTurboCourt	Enable e-filing of all appellate case types	Mandated for Division One and Supreme Court
e-Filing	e-Filer	Enable e-filing of all appellate case types	Continued development/ expanded use at Division Two
Second-Generation Applications	Appellamation	Enhance and improve court case management systems to meet increasing demands	Multiple releases provided during plan period
Server Consolidation	Reduce Number of Physical Server	Virtualize Windows servers	Division One reduced 20 Windows servers to 3 Citrix Xen Servers Division Two reduced number of hardware servers and increased number of virtual servers
Case Processing	caseDocs	Implemented efficient and effective electronic environment for decision development and workflow	Division Two supplied to all judges, staff attorneys, law clerks, and judicial assistants

STRATEGIC PROJECT (State or Local)	PROGRAM / PROJECT	DESCRIPTION	LOCAL ACCOMPLISHMENT
Electronic Distribution	eDistribute	Pair orders and litigant e-mail addresses	Division Two constructed an extensive set of forms and litigants' e-mail addresses for use by the eDistribute system

COURT PROJECTS MASTER LISTING

This section collects all information technology project-related information for the state appellate courts during fiscal year 2013 (really January 2012 to January 2014). Projects listed include both those in support of statewide efforts as well as strategic technology projects that support the court's strategic initiatives independent of the statewide projects.

This plan does not yet include a detailed project listing, but will be updated as soon as one exists.

D.1. MAJOR STATEWIDE INITIATIVES AND PLANNING/IMPACT INFORMATION

N/A

D.2. LOCAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC RESOURCES

This section provides high-level information about the technology spending and resources by court.

LOCAL TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES				
Court	State Device Cost	Other Technical Cost	Number of:	City or County FTE Technical Support Staff
			Court FTE Technical Staff	
Supreme Court			<2	
Division One			3	
Division Two			<2	

APPENDIX A. CURRENT ENVIRONMENT

1. HARDWARE ENVIRONMENT BY COURT

This section lists the judicial branch-owned hardware deployed in the state appellate courts, including mainframes, servers, desktops, and other peripherals.

Court	Number of PCs	PC Operating System	Number of Laptops	Laptop Operating System	Number of Network Printers
Division Two	42	XP	5	XP	15
	3	Windows 7	9	Vista	
Division One	113	Windows 7	19	Windows 7	31
	3	XP			
Supreme Court	48	Vista	10 Laptops 2 Notebooks	Vista Windows 7	15

2. HARDWARE FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

Court	Number of:				
	Public Access PCs	In Courtroom PCs	In Chambers PCs	Imaging/ Scanning Workstations	Other PCs
Supreme Court	1		Included in above count	5 Scanners 2 FAX	6 iPads 2 iPhones 5 Blackberry
Division Two	1	0	Included in above count	1 Scanner 5 Scan/Fax/Copy	6 Androids 4 iPad2
Division One	1	2	Included in above count	2	18 iPad2

3. LOCAL SERVER HARDWARE AND FUNCTION

Local Server Information					
Court/Dept.	# Brand / Model	Operating System	Database	Managed by	Use/ Applications
Division Two	Dell PowerEdge 1950	2- Win2003R2	SQL2005	Division Two	EDMS, Web
Division Two	Dell PowerEdge 2650	1 - Win2003		Division Two	Exchange2003
Division Two	Dell PowerEdge R710	1 - Windows 2008		Division Two	Virtual Server File and Print

Local Server Information					
Court/Dept.	# Brand / Model	Operating System	Database	Managed by	Use/ Applications
Division Two	Dell PowerEdge 2900iii	1 Windows 2008		Division Two	Backup Exec
Division One	HP Proliant	5 2008 R2 & 12 Win2003		Division One	
Supreme Court	See AOC inventory	See AOC inventory		AOC	

4. NETWORK ENVIRONMENT

The state courts' network is the Arizona Judicial Information Network (AJIN), maintained by the AOC.

5. SOFTWARE ENVIRONMENT

This section identifies all the software used in the state appellate courts. It includes the state-provided applications (such as Appellamation) and also any word processing, spreadsheet, report writing and other database or other tracking applications.

Local Applications				
Application Name	Developed/ Supported by	Resides on ("local PC" or server name)	Courts Using	Description of Application
Appellamation	AOC	Server/Local PC	AZ Supreme Court and Appeals Division One	State standard appellate case and cash management system.
Appellamation: Receipting	AOC	Server/Local PC	AZ Supreme Court; Division One	A module of Appellamation to process payments.

Local Applications				
Application Name	Developed/ Supported by	Resides on ("local PC" or server name)	Courts Using	Description of Application
Appellation: Calendaring	AOC	Server/Local PC	AZ Supreme Court; Division One	A module of Appellation integrated to docket and case management that tracks all events and provides daily calendars.
Appellation: Document Management	AOC	Server/Local PC	AZ Supreme Court; Division One	A module of Appellation that integrates with the internal document mgt. system.
Appellation: Document Production	AOC	Server/Local PC	AZ Supreme Court; Division One	A module of Appellation that feeds the internal document management system.
ODSPlus	Division Two	www.appeals2.az. gov	Division Two	Case Mgt System
ODSPlus WebDocs	Division Two	www.appeals2.az. gov	Division Two	Web access (including remote) to court documents.
Word Perfect Versions. 8 & 12	Corel/local staff	Local PC	; Division Two	A word processing system.
Microsoft Word 2007	Microsoft/local & AOC staff	Local PC	AZ Supreme Court; Division One; Division Two	A word processing system.
Windows 2000	Microsoft/AOC staff	Local PC	; Division Two	A PC operating system.
Windows XP	Microsoft/AOC staff	Local PC	AZ Supreme Court; Division One; Division Two	A PC operating system.

Local Applications				
Application Name	Developed/ Supported by	Resides on ("local PC" or server name)	Courts Using	Description of Application
Windows Vista	Microsoft/AOC staff	Local PC	AZ Supreme Court	The operating system of state standard desktop PCs.
Windows 7	Microsoft/Division One	Local PC	Division One	A PC operating system
Outlook 2007	Microsoft	Local PC	AZ Supreme Court; Division One; Division Two	E-mail client
Exchange Server	Microsoft/ Division One/ Division Two	Server	AZ Supreme Court; Division One; Division Two	E-mail server
Outlook Web Access	Microsoft/AOC/ Division Two	Server	AZ Supreme Court; Division One; Division Two	Web email
Netscape Messenger	Vendor/Division Two	Local PC	Division Two	E-Mail (phasing out)
DBMS	SQL Server	Server/Local PC	AZ Supreme Court	Database mgt tools
DBMS	IBM Informix	Server	AZ Supreme Court; Division One	Database
DBMS	DB2	Server/Local PC	Division Two	Database Mgt.
Adobe Acrobat Reader	Adobe/AOC	Local PC	AZ Supreme Court; Division One; Division Two	A free product from Adobe Acrobat for reading documents in pdf format.
Acrobat PDF Writer	Adobe	Local PC	AZ Supreme Court; Division One; Div Two	PDF creation/ conversion

Local Applications				
Application Name	Developed/ Supported by	Resides on ("local PC" or server name)	Courts Using	Description of Application
1-Step Robo PDF		Local PC	Division Two	PDF creation/ conversion
GhostScript	Distributed with GNU general public license	Local PC	AZ Supreme Court; Division. One	PDF creation/ conversion
Excel	Microsoft	Local PC	AZ Supreme Court; Division One; Division Two	A spreadsheet product from Microsoft.
Visio	Microsoft	Local PC	AZ Supreme Court; Division One; Division Two	Diagramming/ flowcharting software
MS Office	Microsoft	Local PC	AZ Supreme Court; Division One; Division Two	Office production tools (Word, Excel, PowerPoint....)
McAfee Virus Scan	McAfee	Local PC and Various AOC Servers	AZ Supreme Court; Division One; Division Two	Virus detection software to protect local PCs.
Digital Audio: Product Name: Sound Forge	Sony	Local PC / Courtrooms and 1 laptop	Division One	Record OAs to MP3
Document Scanning Product Name: KOFAX/SIRE		Scanner1	Division Two	Imaging system
Document Scanning Product Name: OnBase Production Document Imaging	Hyland/OSAM Local		AZ Supreme Court/Division One	Imaging system

Local Applications				
Application Name	Developed/ Supported by	Resides on ("local PC" or server name)	Courts Using	Description of Application
Electronic Document Management System Product Name: SIRE	Alpha Corp.	NEW EDM Server	Division Two	Storage and retrieval of electronic documents
Electronic Document Management System Product Name: OnBase EDMS	Hyland/OSAM/ Local		AZ Supreme Court and Division One	Storage and retrieval of electronic documents
Integration:- Electronic Records on Appeal Product Name: e-Blueback	Division Two	www.appeals2.az. gov	Division Two, PCSC	
Integration:- Electronic Records on Appeal Product Name: e-Appeal	AOC	Local PC	Division One	Support e-filing of the record on appeal and amendments to the record.
Electronic Filing: Product Name: e-filer	Division Two	www.appeals2.az. gov	Division Two	
Electronic Filing: Product Name: Court Rules Forum	AOC	Hosted by PowerDNN	AZ Supreme Court	Permits e-filing of rule change petitions and comments

Local Applications				
Application Name	Developed/ Supported by	Resides on ("local PC" or server name)	Courts Using	Description of Application
e-Distribute	Division Two	www.appeals2.az.gov	Division Two	Electronic distribution of court documents to litigants
e-PR	Division Two	www.appeals2.az.gov	Division Two/ASC	Electronic Petition for Review
Message Transport/Middleware Product Name: MQ Series	IBM/AOC	Server	AZ Supreme Court/Division. One/Division Two	Supports e-Appeal
Court Web site	AZ Supreme Court	www.azcourts.gov	AZ Supreme Court	Provides information about courts, public access, rules, etc.
Court Web site	Division Two	www.appeals2.az.gov	Division Two	Provides public access to court information, and opinions; provides public notification of opinions
Court Web site	Division One	azcourts.gov/coa1	Division One	Provides general information for court, including access to opinions and memorandum decisions
ColdFusion	Macromedia/ Division Two	www.appeals2.az.gov	Division Two	Web Application Development
DreamWeaver	Macromedia	Local PC	Division Two	Web application creation/editing tool
XML Spy	Altova	Local PC	AZ Supreme Court	XML development tool

Local Applications				
Application Name	Developed/ Supported by	Resides on ("local PC" or server name)	Courts Using	Description of Application
Altova XML Suite	Altova	Local PC	Division Two	XML development tools
.NET Framework SDK	Microsoft	Local PC	AZ Supreme Court, Division One; Division Two	.NET environment development
PowerBuilder	Sybase	AOC Server	AZ Supreme Court	Development environment
Visible Developer	Visible Systems Corp	AOC Server	AZ Supreme Court	Development environment
Visual Studio	Microsoft	AOC Server	AZ Supreme Court	Development environment
PVCS	Altova	AOC Server/Local PC	AZ Supreme Court	Source Code Management
Source Safe	Microsoft	AOC Server/Local PC	AZ Supreme Court	Source Code Management
Citrix Server	Citrix	Server	AZ Supreme Court Division One	Desktop Virtualization for mobile devices

6. COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENT TO ARIZONA JUDICIAL BRANCH ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE

The table below prompts you to identify any current technologies and products classified in the retirement and containment categories of the architecture. Beginning with the FY08 plan, COT requires that a project be defined for the removal/replacement or any item listed in the “retirement” category within plan period. Items in the “containment” category can have no additional use without exception being granted by COT. The next stop on the lifecycle is retirement; therefore, further investment is unwise and serves to make removal/replacement only more difficult and expensive.

The complete, updated table appears on the COT website at <http://www.azcourts.gov/cot/EnterpriseArchitectureStandards.aspx>. Where there are unique, local undertakings that cannot be leveraged, a court is free to go beyond the standards set in the table. When sharable modules related to core applications are developed, the standards must be followed.

Architecture Layers	Retirement (targeted for de-investment)	Containment (limited to maintenance & current commitments)	Current Court Technology or Product (fill in)
User Interface Delivery Method for Public Access	Netscape		
User Interface Delivery Method for Business Applications	Character based		
Electronic Document Management	LaserFiche, Hyland OnBase <9.2	Kofax	OnBase, SIRE, Kofax
Report Writer for Ad Hoc Reporting	Crystal <10, MS SSRS 2000	Crystal 10, MS SSRS 2005	
Report Writer for Business Application Reports	Crystal <10	Crystal 10, MS SSRS 2005	
Development Languages	COBOL, JAM, RPG, MUMPS, FoxPro	Java (on a business case need basis), ASP (Classic), .NET Framework V1.1	
Development Environment	Panther, Visual Studio ≤2003, Visual Studio 6, Visual Interdev	Visual Studio 2005, PowerBuilder	
Analysis Tools	HOW		

Architecture Layers	Retirement (targeted for de-investment)	Containment (limited to maintenance & current commitments)	Current Court Technology or Product (fill in)
Word Processing	Word Perfect, Word <2003	Word 2003	Word 2007
Spreadsheet	Excel <2003	Excel 2003	Excel 2007
Presentation	PowerPoint ≤2003, CorelDraw	PowerPoint 2003	PowerPoint 2007
Local Standalone Database	MS-Access <2003	MS-Access 2003	
E-mail Client Product	Outlook <2003, Lotus Notes, GroupWise (unsupported)	Outlook <2003, Lotus Notes, GroupWise (supported)	Outlook 2007
DBMS	SQL Server ≤2005, FoxPro, Clipper	SQL Server 2005	Informix, DB2, SQL 2005 SQL 2008
Data Exchange Model		Fixed format, XML homegrown	
Network Protocol	SNA		
Wireless Network Access	WEP		
Network Operating System	Novell (unsupported) Windows (unsupported)	MS-Windows Server 2003	
Client Operating System	≤ Windows 2000	Windows XP	Vista, Windows 7
Server Operating Systems	OS/400, DEC VMS	Microsoft Windows 2003	Win 2003, Win 2008
Mobile Operating Systems		BlackBerry O/S	Blackberry, iOS, Android
Component Service Layer		Web Services (current version), DCOM, ASP (classic)	

Architecture Layers	Retirement (targeted for de-investment)	Containment (limited to maintenance & current commitments)	Current Court Technology or Product (fill in)
Message Transport	MQ ≤ V5.2	MQ V5.3/V6.0	
Data Transformation	Data Junction, MQSI ≤ V2.1, DTS	Cloverleaf, WMB V6.0	
Data Routing/Publish and Subscribe	MQSI ≤ V2.1	Cloverleaf, WMB V6.0	
File Transfer, Scheduled Production	FTP (intercourt and using public Internet), MQ ≤ 5.2	FTP (intracourt only), MQ V5.3/ V6.0	
File Transfer, Ad Hoc	MQ ≤ 5.2	MQ V5.3/ V6.0	