COT MEETING MINUTES

DRAFT

COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY

Friday, June 3, 2016 9:30 AM - 3:30 PM

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

CONFERENCE ROOM 119

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kent Batty
Michael Baumstark
Raymond Billotte *(Phil Knox, proxy)*
Michael Brown
James Conlogue
Bennett Cooper
Chris Hale *(Laura Spain*, proxy)*
Michael Jeanes
Gary Krcmarik
John Lucas*
Michael Miller *(Christopher Staring*, proxy)*
Roxanne Song Ong
John Pelander, *Chair*
John Rezzo
Tivo Romero
Virlynn Tinnell

MEMBERS ABSENT

Paul J. Faith

GUESTS

Alexis Allen, *Tempe Muni Court*
Carla Boatner, *Chandler Muni Court*
Aaron Carpenter, *Lexmark Inc*
Ken DeWitt, *Navajo County IT*
Julie Dybas, *CACC*
John Hudson, *Gilbert Muni Court*
Randy Kennedy, *TAC*
Phil Knox, *CACC*
Van Le, *Gilbert Muni Court*
Rona Newton, *PACC*
Joseph Olcavage, *Scottsdale Muni Court*
Jayne Pendergast, *Maricopa Superior Court*
Debi Schaefer, *Tempe Muni Court*
B. Don Taylor, *Phoenix Muni Court*
Adam Walterson, *Gilbert Muni Court*

AOC STAFF

Jennifer Albright, *CSD*
Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Dave Byers, *Exec Office*
Eric Ciminski, *ITD*
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*
Kevin Kluge, *Finance*
Amy Wood, *CSD*
Adele May, *ITD*
Denise Lundin, *ITD*
Marcus Reinkensmeyer, *CSD*
Jason Shumberger, *ITD*

*** indicates appeared by telephone**

COT MEETING MINUTES DRAFT

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS	Hon. John Pelander, Chair

Vice Chief Justice John Pelander, Chair, called the Commission on Technology (COT) annual meeting to order just after 9:30 a.m. He welcomed members and the public and then recognized Kent Batty on the occasion of his pending retirement, presenting him with a certificate of appreciation for 16 years of service to COT and the courts. The chair then asked members in the room and on the phone to introduce themselves for the record.

Staff confirmed that a quorum existed before the chair updated members on several items, including:

- An overview of the topics being discussed in the meeting and the progression of discussions through the day, including procedural details;
- News of recent cyberattacks against government entities including the courts, some training being released to raise employees' awareness of recent schemes, and the importance of a coordinated approach to information security across all courts;
- News of the budget and re-appointment processes; as well as
- Recognition of COT and subcommittee members for their continued service and guidance at the statewide level.

The chair then called members' attention to the minutes from the February 19, 2016 meeting.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the February19, 2016 Commission on Technology meeting, as written. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH 16-05**

IT STRATEGIC ROADMAP	Mr. Karl Heckart

Justice Pelander introduced Karl Heckart, chief information officer (CIO) for the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), to set the stage for the planning effort. Karl began his twentieth annual planning meeting by contrasting prior years' emphases with this year's. He reported that so many large initiatives are underway simultaneously that IT staff and court employees are stressed. He decried customers' desire for "filet-mignon"-quality software applications but delivered at the speed and cost of "quarter-pounder" systems. The result is continual frustration with long timelines and lower functionality than expected.

He also pointed out the struggle against status quo work processes brought about by new technology. New systems get complicated by business rules that have built up over time and increasingly become unnecessary requirements – the past procedures are being applied to the new technology without questioning why. With that background, Karl shared details about three categories of items: infrastructure, core systems, and services. He described increased demands brought on by new licensing models and new user expectations, then provided a few current examples.

Karl then emphasized two technology themes for fiscal year 2017: shifting the emphasis from software development to implementation and better managing elements of cyber security. Kent

Batty suggested an additional theme of planning the next generation of major automation systems as replacement cycles continually shorten.

STRATEGIC PROJECTS REVIEW/UPDATES	Subcommittee Chairs

	COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE	Mr. Phil Knox

Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) member Phil Knox briefly described various projects that have been completed over the past year as well as key projects that are planned for completion in the coming year, especially the new case management system (CMS) for limited jurisdiction (LJ) courts. He emphasized the need for continued funding to see current projects through to completion and get necessary enhancements made, most notably AZTEC replacement at over 100 courts, eFiling/eBench expansion, and moving the final few courts onto FARE.

	PROBATION AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE	Ms. Rona Newton

Ms. Rona Newton, chair of the Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC), listed accomplishments in automation from the past year and anticipated progress for next year in both juvenile and adult probation automation at Maricopa Superior Court and the rest of the state. She focused attention on the JOLTSaz statewide rollout in completed and scheduled counties. Maricopa representatives briefly described the benefits being realized from their local efforts with the iCISng eSentencing module.

	e-COURT SUBCOMMITTEE	Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer

Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Director of AOC's Court Services Division, provided the progress of eCourt- / eServices-related projects over the previous year, including the number of electronic filings submitted. He listed enhancements made to public-facing functions over the past year. Marcus focused on activities associated with piloting the next-generation eUniversa e-filing product in Yavapai County before the program expands to Mohave Superior, a higher volume court. Small claims e-filing is in the plan for next year. He showed several eBench screens to illustrate its flexibility. Marcus also displayed a few eAccess screens and provided an update on loading the data and documents necessary to power it. Online citation payment integration with AJACS is nearly complete. nPayment, the e-filing payment processor, is currently creating a web portal for accepting pre-disposition payments in AZTEC courts, but without CMS integration. Marcus ended by recognizing Eric Ciminski, who is leaving the court's employ, for his hard work in managing the eBench, eAccess, and online citation payment programs.

	TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL	Mr. Karl Heckart

Karl Heckart, chair of the Technical Advisory Council (TAC), informed members in detail about several key challenges related to court technology, including:

- Ever increasing needs for integration,
- Growing complexity among connected systems,
- The need for increased security at all levels and in all areas,
- Difficulty attracting and retaining technical staff,
- Correctly deciding when to build and when to buy core systems,
- Assessing the high cost of operating our own infrastructure, and
- Change control for local systems that feed the central repositories.

He then focused attention on the role and value of the central repositories for data and documents – CCI and CDR – to provide a single view of the courts to the public and justice partners and to enable a "web services" approach that protects the data in core applications. An important next step is to provide filers hyperlinks to previously filed documents held by the court.

He also summarized various TAC-related items recommended to COT for a formal decision, including

- Revision of the enterprise architecture standards table,
- Minimum security standards applicable to all courts designed to address audit concerns,
- A phased implementation plan for the security standards,
- Revisions to the administrative code section related to destruction of paper, and
- Extensions of time for deletion of records in three courts operating their own CMS/EDMS combinations.

Karl answered questions about bring your own device (BYOD) policies as well as Wi-Fi access in courtrooms. Kent Batty warned that minimum security standards will have cost and resource consequences for larger courts around the state. Michael Jeanes explained the lengthy timeline for destruction at Maricopa Superior Court. Karl then explained the AJACS deletion queue being employed going forward. He listed TAC's key priorities for FY 2017, including the move of Exchange e-mail to the cloud, completion of Windows 10 and Office 365 upgrade cycles, focusing on a "cloud-first" strategy, dealing with change management across courts, and constructing public notification services.

	OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL REVIEW	Mr. Kevin Kluge

Mr. Kevin Kluge, chief financial officer for the AOC, shared the financial status of the Judicial Collections Enhancement Fund (JCEF) and showed a projection of actual revenues against predicted revenues, revenues against expenses, and the projected remaining fund balance at the end of FY2017. Kevin provided the larger context for the total automation budget as whole, funded 43 percent by JCEF. Diminishing revenues are the culprit behind lowered percentages of JCEF funding for automation. Kevin walked members through the components of the three main tiers of the budget. He described the strategies for handling expenditures in FY17 predicated on projected revenues remaining unchanged for the current year. The budget remains flat except for a supplement to appropriated funding needed to replace network compression hardware. The remaining JCEF balance is projected to be $700K, an amount Kevin described as adequate to cover the typical fluctuations during the year. In response to a question, Kevin detailed the WAAS network hardware upgrade appropriation from the legislature and the court supplement to provide the total estimated cost of the replacement project.

	IT STRATEGIC PRIORITIES FY17-FY20	Mr. Karl Heckart

Karl updated members on the status of each of last year's priority projects before reviewing the agreed priorities from last year. He then recommended a slightly modified list of priorities for the next plan period and described each of the projects that will require resources. In answer to members' questions, Karl described the relationship between the priority list and the projects list using some specific examples. The chair clarified that the vote involves the priority list used to make decisions among the projects.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to adopt the updated list of priorities as presented. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH 16-06**

	DECISIONS	Mr. Karl Heckart

Karl refreshed members' memories about the budget numbers and tier breakdowns previously described by Kevin Kluge and explained the function of the WAAS units discussed in Kevin's presentation, the manner of accounting for the costs of enhancements to statewide systems now that no vendor is involved, and field trainer funding.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve the funding for existing operations and continued development of previously authorized statewide systems, as presented. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH 16-07**

Karl highlighted changes recommended by TAC to the enterprise architecture standards table and the implications of moving certain items used by courts from one category to another. In response to a member's question, staff member Stewart Bruner clarified that Adobe Acrobat Professional is considered a utility rather than a word processing tool for document creation. Karl explained the difference between core, end-user applications documented in the code section and the more component-like products contained in the standards table.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve the revisions to the enterprise architecture standards table, as recommended by TAC. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH 16-08**

Karl reviewed the proposal for phased implementation of the minimum security standards: critical items by September 30 along with a gap analysis, then all remaining items by December 31, unless COT approves individual items that will take longer. He also recommended formation of a subcommittee to deal with security policies and review the gap assessment reports in a non-public forum, since they expose critical infrastructure weaknesses that could be easily exploited. Members discussed the budget implications on cities and counties should the standards pass. Karl described contact he has had with Maricopa County's CIO and his plan to communicate the details with the other county CIOs. Karl also emphasized his responsibility, rather than the subcommittee's, for rapid response to network issues and his desire to have the subcommittee in place to review the gap assessments that will be returned.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to recommend to AJC the contents of the minimum security standards table and effective dates, as presented. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH 16-09**

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve the formation of an ad hoc COT security subcommittee to review gaps, set policy, and provide oversight, with details and charter to be presented in the September COT meeting. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH 16-10**

Karl reminded members about his opposition to eliminating the vendor certification requirement for court technical resources that manage digital records. He recounted specific issues with the current certification requirements raised at TAC. Members expressed a preference for certification of resources but acknowledged the difficulties of obtaining and maintaining certified administrators. Concern existed that rural courts would not be able to implement e-filing when certified resources are required.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve the wording changes proposed in ACJA 1-507 related to virtual tape technology, as recommended by TAC. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH 16-11**

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve the wording changes proposed in ACJA 1-507 related to certification requirements for technical resources, as recommended by TAC. The motion passed with 3 no votes.**	**TECH 16-12**

Karl reminded members of the ERR&D recommendation for automated destruction of records beyond their retention and those courts that requested an extension of the June 1, 2016 deadline.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve all three ERR&D extensions: Mesa Municipal Court to July 31, 2016; Maricopa Superior Court to March 31, 2017; and Pima Superior Court to January 31, 2017, as presented. The motion passed unanimously with Michael Jeanes and Ray Billotte abstaining.**	**TECH 16-13**

	FY2017-2019 INDIVIDUAL COUNTY AUTOMATION PLANS	Mr. Stewart Bruner

Mr. Stewart Bruner, Manager of IT Strategic Planning for AOC, shared the larger context of the strategic business planning, IT planning, and COT's direction regarding the frequency of plan updates, including the process employed for urban counties this year. He then highlighted several prominent technology themes running through plans this year, including

- getting and sharing more digital information at all levels of court with digital input becoming the norm;

- continued growth of remote resource video projects and resultant need for increased bandwidth and priority for certain types of network traffic;
- equipment refreshes for courtroom audio and video equipment;
- continued movement toward local solutions and resources crafting ad hoc reports
- pursuit of "call out" auto-dialer systems to reduce failures to appear;
- out-of-support, retirement category software being replaced at a more rapid pace; and
- increasing project backlogs for local IT resources, year over year.

He reminded members that his presentation details certain accomplishments and concerns from the individual plans; that those concerns are conveyed to the presiding judge of the county in a letter from the COT chair; and that, while he makes suggestions, the choice of motion text related to any individual plan is ultimately theirs. Stewart then launched into an abbreviated, county-by-county, strategic plan summarization effort since materials had been shared with members well in advance with the goal of speeding the in-meeting review process.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve the Apache County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2017-2019. The motion passed with 7 aye votes and 5 no votes.**	**TECH-16-14**

Karl Heckart described the practical ramifications of being out of synchronization with other courts and the AOC repositories in the digitally interconnected world.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve Coconino County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2017-2019 with a concern noted for the lack of OnBase 15 upgrade precluding participation in the central document repository. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH-16-15**

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve the Gila County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2017-2019. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH-16-16**

Stewart explained his motivation for treating Maricopa courts' submittals as a single plan again this year but clarified that letters would be sent to the individual presiding judges in addition to the presiding judge for the county. Michael Jeanes explained the uniqueness of situations with use of Windows XP and MS-Access by the Clerk's Office and assured members that plans exist to address both situations. Stewart and Karl explained the issues with continued use of ftp for scheduled, production transfers of data by courts.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve Maricopa County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2017-2019, with concerns noted for the continued use of Windows XP by the Clerk, production data/processes in MS-Access at the Clerk's Office, and use of ftp for production data transfers in a number of courts. The motion passed unanimously with Michael Jeanes and Ray Billotte abstaining.**	**TECH-16-17**

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve Pima County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2017-2019. The motion passed unanimously with Kent Batty abstaining.**	**TECH-16-18**

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve Pinal County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2017-2019, with concerns noted for the number of local bolt-on applications connected to AJACS presenting business risk as new versions are released and lack of OnBase 15 upgrade precluding participation in the Central Document Repository. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH-16-19**

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve Santa Cruz County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2017-2019. The motion passed unanimously with Primitivo Romero abstaining.**	**TECH-16-20**

Stewart mentioned the extra efforts devoted to getting the eBench and eUniversa products functioning in Yavapai Superior Court at the same time as the planning process was in full swing.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve Yavapai County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2017-2019 with a concern noted for use of non-standard imaging systems to digitize case documents at two limited jurisdiction courts, posing business risk and affecting eventual e-filing efforts. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH-16-21**

Stewart closed with a timeline of remaining milestones in the planning process and verified that members were comfortable receiving only project names and planned end dates in next year's "lite" update process for the Maricopa and Pima courts. He will begin work on the branchwide plan for review in September.

MEETING REVIEW/WRAPUP	Hon. John Pelander

Justice Pelander reminded members of the decisions made during today's meeting that are headed for AJC later this month and also the next two COT meeting dates and locations.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC	Hon. John Pelander

After hearing no further discussion from members or the public, the chair then entertained a motion to adjourn by Kent Batty at 2:30 p.m.

Upcoming Meetings:	September 09, 2016	AOC – Conference Room 106
	November 18, 2016	AOC – Conference Room 106

MEETING ADJOURNED	2:30 PM