

**COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE  
A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**February 28, 2008**  
9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

**Arizona Supreme Court**

Conference Room 230  
Arizona Supreme Court  
1501 W. Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Kip Anderson\*  
Cathy Clarich  
Joan Harphant  
Donald Jacobson (*Gary Kremerik, proxy*)  
Phillip Knox  
Patrick McGrath  
Gordon Mulleneaux  
Patricia Noland\*  
Gregg Obuch  
Michael Pollard, *Chair*  
Rick Rager  
James Scorza  
David Stevens  
Paul Thomas

**GUESTS**

Phillip Ellis\*, *Pima Superior Court*  
Jason Epel\*, *TAC*  
Michael Nickelsburg, *Auditor General's Office*  
Becky Williams, *Tucson Municipal Court*

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Margaret Guidero  
C. Steven McMurry

**AOC STAFF**

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*  
Stephanie Nolan, *ITD*  
Renny Rapier\*, *ITD\**

\* indicates appeared by telephone

## **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS**

Judge Michael Pollard, Chair, called the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meeting to order promptly at 9:30 a.m., introducing Michael Nickelsburg from the Auditor General's Office, who was visiting. Judge Pollard expressed concern about the general slippage indicated on the project dashboards over the past couple of months. The goal of the stringent reporting requirements, as directed by the COT chair, is to address slippage in individual tasks before that translates to slippage in delivery dates for the project as a whole. Early warning is for the purpose of taking corrective action before the delivery dates have to be adjusted.

Discussion turned to the standard format for displaying changed delivery dates on dashboards. Consensus was to add a column each time delivery dates change, but hide all dates between the original COT delivery date and the two most recent columns of CACC delivery date changes.

Since the scheduled June meeting date falls during the Judicial Conference at Ventana Canyon Resort in Tucson, the chair asked members' interest in holding the CACC meeting at the conference venue, rather than in Phoenix. Interest, gathered by a show of hands, was mixed. Stewart will investigate the feasibility of adding the meeting to the end of the conference and report back. Members felt strongly that a call-in option must be provided, regardless of location.

Discussion of the minutes from previous meeting revealed the need to remove the redundant word "requirements" from the Tempe CMS report.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes from last month's meeting as minimally revised. The motion passed unanimously.**

## **MARICOPA CLERK'S FINANCIAL SYSTEM UPDATE**

David Stevens reminded members that the detailed scope for his portion of iFIS development, (the RFR replacement) which his group has undertaken for the Clerk's Office, cannot be determined until the April-through-July analysis effort is complete. His dashboard will show very few changes until then. He described the risks that were documented on this month's dashboard. He explained why several milestones at the very end of the project were changed from yellow to green.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the RFR replacement status report as delivered. The motion passed unanimously (Gordon Mulleneaux and David Stevens abstaining).**

Gordon Mulleneaux, Maricopa Clerk's Office iFIS Project Sponsor, briefly reviewed changes from last month's report and added risks related to staffing and budget. Gordon clarified that next month's demonstration will feature the Clerk's Project Web Access system, but some pieces of the cash receipting system may be available to view, as well.

Gordon answered a question about the high number of tasks having past or near delivery dates with very little percentage progress shown. He noted that the period of time between when the report was submitted and the meeting introduced the appearance of some issues. The chair requested that project managers use the comments field on tasks to indicate that they're aware of

any issues and to explain why near term dates having low completion percentages do not present problems.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the cash receipting system replacement status report as delivered. The motion passed unanimously (Gordon Mulleneaux and David Stevens abstaining).**

In a roll call vote, members present characterized the project's overall health as "green."

#### **GENERAL JURISDICTION COURTS CMS UPDATE -- AGAVE**

Phillip Ellis, AGAVE Project Manager, stated that he will conform his dashboard to the format agreed to earlier in the meeting. He informed members of a recently discovered technical issue with recurrences that affects calendar development efforts. All calendar-related tasks are being postponed one month to March 14. Training and documentation dates have moved back, as well, to May 2, reflecting a change in the customer requested implementation date. Patti Noland pointed out that moving to May 2 avoids the complexities of the end of the month and a scheduled bench rotation. Phillip detailed his phased approach to implementation: civil bench on June 2 followed by family law 4 to 6 weeks later followed by criminal bench 3 to 4 weeks after that. A question was raised about the point in the implementation when AGAVE would no longer be reporting. Phillip reminded members that development work will move from AGAVE 2.0 to 3.0 and reporting continues.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the Pima AGAVE status report as delivered. The motion passed unanimously (Gregg Obuch abstaining).**

In a roll call vote, members present characterized the project's overall health as "green."

#### **GENERAL JURISDICTION COURTS CMS UPDATE -- AMCAD**

Renny Rapier, AOC's General Jurisdiction Case Management System Project Manager, reported from Herndon, VA, that the project remains in green status and on schedule. The team is reviewing the vendor's work on the test application before it gets loaded onto servers at AOC. Data conversion remains a concern, but a test will take place this week using data from Yuma and La Paz. Renny iterated the approach for converting financials and what court users will experience when using the repository being developed. Patrick McGrath translated Renny's explanation to help AZTEC users understand. Integration tasks remain on schedule. Emphasis in March will be on training various levels of users on the system using 40 workstations in Phoenix. Delivery of the final test application for use in the pilot courts remains on schedule for April 21.

Members requested detail about the coordination of code standardization efforts with CMS development. Patrick confirmed that the special workgroup described by Carrie Stoneburner last month is working hand in hand with Renny's team to ensure that every code going into the CMS has first been through the standardization process. Testing will confirm that the correct codes have been loaded.

Renny explained that his data conversion task will not show as 100 percent complete until the pilot courts cut over, even though the date shown on the task is earlier – a reporting strategy in line with the way other projects show data conversion. He briefly highlighted the result of two years’ data cleanup work to get from over a million data errors to under 6000 for Yuma in the latest run.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the GJ CMS status report as delivered. The motion passed unanimously.**

In a roll call vote, members present characterized the project’s overall health as “green.”

### **LIMITED JURISDICTION COURTS TEMPE CMS UPDATE**

Rick Rager, Tempe CMS Project Manager, updated members on recent activity for a variety of functional modules. He discussed the significant backlog building in the testing and quality assurance area. The single AOC resource is not sufficient now that eight developers are submitting work. Rick described efforts he’s taking to acquire additional resources. He noted that the work of the Order of Protection Module developers from AOC will only produce 5 of the 14 required forms before Tempe’s go-live date. A migration analyst began work February 19, closing the staffing issue. Tucson and Mesa are contributing resources on a part-time basis.

Joan Harphant reported that Becky Williams from Tucson City Court had spent a week in Tempe to view the CMS. Ms. Williams reported that she had viewed the system from the inside, testing financials and inspecting detailed tables. She reported that the system breaks down payments into the appropriate categories of the surcharges. She echoed Paul Thomas’ sentiments from last month and complimented Rick on the level of detail and completeness of the documentation she reviewed.

Members expressed some concern about the lack of progress on Tempe’s Bonds and Collections functional components. Rick described the complexity of the effort, the fact that it crosses other functional clusters, and the need for concentrated analysis before programming can begin.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the Tempe CMS status report as delivered. The motion passed unanimously (Rick Rager abstaining).**

In a roll call vote, members present characterized the project’s overall health as “green.”

### **PCCJC TECHNOLOGY STABILIZATION UPDATE**

Pima Consolidated Justice Court’s IT Manager, Jason Epel, stated that the servers discussed last month have been received and are being installed. Now that the contractor discussed last month has been formally engaged, he is confident that CMS documentation tasks will get back on schedule. The design of the application services migration path is being expedited by dividing it among four people. The project still lacks a VMS hardware support resource; Jason’s direction is to obtain a contract resource in that area.

Members asked Jason for details regarding the date by which the overall system will be stable and to describe Plan B if the CMS server ceases to function. Jason’s best estimate was about 60

days total for the full impact of all the new servers to be felt, assuming current resource levels. He walked through the switch to his other server and restoration of data from backup tapes in the event of a breakdown. Members also questioned the learning curve of the technical personnel involved in setting up the servers. Jason stated a possibility of amending the current contract to enable help with configuration as well as documentation tasks, if need be.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the PCCJC status report. The motion passed unanimously.**

In a roll call vote, members present characterized the project's overall health as "yellow," based on the speed of progress being made at addressing issues and perception that day-to-day risk to the system is not yet reduced from the critical level.

### **STAFF UPDATE**

- **IT Strategic Plan Input** – The chair reminded members of the short time between this meeting and the March 14 due date submitting complete plan input from the counties.
- **COT Meetings** – Staff member Stewart Bruner reported that the March 7 Commission on Technology (COT) meeting is being cancelled, but members will be receiving written updates about projects that would have been on the agenda. He felt the May 5 and 6 COT annual planning meeting would be cancelled, as well, and hoped the budget situation at the Legislature will stabilize in time to keep the June 5 and 6 alternate meeting dates.
- **Document Update** – Stewart reported on three documents currently in development. One is a draft of a new code section that tailors document management requirements for the smallest limited jurisdiction courts in the state. A subteam of LJC examined all provisions of ACJA 1-504 and 1-506, the technical requirements for imaging and e-filing, to suggest which should be lessened to lower the barrier to using electronic documents in courts not of record. The second is a draft administrative order spelling out requirements for protecting unencrypted or unredacted personal information held by courts and subsequent notification of those affected in the event of a breach in security. It defines responsibilities for those copying personally identifiable information from central court systems onto portable storage devices or laptops. It may eventually become a code section. Last, the enterprise architecture table is again being updated by Technical Advisory Council (TAC) for review by COT. Courts will be affected by the move of software products and versions from one lifecycle category to another.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business presented.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Joan Harphant invited interested members to attend an LJC implementation committee meeting dealing with the research fee and use its throughout courts following the LJC meeting on March 5, 2008, at 3:30 p.m. in 119A/B of the State Courts Building. She requested any policies and procedures courts use in that area to be submitted to her ahead of the meeting.

After a reminder to members that the next meeting will take place at the Downtown Justice Center, 620 West Jackson, the meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.