

# CACC MEETING MINUTES

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

Thursday, April 16, 2009  
10:00 AM - 12:30 PM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT  
1501 W. Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007



AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: (602) 452-3192  
AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 1112

### MEMBERS PRESENT

Kip Anderson\*  
Cathy Clarich  
Janet Cornell  
Margaret Guidero\*  
Joan Harphant (*Julie Bower\**, proxy)  
Donald Jacobson (*Jessica Cortes*, proxy)  
Phillip Knox  
Patrick McGrath  
C. Steven McMurry  
Gordon Mulleneaux  
Doug Pilcher (*Terry Maack*, proxy)  
Michael Pollard, *Chair*  
Rick Rager  
David Stevens  
Paul Thomas

### GUESTS

### MEMBERS ABSENT

Patricia Noland

### AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*  
Keith Kaplan, *CSD*  
Adele May, *ITD*  
Stephanie Nolan, *ITD*  
Jim Price, *ITD*  
Renny Rapier, *ITD*  
Jim Scorza, *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 10:00 a.m. and confirmed that a quorum existed. He asked for a motion regarding the minutes of the previous meeting.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the March 19, 2009, meeting as delivered. The motion passed unanimously.**

Judge Pollard then introduced the update for the cash receipting replacement system from the Maricopa Clerk's Office.

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

Gordon Mulleneaux, project manager for the cash receipting portion of the Clerk's Office Integrated Financial Information System (iFIS) project, stated that all tasks remain on track and handed out a newsletter that described reporting and search capabilities being built into the new system. The chair commented that the project appeared to be progressing well.

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

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

David Stevens, project manager for the RFR replacement portion of the iFIS project, pointed out that all tasks associated with construction of the .NET framework were now complete. Effort is switching to the detailed design phase of the project. David described his encouragement about how quickly technical specifications are emerging, but also his concern about the staffing risks that exist, especially over the next few weeks. Gordon added that a technical expert from the Clerk's Office has been ill this week which may have an impact on the schedule. David also explained how the detailed work breakdown structure created helps the project remain on track and will be reflected in the "Refine Project Plan" tasks coming up as the project progresses.

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

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, announced that the project did not implement on March 30 on account of the production environment not being fully prepared far enough in advance for load testing and migration. He reiterated the phased implementation approach over 30 to 45 days being planned to ease the transition at the court. Some last-minute specifications are still coming in and being coded this week. Rick anticipates another build on April 20 followed by a final production version on April 23.

Concern was raised about the capability of the financial module and the duration of time the legacy system would remain in use. Rick also shared his detailed order of conversion related to the phased implementation. A question was raised about why the project still shows green status when the Commission on Technology- (COT-) approved implementation date has been missed. Stewart will provide members the color criteria for the next meeting.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the 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 "yellow," due to the slip in the implementation date to May 4 from March 30.

## **GENERAL JURISDICTION COURTS CMS UPDATE – AJACS**

Renny Rapiet, AOC's General Jurisdiction (GJ) Case Management System (CMS) Project Manager, provided a brief update on the status of the AJACS implementation. He noted that the schedule is being changed slightly and extended to May 2010. Pinal's implementation date has been moved back, based on experience with Mohave's implementation, and the post-conversion support time (onsite support) is being doubled for upcoming implementations, including Yavapai. Some less complex implementations are being slotted in between Pinal and Yavapai.

Renny briefly reviewed the history of several recent releases of the AJACS code by the vendor. He also characterized the distribution of reported issues between implementation-related items and software defects, stating that remaining defect items are addressed in the upcoming release (V147) currently being tested. Concern was raised about how all four currently implemented courts would be converted to the new code within the same weekend. The database work is being done in Phoenix but the testing is being handled locally by the same people who are testing prior to the go/no-go decision on the cutover, so it should not take long.

Members asked Renny for his assessment of the magnitude of business process impacts on the courts wrought by adoption of AJACS, due to the automation forcing change and not the other way around. Renny stated that the amount of change varies widely from court to court and referred members to Carla Tack's paper for Institute of Court Management on the details of driving business standardization through automation. Gordon Mulleneaux reminded members of the significant effort required to standardize 13 courts on the same CMS.

## **LIMITED JURISDICTION CMS UPDATE**

Adele May, project manager for the limited jurisdiction (LJ) CMS effort, provided members with a brief update of activities taking place as the project gears up for a 12 to 18 month development effort. Various rollout scenarios are now being constructed and assessed for their training and manpower implications on the smallest courts. She reiterated the three general phases of the project currently envisioned: Phase 1 to provide AZTEC replacement, Phase 2 to add Wizard and Tempe functionality, and Phase 3 to add the functionality beyond the gap analysis items that is needed only by the largest volume courts. The AmCad contract negotiation is being expanded to include support for all three phases. Jim Scorza described Phoenix's approach and role in the Phase 3 effort. Phoenix recently hired a project manager who will coordinate with the AOC

project manager and will be performing an additional gap analysis on the Phase 1 build, in conjunction with Mesa.

Concerns were raised about the need to modify the rollout approach for LJ courts based on the pain suffered by GJ courts thus far and whether sufficient funding exists to complete all 3 phases. Jim shared that stability is being favored over speed and that AOC intends to cover the costs of all 3 phases. Phoenix has obtained approval to contribute the funds to obtain the enhancements it identifies affecting the largest courts. Jim felt funding issues could affect the speed and timing of the rollout but not likely the development effort.

Pat McGrath shared the experience gained from the FACTS/AZTEC development effort where the large courts were not at the table early on and he stressed that keeping Phoenix and Mesa heavily involved in the project creates the road to eventual implementation by non-ACAP courts.

## **CODE STANDARDIZATION UPDATE**

Keith Kaplan, AOC's Data Standards Manager, described the issues that arise as courts try to use their old, non-standard codes after AJACS implements. This has resulted in the proliferation of rush requests to the general jurisdiction subteam. Keith is working on taking the next step beyond common codes to get the same code to be applied to the same status in every court, enabling increased automation of workflow. Paul Thomas recommended that the team publish their understanding of the meaning of each event code and its intended use, to promote standard application of codes. On the LJ front, Keith continues work on the database of codes but cannot get too far without the tables being set by AmCad as part of their development activities. Patrick McGrath mentioned the importance of full participation in the workgroups that handle the code-related details.

## **STATEWIDE E-FILING UPDATE**

Jim Price, e-Filing Project Manager at the AOC, brought members up to date with activities on the forms creation portion of the project being handled by Amy Wood. Most forms are in the first of three stages of development and Jim predicted that the published timetable will be hard to meet. Technical work in support of the environment at the AOC continues; equipment is being ordered. The vendor has agreed to support the LegalXML Electronic Court Filing (ECF) 4.0 specification and to create an interface for ECF 3.1 used in Maricopa. COT's e-Court subcommittee delivered decisions on nine issues raised by the project last week. Options for the payment portal are still being defined and investigated in advance of the initial rollout.

Jim reminded members that oversight of the project was given to e-Court by COT. Members raised concern about the number of courts affected by the project and the need for close coordination between AOC and each court as details unfurl. Members discussed asking for more formal oversight of the project's overall scope, dates, and financial picture, possibly through a letter sent by the chair of CACC to the chair of e-Court.

## **STAFF UPDATE**

In place of staff, Judge Pollard briefed members on the upcoming COT annual meeting, saying it would serve as a briefing for the incoming COT chair, Justice Hurwitz. He asked CACC presenters to follow a prescribed format prepared by staff and announced that the May CACC

meeting will serve as a dry run for COT. He asked that even completed projects like PCCJC technology stabilization and AGAVE present briefly at COT to receive recognition.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Gordon Mulleneaux again expressed concern that the e-filing project affects operations like the Maricopa Clerk's Office to a large extent and yet he is getting very little long-range information about it. Gordon requested that CACC take a more formal role in the oversight of the project going forward.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to direct Gordon Mulleneaux to document the concerns that necessitate a more formal review of the e-filing project by CACC each month. Members will then have an opportunity to modify the language prior to submittal by the CACC chair to the e-Court chair. The motion passed with 9 aye votes and 1 nay vote.**

In explaining his nay vote, Phil Knox asked members to examine the criteria that have led COT to direct CACC to monitor previous projects and to ensure those criteria are being applied equally in this case. Pat McGrath expressed his opinion that receiving a monthly PowerPoint update like Renny delivers for the AJACS rollout would suffice. He felt no need to review a formal dashboard and take a green/yellow/red vote.

Gordon also requested standards regarding date changes within projects, stating that too much variation exists in the way projects arrive at and change their task and end dates. Some project managers consider dates to be more of a goal while others consider them to be very firm. The significance of a missed date is widely different in the two scenarios. Stewart said he would communicate the previously agreed color definitions to members for the next meeting.

The next meeting will take place in **Room 119** of the **State Courts Building** on **May 20, 2009**. Dates reserved for 2009 CACC meetings are posted at <http://www.supreme.state.az.us/cot/Archives/FY09/2009MtgSchedule.pdf>.

After confirming that no other business existed, the chair adjourned the meeting at 11:55 a.m.