

**COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY
MEETING MINUTES**

August 10, 2006
1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
&
August 11, 2006
9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Arizona Supreme Court

Conference Room 345 A/B
Administrative Office of the Courts
1501 W. Washington St.
Phoenix, AZ 85007

MEMBERS PRESENT

Louraine Arkfeld
Kent Batty
Michael Baumstark
Rebecca White Berch, *Chair*
Robert Brutinel
Mark Candioto
Christopher Cummiskey (*Chris Muir proxy*)
B. Robert Dorfman
Peter Eckerstrom
John Gemmill (*Phil Urry proxy Fri. AM*)
Jeanne Hicks
Michael Jeanes
Roger Klingler
Gary Krcmarik
Martin Krizay
Catherine O'Grady
Marcus Reinkensmeyer
John Rezzo

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jessica Blazina

GUESTS

Isaac Barrera, *Yuma Superior*
John Barrett, *PACC*
Ron Beguin, *CACC*
Tom Brady, *CACC*
David Cooper, *Yuma Justice*
Janet Cornell, *CACC*
John Greacen, *Greacen Associates*
Donald Jacobson, *CACC*
Albert Lemke, *Mesa Muni Court*
Rich McHattie, *Maricopa Clerk's Office*
C. Steven McMurry, *CACC*
Carey Meister, *TAC*
Carol Merfeld, *TAC*
Leonard Montanaro, *Mesa Muni Court*
Chris Muir, *GITA*
Gordon Mulleneaux, *CACC*
Gregg Obuch, *CACC/TAC*
Michael Pollard, *CACC*
Eloise Price, *TAC*
Rick Rager, *TAC*
Kyle Rimal, *TAC*
David Stevens, *TAC*
Phil Urry, *COA Div. One*
Carl Ward, *TAC*
Myrtle Young, *PACC*

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Jennifer Gilbertson, *ITD*
Gary Graham, *ITD*
Melinda Hardman, *CSD*
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*
Paul Hrisho, *ITD*
Tim Lawler, *ITD*
Pat McGrath, *CSD*
Stephanie Nolan, *ITD*
Pam Peet, *ITD*
Robert Roll, *ITD*
Jeff Viemont, *ITD*
John Overholtz, *CSD*

DAY 1 -- WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Justice Rebecca White Berch, Chair, called the Commission on Technology (COT) meeting to order at 1:07 p.m., welcoming members and guests. Because this was the first meeting of the fiscal year, she introduced newly appointed members, then had those at the table introduce themselves and state the constituency they represent. Justice Berch delivered introductory remarks regarding limiting the direct participation of audience members in COT discussions outside of the public comment process. She asked that audience members refrain from entering the fray unless directly called upon by a member or current presenter and reminded them that the public comment process is always available.

Judge Peter Eckerstrom, from Appeals Division Two, submitted a proposed amendment to the draft minutes of the March 3, 2006, meeting, based on Judge Espinosa's recollection of his response to issues raised during his presentation about the portability of the Division Two e-Blueback system.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to amend the draft minutes of the March 3, 2006, Commission on Technology meeting, based on the recollection of Judge Espinosa regarding comments he made in response to issues raised regarding the portability of e-Blueback. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 06-08.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the March 3, 2006, Commission on Technology meeting as amended. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 06-09.

Justice Berch stated that her objective for the day-and-a-half planning meeting was to emerge with a clear direction and path for the next three to five years.

IT STRATEGIC PLANNING: HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

Mr. Karl Heckart, CIO for the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), reviewed the history of Arizona's court automation as background to the Commission's planning efforts. He described the first wave of automation beginning in 1990 as constructing siloed, function-specific systems having no integration and relying on a back-end data warehouse. This type of automation only increased the workload of court employees. The second wave of automation is component based, allowing re-use of functional modules among various systems, but requiring well-defined standards in technology and business processes. Workload will be reduced by driving data entry to the source as part of a "digital ecosystem." He emphasized that the entire environment must be standards based. Karl reminded members that COT and Arizona Judicial Council (AJC) both agreed to business process standardization a few years ago and that must be made a reality in the second wave. He also mentioned that in the second wave integration services are key, that interdependence ever increases risk factors, and that data must be presented onscreen in a coherent, user-based manner.

Karl gave his estimation of where things stand with various technologies and applications included in the second wave like electronic document management systems (EDMS); Appellation; APETS; public access/JUSTIS/data bus approach; bolt-on enhancements

to AZTEC (since it will be around for awhile still); the Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS) the base infrastructure for statewide justice integration; and the new case management systems (CMSs). He displayed a diagram of first-wave systems overlapped by integrated second-wave systems to illustrate the various dependencies that exist, since they share various parts and pieces. The risk is getting all the pieces delivered in a coordinated way following the standards. The longer this takes, the more issues are raised with the function of AZTEC, since the CMS lies at the heart of the second wave. There is also a need to manage risks more deliberately and require more compliance with detailed standards. The value comes from cost avoidance in construction and maintenance.

Members voiced some concern about the elongated timelines for delivery of the CMSs currently in development. Specific updates were given as part of the CACC update later in the meeting.

OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL REVIEW

Karl Heckart briefly reviewed the JCEF and TCPF numbers approved by AJC at their June 19 meeting along with the reason AJC has already voted. A base operating budget of \$12.9M was approved along with a project pool of \$2.3M to be allocated by COT. Karl put the sizeable project amount in context by stating that courts are not in a high revenue growth position currently and revenues will drop again when the time payment fee reverts to \$12 on January 1, 2010. In the meantime, the cost of enhancing and deploying case management systems statewide and converting related data may be around \$7.1M, the data center will need to be upgraded and expanded to support future systems, unspent commitments to various projects are being carried forward, and a statewide Jury+ upgrade could consume funds, as well. The projected fund balances in out years do not include any growth in the ACAP device fee, but do take into account the upcoming PC refresh cost and deferred Informix maintenance now due.

Though the legislature has earmarked \$2M per year for four years specifically for the new case management systems, Karl warned members that spending the entire \$2.3M available now will hasten the projected eventual decline of the fund balance into the red.

STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS PRIORITIZATION

Karl Heckart reviewed the business initiatives presented in the Branch Strategic Plan, *Good to Great*. Everything done in the IT arena needs to be aligned with the *Good to Great* initiatives. He pointed out the changes made in the revised IT planning process which revealed courts' local business concerns or areas of emphasis. Those include e-records, MEEDS, archiving and disaster recovery, increased access to data, e-signature, and electronic record on appeal transmittal. Karl reviewed various issues to be considered in each of the areas along with the trends gleaned from the countywide courts' IT plans. He also gave an overview of the approach being explored with JSI on upgrading jury management systems statewide.

He presented an update to the project set contained in last year's priority list, continuing the strategy for dividing projects into categories based on their relative importance/impact (**H**igh/**M**edium/**L**ow) and predicted timing of implementation (**S**hort-/**M**edium-/**L**ong-term). Members discussed whether the priorities functioned as a wish

list or to actually set direction for courts and projects. Members also questioned what had happened with projects labeled short-term last year. Karl answered questions from members about where disaster recovery fits and what costs are associated with the projects listed. They asked that specific projects be moved up on the priority list to send a message of urgency to the project teams.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to change the time to implementation in the table for New Case/Financial Management System from medium term to short term. The motion passed (Krcmarik opposed) (Batty abstaining). TECH 06-10.

Discussion ensued about the actual demand for e-filing versus the clerks' perceived demand in the courts. Hon. Michael Jeanes, Clerk of the Superior Court in Maricopa County, provided several reasons why he believes the demand is currently compelling even among small firms and sole practitioners.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to change Electronic Filing from medium to high priority and Electronic Document Management from medium to high priority. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 06-11.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the project priorities table as amended. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 06-12.

STRATEGIC PROJECTS REVIEW/UPDATES

CACC UPDATE

Judge Michael Pollard, co-chair of the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC), described the role of that subcommittee as being the everyday point of contact between COT and the statewide projects in development. He explained that CACC currently receives monthly status reports in a format approved by COT last year but has recently determined that those reports do not provide the necessary detail about timelines, milestones, deliverables, and cost to effectively carry out its oversight role. A consultant has recommended changes to the reporting process and CACC is currently revising the assessment with an eye toward delivering a monthly red/yellow/green assessment. Specific recommendations will be made at the November 3 COT meeting. He introduced the key projects being overseen.

Mr. John Barrett, CIO for Maricopa Superior Court, reviewed the timeline for the Limited Jurisdiction iCIS CMS implementation which completed in April 2006. Judge C. Steven McMurry described the initial system implementation as "painful" when his court piloted it in September, but said it quickly became "old news." John Barrett informed members that the financial system will be audited by an outside consultant early next year. Dave Stevens, CIO for Maricopa Superior Court, presented some screen shots to show look and feel and described how the modules were largely re-used from the iCIS system. Progress was also reported on the forcible detainer e-filing project which was prioritized behind the iCIS for Justice Courts rollout. The project uses the *Arizona @ Your Service* web portal as its payment gateway. The first case will be filed in Judge McMurry's court next week now that credit card processes have been worked out with GITA's digital government manager. John used screen shots to step through the case

initiation process completed using interactive forms. Judge McMurry informed members that Community Legal Services and the State Bar forcible detainer committee have been involved all along the way. He mentioned that they've recommend changes to the standard forms associated with forcible detainers. The judge proposed returning to COT in November to discuss how the new automation traps exception cases for judges.

Mr. Pat McGrath, AOC Court Services Division, introduced Mr. John Overholtz, the newly hired data standards manager approved last year at COT's annual meeting. John scoped the presentation of the limited jurisdiction (LJ) activity codes needed by Tempe for the new CMS. John Greacen, the consultant working on code standardization, reviewed five sets of activity codes compiled into five case types (Civil, Civil Traffic, Criminal, Ordinances, and Parking) as a single set. The Code Standardization Subcommittee is asking for adoption of these codes designed to get LJ courts to speak the same language. The focus is on use with new/future systems, not current systems like AZTEC. John Overholtz also emphasized the role of the data standards committee in maintaining the codes once approved and the review process the codes have traversed in the past six months. He asked members to suggest names for the data standards committee going forward. Since materials had been omitted from members' packets, further discussion was deferred to Day 2.

Mr. Rick Rager, project manager for the Tempe Municipal Court, updated members on progress being made on the Tempe CMS project. He gave a plea for the LJ activity codes to be approved since his project is waiting for that input. He detailed the development system's current capabilities. The major efforts today revolve around financials. Database structures are in place and the system has the ability to create a receivable or obligation. Linkages are underway to integrate CMS and sentencing components. The project is not requesting additional funds for FY07. The final two milestones associated with last year's funding – calendaring and compliance activities – are very close to complete. Rick mentioned other courts Tempe has reached out to for input. He also distributed the high-level project plan and timeline. He shared that the project has been performing data migration in tandem with development using a technique related to the code generator. Rick believes the tool will increasingly speed data conversion in Tempe as well as in other courts during the statewide rollout.

Mr. Gordon Mulleneaux, from the Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court in Maricopa County, reported on the effort to create a financial module in iCIS to process payments related to both adult and juvenile probations as a joint process between the Clerk and the Court. Gordon described the increasing complexity of financials related to juvenile probation, especially due to the inherent treatment aspects. He reviewed the phases already completed and the functionality that work has enabled. The focus is on coding joint and several liability, coding void and reissue of payments, and converting data from the Maricopa legacy JOLTS and RFR systems. Gordon will hold a demonstration of Phase 3 capabilities within the next month or so in anticipation of receiving the final milestone payment. The project will not be asking for any additional funding. Activities are running 6 to 8 months behind the original schedule described in the JPIJ.

Mr. Gregg Obuch provided a brief history of the AGAVE project for new members and reviewed major milestones since the project kickoff in August 2004. Release 1 was implemented in June and the Clerk is using AGAVE exclusively today -- old systems have been retired. He reiterated the overall project goals. Gregg reviewed the CACC

audit recommendations. The overall takeaway was that the project isn't documenting well. Four of the eight groupings of recommendations are in place today. Four more areas are being worked on currently. He listed communications improvements as near-term items that will be focused on: A new, less technical project portal is in place, a single reporting structure is being developed for all governance bodies, the internal steering committee will keep formal minutes of meetings, and a new status reporting format will be used. Also, the auditor recommended a certified, external project manager be added. Project issues include undergoing a Visible review and dealing with continued resource losses. The project team is working to implement the remainder of the recommendations in the auditor's report and get a certified project manager on board to serve as the single point of contact. The goal is to return to COT November 3, 2006, with a detailed plan and cost to complete development and installation. Kent Batty committed to re-invigorate the AGAVE review committee.

Day 1 of the COT strategic planning meeting recessed Thursday, August 10, 2006, at 4:45 p.m.

DAY 2 – WELCOME AND PLAN

The meeting resumed at exactly 9:00 a.m. on Friday, August 11, 2006, with Justice Berch calling the Commission to order.

Justice Berch reminded members that one item had been carried forward from yesterday and would be dealt with later in the meeting now that the material had been distributed. She introduced Karl Heckart with the next subcommittee update.

STRATEGIC PROJECTS REVIEW/UPDATES

TAC UPDATE

Mr. Karl Heckart introduced the two-year update to the Enterprise Architecture table by reiterating the value of standardization to the courts. Standards were not individually selected to be the optimal technology, but rather to provide the best long-term approach and cost implications due to leveraging or integration. They serve to protect courts from a variety of ills. He reminded members an exception process exists for both pointing out a deficient standard and gaining a business-based, one-time waiver. Municipal government plays a large funding role and therefore can also play a large role in determining what products are selected for what function, regardless of state standards.

Karl reviewed the additions to the table headings in the proposed revision:

- Baseline – what exists today in the judiciary,
- Retirement – end-of-lifecycle technology which requires approach to discontinue its use be documented in next IT plan,
- Containment – viable technology nearing the end of support that should not be propagated further,
- Mainstream – the target for new systems or implementations today,
- Scope of Standard – describes applicability, and
- Watchlist – interesting new technologies TAC has its eye on.

He directed members' attention to specific retirement items that must be addressed in next IT plan input: WordPerfect, DB2, Informix, Windows 2000, WEP for wireless

security, AS/400 and Wang midrange systems, ftp for production data transfers. A question was raised about the fate of AZTEC forms if WordPerfect is removed from support. AZTEC is in the process of switching to Word and will provide best practice documentation and training related to the changeover. Courts should begin planning to convert their local processes.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the update of the enterprise architecture standards as recommended by TAC. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 06-13

Karl then took the conversation to the next level, discussing the need to define interchange standards as a subset of the GJXDM approach specified in the EA standards table. Various project teams need direction they can rely on. Two projects are looking for ratification: the multi-provider civil filing project and the court-to-court record on appeal project. The interchange standards provide tags for all the data that needs to flow between courts or between filers and courts. Karl asked the members for direction regarding the best way to proceed with this level of detail – should COT be approving specific tags or detailed action codes, or should that responsibility be assigned to subcommittees of practitioners closer to the point of need? He recommended COT authorize a structure and serve as the body for appeal when detailed decisions can't be made at the subcommittee level. Mention was made that having the imprimatur of the Supreme Court would lend authority to specifications.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to authorize TAC to establish and maintain the XML data interchange standards to support e-filing and integration initiatives. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 06-14

Karl concluded by stating that TAC intends to be a resource for the e-Court Subcommittee to deal with the technical details of e-filing. TAC also intends to address security, privacy, and disaster recovery policy and process concerns in the upcoming year, as well.

CODE STANDARDIZATION RETURN

Pat McGrath returned to request that the data standards committee be placed as custodian of the standard code tables. Pat asked members to submit names of individuals for membership on the committee by August 30, 2006. He also reviewed the primary goals of the committee. Members discussed the authority of the committee and what COT had intended at its formation.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to authorize creation of a data standards committee and its general composition, with a measure of flexibility. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 06-15

Pat reviewed the approval process for the codes at LJC and CACC. The focus of those bodies was more on the names of committee members who developed them and assurances that these would be “living” codes once established.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the set of codes presented to LJC and to CACC, with the understanding that the data

standards committee will monitor them. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 06-16

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the primary goals for the data standards committee, as presented, with the substitution of “Commission on Technology” for “Supreme Court” in the third bullet. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 06-17

The primary goals include:

- Monitoring the performance of the standard codes and the Supreme Court policies governing data standards for both general and limited jurisdiction courts;
- Reviewing and acting on requests for additions, modifications, or deletions of existing codes;
- Preparing recommendations for the COT for additions, modifications, or deletions of policies governing data standards; and
- Proposing and commenting on policies related to use of data arising from standardized code sets.

PACC UPDATE

Ms. Myrtle Young, chair of the Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC), provided members with an overview of activities in probation-related automation for both adult and juvenile justice: APETS, iCIS-Juvenile (formerly e-JOLTS), and JOLTSaz. She assured members that the juvenile systems will be synchronized. All three application development areas presented their individual current successes/progress, plans for completion, challenges, and lessons learned. Ms. Jennifer Gilbertson, from AOC Information Technology Division (ITD), showed APETS screens related to transfer of probationers from one county to another, probation officers’ view of what’s due, and caseload statistics for supervisors. John Barrett, from Maricopa Court Technology Services, showed iCIS-Juvenile screens related to detention, unit control, management view, court check-in and case chronology, as well as dependency placement. Jennifer showed several JOLTSaz screens related to detention visitation and example reports.

APETS has been rolled out in 11 of 15 counties to date and captures over 90 percent of statewide adult probation data. The four remaining counties will be rolled out by the end of the calendar year. Informix is no longer mainstream, so work will need to be done to move to a mainstream database following the rollout completion. ICIS-Juvenile has a target of February 2007 for enabling probation, court, and juvenile financial functions using a “deploy and enhance” strategy. Their next steps will involve e-filing juvenile documents to the clerk and interfacing with the statewide data repository. JOLTSaz has a critical dependency on the new general jurisdiction (GJ) CMS, since the project will not duplicate components in its modular approach. The project needs to simultaneously continue supporting legacy JOLTS, make enhancements to JOLTSaz, and roll out the new system county by county. This is a big challenge, but support will remain a priority.

E-COURTS UPDATE

Karl Heckart explained how the e-court initiative involves the intersection of technology, policies, and people. Karl reviewed the principles approved at the March 3, 2006, COT meeting and some of the implications of their adoption. He reiterated that courts will build minimum function interfaces for the public to do basic filing without competing

with vendors. Karl raised a concern that if courts try to staff technical support for e-filing the volume of calls will swamp them – it makes sense to have vendors perform that support. He described the progress made since the subcommittee was authorized at last year’s annual meeting and how teams have been spun off to determine projects, barriers, and timelines at various levels of courts.

- The LJ subteam is focusing on getting digital data into the system via e-citation and forms standardization (standard data rather than standard look and feel), then standard tagging schemes to allow e-filing of the form data. The current AZTEC system needs to be opened to process XML data feeds in opening cases.
- The GJ subteam is working on data transaction specifications based on ECF 3.0 and service oriented architecture in support of the multi-provider model ratified as one of the principles by COT. They are addressing the back-end processing within the court to queue and move electronic documents following filing. They are also digging into issues like vendor certification statewide, the necessity of an e-signature solution, and what documents really require a signature.
- Criminal filing is being addressed in concert with Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC) as part of the Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS) approach. The goal is 90 percent accuracy in criminal history records.
- The Appellate-level focus is on EDMS in Division One and the Supreme Court as well as opening the Appellamation CMS to enable e-filing. The e-Blueback approach to record on appeal is being made more robust for statewide use following the enterprise architecture standards. The goal is to quickly get to appellate e-filing for a limited number of case types.

Justice Hurwitz, chair of the e-court subcommittee, has emphasized to all subteams that current policies related to paper filing should not get in the way of crafting electronic solutions, in order to keep new ideas flowing and progress being made.

A question was raised about whether the multi-vendor approach forced payment for services that used to be free and if sufficient buy-in exists. Lawyers will continue to pay private businesses for value-added legal services as a cost of doing business and the court has no intention of entering that market space. Gordon Mulleneaux stated that the Maricopa Clerk’s Office is committed to charge no more for electronic filing than they do for paper. Jeanne Hicks shared that the GJ subteam is discussing how to actually economically incentivize e-filers.

BUSINESS CONTINUITY PLANNING

Karl Heckart reminded members that disaster recovery has always been an issue, but is becoming more pervasive as courts increasingly rely on automation systems and electronic documents. Fixing a central site like the State Courts Building only addresses a piece of the problem, since more of the environment is becoming distributed among local courts. Karl reviewed the long, detailed list of risks. Arizona is now the number one state for identity theft and legislation related to limiting/reporting identity theft is increasing. He described EDMS installations in clerks’ offices as his biggest point of concern for several reasons: 1) Courts are going to stop collecting paper in the near term. 2) Courts then become process dependent on the availability of electronic records stored in their system. 3) Courts are not prepared to quickly rebuild servers and get data restored even when good backups exist safely offsite. 4) Rural courts have had to stretch to even afford a single EDMS instance and purchasing a second, redundant system remains well

out of their reach. AOC can't afford to replicate everything courts do with automated systems.

Karl recommended a set of systemic best practices be adopted after discussion with the practitioners about determining and addressing vulnerabilities. He also recommended some education sessions be held in conjunction with communications of the best practices. A big issue exists regarding availability – COT needs a set of scenarios and cost options to evaluate next year to determine the appropriate initiatives to fund. Members mentioned the presence of some past documents that addressed disaster preparedness. National Association for Court Management (NACM) has released two documents of templates/checklists that could be helpful as a starting point.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded that CACC and TAC be directed to develop an assessment and planning guide for IT business continuity. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 06-18

FINANCIAL AND TACTICAL DECISIONS

Mr. Leonard Montanaro, from Mesa Municipal Court, requested a one-time exception to the enterprise architecture standards for use of a FileNet rather than an OnBase document management system. He listed the benefits of joining the city EDMS effort rather than the court striking out on its own:

- Over \$600K would be saved over 5 years,
- Uses common infrastructure,
- City provides technical support,
- City provides network database servers,
- City absorbs ongoing enhancement costs, and
- Commonality exists with local law enforcement and prosecutor.

As with the Scottsdale Hummingbird exception a year ago, members wondered about the relative cost of the state standard versus the exception product. Stewart Bruner, COT staff, provided a summary of his analysis and focus on the total project cost (city incurred costs for FileNet versus OnBase costs the court would bear alone). Mesa's data is predominately captured in the CMS not the EDMS and Mesa has agreed to provide the standard data the state requires. TAC did not have a problem with the exception from a technical standpoint.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to approve the exception to allow Mesa Municipal Court to use FileNet, the city's chosen solution, rather than OnBase, the State's standard solution, based on based on reduced total operating cost, reduced risk in implementation, and benefits to the court from local integration. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 06-19

Karl reviewed the typical budget process and how it got out of sequence this year because AJC met before COT. He summarized the financial situation as follows: \$6.695M in operating budget which includes PC refresh costs, Informix maintenance, and commitments made to projects in previous years but yet unspent. There is also \$2.3M in total spending authority for new projects. Those requesting funding include AJIN upgrades for \$236K, EDMS implementation in Division One for \$347,393.29, and addition of a project manager to AGAVE for \$165K. Clerk of the Court Phil Urry, from Division One,

thanked AOC for their support in preparing the JPIJ and getting it through the approval process.

Karl also pointed out upcoming costs that were not on the table yet:

- Remaining AGAVE CMS development, amount unknown;
- Assessment and assimilation activities for the new CMSs, estimated to be around \$280K;
- Statewide rollout of CMSs, still guessed to be around \$7.1M;
- Statewide interactive Jury+ project (apart from Maricopa and Pima), depending on the outcome of a jury commissioners' meeting, estimated at around \$200K; and
- A new data center to support new statewide applications, cost unquantified until a study of needs and options is completed.

The \$2.3M spending authority must be balanced with the inflation rate and upcoming bubble of costs. Reversion of the time payment fee will provide \$1.2M less income per year after January 1, 2010, leading expenses to eclipse revenue and erosion in the fund balance to just \$368K in FY10. Discussion revolved around the case management systems' development approach, scope, assessment plan, and implementation estimates. Details about these should be provided as part of the November presentation.

In light of all that was presented, the following consolidated motion was made:

**MOTION: It was moved and seconded to continue existing project commitments, fund the AGAVE project manager reporting to AOC, fund EDMS in Division One, and approve the upgrade in AJIN capacity. The motion passed unanimously (Judge Gemmill and Kent Batty abstaining).
TECH 06-20**

At the request of a member, Kent Batty assured the Commission that he was comfortable with having the AGAVE project manager report directly to AOC.

REQUEST FOR E-FILING PILOT: ELECTRONIC RECORD ON APPEAL

Mr. Gary Graham, AOC Appellate Project Manager, described the operation of a standards based set of programs used to collect, transport, and file records on appeal between superior courts and Division One. The product was designed to work with AZTEC and OnBase.

He described the process by showing various screens from the application. Documents will be located using a user-definable keyword method, since the index method varies from one OnBase installation to the next. Documents can be transferred in their native formats as well as TIFF and PDF. It creates a dynamic index of record that is editable by the court. It includes full documentation, a help function, and AOC help desk support. Gary reviewed the list of standards met by the product design.

Having completed a prototype, Gary is requesting COT approval to run a six month pilot with Yavapai Superior. Hon. Jeanne Hicks, Clerk of the Superior Court in Yavapai County, shared her excitement about the project with members. Judge Gemmill voiced the support of Division One for the project, as well.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to approve a statewide court-to-court e-filing pilot for the filing of a record on appeal between the Court of Appeals Division One, the Supreme Court, and all sending courts, including state superior courts. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 06-21

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLANS

Karl Heckart presented members with a process description of how the individual plans were gathered and summarized. He highlighted several changes made to the planning process last year and pledged that Stewart would be providing more help to the rural courts by visiting many this fiscal year. He also noted that the process will get off to an earlier start, in September this year. Karl scoped the content of his presentation about the plans, reminding members that full details and accomplishments exist in the summaries distributed in members' packets. His focus is on issues and concerns raised, not courts' accomplishments, due to time constraints.

He also pointed out that general approval of an IT plan does not constitute approval of specific projects that may require additional information and clarification. Further, where concern was raised, staff will communicate to the court the issues raised via a letter to the presiding judge. He then briefly summarized each Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009 submitted by county courts and the state appellate courts.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Apache County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009, with a concern raised that pursuit of any automated collections solution apart from FARE will require the approval of the chief justice. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-06-22

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Cochise County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-06-23

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Coconino County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009, with a concern raised for lack of a detailed plan for implementation of an EDMS within the plan period. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-06-24

Karl congratulated Gary Krcmarik and Coconino for their award winning Justice 2025 strategic planning process.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Gila County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009, with a concern raised that building information systems and storing court data external to AZTEC will make data conversion more difficult. TECH-06-25

Karl shared a general concern for superior courts lacking IT support or a field trainer. Often this boils down to a funding issue, but the result is to preclude effective use of the

automation given to them. A possible solution is to increase state funding for field trainer positions, making them more affordable for smaller counties. Members discussed sending a message to presiding judges about needing to find some way to better support technology locally, hoping that would provide needed leverage with county boards of supervisors.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Graham County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009, with concerns noted that LaserFiche is not a full-featured EDMS suitable for supporting e-court activities and that a mechanism for better support of superior court information technology systems needs to be developed. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-06-26

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Greenlee County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009, with a concern noted that a mechanism for better support of superior court information technology systems needs to be developed. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-06-27

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve La Paz County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009, with a concern noted that a mechanism for better support of superior court information technology systems needs to be developed. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-06-28

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Maricopa County Courts' Consolidated Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009, with a concern noted that development of a jury management application apart from the state standard will require an exception to ACJA §1-501. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-06-29

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Mohave County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009, with concerns raised for lack of CMS currency limiting ability to pursue automated collections using FARE and that projects in e-filing and online payment arenas remain in sync with statewide efforts. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-06-30

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Navajo County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-06-31

Karl raised a question about porting the non-standard EDMS internal to AGAVE to other counties as part of the CMS rollout. It was already in existence when the enterprise architecture was adopted and therefore grandfathered. Members did not feel strongly enough to include any direction in a motion.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Pima County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-06-32

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Pinal County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009, with concerns raised for justice integration using other than the state-standard transport method and the need to rewrite the collector program for record on appeal to comply with .NET architecture going forward. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-06-33

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Santa Cruz County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009, with a concern raised for the lack of a detailed plan for implementation of an EDMS within the plan period. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-06-34

Jeanne Hicks announced her intent to amend the Yavapai plan to include a MEEDS project, based on the longer timetable mentioned for completion of AGAVE and rollout of the state standard general jurisdiction CMS. The Yavapai plan and summary will be updated to include MEEDS information. A question was raised about why Prescott Consolidated's non-standard CMS was not listed as concern. Karl responded that the system pre-dates AZTEC, but cautioned that Prescott will become increasingly isolated as new systems and integration efforts progress.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Yavapai County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-06-35

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Yuma County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009, with concerns raised for remaining data from the AS/400 system that must be transitioned and the integration method used between AZTEC and the proposed electronic docket display system in the new justice center. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-06-36

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the State Appellate Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2007-2009. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-06-37

Justice Berch thanked Stewart and Karl for their efforts in boiling down the hundreds of pages of court plans to summaries, single-page charts, and concise motions.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Justice Berch concluded the meeting after making a call to the public and verifying that members had no further items to discuss.

She told members that she was entertaining the idea of holding the September 8 meeting via teleconference and that more information would follow. She also reminded members of the scheduled November 3rd meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:38 p.m.