

**DISCUSSION BRIEF  
EDMS WORKGROUP CONFERENCE CALL  
November 13, 2002**

**In Attendance:**

Bob Brutinel	Maureen Haggerty
Sheri Newman	Ted Wilson
Daniel Edwards	Pam Pucetas
Diane Drain	
Rick Rager	

- The three items on the agenda for this call were to respond to the issues raised at the last COT meeting, decide if the group would have representation at the December 9<sup>th</sup> special meeting of the COT, and discuss whether or not the recommendations from our presentation should be amended.
- Some thought that the group's recommendations should be amended to include Karl's suggestion of a certification process for those courts wishing to implement an EDMS system. The current recommendations suggest EDMS policies, procedures be documented and that there be standardization of codes and processes. But this certification process determines the "readiness" of the court to handle the long term management and maintenance of the EDMS system. Maureen sent the group a copy of the one-page form that is required by the AZ State Library and Archives, pursuant to A.R.S. §41-1348, to be submitted for approval by any state agency wishing to implement EDMS. Currently, the courts are exempt from this state approval process. But the form such as this could be modified to work for the Judiciary.
- Rick cautioned the group that the State Library and Archives is slow to approve these implementations. They still haven't approved Tempe's certification form and it has been months. The courts would need to do something about the timeframe—there needs to be a quicker turnaround time on approvals if the courts were to adopt the state's process and be certified by Library and Archives.
- It was recommended that the courts develop their own certification process, perhaps approved by the AOC or a separate committee. Daniel suggested that perhaps detailing a certification process was out of the scope of this workgroup. The group could, instead, recommend that a certification process be developed for the courts. Committees like CACC, TAC and State Library and Archives should be involved in the process development.

- A suggestion was also made to include a centralized repository option for those courts that do not have the funding or technical resources to successfully implement and maintain an EDMS system on their own. There was some discussion that maybe this is not a “one size fits all” (all local) implementation and that there may be different options for small, medium and large courts.
- Concerns regarding a certification process were voiced. Some felt that there should not be an approval process. If the court has the funds and access to the required technical resources, it should be up to the individual court to implement EDMS. Diane shared her perspective and the need for the group to look at this *systemically*. These court documents belong not to the individual courts, but to the public and safeguards need to be in place and adhered to, by the courts, for the preservation of these documents for public access. Although the group maintained their philosophical differences there was consensus that at least minimum requirements should be established, as good business practice.
- Before the next meeting, Maureen will draft an amendment to the group’s recommendations to include our position on a certification process. The draft will be sent out to the group for comments prior to the November 20<sup>th</sup> conference call.

END