

**COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY
e-COURT SUBCOMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY**

September 22, 2005
1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

Conference Call 602-542-9006

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andrew Hurwitz, *Chair*
Rebecca Berch, *COT Chair*
Robert Brutinel, *General Jurisdiction*
Karl Heckart, *AOC*
Jeanne Hicks, *Clerks*
Michael Jeanes, *Clerks*
Donald Jacobson, *Court Administrators*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Donna Killoughey Bird, *State Bar*
Dennis Lusk, *Limited Jurisdiction*

GUESTS

Will Tagart, *Maricopa Clerk's Office*
Rich McHattie, *Maricopa Clerk's Office*

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Greg Eades, *Legal Services*

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Justice Hurwitz welcomed members and reviewed the names of those on the call and the areas of the judicial system they represented. The meeting proper was convened at about 1:10 p.m. after waiting for late callers.

Justice Berch delivered the charge from COT to the subcommittee. She asked members to oversee the business aspects of the evolution of electronic case filing in Arizona by providing solid policy direction. She said COT's expectation was that the group would oversee the business decisions, the change process, and the domain-specific plans to ensure success in three main areas: within the courts, within the justice community, and public/attorney to and from the court.

OVERVIEW

Karl Heckart, CIO for the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), described the three domains in detail:

- Court to Court
- Prosecutor/Justice partner electronic data
- Attorney to court and public to court electronic filing

He also described pilot projects underway in the various areas and the knowledge being gained from them. Karl described the pent up demand he sees. Courts are looking for COT to provide standards and an approach for moving beyond the pilot project oversight mode. Karl also reviewed in detail the spectrum of approaches to e-filing in other states. He outlined some next steps for the committee to consider taking.

BRAINSTORMING THE ISSUES AND BARRIERS

In lieu of a detailed brainstorming session, Justice Hurwitz asked members to put on the table the biggest issues or the highest principles to be considered going forward. Ideas mentioned were:

- How will the systems be paid for?
- How will we get more input from others outside the subcommittee?
- Design user fee structure to encourage e-filing and discourage paper filing.
- Systems need to be transparent to each other.
- Select the level at which standardization happens and decide how tightly to control the look and feel or public interface with the systems.
- Can we identify a set of key measurements that would identify “success?”
- Should we allow courts to meet the goals however they can rather than forcing adoption of “the one system?”
- Solutions must be coordinated with the criminal justice community.
- Consider exhibits and transcripts in the solutions.

In the end, the chair directed members to solicit their constituencies and each submit a “top-10” list of goals and aspirations to staff in advance of the next meeting.

FINAL THOUGHTS

The next meeting, another conference call, will take place next month. Stewart was directed to do the scheduling and to ensure the State Bar is represented. He will also make contact with Judge Lusk to ensure representation for limited jurisdiction courts.

Stewart will remind members about the “Top 10” lists and collect them as they are submitted.

Members will e-mail Stewart the names of any representatives they feel could bring additional perspective to this subcommittee, keeping in mind the right of this subcommittee to spin off task groups in specific areas being covered.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

After verifying that Commission members had no further business to discuss, Justice Hurwitz made a call to the public. No one responded.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:25 p.m.