

Top 10 Lists submitted by e-courts members

Items submitted to Jeanne Hicks by clerks:

1. iForms available on all self service forms for pro per litigants in “Turbo Tax” format. (as Maricopa has)
2. Easy, safe and electronic transmittal of fees associated with the filings.
3. The ability to accept and file documents electronically for all case types, i.e. from parties and courts and to other courts.
4. The ability to easily distribute e-filed documents to the proper individuals within the court.
5. The ability of those individuals (i.e., judges, JAs) to sort, manipulate and return those filings to the Clerk.
6. The ability to perform electronic signatures that are accepted throughout the legal system.
7. Integrated criminal justice system whereby data only has to be entered at law enforcement level and passes up throughout the system.
8. Ability to pass information rather than documents electronically to those that only need the information and not the documents.
9. Ability to manage Exhibits electronically as to description, storage location, date when they can be returned to parties or discarded, etc.
10. Ability to have minutes, orders and judgments automatically docketed and electronically distributed to parties.

Maricopa County Top 10 List from Michael Jeanes

1. Draft and Adopt State and Local Rules for E-Filing
2. Case Initiating E-Filing (All Case Types)
3. Provide Filer Access to Document Repository
4. Accommodate Pro Per (Self Represented) Filers
5. Accommodate E-Filing on Specialty Documents
6. E-File All Minute Entries and Court Generated Documents
7. Standardize Electronic Signatures
8. Implement Multiple Vendor Filing Solution
9. Provide Lower Courts E-Filing Option for LC Appeals Cases
10. Electronic Transfer of Record to Court of Appeals

Items submitted to Don Jacobson by court administrators:

1. E-filing across the system, including all case types, public agencies, private agencies, pro pers (criminal, civil, domestic relations, juvenile, probate, etc.).
2. Court-to-court e-filing, i.e. lower court appeals to Superior Court, Superior Court appeals to Court of Appeals.

3. New case management systems being fully integrated and interpretational with any e-court standards and current efforts.
4. Integration with current standards and operating systems for EDMS.
5. Electronic signature acceptance from all users of the court system (standardization).
6. Automated docket entries based on filing process.
7. Include in e-filing process both internal documents and external documents.
8. Ability to assess value earned (not just monetary) for the cost of implementation.
9. Address privacy, access and security issues.
10. Development of a compliance and certification process for e-filing.

Don also sent California's e-Filing Standards for discussion – their technical assumptions have been distilled into the following list:

1. Users should be presented with a common look and feel no matter the jurisdiction.
2. Courts are too resource constrained to provide technical support themselves for filing attorneys and the public.
3. Only one e-filing interface should exist per case management system.
4. Data must be exchanged bi-directionally between case management and e-filing systems
5. No monopoly on electronic filing services may be allowed either statewide or within a jurisdiction
6. Privacy and access issues must be adequately addressed
7. The path to success involves general consistency with national standards and cooperation between courts and private sector ventures

State Bar Top-10 List from Donna Killoughey

(Donna's unedited file appears as a separate document due to its length)

1. The Court's policy must result in assurances of **uniformity**:
 - Create uniform rules for filing, preferred methods of signature or authentication, issuance of passwords, service, rejection standards for pleadings, maintenance of original pleadings, documents and/or exhibits, certified copies, recordation requirements
 - Mandate that all courts within the state use the same codes for pleadings and numbering for paragraphs, texts, embedded references policy, etc.
 - Specify uniform treatment by attorneys of sensitive or protected data
 - Require that the method for remote or public access in each level of the state courts, and in every court, must be the same (whether online or at kiosk)
2. *Mandate* compliance to achieve appropriate self-education, training and management by legal professionals.
3. Consider the inevitable further acceleration of law practice procedures and spillover into private lives that result from e-filing:
 - Diminishing return from a further reduction in the time for contemplation and disciplined thought

- Attorneys are now expected to return all calls the same day, respond to e-mails virtually upon receipt, file pleadings immediately, but with e-filing, there will be an expectation of an “after hours” law practice and availability
4. Anticipate and articulate for legal professionals the practical impacts of e-filing upon the practice of law and office procedures
 5. Emphasize the importance of maintenance and management of password and signature security
 - Set detailed password policies
 - Adopt rules for preferred forms of authentication and signature
 - Direct whether attorney must “read and sign” all pleadings – if not, staff will be signing for attorney and the risk of error, theft of professional identity, fraud upon the court will be elevated