

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

October 27, 2005
1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Conference Call 602-542-9004

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andrew Hurwitz, *Chair*
Karl Heckart, *AOC*
Jeanne Hicks, *Clerks*
Michael Jeanes, *Clerks*
Donald Jacobson, *Court Administrators*
Donna Killoughey Bird, *State Bar*
Dennis Lusk, *Limited Jurisdiction*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Robert Brutinel, *General Jurisdiction*

GUESTS

AOC STAFF

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

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Justice Hurwitz welcomed members at about 1:32 p.m. and took the roll of those on the call.

REVIEW OF LIFECYCLE AND CONTEXT CHARTS

Justice Hurwitz reviewed the two PowerPoint charts Stewart created to refocus members on where the subcommittee standards and our approach for arriving at solutions.

REVIEW OF MOST SIGNIFICANT LIST ITEMS

Members who had contributed Top-10 lists then reviewed the most significant times from the lists, prompting discussion on various points:

- Uniformity and standardization as top considerations of any approach/solution;
- Sufficiency of unique userID and password as intent to file (aka a signature);
- What it would take to automatically route filings within the court case management system;
- Public access considerations;
- Oversight of Maricopa County's pilot e-filing activities;
- Vendor vs. Court-sponsored models, especially related to accessibility for pro per filers and obtaining free reader software or non-proprietary output from vendors;
- Setting minimum technical standards for the practice of law;
- Need to communicate effectively with and solicit help from outside groups;
- Receiving ATTC data electronically from law enforcement; and
- Expanding beyond paper filings to have physical exhibits being submitted electronically.

Members spent time examining the main principles behind the California technical standards submitted by Don Jacobson and distilled by Stewart:

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

Discussion focused on the feasibility of comparing those to the themes contained in the Top 10 items members had discussed. Work began on Item 1 to determine the proper level at which to specify uniformity. Members agreed to separate free-form pleadings from form-based filings. Clerks discussed common data required as part of the electronic cover sheet or “document envelope” for filings and what data might eventually need to be shared with other courts about a case being submitted. Time began to run short.

NEXT STEPS

Justice Hurwitz asked members to review the California e-Filing Standards (available on the [website](#)) and to suggest modifications. We can then attempt to organize our Top-10 list items under the appropriate principles. The goal is to return a set of principles to COT along with the policies or projects necessary to implement those principles, before soliciting help beyond the subcommittee.

The next meeting, another conference call, will take place in the middle November. Stewart was directed to do the scheduling and to move away from the Thursday PM time slot. He will make contact with members to discover the best available time for the teleconference meeting.

Stewart will also remind members about the task of refining the list of principles and slotting individual top-10 items under the applicable principles. He will collect them as they are submitted.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

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

The meeting was adjourned at 2:52 p.m.