

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

November 21, 2005
1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Conference Call 602-542-9010

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andrew Hurwitz, *Chair*
Robert Brutinel, *General Jurisdiction*
Karl Heckart, *AOC*
Jeanne Hicks, *Clerks*
Michael Jeanes, *Clerks*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Donald Jacobson, *Court Administrators*
Donna Killoughey Bird, *State Bar*
Dennis Lusk, *Limited Jurisdiction*

GUESTS

AOC STAFF

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

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Justice Hurwitz welcomed members at about 1:33 p.m. and took the roll of those on the call. He reviewed last meeting's discussion about the Top 10 list items, the next milestone of presenting the list of principles to Commission on Technology (COT) at its January 6 meeting, and the decision made not to expand the membership of this group, though various workgroups will include wider membership as time goes on.

REVIEW OF e-COURTS PUBLIC FACING WEBSITE

Stewart asked members for their suggestions regarding some draft web pages he created to describe the work of the subcommittee to the public and vendors. Karl Heckart suggested the focus be more on the timeframes for attacking various items. Justice Hurwitz asked members to e-mail Stewart their comments, since there is no hurry to unveil the site until more things are decided.

DISCUSSION ABOUT SERVICE

Members discussed whether e-filing has to be accompanied by vendor service and concluded that it should be allowed (by Rule 124) but not required. It is a value certain vendors add and a business space the court doesn't want to be in.

DETAILED REVIEW OF PRINCIPLES

The remainder of the meeting involved item-by-item discussion of the principles distilled from the California technical standards document. Most discussion revolved around Principles 1 and 5. There was confusion about what the word "user" meant in Principle 1 and whether it might contain several distinct principles within it. Somehow the concept of providing limited function public access needs to be included to ensure that access to

justice never requires use of a vendor. On the other hand, some assurance needs to be made that vendors will not be competing for customers with the court. Members also labored long about the logical conclusion of the “no monopoly” wording in Principle 5 and whether it was sufficient to require any solution to be open, standards-based and seamlessly transferable. In the end, the consensus was to let the wording remain.

The other principles were agreed to essentially as written.

One additional item was suggested by Judge Brutinel: Include criminal case filing within the scope but indicate that the courts, not a vendor, will be responsible for integration of criminal justice data. This helps convey that the scope of the principles is beyond civil filings.

NEXT STEPS

Justice Hurwitz asked Stewart to circulate the principles with revised wording resulting from discussion before the next meeting. Members will review them along with salient points to make to COT about the implications of each in our presentation January 6.

The next meeting, another conference call, will take place December 15 at 1:30 PM. The focus will be on solidifying the principles and the talking points for the upcoming COT presentation.

Stewart will also invite Patti Noland, Clerk of the Superior Court in Pima County, to attend the next meeting and make the e-filing project proposal she shared with Karl to the subcommittee. It may provide a real-world test of the principles and the process of using them to evaluate a project.

After verifying that subcommittee members had no further business to discuss, Justice Hurwitz adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.