

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

**October 27, 2006
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**

Conference Call 602-542-9001

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andrew Hurwitz, *Chair*
Robert Brutinel, *General Jurisdiction*
Karl Heckart, *AOC*
Donald Jacobson, *Court Administrators*
Michael Jeanes, *Clerks*
Donna Killoughey, *State Bar*
Dennis Lusk, *Limited Jurisdiction*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jeanne Hicks, *Clerks*

GUESTS

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Justice Hurwitz welcomed members to the call at about 2:05 p.m. and reviewed the objective for the meeting. He also desired to identify the big issues that must be raised in the progress presentation being made to the Commission on Technology (COT) at its November 3rd meeting.

Justice Hurwitz suggested that members of the subteams at the various jurisdictional levels could share more about their projects at COT to supplement his presentation.

LIMITED JURISDICTION SUBTEAM

Judge Lusk updated the team on progress being made by volunteer associations with the effort to standardize forms. The ultimate goal is to have web-enabled forms that feed case data into case management systems and document management systems. Initial efforts by the associations ought to be able to be evaluated by the end of February.

Stewart Bruner raised a point about the need for DPS to “own” a statewide contract for handhelds, leading to a larger conversation about whether the courts should do anything beyond specifying what digital data they expect to receive and in what format they expect it.

APPELLATE LEVEL SUBTEAM

Justice Hurwitz reviewed the Supreme Court’s e-Distribution project progress. Discussion focused on the lack of searchability within images captured in superior court clerk’s offices and sent up in the record on appeal. Should optical character recognition (OCR) processing be required at the superior court or the appeals court, since it would

benefit both? The team decided that Judge Gemmill's presentation to COT about the e-ROA project will bring this issue to light.

GENERAL JURISDICTION SUBTEAM

The Clerk of the Superior Court in Maricopa County, Michael Jeanes, reported that two judges will be going "all electronic" by early April 2007 using the multi-vendor model. Discussion focused on the implications of the clerk's "limited function filing interface," especially whether Maricopa would make that primarily *pro se* interface available to attorneys against the wishes of the already qualified vendors. More discussion will take place at the next e-court meeting.

Stewart also mentioned the need to ask COT to lay the electronic document management system (EDMS) foundation in the three remaining superior courts as a key enabler to e-filing at the general jurisdiction level:

CRIMINAL FILING

Karl Heckart briefly described the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission's (ACJC's) strategic plan and effort to obtain \$24 million to carry out that plan and to sustain the automation already developed using past grant money. There was some discussion regarding use of the Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS) to file long form complaints, positioning it as the hub for criminal data integration in the state.

CONCLUSION: WHAT WE NEED FROM COT

A couple of clear topics for COT emerged from the discussions 1) The need for an immediate decision on whether to improve AZTEC for e-filing or to wait for AGAVE to handle it and. 2) The need for help resolving the electronic signature issues apparent at all court levels.

Document searchability and the cost of technology for backoffice processes changed by electronic documents were removed from our issues list pending Judge Gemmill's raising them in his presentation.

The question of how low tech attorneys will access the bench in electronic only courtrooms will be discussed in the next meeting. Filing incentives, disincentives, and mandates were also set aside to be discussed.

After verifying that subcommittee members had no further business to discuss, Justice Hurwitz adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m.