

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

**February 22, 2008
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**

Conference Call 602-452-3193 ID 7002#

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andrew Hurwitz, *Chair*
Robert Brutinel, *General Jurisdiction*
Karl Heckart, *AOC*
Donald Jacobson, *Court Administrators*
Michael Jeanes, *Clerks*
Dennis Lusk, *Limited Jurisdiction*
Sheri Newman, *Clerks*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Diane Drain, *State Bar*

GUESTS

Sean Abrigo, *Clerk of Court, Pima Superior*
Joseph Alvarez, *Clerk of Court, Pima Superior*
Jan Kearney, *Presiding Judge Pima Superior*
Rich McHattie, *Maricopa COSC*
Patricia Noland, *Clerk of Court, Pima Superior*

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Justice Hurwitz welcomed members to the call at 2:00 p.m. and took a roll call of those on the phone and assembled in the room.

E-FILING PILOT PROJECT UPDATE

Clerk Patti Noland and Presiding Judge Jan Kearney updated members on the Pima Superior Court e-filing pilot. Patti Noland stated that Clerk's Office resources are doing the development and testing work, though court resources will eventually be needed to add judge review functions into the Cactis replacement system. Her plan is to replace Lexis-Nexis probate filing first, then move to accepting cases for the civil bench.

A screen-by-screen and step-by-step demonstration highlighted the similarities to the system in use today at the Maricopa Clerk's Office. The Pima system will go beyond Maricopa's current functionality by enabling case initiation through a relationship with the county's bank under which the fees of the court can be paid. Judge Kearney commented on the challenges of a transition period and increasing the comfort level of judges with electronic review of case documents. She believes the time is right to institute the change.

Discussion focused on the implications of financial processing, the multi-provider model, and the possibility of remote user support issues. The chair reiterated that pilot projects

like this one are used to test the principles. Karl Heckart added that the statewide case management system (CMS) products are being constructed to accommodate e-filing.

Overall, the concept presented seemed to members to merit their recommendation to COT. The support considerations inherent in the various e-filing approaches will need to be discussed at COT as part of the e-court subcommittee update.

GENERAL JURISDICTION SUBTEAM PROGRESS

Clerk Michael Jeanes discussed his recent report to the Chief Justice regarding the potential impact of mandated e-filing in Maricopa Superior Court. The State Bar Board of Governors has unanimously supported the concept. It is also supported by the Maricopa County Bar. Michael estimated that his office could complete the necessary background tasks for mandatory e-filing into existing cases by January 1, 2009, should the Chief so order.

Prove the multi-provider case filing concept. Michael Jeanes also reported on an approach by WizNet, a vendor currently under contract as an EFSP for Maricopa Superior Court, to become the court's and ultimately the state's sole provider of e-filing services. Since the Clerk's "free filing" interface remains, the vendor also requested mandating e-filing to increase the volume to the level of his business model. Rich McHattie from the Clerk's Office shared the process being considered to enable many more vendors to be certified to submit electronic filings to the court. Karl Heckart raised questions about the manpower load on the court of having to certify and work with a potentially unlimited number of vendors, drawing an analogy to the defensive driving effort underway today. The clerk's current contract with Lexis-Nexis for complex civil litigation expires in September 2008 and the court would like to have various other vendors qualified prior to that date.

Obtain document management systems in all superior courts and integrate them with case management systems. In response to a member's question about progress, Karl Heckart very briefly reviewed the direction in the remaining rural superior courts without OnBase: Coconino, Graham, and Apache.

LIMITED JURISDICTION SUBTEAM PROGRESS

Enable electronic citations statewide to prevent re-keying citation data. Judge Dennis Lusk asked Stewart Bruner to brief members in his place since he had to leave the call. On the subject of implementing handheld citations, members were concerned that the rate of sales far outpaces the purchasers' abilities to tie the devices into AZTEC and harness their full power. Karl stated that AOC is working on a brochure to better publicize what has to happen between purchase and production use. Stewart reminded members that an e-citation website exists for courts and law enforcement to learn the process details at <http://www.supreme.state.az.us/courtserv/ATTC/>.

Create web-enabled forms that feed case data into case management systems and documents into document management systems. Stewart and Karl provided a brief update on recent efforts with two forms developers, AZFLSE and TurboCourt, to obtain an XML data stream that would integrate into the case management system to enable forms-based electronic filing and a firm timetable for pilot projects.

APPELLATE LEVEL SUBTEAM PROGRESS

Enable e-filing at the appellate court level. The Supreme Court is on the verge of accepting electronic criminal filings from the State Attorney General's Office. Following a test period, the next step would be to extend the pilot to include filings from the public defender. Division One could then begin its e-filing pilot.

Justice Hurwitz mentioned various changes within the Supreme Court designed to make paper an "on request" medium for materials related to petitions for review rather than the default.

CRIMINAL FILING PROGRESS

Karl informed members that adoption of the Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS) by Maricopa County ICJIS revealed issues related to different players having different understandings of the overall process flow from arrest to disposition. Meetings are being held by ACJC to discuss the specifics. Ultimately, differences will have to be resolved by ACJC's policy committee. Though ADRS is being built into the new general jurisdiction case management system, it cannot be turned on for a county until the sheriff, prosecutor and court are all in agreement about the process flow that involves them all.

NEXT STEPS

Considerable discussion took place regarding the impact of sweeps of court funds and strategies for obtaining needed funds another way. Karl stated that money slated for implementation of the limited jurisdiction case management system is on the block to be swept, making an extension of AZTEC's life likely. If this occurs, we may need to ready AZTEC to support e-commerce as well as full FARE processing related to e-citations to deal with increasing court workloads as revenue enhancing photo vans and handhelds proliferate. Courts need backend case automation in addition to the front end automation developed so far.

Justice Hurwitz requested that the next meeting be scheduled for late April to prepare the subcommittee's presentation for the annual meeting of the Commission on Technology.

After verifying that subcommittee members had no further business to discuss, Justice Hurwitz adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m.