

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology
Minutes
December 10, 2004

Members Present:

Mohyeddin Abdulaziz
John Barrett
Ron Beguin
Janet Cornell
Daniel Edwards
Joan Harphant
Karl Heckart
Cary Meister
Carol Merfeld
Eloise Price
Rick Rager
Will Tagart

Members Not Present:

Eric Ciminski
David Davis
John King
Greg Obuch
Kyle Rimel
Alan Turner

Others Present:

David Adams
Stewart Bruner, Staff
Elaine Cadman
William Earl
Gary Graham
Melinda Hardman
Rep. Carole Hubbs, COT Leg. Member
Randy Kennedy, Scottsdale Municipal Court
Tim Lawler
Cathy Nemecek, Scottsdale Municipal Court
Pam Peet
Robert Roll

* indicates attendance via phone

Welcome and Introductions

The December 10, 2004, meeting of the Technical Advisory Council was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Karl Heckart, Chair. Karl introduced Maureen Haggerty's replacement, Stewart Bruner. For Stewart's benefit, Karl had members and guests introduce themselves.

Discussion of Architectural Requirements and Exceptions

The purpose of the discussion was to enable COT to have a better understanding of the exception process. The group discussed the implications of naming product-specific standards as well as those of function-based standards. Standards may need to vary by category of court, more than by product. Members agreed that naming individual product standards is not always totally realistic and that the focus should therefore be one of better delineating the goals and mechanics of the exception process.

Two key questions to be asked about any requested exception were arrived at: 1) Is the present standard functionally deficient? 2) If not, what does the specific court do uniquely that warrants an exception due to its compelling business case? The committee felt that further guidance needs to be provided to courts filling out JPIJs for the purpose of obtaining exceptions rather than state funding.

Discussion netted a set of principles that need to be documented as guidance to courts completing an exception request JPIJ. In support of creating an instructional cover sheet to aid those requesting exceptions, Karl assigned Stewart to record both TAC's principles and the specific areas for consideration in evaluating requests for exceptions. These items will be circulated to TAC members and also shared with COT.

JPIJ Review: Scottsdale City Court EDMS Exception

Janet Cornell distributed a draft JPIJ and summarized Scottsdale City Court's business reasons for requesting an exception to the EDMS standard. She clarified that the court was not requesting that the Hyland OnBase statewide standard be revisited.

The conclusion was that the court's need to be on the same system as its "key customers" at the City of Scottsdale outweighs the drawbacks of authorizing another non-standard EDMS in the state. The exception request will be recommended to COT for approval.

As a byproduct of discussions, TAC wants all courts that have exceptions approved to understand their tacit agreement to bear any later costs at the local level necessary to integrate the exception component or systems with a statewide standard component or core system. The written requirement will be added to the exception cover sheet for the JPIJ.

Strategic Projects Update

Karl Heckart provided detailed updates on FARE (including interim FARE, full FARE, and FARE forward projects), e-Disposition, Statewide Justice Integration, Crystal Reports, ACJIS, APETS, ACAP, JOLTSaz, and other potential projects on the horizon.

Local Project Roundtable

Various members reported on local projects underway including

- *Joan Harphant* on a variety of Tucson's activities,
- *Will Tagart* on Maricopa County's expansion of its e-filing pilot project,
- *Janet Cornell* on the rollout of Scottsdale's AZTEC Wizard to other Valley courts,
- *Eloise Price* on progress being made with Gila County's OnBase EDMS implementation,
- *Mohyeddin Abdulaziz* on the use of the e-filer program at Division 2,
- *Cary Meister* on a variety of projects in Yuma including construction of the new courthouse, and
- *Ron Beguin* on Phoenix's experience as a FARE forward participant.

Input: 2006-2008 Strategic Plan and Process

Stewart Bruner asked members for input regarding the current process of creating the branch-wide annual IT strategic plan and whether the template for creating local court plans was still of benefit. Since the March 18 deadline for input might not allow sufficient time for all necessary local and county approvals to be obtained prior to submittal, members felt no process changes should be made this year. Stewart will update last year's template as quickly as possible.

Members were asked to contribute the names of the actual planners in their jurisdictions to facilitate more direct communication of requirements and reminders.

Karl asked for any other issues from members and guests. Hearing none, the meeting adjourned at 3:57 p.m.

Next meeting is scheduled for February 11, 2005 (based on the usual second Friday of every even-numbered month) in Room 230.