

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL**  
**A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology**  
**Minutes**  
**April 8, 2005**

**Members Present:**

**Ron Beguin**  
**John Barrett**  
**Janet Cornell**  
**Joan Harphant**  
**Karl Heckart**  
**John King**  
**Carol Merfeld**  
**Gregg Obuch**  
**Eloise Price**  
**Rick Rager**  
**Will Tagart**

**Members Not Present:**

**Mohyeddin Abdulaziz**  
**Eric Ciminski**  
**David Davis**  
**Daniel Edwards**  
**Cary Meister**  
**Kyle Rimel**  
**Alan Turner**

**Others Present:**

**Stewart Bruner, Staff**  
**Robert Ellis**  
**William Earl**  
**Melinda Hardman**  
**Randy Kennedy**

\* indicates attendance via phone

**Welcome and Introductions**

The April 8, 2005, meeting of the Technical Advisory Council was called to order at 10:06 a.m. by Karl Heckart, Chair. Karl briefly previewed the topics on the agenda for the meeting and asked those present to introduce themselves.

**Input for TAC Presentation at COT Strategic Planning Meeting**

Karl Heckart handed out the revised branch plan along with COT's latest priority list for statewide projects and a couple of criminal justice integration diagrams for members' reference. He displayed onscreen a diagram composed in MindManager software and asked members to contribute further ideas to it by brainstorming strategic areas for IT involvement in the upcoming three to five years (refer to separate document). Throughout the meeting, Karl recorded additions in the following areas as input for presentation to COT.

- Architecture Enhancements
- Integration
- Case Management Systems
- Operational Model
- E-Courts

### **Architecture Enhancements**

Karl introduced the topic by reminding members that the technical architecture is a living entity that requires periodic re-examination and updating. John Barrett felt that TAC had previously stopped short in its effort to define the architecture and that another session was needed to fill in more of the table. In addition, more depth is necessary in existing standards like .NET. Some members felt that standard web service modules should really be the focus of the table rather than naming full blown business applications.

Discussion focused on building systems to the standards now that they have been agreed to and published. Some other necessary areas for standards suggested include biometric identification in the courtroom, disaster recovery, wireless communications, calendaring systems, and bar number/attorney verification.

### **Integration**

Karl broke the very broad integration category into several subsets.

1) Court to Law Enforcement – new systems are being architected for integration but not at every possible point. Karl described the Northrup study and ACJC vision for making the Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS) into an information bus. Members were interested in hearing more about the strategy and related development path by which ADRS becomes the ultimate “dream” system over time, feeling the court may need to take the lead in explaining that vision to justice partners in the counties.

2) Court to Court – With the exception of e-Blueback between Appeals Div. II and its feeder County Superior Courts, Karl stated that court-to-court integration is really not happening, but seems the best area for beginning e-filing. Suggestions for features new CMSs need to accommodate e-filing within the criminal justice community include bindovers and probation data moves, including juvenile data, as well as warrant issue and quash. Karl also brought up the initial appearance auto-post project, a pre-ADRS integration project currently underway in Coconino, and the e-ticket project in Flagstaff Municipal Court. Joan Harphant provided an update on progress with Tucson Municipal’s e-ticket implementation. She spoke highly of the selected vendor and reminded members that the contract may be leveraged by other entities in the State. Current justice integration projects point out the need not for a common application itself but rather for a standard technology set for feeding data to the court CMS. Discussion turned to the more general need to provide web access to certain AZTEC data for certain justice partners. Unfortunately, widespread confusion regarding which justice partner is responsible for what parts of the puzzle prevents progress.

3) MVD and DOR Integration – Dept. of Transportation Motor Vehicle Division (MVD) is planning to migrate off the mainframe as soon as they can secure the funding. The new

technology would then enable an XML interface which would allow courts to package all MVD data exchanges in a standard set. Dept. of Revenue (DOR) is currently leaving its mainframe behind, requiring the TIP interface to be rewritten. Members suggested areas of benefit including making MVD rejects electronic and using MVD vehicle/driver information for address verifications as a web service. Maricopa representatives stated that they also desire MVD to provide electronic license suspension data on juveniles to replace current paper abstracts.

4) FARE – The lone improvement suggestion for FARE involved adding an interface to approved defensive driving schools. No standard has yet been defined for electronic submittal of school-related data.

### **Case Management Systems**

Timelines for implementation are currently an issue with Clerks. Karl asked the representatives from Tempe and Pima for their “best guess” implementation dates. Tempe estimated a September 2006 go-live date for their court. Pima estimated a fall 2006 date, again for superior court only. Karl pointed out that not until these systems are live can the AOC know the extent of work necessary to prepare them for general adoption by other courts. He asked CACC to publish a plan for each containing a formal implementation date along with the underlying assumptions so that when assumptions are not met, dates will change accordingly.

An area for future consideration mentioned was JUSTIS integration with the new CMSs. That would require code standardization, validation narrowing, a plan for handling legacy data (as large a task as all the rest combined) and a re-engineering of the statistical reporting process.

Karl explained that AZTEC enhancements will continue, even as it has been declared end-of-life, to get better conversion tools and make cleanup easier. Karl mentioned an idea of using dedicated conversion teams like those for FARE in the CMS changeover.

### **Operational Model**

Karl briefly described the two historical support models (large volume court and standard ACAP court) then asked members if the state really needs to own and operate so much. The consensus was that both models remain necessary due to the wide variation in court types/sizes/abilities and that the issue revolves not around the categories of support but rather how specific courts get themselves into the large volume court category while others do not. Many questions were raised by members about the pre-requisites for self-support but the general conclusion was that an agreement must somehow be documented between AOC and the court using an agreed checklist by which the court “certifies” that it is indeed able to act as an autonomous IT entity.

### **E-Courts**

Karl asked members where they felt resources should be invested now that CMS and EDMS backoffice work is largely decided. Areas members suggested were making standardized, interactive forms; enabling fully paperless files; courtroom recording, including audio, video, and evidence; expanding videoconferencing, especially for initial appearances; automating the metrics for National Center for State Courts' (NCSC's) 10 measures of court performance; and .NET training. Discussion about these was limited by the lack of remaining time in the meeting.

### **Local Project Updates**

Rick Rager invited members to Tempe's demonstration of its new CMS complaint entry module and conversion tool to be held at 10 am on Thursday, May 5, at the police auditorium across 5<sup>th</sup> Street from city hall. Stewart Bruner will forward a formal invitation to members on Rick's behalf. Randy Kennedy reported that the AZTEC Wizard is now operating in Glendale and doing well, thus far. Scottsdale is working with AOC to determine in which court to next place the Wizard.

Karl asked for any other issues from members and guests. Hearing none, he reminded those present of the upcoming COT strategic planning meeting and adjourned the meeting at 2:10 p.m.

TAC's next meeting is scheduled for June 10, 2005, (based on the usual second Friday of every even-numbered month) in Conference Room 230.

COT's next meeting is scheduled for June 2 and 3, 2005, in Conference Room 345A/B. The June 2 agenda gets underway at 1 p.m. and includes project updates from subcommittees.