

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology
Minutes
April 7, 2006

Members Present:

Mohyeddin Abdulaziz
Lillith Avalon
Ron Beguin
Karl Heckart
Correnia Honaker
Randy Kennedy
Cary Meister
Carol Merfeld
Gregg Obuch
Eloise Price
David Stevens

Members Not Present:

David Davis
Joan Harphant
John King
Rick Rager
Kyle Rimel
Alan Turner

Others Present:

Kip Anderson
Stewart Bruner, Staff
William Earl
Gary Graham
Jeff Viemont

* indicates attendance via phone

Welcome and Introductions

The April 7, 2006, meeting of the Technical Advisory Council was called to order at 10:03 a.m. by Karl Heckart, Chair. Karl reviewed the agenda for the meeting and asked those present to announce their presence for the record.

e-Court Subcommittee Update

Karl Heckart gave members a brief recap of the presentation made at COT by the e-Court Subcommittee to address electronic filing in the court system using a broad approach rather than pilot by pilot. He shared the direction being pursued now that the competitive, multi-provider model and the subcommittee's other general principles have been ratified by COT. Larger groups are being convened by jurisdictional level to identify the best opportunities, set goals and timelines, then report back to the e-Court subcommittee. Overlap items will then be addressed by task-specific teams.

Stewart Bruner handed members a printout showing the front page of the public e-Courts website (<http://supreme.state.az.us/ecourts>) while Correnia Honaker provided members with a brief update on progress being made using the multi-vendor model in Maricopa County. Stewart agreed to distribute more detailed information to members as provided by Maricopa Clerk of the Superior Court's office.

Concern was raised that e-Court might be performing technical review of solutions and selecting the specific approaches to the exclusion of TAC or COT. Karl agreed that e-Court is not a technical body and anything it decides must be approved by COT.

Enterprise Architecture Policies and Standard Two-Year Review

Stewart reviewed each changed made to the standards table since last meeting, following the direction of members to research and add product release identifiers where applicable. Members asked for more detailed definitions of the category headings used in the table (Baseline, Retirement, Containment, Mainstream, Watchlist) and the addition of descriptions of the implications of a product or solution appearing in each column. The courts comprise an increasingly decentralized, federated organization that implements varying complex technologies and application systems at varying pace, necessitating a clear statement of what standard items are on the path that will allow key systems to interoperate. The table performs that role. The table was unanimously approved for submittal to COT with the additional text.

Attention switched to Arizona Code of Judicial Administration (ACJA) Section 1-501 and the inclusion of Jury+ in its list of enterprise applications. Mohave and Maricopa representatives questioned the appropriateness of the inclusion of the product. Discussion focused on the differences between the EA standards table and the list of business application systems in 1-501 as well as the differences between requesting a re-evaluation of a statewide standard and requesting a one-time- business-case-based exception from a standard. The decision was made to raise the question about the effectiveness of the product to the jury commissioners. Kip Anderson will raise the question at the next clerk's meeting to see if a business need to change the standard exists.

TAC Subcommittee Update for COT

Karl collected topics members thought important to raise in the annual TAC chairman's presentation to COT. Members' suggestions included

- AGAVE (implementation, assessment team, detailed review, and integration);
- Tempe CMS;
- Alternatives to AGAVE and Tempe CMS;
- Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS) for criminal e-filing;
- Hardware rollout for ACAP and JOLTS (defining level so of court user and standard configurations by level, Vista vs. XP decision, new CMSs use Word, not purchasing WordPerfect for rollout, Live Communication Server and IM);
- Identity theft reporting legislative impacts;

- e-Records issues (storage, archiving, business continuity);
- Rural bandwidth increases;
- e-Signature (what does and doesn't require signature; what rules require change);
- Victim notification improvements;
- Storing court reporter notes in OnBase;
- Moving websites to content management approach;
- Assessment of the interactive forms pilot;
- MVD enhancements to machine readability of documents
- FARE progress and data cleanup tie-in to CMS conversions;
- Agility issues – lack of a flexible infrastructure in the age of ubiquitous communication; and
- Investigating VOIP videoconferencing.

Stewart informed members that the COT annual meeting in May will likely be rescheduled to June 1 and 2, due to a lack of clarity about JCEF budget and legislative impacts.

The meeting adjourned at 1:37 p.m.

////////////////////////////////////

TAC's next meeting is scheduled for June 9, 2006, in Conference Room 230.

COT's next meeting is scheduled for June 1 and 2, 2006 in Room 119.