

# Data Management Steering Committee (DMSC)

Thursday, December 16, 2010

9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

AOC SeaTac Office, SeaTac Office Center

18000 International Blvd., Suite 1106, SeaTac

## Approved Meeting Minutes

**Members and Alternates Present:** Rich Johnson, Chair, Larry Barker, Judge D. Mark Eide, Lynne Jacobs, Frank Maiocco, Cynthia Marr, Carl McCurley (by Phone), Barb Miner, and Siri Woods and Kim Morrison (by Phone).

**AOC Staff:** Jennifer Creighton, Vonnie Diseth, Bill Burke, John Howe, Mike Walsh, and Kathie Smalley.

### Call to Order

Introductions were made. The September 16, 2010 Meeting Minutes were approved as submitted.

### Previous Action Items Review

For decision: the revised analysis of accounting information expansion to the data warehouse.

Update on delay of the Vehicle Related Violations (VRV) Operational Readiness project due to outside influences.

Status update on the Superior Court Data Exchange (SC DX) Imaging piece.

### Open Action Items

Jennifer Creighton will work with the interested committee members and AOC staff to produce a 1-2 page Accounting Proposal document that states the problem (with history), shows the added value by citing the new capabilities this will provide the users, emphasizes the use of existing resources for this project, and clearly states the DMSC's recommendation, for presentation to the JISC. *(due January 20, 2010)*

Mike Walsh will do a preliminary assessment on what impact the RMS changes might have on the AOC and any budgetary consequences related to the VRV on-boarding of the target courts (and globally to any court that might want to do the VRV). If no impact were apparent, then point out the only issue would be the time delay. *(due March/April 2011)*

After the AOC has met with Pierce County, Bill Burke (the Superior Court Data Exchange project manager) will provide Rich Johnson with the outcome/decisions of that meeting *(due December 2010)*.

### Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW) Update – Jennifer Creighton

#### EDW Monthly Project Status Report

Jennifer reported the team is currently in maintenance mode; waiting for the next project assignment. A recent hardware failure required the purchase and reconfiguration of new storage and caused some delays. A district and municipal court request, made prior to the new governance process, to add vehicle and eTicketing information to the warehouse should be completed and brought up in the February or March timeframe. In addition, the team is gearing up for the Legislative session beginning in January.

#### Revised Analysis of IT Governance Request #009

The project was re-scoped to reduce significantly the number of hours for Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Court Education involvement in assisting court users in doing ad hoc queries of the accounting data being added. Specific reporting needs were identified by court users so the AOC could create the reports to run at times and within the parameters

the users desired. A list of available reports is included in the analysis, and there will be no ad hoc capability available at this time. Eight of the reports listed are already available, but are constrained by date parameters making the information provided irrelevant when not run at specific times. Larger volume courts have also caused system crashes when retrieving some reports. Moving the information to the data warehouse will allow a historical perspective and more flexibility.

Committee members to benefit from this project stated it as a high priority for both CLJ courts and Superior courts, a significant timesaver, and would provide more accurate research results and budgeting forecasts.

**MOTION:** Rich Johnson called for the motion to endorse or recommend the request for this project be moved forward in the governance model. **Motion Passed.**

**ACTION ITEM:** Jennifer Creighton will produce a 1-2 page document for presentation to the JISC. (see *Open Action Items*)

Mr. Johnson suggested this request might be able to move forward through the Multi Court Level User Group (MCLUG) with an email.

### **Data Exchange Update –**

#### **Vehicle Related Violations Data Exchange (VRV DX) Status Update – Mike Walsh**

Mike Walsh introduced himself as the new project manager taking over for Kathy Wyer on the VRV and the Records Management System (RMS) projects. He reported the project had been moving along and the vendor had met the first six of their deliverables. The project was nearing readiness to move to Operation Support with the AOC until the RMS project came along and stalled it.

The Records Management Systems (RMS) – for Law Enforcement Agencies – project is through the Washington State Traffic Safety Commission, and involved multiple agencies, including the Department of Information Systems (DIS). DIS made changes to the package when a message is built that impacted both the AOC's ability to communicate to the system and to the current VRV customer (Everett), and ultimately affecting all the VRV on-boarding. AOC is working on getting programming changes implemented, testing the connectivity of the messaging and will follow up in early January with more in-depth testing between different courts and law enforcement agencies. Several other agencies (WSP, DOT, and DOL) are involved in the process and must finish their work in order to complete the testing. The AOC resources that were slated to transition from vendor to AOC support are now being held aside to work on the RMS changes. The new target date for this project has been pushed to a March/April 2011 timeframe.

The three main vendors that are working with the courts are ATS, RedFlex, and CodeSmart and they will have work to do once the AOC releases the changes in specifications, resulting from the RMS project, to the on-boarding courts. Mr. Johnson emphasized the importance of linking the vendor (ATS, etc.) readiness with the on-boarding courts schedule to make adjustments where necessary in moving forward. **ACTION ITEM:** Mike Walsh will do a preliminary assessment on the impact of the RMS changes on the jurisdictions moving forward. (see *Open Action Items*)

#### **Superior Court Data Exchange (SC DX) Status Update – Bill Burke**

Rich Johnson provided an overview of the history behind this project, the significant transitions between AOC project managers, and the evolution of the project identifying three distinct components focusing on the Superior Court data exchange level (being docketing, imaging, and calendaring). The committee had decided the order based on a previous agreement between the AOC and Pierce County, identified needs, and discussions with end users. Docketing was listed first because of the agreement that AOC would provide staff to perform double data entry at a significant cost to AOC.

Mr. Johnson introduced Bill Burke as the new project manager, noting he had a tough job

because the committee was finding itself in the position of having to regroup, readjust the project plan, the contracts, and the expectations. In that a Superior Court Calendaring Feasibility Study is under way, and to pave the way for any future superior court data exchange other than SCOMIS, the committee must focus on the Pierce County situation. The imaging users told the DMSC that they were doing fine with their present solutions, and that piece is being taken off the table because all three of those pieces can no longer be done. The complexities of doing just the one exchange have increased exponentially, and Mr. Johnson has asked AOC to look at a short-term approach to dealing with the immediate double data entry issue, while the DMSC reformulates the strategy for the long-term solution. He also suggested the committee might want to recommend that the second component of the SC DX be focused on the calendaring effort approved by the JISC. Bill Burke agreed the project has serious problems that didn't occur overnight and must be dealt with. Currently, the AOC has a vendor on board to go ahead and implement the three functions talked about with a fixed firm price contract of approximately \$1.4 million to do both the design and documentation phase, and the implementation phase. Bottom line is they are not going to be able to complete the work with that amount of money, and are requesting another \$375,000 above the contract to do the next two deliverables in the design and documentation phase. For the implementation phase, the vendor is requesting nearly another million dollars. This situation requires de-scoping part of the project at a near-term basis, and the potential of moving into a re-procurement situation. The SC DX project is significantly outside the June 2011 delivery date by a minimum of one year. Mr. Burke proposed moving forward with just the LINX solution at this point in time, and do the detail plans to get that interface established, which would establish core services of interfacing for docketing only. That would allow time to look over the larger piece and would require an outside contractor be brought in and a re-procurement to take place. Vonnie Diseth stated, at a high level, the AOC is proposing focusing on some services or some data exchanges with just Pierce County, so coding could go from beginning to end to make sure the data exchange worked, rather than using a waterfall approach where a flaw in the analysis, design, or coding might not be found until the end and after significant time and money had already been invested (like a Proof of Concept). Mr. Burke explained that the Superior Court Data Exchange that will be used by Pierce County would be done in separate increments in order to ensure that each service gets verified before moving on to the next service, allowing data exchange services to be moved into production faster, and also providing lessons learned for subsequent increments. AOC plans to meet with Kevin Stock and his technical team in Pierce County Monday, December 20, to go over various options and what they think is best for them as a short-term solution. Results of that meeting will be presented to the DMSC and the JISC. After discussion about the options, Rich Johnson stated it seemed as though the entire superior court case management system was being rewritten, which would be different than a data exchange. John Howe replied that this data exchange project would essentially be replacing SCOMIS with new code and when completed, a new modern SCOMIS system would be available, and AOC would also be supporting the old one for a while. Judge Eide commented that the SCOMIS, DISCIS, and other systems that were written on the old WANG technology are near end of life and suggested ignoring the data exchange and dumping the contract with the vendor. Mr. Johnson stated that there was still a fundamental need across the state for the judiciary to know whether a defendant sitting before them had multiple convictions in another jurisdiction. Barb Miner stated that King County has their own calendaring system because one has not been provided by the state, and they just want to be able to utilize the data that they're putting in and have it back to use for their own purposes. Without data exchange, they are stuck using an old ODBC download of SCOMIS data (with restrictions and screen scraping) so they can populate their own calendaring system, and they still have difficulty getting their own data back.

Mr. Johnson wrapped up the discussion saying that the data exchange strategy is out of the realm of the DMSC's charter and needs to go to the JISC to decide where to go from here.

### **Next Steps / Motions / Decisions**

Ms. Diseth and AOC staff will meet with Kevin Stock and technical staff in Pierce County, and will provide the results of that to Rich Johnson, allowing him to decide whether or not to call everybody back together prior to the January 21, 2011 JISC meeting. *(see Open Action Items)*

Mr. Johnson will report for the DMSC and Ms. Diseth for the AOC's Information Services Division at the next JISC meeting that the current strategy isn't working, and what was set out to be done might not be able to be done in the current environment. That what the committee thought they were buying for the \$1.6 million, they didn't get and so now needs direction from the JISC.

Meeting adjourned 12:20 p.m.

### **Future Meetings**

January 20, 2011, 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Conference Call

February 17, 2011, 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Conference Call

March 17, 2011, 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Conference Call