

**APPROVED MINUTES**  
**DATA MANAGEMENT STEERING COMMITTEE**  
**March 20, 2008 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.**  
**SeaTac Facility, SeaTac, WA**

**Members Present:**

Mr. Richard Johnson, Chair  
Ms. Barbara Miner  
Mr. Frank Maiocco  
Ms. Renee Townsley  
Mr. Larry Barker  
Mr. William Holmes  
Mr. Chuck Ramey

**Members by phone**

Ms. Jeri Cusimano

**Members Absent:**

Judge Michael Lambo  
Judge Brian Tollefson  
Judge Thomas Wynne  
Ms. Siri Woods

**Staff Present:**

Mr. Randy McKown  
Mr. Gregg Richmond  
Mr. Eric Kruger  
Mr. John O'Conner  
Ms. Jennifer Creighton  
Ms. Ronee Parsons

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Johnson called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m., and introductions were made.

The meeting minutes for January 17, 2008 were reviewed and one change was made per Ms. Barb Miner's request. Minutes were approved pending that change.

Mr. Rich Johnson said that he had been working with Gregg, Randy, John, and Eric to get on track, so that everyone can be on the same page, moving forward based on the Judicial Information Services Committee's (JISC) focus on Data Management, while the Data Management Committee regroups.

Mr. Randy McKown provided a PowerPoint presentation. He started with a slide that came from a Gartner Report in 2005. He went on to say that the slide indicated lack of requirements as the general focus. He went on to say that many items from the old report were still valid and some were currently being worked on.

Ms. Barb Miner asked if Gartner had said whether requirements had not been explicitly defined.

Mr. McKown said yes. He said that at that time an effort had been taken to start working on a single case management system.

Mr. Eric Kruger said that the Gartner reaction was stop doing in-house development before AOC knew what all the requirements were.

Mr. McKown talked about mixed direction regarding data exchanges and the data warehouse. He said Gartner was saying the only way that AOC would succeed was through data exchange. Others said the data warehouse would be able to do everything that the courts would want to do with data exchange - until they finally got to looking at the warehouse and there were issues there.

Ms. Miner asked if there needed to be two committees again: Data Exchange and Information Access.

Mr. McKown said that was valid question, he said his personal opinion was that these are all data related efforts and projects that the committee is working on. He said there is a lot of overlap at times and that having one committee made more sense to him.

Mr. Johnson said that if they get to a point where a strategy of running separate tracks or different groups of people needs to be looked at, it can; but at this point we're still looking at a higher level and seeing how things play out.

Mr. Johnson said that the committee went from having Gartner, the Roadmap, and Tim driving the direction, to Brian Lonardo trying to steer it, to the focus on the CMS all the way back to where we are now. He said that the focus needed to be; Gregg at the top leading it, with Randy, Eric, and John trying to go back and look at what everyone was saying they were going to do and then move forward. He said he thought the big question was how the data management effort would be coordinated with the JISC effort that will be going on.

Mr. McKown talked about the need for the Data Management Steering Committee. He indicated that the Charter was still good. He said he spoke with Rich and the key things are the planning, guidance, and oversight. Mr. McKown added that the Scope is still good from the Charter.

Mr. McKown went on to the next slide reviewing what the committee needed to do in order to move forward. He continued with the slide that indicated how the DMSC would move forward.

Mr. Johnson commented that 'how will DMSC move forward' was critical because they never had the foundation of how the committee was going to accomplish all of the things they were going to accomplish and it was never clear. He added that they were actually starting again, asking Gregg and his staff to start at the architecture level so the committee understands what the strategy is and how it was supposed to go together.

Ms. Miner asked what the committee should do if the committee did not agree with or understand a decision that AOC was making in regards to data management. She asked if they should go to the Judicial Information System Committee (JISC) or the Executive Committee. She added that many things did not go to the committee for approval.

Mr. Richmond said that since the Case Management System budget stopped, AOC has gone back and closed down all CMS-related projects. He added that the Information Systems Division has embarked on a Strategic Plan. Part of this Plan includes implementation of project tracking metrics. In the future, the Steering Committee can expect to receive measurements regarding the work that is being don

Mr. Johnson said that if something does not make sense then the committee needed to go to the JISC.

Mr. McKown talked about the eParking data exchange being a small set of data that would have a simple set of business rules that would be a low risk effort for ISD staff to work on and learn how to establish data exchanges that update data into the AOC database. Mr. McKown also referenced other projects such as Document imaging and Pierce County exchange.

Mr. Larry Barker asked if eTicketing was still part of the plan.

Mr. McKown said that eTicketing was a production application that did not have a lot of work being done to it. He said that the work being done was related to problem fixes.

Mr. McKown spoke about the slide regarding delivering short term value. He said that he wanted to make it clear that the warehouse project as implemented was not delivering 'real time' data.

Mr. Chuck Ramey commented that without real time data going into the warehouse the data may need to be limited to management report data and such.

Mr. Ramey asked if AOC was anticipating any budget issues.

Mr. Richmond said that the AOC does not anticipate any budget shortfalls.

Mr. Kruger provided a PowerPoint presentation on Enterprise Architecture. He said that one of the goals was to feed information to the committee so they are at a point where they can provide good guidance to questions coming from ISD. He said he wanted to give a high-level picture of what an Enterprise Architecture is. Mr. Kruger said that the Enterprise Architecture was not just one thing, it was comprised of; business, technology, information, and governance. He said that if only one of the points is concentrated on then the others fail, he said everything should align. Mr. Kruger said that all plans would be tied to a measure and he encouraged members to ask where ISD is with those measures at any given time.

Mr. Kruger talked about the different applications that AOC has built over the years including; CAPS, DISCIS, ACORDs, etc. He said that as time goes on it takes longer to do things because there is no repeated architecture. He said instead, the systems continue to be added to and it takes longer to make changes. He said they are looking for a universal language for applications to use.

Mr. John O'Conner presented a PowerPoint regarding Enterprise Data Architecture. He began talking about the 45-page document that was to be sent out to committee members via e-mail.

Mr. Johnson asked that the document be, e-mailed to the committee members for them to review prior to the April meeting. He also asked that the summary portions be highlighted.

**Action Item:** Randy McKown to send out document to committee members with summary portions highlighted: *Enterprise Data Architecture; Conceptual Framework.*

Mr. O'Conner explained that the document consisted of 4 sections, the first being the data management strategy. He said that he discussed governance and data policies.

He said that the document does not say that there will be a data warehouse. He said that when there were copies of data that ISD manages; they follow the principles noted in the document.

Mr. O'Conner said the 2 subsequent parts talked about specification for the data documentation. He said the last section included a data standards table to keep track of different standards to be followed.

Mr. Johnson asked if there was an executive summary of the document and if there wasn't one, could one be provided.

Mr. O'Conner said that there were two summaries, one at the beginning and one at the end. He said the one at the end sounded more like an executive summary. He said that the members should look through the data management section.

Mr. Johnson asked if the assumptions and premises utilized in the document were still valid.

Mr. Kruger said that Yes. The document stands on its own. He said that any data housed at AOC, however it was done, was covered in the document. He said that the data would be covered whether a system is purchased off the shelf or custom built.

Mr. O'Conner said that each source, application or exchange, which communicates with the database, has to perform all the security, validation, etc. He said that all of those processes are repeated and possibly done in different ways. These different methods can compromise the data. He added that what is wanted is for the information to go into the Master Data Management box and have one way to do security, validation, searches, etc. to maintain consistency and integrity of the data.

Mr. O'Conner continued that what they do not have is the management component of master data management. He said that what they want to have is all the same applications, exchanges, and new things to go into a box and have one way to do security, validation, links, and searches.

Mr. Johnson asked where the master data management is being built.

Mr. O'Conner said that master data management is more of a technology or technique. He said the technology could be built and will probably be built in a separate database to house master data.

Mr. Johnson said that his impression was that the data warehouse was the master data management.

Mr. O'Conner said that the intention was to have the data warehouse be a warehouse and master data, but those are not the same thing. He said the purpose of the data warehouse was to separate the data that was being queried in mass quantities from the transactions that need to just go in and out.

Mr. Johnson said that he would like to see a visual of the information that Eric and John talked about in their presentations. He added that from his understanding, AOC knows how they want to build the master data management but was it clearly documented or drawn or was it based on the 50-page document that would be e-mailed to the committee members later. He said that he wanted documentation and visuals at the committee level for their understanding.

**Action Item:** High level, 5-page outline for committee members.

Mr. O'Conner said that the detail presented in his PowerPoint was not in the 50-page document. He said the 50-page document talked about the principles that were being followed by AOC.

Mr. Johnson said he was more interested in the level approach as presented by AOC. He said that it was still not clear as to how the exchanges were going to work. He said in order for the committee to understand and make decisions, they were going to need to know; business needs of the exchanges, what the source data is, whether the data is coming from the warehouse or the MDM or a data mart.

**Action Item:** Create an agenda item for a walk-through of the information mentioned above.

Ms. Renee Townsley asked if there was a prioritization of access to data; would courts be second to outside entities, or law enforcement.

Ms. Townsley clarified that she wanted to know if the courts would have priority in response time; the courts would have a quicker response time than other entities.

Mr. Kruger said that the goal was to provide governance so decisions were made on strategic value; in regards to constituent value, courts are more important. He said a prioritization matrix would be valuable.

## **SERVICE ENABLEMENT**

Mr. Kruger provided a second presentation to de-mystify the term Service Enablement of the Legacy system. He said he would send out more information on Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) later. He likened it to lasagna in that it has many layers. He said the purpose of having all the layers was to be able to change out some layers without affecting the other layers. He said it was a methodology to build things currently and be able to improve them later. He added that the cost of changing existing systems is very high. He said that the SOA would be applied to the Legacy system, which has twenty years of edits and rules built into it. A lot of those rules are good, but the problem is (Seattle Municipal, as example) not being able to re-use those rules when bringing data into the system using new methods (data exchange, etc).

Alternatives:

- Continue as is, unacceptable
- Recreate all edits and rules, at a cost of around \$38,000 per 10,000 instructions.
- Reuse existing JIS database
  - This would be a savings; about \$4,000 per 10,000 instructions to service enable JIS.
  - We would not need to service enabling all of JIS.

Mr. Kruger said that Service Enablement would increase speed of JIS.

Mr. Johnson asked what it actually means to service enable. He asked if hardware or software needed to be purchased.

Mr. Kruger said the exact method had not been selected, but they do have the tools needed to create a medium crude method of getting data into JIS.

Mr. Richmond said the Legacy application is written in Cobol and Natural, which need to be upgraded to the newest version, plus an upgrade to the mainframe database and then software will need to be purchased.

Mr. Richmond said that the software would utilize screen pasting technology. He added that IBM has been doing that technology for several years.

Mr. McKown said that they wanted to by a software product that will take existing business rules and make them reusable for data exchange and data entry, which will save AOC from having to rewrite business rules.

Mr. Kruger said the business rules were documented, but need to be converted to a reusable format.

## **DATA MANAGEMENT STEERING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Mr. Johnson talked about resource realities (based on handout provided; Resource Usage). He said the handout indicates how staff is allocated to Data Management and how many hours are dedicated to the different projects. Mr. Johnson wanted more clarification on what the different projects are. He said that it would be good to know who the staff members are that are allocated to data management, and what they do. He said that he thought a lot of value was added by having the staff member attend meetings when discussing the project they are working on.

Mr. McKown asked if Rich wanted the Data Management Status Report to reflect red or yellow. Rich said yellow after agreement of the committee.

Ms. Miner said that should be something that the committee should approve. She said that anytime a completion date changes, the committee should be the one to approve it, not just be informed of it.

Mr. Johnson asked what should be accomplished at the next meeting; what does the committee need to provide as far as the draft strategic business plan. He said there should be a high-level plan for all of the projects and a detailed plan for the near term projects.

Mr. Johnson asked about the test ESB platform for performance and stability.

Mr. McKown said the ESB was purchased, but was never placed through the exercise of actually testing it to see how it worked in the AOC environment. He said there are a lot tests that can be run through the ESB to ensure that the data exchanges will run in the AOC environment.

Mr. Holmes commented on the Generic Data exchanges in regards to courts of limited jurisdiction; post disposition responsibilities should be included. Do we know if post disposition proceedings will be included, such as modification of disposition or probation violation?

Mr. McKown said he did not know if those are included. He said the intent with the generic exchanges has always been to find out what people really want to do with the data. He said that something that is missing from both court levels was dispositions. He said that the whole set up needs to be reviewed to understand what is in the data exchanges and how to make them of greater value.

Mr. Johnson asked if the AOC generic web services were going to be maintained or abandoned. The Committee will ultimately decide.

Ms. Jennifer Creighton said the VIP contract ended on December 31, 2007 but the product received was incomplete so an extension to the contract was signed. Contractors are on site at AOC, and the contract will end on April 30, 2008.

Mr. Richmond said that the contractors would complete the work at no extra cost, same scope.

Mr. Barker commented that the meetings have been very rushed and asked if the length of the meetings should be extended.

Mr. Johnson said that he agreed and would see how the meetings progressed and will look to extending them if necessary.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

**Action Items:**

**Action Item:** Randy McKown to send out document to committee members with summary portions highlighted: *Enterprise Data Architecture; Conceptual Framework*.

**Action Item:** High level, 5-page outline for committee members.

**Action Item:** Create an agenda item for a walk-through of the information mentioned above.