JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

October 24, 2014
10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
AOC Office, SeaTac, WA

DRAFT - Minutes

Members Present:
Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Mr. Larry Barker
Chief Robert Berg
Judge Jeanette Dalton
Ms. Callie Dietz
Ms. Delilah George
Judge James Heller
Mr. Rich Johnson
Judge J. Robert Leach
Ms. Barb Miner
Ms. Brooke Powell
Judge Steven Rosen (Phone)
Mr. Robert Taylor
Mr. Jon Tunheim
Ms. Aimee Vance
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

Members Absent:
Ms. Yolande Williams

AOC/Temple Staff Present:
Mr. Kevin Ammons
Mr. Dan Belles
Ms. Kathy Bradley
Ms. Marie Constantineau
Ms. Christine Cook
Ms. Vicky Cullinane
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Mr. Mike Keeling
Mr. Martin Kravik
Mr. Eric Kruger
Ms. Kate Kruller
Mr. Dirk Marler
Ms. Mellani McAleenan
Ms. Pam Payne
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Ms. Maribeth Sapinoso
Mr. Mike Walsh
Mr. Kumar Yajamanam

Guests Present:
Judge Veronica Alicea-Galvan
Ms. Lynne Campeau
Ms. Lea Ennis
Judge Corinna Harn
Mr. Enrique Kuttemplon
Judge David Larson
Mr. Allen Mills
Mr. Othniel Palomino
Judge Kim Walden

Call to Order

Justice Mary Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and introductions were made.

September 5, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any additions or corrections to the September 5, 2014 meeting minutes. Hearing none, Justice Fairhurst deemed them approved.

JIS Budget Update (13-15 Biennium)

Mr. Ramsey Radwan provided the budget update for the 2013-2015 biennium. The green sheet, representing the amount allocated for projects listed, shows the expenditures and current allocations for the current biennium for the INH, SC-CMS, AC-ECMS, and the equipment replacement projects. Expenditures are on track. There have been some savings, which will go back to the JIS Fund for the next biennium.

Mr. Radwan presented information on the anticipated additional revenue and additional costs statewide. There will be approximately $2.6 billion in new revenue for the General fund, but

DRAFT

anticipated costs, including funding for education, exceed $5.3 billion. Even without the McCleary decision, expenditures will outpace revenue by over $1 billion. Although revenues have been better than expected, the additional costs dwarf them. Of the overall budget, 2/3 of the expenditures are protected and must be funded. The Legislature will likely start to reduce costs and locate existing revenue, before looking to increase taxes and other revenue. It is possible that funding may be pulled from the JIS Fund, and there may be a cut to the general fund, across the board, to help balance the budget. The Information Services Division receives funding from both the general fund and the JIS account, therefore, reductions to AOC's general fund budget could impact information technology projects during the 2015-2017 biennium.

CIO Report

- **House Appropriations Workgroup Update.** Ms. Vonnie Diseth provided a brief update on the House Appropriations Workgroup. Mr. Radwan, Ms. Callie Dietz, and Ms. Diseth presented information on the SC-CMS and AC-ECMS Projects to the House Appropriations Committee on September 29. Representative Hudgins directly asked if the two provisos had been implemented and what the status was on both. Ms. Diseth stated that both provisos have been implemented and explained that the JISC officially approved the JIS Data Standards on June 27, 2014, but allowed for further review and input from stakeholders. Representative Hudgins further inquired when the standards would be finalized. Ms. Diseth stated that they would be finalized at the October 24th JISC meeting.

- **Removal of Social Security Number in JIS Update.** Ms. Diseth also provided an update on the removal of Social Security Numbers in JIS. The first step to make the SSN field read only, was implemented in August. Once that was done, AOC offered to provide the courts with an SSN report that would help them to store the SSN in another manner outside of JIS. On October 20, 2014, the new release of JABS was implemented that removed the display of SSN and the ability to search for SSN's. On November 3, 2014, the SSN field will be removed from the JIS screens and database, as well as the Electronic Ticket Process (ETP) application. The last step is to develop a process that will identify social security numbers that have been entered into alternate data fields.

- **IT Security Assessment for the Appellate Courts.** A new RFQQ to have a security firm conduct an IT assessment for the Supreme Courts and Court of Appeals will be released October 24, 2014. Vendor proposals will be due in November. The expected start date will be in late December or early January 2015.

- **SAO IT Security Performance Audit.** Ms. Diseth gave an update on the State Auditor's Office Performance Audit, which followed up on the Intrinium Report. The final report from the auditing firm, chosen by the SOA was received on October 20, 2014. The State Auditor's feedback has not been received regarding this report.

- **Disaster Recovery and Business Resumption Program Audit.** In compliance with the JISC directive that an audit be conducted every three years on AOC's Disaster Recovery and Business Resumption Program, the audit was conducted by Sirius Computer Solutions, Inc. of San Antonio, TX. The audit findings stated AOC complied with the requirements of the JIS policy and National Institute of Standards (NIST). It was noted that the AOC/JIS Group did an exceptional job on IT Disaster Recovery Preparedness, and is well prepared.

JIS Policy Amendment

DRAFT

Justice Fairhurst opened the discussion on the JIS General Policies Amendment. Ms. Vicky Cullinane addressed questions relating to section 10.2 and section 4.1.8. Ms. Cullinane addressed written questions regarding section 4.1.8, which requires employees to review the confidentiality agreement annually. This does not require a new signed agreement. The courts may define "annually" as they see fit, as long as it occurs at the same time from year to year. The question of keeping additional signed agreements is irrelevant, and nothing is changed with how the documents are kept. In section 10.2, there were many comments and suggested edits to the draft policy.

Justice Fairhurst noted that comments were included, if anyone would like to speak to them. Ms. Barb Miner referred to her suggested edits to the policy. Ms. Miner asked if the DMS systems county clerks use would be exempt or grandfathered in. Ms. Diseth responded that the policy focuses on case management systems. Ms. Miner clarified that it would not be relevant to the DMS system, and Ms. Diseth concurred.

Justice Fairhurst noted that the decision point is to amend the policies according to the draft. Judge Thomas Wynne appreciated the changes in language and supports the change. Judge J. Leach supports the changes as well, except for the addition of the word "local," because the language should mirror the legislative proviso. Ms. Miner disagreed, stating that it reads more clearly, and she believes it doesn't change the meaning of the proviso. Judge Leach stated that it is unwise to deviate from the language in the proviso, which may have a different interpretation.

Mr. Mike Keeling noted that there is a network, and there are several layers of the network components to maintain connectivity to the applications. Ms. Miner disagreed with the concept of the network from the Clerks' perspective. Ms. Lea Ennis expressed concern that including "network" may mislead others, and it would be best to remove the term. Justice Fairhurst clarified that section 10.2 addresses alternative local systems. Justice Fairhurst asked Mr. Keeling if retaining the word "network" is essential or if it is sufficient without it. Mr. Keeling responded that for the purpose of this document, the "network" isn't really key.

Motion: Judge Thomas J. Wynne

I move to amend proposed section 10.2 to adopt language proposed by Barb Miner, minus the word "local" in the second paragraph.

Second: Judge Jeannette Dalton

Judge Corinna Harn commented that the proviso given by the Legislature only related to superior courts. The JISC is extending the proviso to lower courts with alternative systems. It may not have been intended by the Legislature, but their language was very clear that it was only supposed to be for superior courts. Judge Harn expressed concern that the proviso was extended to courts that do not have a system available from the state. Judge Harn doubts that it was the intent of the Legislature to go beyond what was stated in the proviso, and would discourage the JISC from extending this to courts of limited jurisdiction. Justice Fairhurst stated that JIS will continue to be the operating system for courts of limited jurisdiction until the new CMS is available. Judge Harn replied that the proviso was implemented at a point where superior courts do have a state-funded case management system besides SCOMIS. District and municipal courts do not have that alternative. The Legislature may have intended to

DRAFT

provide funding for those courts where the state was paying for a system already and therefore, would not pay for alternative systems.

Ms. Mellani McAleenan addressed Judge Harn's concerns, noting that the provisos passed were specific to the superior courts, as AOC was not seeking funding for the CLJs at that time. However, conversations with Representatives Hunter and Hudgins made clear that they fully intend to extend the same provisos to all courts. Ms. McAleenan believes that it is dangerous to draw a distinction between court levels because that is not the Legislature's intention. Judge Veronica Alicea-Galvan stated that it would be disingenuous to not apply the proviso to all court levels. Judge Harn's concern is understandable from a local perspective, but the JISC must have a statewide point of view.

Judge David Larson inquired if it was legal to extend the proviso to courts of limited jurisdiction when only the superior courts are addressed in the proviso. Justice Fairhurst addressed Judge Larson's concern about legality, stating that RCW 2.68.010 supports JISC's authority to implement these changes. It states that the JISC determines all matters pertaining to the delivery of services available from the Judicial Information System. Ms. Miner asked for the purpose of developing a wider interpretation of the proviso. Judge Steve Rosen inquired about the compliance with data standards as they change over time, and how long the courts have to adjust to those changes. Justice Fairhurst noted that the question was applicable to the Data Standards decision point further into the meeting. Justice Fairhurst recommended postponing this discussion until later in the meeting.

Judge Rosen stated that courts that choose alternative systems must perform double data entry, because there is no other option for CLJs, and there will not be in the near future. The local jurisdiction must pay for the double data entry, which increases the cost, and makes the sustainability questionable. Judge Rosen believes a standardized system is worthwhile, however the CLJs do not have a system. The cost increase is substantial for a number of jurisdictions and there is no need to include the CLJs in the change. Judge Rosen agrees with the Legislature's intent to include all courts, but the timing is incorrect. Judge Rosen would like to remove the CLJs from today's decision.

Motion: Judge Steven Rosen

I move to amend proposed section 10.2 to adopt language proposed by Barb Miner, minus the word "local" in the second paragraph, and add a sentence exempting the CLJ's from the policy.

Second: Ms. Barb Miner

Mr. Larry Barker asked if this policy did not apply to CLJs, what would? There would be no policy regarding the CLJs. Justice Fairhurst clarified that the motion is for section 10.2, and the motion is to remove the CLJ's from that. Justice Fairhurst called a vote.

Voting in Favor: Judge Rosen, Barb Miner
Opposed: Justice Fairhurst, Larry Barker, Chief Berg, Judge Dalton, Callie Dietz, Delilah George, Judge Heller, Rich Johnson, Judge Leach, Brooke Powell, Robert Taylor, Jon Tunheim, Aimee Vance, Judge Wynne
Absent: Yolande Williams

DRAFT

The motion fails. Justice Fairhurst called for the vote on the original motion made by Judge Wynne.

Voting in Favor: Justice Fairhurst, Larry Barker, Chief Berg, Judge Dalton, Callie Dietz, Delilah George, Judge Heller, Rich Johnson, Judge Leach, Barb Miner, Brooke Powell, Robert Taylor, Jon Tunheim, Aimee Vance, Judge Wynne
Opposed: None
Abstain: Judge Rosen
Absent: Yolande Williams

Justice Fairhurst then moved to the official decision point for the JIS General Policies.

Motion: Judge Thomas J. Wynne

I move to amend the JIS General Policies, as indicated in the attached draft, with the amended section 10.2.

Second: Judge James Heller

Voting in Favor: Justice Fairhurst, Larry Barker, Chief Berg, Judge Dalton, Callie Dietz, Delilah George, Judge Heller, Rich Johnson, Judge Leach, Barb Miner, Brooke Powell, Robert Taylor, Jon Tunheim, Aimee Vance, Judge Wynne
Opposed: None

JISC Rule 13

Justice Fairhurst opened the discussion on the JISC Rule 13 amendment. Ms. Cullinane provided an overview of the changes to the proposed Rule 13. Justice Fairhurst noted that some of the prior comments and letters were placed in Tab 3, and requests from King County Bar Association and King County District Court to delay action came in yesterday, October 23, 2014. Judge Alicea-Galvan indicated that this rule has divided the DMCJA Board, and, on behalf of the DMCJA Board, asked that action be delayed as well.

Ms. Diseth stated the primary frustration with delaying a decision comes from all of the time and energy that has been put into working on this issue. The JISC formed a workgroup several years ago to deal with this issue, and provide an update to the JISC Rules. The committee met for two years and could not reach consensus on changes. There were proposed minority and majority proposals which were brought before the JISC for a decision, but the group could not reach consensus, and eventually the workgroup was disbanded without an agreement being reached. Ms. Diseth does not believe delaying action will solve the issue or create consensus.

Ms. Miner stated that the rule, as is, is preferred by the Clerks and Mr. Rich Johnson. Ms. Miner made a motion to not amend the rule, and leave JISC Rule 13 as is. Judge Leach stated the motion is unnecessary because if we don't vote to change the rule, it will remain the same. Judge Wynne stated the proposed rule is consistent with Legislative expectations, and the adoption of this rule may strengthen our position with the Legislature in terms of funding. And it also sets future standards that will continue the existence of a JIS system.

Justice Fairhurst asked if there was a second to Ms. Miner's motion.

Motion: Ms. Barb Miner

DRAFT

I move to not amend JISC Rule 13, and keep Rule 13 as currently written.

Second: Mr. Rich Johnson

Voting in Favor: Rich Johnson, Barb Miner, Judge Leach
Opposed: Justice Fairhurst, Larry Barker, Chief Berg, Judge Dalton, Callie Dietz, Delilah George, Judge Heller, Brooke Powell, Robert Taylor, Jon Tunheim, Aimee Vance, Judge Wynne
Absent: Yolande Williams, Judge Rosen

The motion fails. Justice Fairhurst asked if there were additional motions.

Motion: Judge Thomas J. Wynne

I move to recommend the proposed Rule 13 to the Supreme Court on an expedited basis.

Second: Judge Jeanette Dalton

Judge Larson commented that the frustration expressed by Ms. Diseth is a result of trying to force a one-size-fits-all system on the individual courts. This is creating an "us vs. them" mentality that will slow down the process. It will not work to force courts into a system that does not work for them. The current problems with superior courts will multiply ten-fold when you add courts of limited jurisdiction. There needs to be a way to incorporate all systems, which is different from what is currently planned. Judge Larson stated that the decision needs to be delayed.

Judge Harn stated that under the existing Rule 13, King County District Court gave the JISC 90-days' notice, and that time has expired. There has been no response from AOC that King County's system isn't approved, and no concerns have been raised. King County District Court has spent over $1 million on their case management system, and they gave notice in February of their intent to implement a new system. The King County IT Director has told them their systems cannot continue to operate without risk of failure. Their court is in compliance under the existing rule.

Justice Fairhurst responded that they have not received JISC approval yet because the data standards weren't finalized, and they need the standards to make a decision. AOC has worked with King County diligently to accommodate their feedback on the standards. In response to Judge Larson, the JISC has already decided to proceed with a statewide case management system at the various court levels. The JISC moved the data exchange to the end of each project to first enable those going with the statewide system, approved by JISC and funded by the Legislature, and then meet the needs of other courts.

Mr. Johnson doesn't believe there is a need to change the rule. Mr. Johnson expressed a fundamental concern with changing the rule because it requires us to go back to Supreme Court to adopt future changes. He suggests adding a sentence to the rule that says the courts with alternative systems have to comply with JIS policies. Ms. Miner stated that when the JISC made the decision to prioritize various CMS projects, it did not understand that it was at the cost of moving data exchanges further out. Ms. Miner continued, stating that JISC has not made a purposeful decision to deprioritize the data exchange, but that is the end result, which is not workable.

DRAFT

Judge Alicea-Galvan stated that the DMCJA 100% supported the CLJ CMS being a priority. She disagreed that data exchange was off the table, but it's a question of timing. Right now we don't even know what systems we'll be exchanging data with. We can't pour resources into data exchange with obsolete systems. Once the system is built, that will be the appropriate time to discuss different needs, and now is not the time to address that. If we were to focus on two different tracks, it will delay the ultimate goal.

Justice Fairhurst noted the JISC's original decision was to do a statewide system, and the Legislature included provisos that the project had to meet King County's needs. The goal of the Legislature was to have a single statewide system. It is recognized that some courts may not want to have the same system, which makes data exchanges necessary. However, we cannot implement a statewide system while at the same time developing data exchanges for those that aren't using the system. Justice Fairhurst continued, stating those that make that choice have an opportunity to come back to the statewide system. Regardless of the outcome of this vote today, the JISC would have to make a different decision to elevate data exchange to its former priority. Those decisions have already been made and funding has been appropriated.

Ms. Miner stated that if there were resources allocated and different priority decisions, it would be possible to complete the case management systems and the data exchange at the same time. Judge Larson added that he was not suggesting data exchange with JIS, but data exchange with future systems. When creating new systems, it's important that they are able to talk with each other. It is better to plan ahead, instead of waiting to the end, when there will be many problems with the data exchange that already exist by having divergent systems. Judge Wynne responded that by establishing clear policies and standards, it becomes part of that process. Judge Larson responded that the current process is not allowing courts to develop other systems. Judge Wynne stated that a mechanism is necessary for standards and policies to be implemented on a local level. In the past, a district court system was created independently, but it did not communicate with AOC or other courts. There is a need statewide to look at the system as a whole, and the need for statewide information sharing. Justice Fairhurst called for a vote.

> **Voting in Favor**: Justice Fairhurst, Larry Barker, Chief Berg, Judge Dalton, Callie Dietz, Delilah George, Judge Heller, Brooke Powell, Robert Taylor, Jon Tunheim, Aimee Vance, Judge Wynne
> **Opposed**: Rich Johnson, Barb Miner, Judge Leach
> **Absent**: Yolande Williams, Judge Rosen

JIS Data Standard and Implementation Plan

Mr. Eric Kruger presented the proposed changes to the JIS Data Standards for Alternative Court Record Systems. He reviewed the changes made to the last draft and provided brief explanations. Mr. Kruger noted that the current draft included clarification of what was considered baseline data. All the data that is considered baseline is what is required now, and can be accepted in JIS. Mr. Kruger then provided a brief summary of the associated implementation plan.

Ms. Cullinane stated that the detail for the data elements will be in the Procedures and Guidelines document that is under development now. Procedures and Guidelines are the appropriate place for that level of detail. At the last stakeholder meeting, there was an outline of what will be included, along with examples of what it will look like for the level of detail. The

DRAFT

timeline calls for the document to be finalized by the end of November. Mr. Johnson requested that the data standards and implementation plan be separated for discussion. Mr. Johnson advocated separating the topics, as there may be some issues with each, and it could better focus discussion. Justice Fairhurst agreed to split the discussion.

Ms. Miner urged the committee not to adopt the standards, and distributed a letter written on behalf of herself, Lea Ennis, King County Superior Court, Othniel Palomino, King County District Court, Kevin Stock, Pierce County Clerk, Yolande Williams, Seattle Municipal Court, and Howard Delaney, Spokane Municipal Court. Ms. Miner stated that the current version of the standards is markedly different from the version adopted in June 2014, raising more questions than have been answered. Ms. Miner cited concerns with the proposed standards document, including that they apply to CLJ's, that they are overreaching as a policy statement, and they prioritize AOC's needs to report statistics over the impact on local court costs, and the implementation date is unrealistic. Ms. Miner stated that there are no electronic methods to transmit this required data to AOC, and that there was insufficient time to review the standards at the meeting with stakeholders on October 6, 2014.

Ms. Miner noted that all five of the courts included in the letter are willing to transmit the data, and no one disputes the benefit of having a statewide repository. However, none of the courts have the staff or financial resources to perform data entry to transmit it to AOC; it is costly and wasteful of time. Without the ability to perform electronic data exchange with AOC, the standards and the implementation plan in their current forms will have negative impacts on the court system as a whole. Ms. Miner noted this letter was submitted to have an official record of their concerns, and she plans to vote "no". It is understood that the "what" component meets the legislative proviso, but we do not believe the "how" is in the proviso. Particularly when the "how" dictates duplicate data entry.

Judge Alicea-Galvan noted that the DMCJA Board concurs with the request to delay the vote based on some objections they had.

Judge Wynne asked how much time would be necessary to fully review and discuss the standards. Ms. Miner responded that it is such a large, important document, and would like a minimum of 4-6 months. Judge Leach inquired if Ms. Miner was asking to delay both the adoption of the standards and the implementation plan. Ms. Miner responded that the issue is largely with the standards. Judge Leach followed, asking if delaying the implementation plan until the INH is established would alleviate the concerns. Ms. Miner responded that having the INH plus data exchange mechanisms are both necessary.

Judge Leach asked if all of the data that alternative systems are required to report will be accepted by the Odyssey system when the Odyssey system is up and running. Mr. Kruger responded that they will not have to report through Odyssey. The data will be reported through the INH, and the electronic data sharing will be for superior courts only. Judge Leach additionally asked if the superior courts using the Odyssey system would be reporting the same data that is required of the alternative systems under these standards. Mr. Kruger responded that superior courts would report the same baseline data.

Judge Wynne stated that the data standards were received in June and many parts have already been adopted, and asked what the differences were. Mr. Kruger noted that some data elements have been removed, and no data elements have been added. Judge Wynne clarified that the standards today were largely consistent with what is already in effect. Mr. Othniel

DRAFT

Palomino explained that he feels that the “what” of the standards keeps changing. We should not be held accountable for changing standards.

Judge Dalton addressed Ms. Miner’s statement of objecting to the “how” of the standards. Judge Dalton asked about the mechanisms, such as the Superior Court Data Exchange, that are already in place to enter baseline information. Ms. Miner wasn’t sure of the technical aspect of the exchange, and indicated that she is fine to send data to the JIS, or the new case management system.

Judge Dalton replied that the proviso intended to construct a statewide case management system and standards for getting data to the statewide case management system, and anyone not using the system will be responsible for getting their data to the statewide system. The Legislature does not want to pay for other systems; that will be the responsibility of those choosing not to opt in. Ms. Miner does not believe that is the case, and the proviso reads that there will be no funding for courts to have a local system. It is necessary to clarify if it is their intention to have counties to do double data entery into the state system.

Mr. Dirk Marler explained that if passage of the data standards is delayed until electronic data exchange is available, the net effect would be to prioritize data exchange in front of everything else, including a statewide case management system for CLJ’s.

Judge Harn said the real issue is how to work together to share as much data as possible without the expense sky-rocketing for courts that made a decision that they cannot operate their system effectively for their customers. Judge Harn’s primary concern is that by implementing these standard immediately, it will prohibit those courts from operating effectively.

Mr. Kruger provided information about the implementation requirements, which are segmented into two paths. Path A is trial courts using JIS as the primary system as of April 4, 2014, which is the proviso date. Those courts will have to comply with the data standards on the date they leave JIS. Path B is trial courts not using JIS as of April 4, 2014. Those courts are required to continue sending data to the statewide system at the same level as they were on that date.

Ms. Miner noted that she had spoken to Ms. Yolande Williams, who was appreciative of the changes made, however it shows that this document is still a work in progress. Judge Wynne asked what it was about the implementation plan that was still a work in progress. Ms. Miner stated that the courts’ letter is specific to the standards, and the implementation plan was seen for the first time on October 3, 2014.

Mr. Kruger noted that Pierce County uses a mix of electronic and manual data entry, as they implemented 6 of the superior court data exchanges.

Ms. Cullinane noted that Spokane Municipal Court came to the JISC requesting, under Rule 13, to go onto their own system, and were told that they would proceed at their own risk, and that they would have to manually enter their data into JIS.

Mr. Palomino stated that his objection to the standards is because they don’t have enough detail, and they have changed recently. His court is trying to figure out how to communicate the data elements to AOC. There has not been enough time to figure out whether it makes sense for them and what aspects are applicable. Ms. Aimee Vance asked, since King County District Court doesn’t even have a system yet, how would he know the timeframe required for passing the data standards? Mr. Palomino replied that they are currently working on the business

DRAFT

requirements for their system. The implementation plan will impact their new system, and has very little to do with their current usage areas.

Justice Fairhurst explained that by taking out the phased implementation plan, it gives time to get SC-CMS up and the CLJ-CMS immediately after. Those who don't use the statewide system, we've agreed, can have alternative electronic court record systems, but they must send their data to the statewide system. Currently, we have the ability to get data from those courts with alternative systems through SCOMIS and DISCIS. SCOMIS and DISCIS will not be turned off until the new statewide systems are complete. The standards are helpful because they identify the baseline information needed from courts choosing alternative systems.

Part of Justice Fairhurst's concern is that AOC has been directed and funded to do the SC-CMS project, and CLJ's are fighting for attention for a new CMS as well. The time spent focusing on courts with alternative systems is taking away from these projects. AOC must be able to work on what has been adopted and prioritized by the JISC. As a body, we need to make a decision and go forward, recognizing that we will continue to work under the implementation plan as written, and hopefully as adopted, trying to take into consideration all of the concerns. But first the projects must get done. A statewide solution will be provided that courts can choose or not choose. Justice Fairhurst remains hopeful that those choosing the alternative systems will decide to come back to the statewide system. It was the goal to serve all courts, counties, and cities. As a body, a decision must be made in order to get on with the work that AOC has been tasked with.

Ms. Miner doesn't believe the JISC made a purposeful decision to deprioritize data exchange, but that is what happened. There was never a vote to make that decision. Ms. Miner also does not think that Pierce and Spokane Counties are okay with duplicate data entry, and they fall into that exemption from previously being off the system. Spokane Municipal Court, King County Clerk's Office, King County Superior Court, King County District Court, Pierce County Superior Court, and the DMCJA are asking the JISC to not pass the standards because they are not ready.

Ms. Vance disagreed with Ms. Miner's assertion that the JISC did not make a purposeful decision to deprioritize data exchange. The JISC clearly prioritized the CLJ-CMS over the Seattle Municipal Data Exchange. Ms. Vance also noted that there has not even been an IT Governance request for a statewide data exchange.

Mr. Johnson said his largest concern is that we will move forward with another case management system on the heels of the SC-CMS, and we will be left with the data exchange issue. We are doubling our problems if we go forward with another system before we resolve the lack of ability to exchange data. When there is a large portion of constituents stating that they are uncomfortable moving forward at the rate we are trying to progress, it is not in our best interest to ignore that. This is a prescription for failure at the highest level, and it forms an "us vs. them" attitude. Mr. Johnson is supportive of the standards and of the effort, but this is so critical that taking more time to vet the document would be beneficial.

Judge Dalton disagreed with Mr. Johnson's perspective that a large part of constituents have concerns. Three counties out of 39 counties is relatively small. Those three counties may have a larger share of data, but they are not a large part of the constituents and they have opted not to use the statewide solution. Judge Dalton's concern is providing standards and certainty for all of the counties in the state; they are the constituents. Judge Dalton does not believe that we should delay the approval of standards simply because the people that wrote the letter have

DRAFT

made their own decisions not to utilize the state system and have concerns about how they are going to get the data into JIS. The only objection they have is with double data entry, and are not objecting to the electronic transmission of any of the data. It is also difficult to meaningfully address the issues being raised when we are handed this letter during the meeting.

Mr. Bob Taylor commented that as far as standards continuing to evolve, they will always change and it is time to either vote them up or down.

Judge Larson agreed with Mr. Johnson, and disagreed with Judge Dalton's statement, indicating that the DMCJA Board opposes the standards, and they represent over 200 courts. Judge Alicea-Galvan clarified that the DMCJA Board does not oppose the standards. The standards were sent to the DMCJA Board for comment, and the board's vote was split as to whether they should request a delay of the JISC vote on the standards. Judge Alicea-Galvan was tasked to inform the JISC of the request to delay the decision, but it was not an overwhelming vote to ask for a delay.

Ms. Miner noted that the five courts that wrote the letter together comprise approximately 50% of the data statewide. The letter explicitly urges the JISC not to adopt the standards, and it specifically stated the only issue is not just the "how"; there are other issues here. The standards sweep in the CLJ's, which was not part of the proviso. The data transmission issue is the largest source of current and future problems.

Ms. Dietz stated that the standards were never meant to polarize the courts, but we must get to a place of action and we have invested several years into the standards. It is inaccurate to state that these standards have been rushed and dropped on individuals. The issues have been worked on in a number of different ways for years, and that will not change. Once the standards are passed, they will still evolve and be a work in progress, but we must start somewhere. Ms. Dietz also noted that other states with decentralized case management systems are moving to statewide case management systems. We should not make the assumption that there will always be counties that don't use the statewide system. Ms. Dietz urged adoption of the standards because it gives us a baseline to move forward and see how the case management systems roll out.

Ms. McAleenan noted that there is a budget proviso that requires standards to be developed. Even though it only specifies superior courts, legislators have made it very clear that this proviso will extend to all courts. Given Mr. Radwan's comments about the budget environment we are moving into, it would not be in our collective best interest to go into the next legislative session without having standards. Ms. McAleenan noted that Ms. Miner's preference for a six month delay would push us to April 2015, which is when the Legislature will adjourn. Personal experience with the legislators indicates that waiting could adversely impact us as a whole.

Ms. Delilah George agreed that standards will never be perfect, but as long as we can modify them, it makes sense. Courts have to have this document as a guide if they are even considering not using the statewide system.

Mr. Johnson stated that there has been a tremendous effort, but he believes the standards are incomplete. If the requirement for manual data entry was removed, and changed to electronic data transfer, the tenor of the discussion would be different. Mr. Johnson said this is the point of opposition, and removing that requirement may bridge the gap.

Judge Dalton made a combined motion to approve the data standards and implementation plan, which was seconded by Ms. Dietz. Judge Leach moved to divide the decisions so the data

DRAFT

standards were voted on before the implementation plan, which was taken as a friendly amendment.

Motion: Judge Jeanette Dalton

I move to approve the Data Standards for Alternative Electronic Court Record Systems as written.

Second: Ms. Callie Dietz

Voting in Favor: Justice Fairhurst, Larry Barker, Chief Berg, Judge Dalton, Callie Dietz, Delilah George, Judge Heller, Judge Leach, Brooke Powell, Robert Taylor, Jon Tunheim, Aimee Vance, Judge Wynne
Opposed: Rich Johnson, Barb Miner
Absent: Yolande Williams, Judge Rosen

Judge Harn stated that adopting the implementation plan will limit courts choosing an alternative system from having other methods of transmitting the data other than manual entry. Justice Fairhurst replied that the intention was for alternative courts to continue providing baseline information through the same method that they originally provided information. This will not freeze courts into a system, but to ensure the information will continue to be received. Judge Harn is concerned that by agreeing to the implementation plan, that courts will not have problems solved through technology. This hinders the state from moving forward in a positive way. Judge Harn urged the JISC to delay accepting the implementation plan.

Mr. Marler stated that by continuing to divert AOC resources for courts with alternative systems, it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy: the state will not be able to implement a statewide system any time soon. Chasing individual implementations for any county will prevent us from finalizing a statewide system. This is a backdoor way of reprioritizing data exchange first. The JISC has already made the decisions, and has not changed them, but if we delay implementation of the standards until the build out of data exchanges, it will be the net effect. Mr. Marler explained that there must be a method to input data into the system. Judge Harn responded that if the JISC allowed for the type of data exchange that already exists with Seattle Municipal Court, courts with alternative systems would be comfortable with the implementation.

Justice Fairhurst clarified that courts choosing alternative systems would not be precluded from inputting data. Judge Leach explained that Seattle Municipal Court is not providing a complete set of data, so they will receive a “pass”, and King County District Court will be required to provide all of the data points, and need a data transfer method beyond what is available. Referring to Mr. Marler’s statement, Judge Leach questioned whether or not the case management systems should be in place first, and then develop the tools to allow for the electronic transmission of information from the alternative systems, or vice versa.

Motion: Judge Jeanette Dalton

I move to approve the Implementation Plan for Alternative Electronic Court Record Systems as written.

Second: Ms. Callie Dietz

DRAFT

Voting in Favor: Justice Fairhurst, Larry Barker, Chief Berg, Judge Dalton, Callie Dietz, Delilah George, Judge Heller, Brooke Powell, Robert Taylor, Jon Tunheim, Aimee Vance, Judge Wynne
Opposed: Rich Johnson, Barb Miner, Judge Leach
Absent: Yolande Williams, Judge Rosen

ITG #2 - SC-CMS Update

Ms. Maribeth Sapinoso provided an update on the SC-CMS project to the JISC. Ms. Sapinoso began with the most recent project activities including the DMS responses received, from all the counties implementing Odyssey, as of October 24, 2014: total of 33 counties responded (12 Odyssey DMS, 11 Link Only, 5 Lack of Agreement, 5 Undecided, and awaiting 4 counties to respond). A more current map reflecting these updates was provided to the members. Two monthly Project Steering Committee meetings occurred since the September 5, 2014 JISC meeting of which some major decision occurred not mentioned in the presentation slides. Cowlitz County's request to be an early adopter site was placed in reserved status by the Project Steering Committee should an existing early adopter should withdraw. The Project Steering Committee agreed that there was no need at this time to add another early adopter to minimize any further project related risks. Ms. Sapinoso indicated just returning from the ACCIS conference that went really well especially the demonstration of Odyssey Case Manager, Document Management System, and Judge Edition at the project's booth. The project team also provided technical specifications for these modules at the conference. Last, the project had a recent meeting with Thurston County's 3rd Party Vendor support (Liberty - Techline Communications) to address the schedule and high level design for the Link Option. The proof of concept for the Link Only solution has been developed by the AOC and is up and running and will be provided to Techline. Ms. Diseth has also been in contact with LaserFiche. Meanwhile, the project continues to work with Lewis County in preparation for training and reviewing of person and case data converted in Odyssey.

INH Update:

Mr. Dan Belles, Project Manager, provided a status update on the INH/SC-CMS Integration Project. Mr. Belles began by reviewing a high level diagram of the INH/SC-CMS integration solution. Mr. Belles stated that the primary components of the integration effort included party data and case data replication between Odyssey and JIS. Mr. Belles stated that there were other integration efforts underway including the Document Management System (DMS) integration with Odyssey. Judge Leach asked if Tyler would be using the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) for its application interfaces in Odyssey to send case data. Mr. Belles stated that Tyler would not be using NIEM for case data replication, but that INH could receive the Odyssey case messages using standard XML. Judge Leach also asked if the INH would be using NIEM to exchange data with other case management systems in the future. Mr. Belles stated that decision on whether to NIEM in the future needed to be discussed and was currently being considered by AOC. Vonnie Diseth stated that there was no formal policy requiring NIEM and that AOC would be looking into whether NIEM would be a standard going forward.

Mr. Belles then provided an update on recent project activities. Mr. Belles stated that the party data replication design was taking longer than expected and was projected to be completed by January 31st, instead of the end of October as originally planned. Mr. Belles also stated that Tyler had made good progress with the case data replication builds and that they would be delivering 90% of the code by the end of October. Mr. Belles stated that the remaining builds for case and party would be delivered in mid-January.

DRAFT

Mr. Belles then provided an update on the project schedule and stated that a new timeline was developed to show the party data replication and case data replication work being completed by the end of January in time for the Pilot Court Go Live early in February. Mr. Belles stated that the target was to have the party data replication solution ready for UAT and integration testing by January 31st even though the schedule showed March, which includes a two month contingency. Mr. Belles stated that there was significant complexity in replicating the data between JIS and Odyssey, due to differences in the way each system handled person business rules. Mr. Belles stated that one example was the way each system handled aliases. Mr. Belles stated that the differences were making the final design for party data replication more challenging and time consuming.

Mr. Belles then reviewed current project risks and issues and the associated mitigation strategies. Mr. Belles stated that there were three main areas of risk that were being mitigated: interdependent projects, case data replication with Odyssey and DMS integration with Odyssey. Mr. Belles continued by saying that the primary issue outstanding involved the delay in coming up with the design for the party data replication solution. Mr. Belles stated that the issue was being addressed by having Tyler resources assist and getting more business analysts and developers involved. Mr. Belles concluded by reviewing the next steps in the project planned over the next several months.

JIS Priority Project Updates

ITG 45 AC-ECMS

Mr. Martin Kravik presented a status update on the AC-ECMS project. He reported that the Functional Specification was accepted by AOC on August 18, 2014.

Two contract amendments resulted from the Functional Specification activity. The first was a licensing adjustment. The second, which was planned for in the contract, updated the project schedule. System configuration will occur in four iterations rather than one. The projected end date moved to September 2015. Neither amendment resulted in additional contract cost.

Iteration A – Base System and Document Structure, modifications to the eFiling process, and requirements analysis for JIS Link/Appellate Court Data are all underway.

Each configuration iteration consists of system configuration, training, and user acceptance testing.

Next steps include finalization of Iteration A, starting Iteration B – WorkView and Associated Workflows, and starting the document conversion set of activities.

ITG 102/174: CLJ - CMS

Mr. Michael Walsh presented the project update on the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction Case Management System (CLJ-CMS) project. Recent activities included the shift of focus from the project planning to the requirement gathering activities. On October 24th we finished our fourth meeting and there are noticeable improvements in efficiency following each one. The current state requirement gathering is scheduled for completion in January 2015 with the future state requirements on schedule to start in February 2015.

The creation of the Inside Courts web site has been delayed due to non-project resource availability. Once resources can be freed up the project team will continue to work on making

DRAFT

CLJ-CMS status, presentations, CUWG and other pertinent documents available for Inside Courts users.

The final project planning documents, Organizational Change Management, Communications, and Quality Assurance have been approved. This marks the completion of the planning activities on the project schedule.

ITG 41: CLJ Revised Computer Records Retention Destruction Process

Ms. Kate Kruller, ITG 41 Project Manager, updated the JISC on project activity. Ms. Kruller reported that the project team planned to begin the pilot courts implementation in January 2015, but resource constraints have caused the schedule to slide downstream. Ms. Kruller continued by stating that project's sole testing resource was reassigned to support other projects beginning in late October. The ITG 41 Project is ready to utilize a test resource any time it comes available at AOC.

The ITG 41 Project is currently working with AOC management to identify an alternate resource or a method of completing the test work. The Project Manager will keep the JISC, Project Steering Committee and Pilot Courts apprised of the situation as new information becomes available.

Committee Report

Data Dissemination Committee:

Redacting Names in JIS Based on Court Order.

Mr. Baner presented his client's issue to the Committee and requested that her name be redacted to initials in the JIS database and on the AOC public search case records website. The Committee unanimously voted to deny Mr. Baner's request.

DSHS-CA Request for Case Type 7s.

DSHS-Children's Administration is requesting access to case type 7s in the JIS database. The DDC wants to grant the access and requested AOC staff provide information at the next meeting on how the account should be setup to allow it. Staff is also to review how the AGO is set-up for dependencies and report back to the Committee.

JABS Access for Prosecutors/Public Defenders.

The DDC voted unanimously to allow all public defenders, prosecutors, and their staff access to JABS. AOC staff is to report back at the next meeting about providing the access with JIS-Link IDs. In the meantime, access will continue to be provided by court-maintained RACFIDs.

Public Access to Accounting Data in JIS for Data Dissemination Requests.

The Committee would like to develop a policy on how financial data in the JIS database is disseminated for non-court requests. Ms. Miner, Ms. Vance and Data Dissemination Administrator Stephanie Happold are to begin a draft policy and present it at the next meeting.

RACFID Training.

DRAFT

The Committee discussed developing a training for Court Administrators and Clerks on RACFID set-up, use, maintenance and data confidentiality. AOC staff is to continue working on the draft PowerPoint presentation for the next meeting and to schedule the presentation for the upcoming Court Administrators and Clerks' trainings.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Justice Fairhurst at 2:05 pm

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be December 5, 2014, at the AOC SeaTac Facility; from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Recap of Motions from October 24, 2014

Motion Summary	Status
I move to amend proposed section 10.2 to adopt language proposed by Barb Miner, minus the word "local" in the second paragraph, and add a sentence exempting the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction from the policy.	Failed
I move to amend proposed section 10.2 to adopt language proposed by Barb Miner, minus the word "local" in the second paragraph.	Passed
I move to amend the JIS General Policies, as indicated in the attached draft, with the amended section 10.2.	Passed
I move to not amend JISC Rule 13, and keep Rule 13 as currently written.	Failed
I move to recommend the proposed Rule 13 to the Supreme Court on an expedited basis.	Passed
I move to approve the incorporated data standards as written in the Alternative Electronic Court Record Systems.	Passed
I move to approve the implementation plan as written in the Alternative Electronic Court Record Systems.	Passed

Action Items

	Action Item – From October 7, 2011 Meeting	Owner	Status
1	Confer with the BJA on JISC bylaw amendment regarding JISC communication with the Legislature.	Justice Fairhurst	

DRAFT

	Action Item – From September 5, 2014 Meeting		
2	Find out whether individual persons' SSNs are needed for the bank account process superior courts use on the BAA and BAS screens	Vicky Cullinane	

DRAFT