<div align="center">

APPROVED MINUTES
JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE
October 26, 2007, 10:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
SeaTac Facility, SeaTac, WA

</div>

Members Present:
Justice Bobbe Bridge, Chair
Judge C. Kenneth Grosse, Vice Chair
    (via telephone)
Justice Mary Fairhurst
Mr. Greg Banks (via telephone)
Chief Robert Berg
Ms. Cathy Grindle
Judge Glenna Hall
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson
Mr. Richard Johnson
Mr. Marc Lampson
Mr. N. A. "Butch" Stussy
Judge Michael Trickey, Ex Officio
Ms. Siri Woods
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

Members Absent:
Judge James Heller
Judge Clifford L. Stilz
Ms. Yolande Williams

Staff Present:
Ms. Denise Dzuck
Mr. Jeff Hall
Ms. Suzanne Hellman
Mr. Manuel Najarro
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Mr. Gregg Richmond

Guests Present:
Mr. Richard Flowerree, Garter Consulting
Mr. Allen Meyer, LT Court Tech
Ms. Barb Miner, King County Clerk
Mr. Sunder Singh, Tata Consultancy Services

CALL TO ORDER

Justice Bridge called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m., and introductions were made. Justice Bridge then introduced Justice Mary Fairhurst who will replace Justice Bridge as Chair of the Committee effective January 1, 2008.

Justice Fairhurst stated that while she has some big shoes to fill in taking Justice Bridge's place, she is looking forward to the challenges and opportunities that are before the Committee.

Motion: A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously carried to approve the June 8, 2007 and June 29, 2007 meeting minutes as written.

JIS ROADMAP PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT – Gartner Consulting

Rich Flowerree stated this assessment focused on the following three areas: Core Case Management, Data Management, and Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Organization and Staffing.

Mr. Flowerree indicated that while the Core Case Management (CMS) area is being rated as high risk, it needs to be put in context – in view of the events and changes in schedules and issues which have taken place, Gartner feels this is not an unexpected rating and it does not lessen Gartner's feeling the project will be successful.

Some of the significant milestones for the JIS Roadmap projects are:

 ➢ The SharePoint project repository deployment was late but is now in place.
 ➢ The business process engineering (BPE) activities were completed and 275 gaps were identified and documented. Gartner received a lot of positive feedback from court staff, clerks, and the AOC. All felt the vendor was well prepared and had a good understanding of Washington courts and the processes. The preview scheduled for November should show how well the system addresses those gaps.

- All courts have completed pre-implementation surveys that includes where each court prefers to be implemented. Sixty-six courts have indicated they want to be in the first phase of implementation. This suggests courts are enthusiastic and supportive of the project.
- The initial Probation Case Management and Juvenile Detention Module activities were completed. Although the effort identified a potential solution, pricing of the off-the-shelf product are cost prohibitive. This means the current Juvenile and Corrections System (JCS) will continue to serve the courts until a replacement system is available.

Gartner's overall findings regarding the JIS Roadmap projects are that Tata Consultancy Services (TCS) and LT Court Tech are performing well and are fully committed to the project. However, the vendor team notified the AOC last week that they felt they would not be able to deliver the system to the specifications of the Washington courts by the current scheduled date of December 31, 2007. Jeff Hall will address the new timetable later in the meeting. Sending AOC staff to TCS was well worth the effort and has helped jump start the vendor in terms of understanding the Washington courts. Data cleanup and conversion is an area that needs close monitoring, although the new timetable may alleviate some issues with data cleanup.

In response to questions about the 275 gaps, Manny Najarro reported that the gaps are across all court levels, touch all current JIS systems today, and are a combination of what can be done now and what the courts want the system to do. The court users participated in additional workshops this week and separated these gaps into two groups – what has to be there and what would be nice to have, but not now. At the workshops, the court users concluded that only 41 of the 275 gaps were "below the line" meaning they cannot realistically be included at the present time. The remaining gaps will be included in the new CMS.

Allen Meyer of LT Court Tech further explained that in reviewing the list, they found that quite a few gaps were included more than once because the list was across all court levels. Therefore, they combined duplicates into one gap. The list was then run through four filters: 1) is it a product requirement to file or manage a case?; 2) is there a statute that said it had to be there?; 3) was it included in the Request for Proposal (RFP) or BPE process?; and; 4) does common sense just say it should be there?

Mr. Flowerree continued that Gartner's recommendations for the CMS Project all focus on implementation. Recommendations include:

- Define specific exit criteria for the design and development phase.
- Define specific entrance requirements for system implementation.
- It is strongly recommended that the number of courts implemented in the first phase be limited—don't rush to failure.
- Plan a post implementation assessment of the initial courts to ensure the application is providing the envisioned functionality and that the BPE activities are effective.
- Ensure end-user support is in place (help desk, documentation, etc.) and validated before system rollout activities begin.
- Aggressively manage the implementation schedule and all its moving parts on a daily basis.
- Move with caution regarding the Probation Case Management and Juvenile Detention Module activities until the CMS implementation is well underway and the process stabilized.
- Aggressively manage the budget to avoid cost overruns and scope creep.

Mr. Flowerree rated Data Management as a medium risk. Data Management activities have stalled due to the reallocation of AOC resources to support CMS. The successful implementation and use of the new CMS hinges on the ability to share and exchange data with local legacy court applications. Without validated data exchanges in place, the implementation of the CMS is at risk. Efforts need to focus on clarifying what will and will not be provided for data exchanges, who will be expected to do what, how it will be funded, and when will the exchanges be completed. The courts need to inventory all screen scraping applications and identify what is needed to develop interfaces necessary for the data exchanges.

Reporting on the AOC Organization and Staffing, Mr. Flowerree rated this key area at high risk. This is due to the resignation of two key staff members: the Information Services Division (ISD) Director and the Data Exchange and Reconstruction Manager. The AOC hired Mr. Gregg Richmond as the Deputy Director for Integration. Mr. Richmond has come up to speed quickly and is committed to ensuring the AOC delivers a quality product to the courts. Gartner is concerned about the Program Management Office (PMO) faltering. The result of this is that the AOC has no standardized processes, tools, or policies to oversee, assess, and manage projects. Although the team appears to be picking up the slack, this is a significant risk to implementation of the CMS and data exchanges. It is recommended, in addition to filling vacant positions as soon as possible, that communication regarding the CMS and Data Management be closely monitored to ensure communication channels are open and a consistent message is provided.

Mr. Flowerree concluded his report by stating the overall rating of the project has moved from a medium-low to a medium-high risk. Although the projects face a number of significant issues, the components of the new CMS and data exchanges are coming together. Effective management is critical to the projects' overall success. November's activities (system validation, process engineering, etc.) will be the litmus test in terms of defining the implementation schedule. All parties need to ensure that there is no customization of the CMS and financial applications to meet court business process requirements unless the modifications will be made part of the vendor's core product set.

William Holmes stated that since the Probation Case Management and Detention Modules are being removed from the CMS that in order to accomplish the pre- and post-disposition supervision functions, these departments will need to create systems within their own locality, so it is important that the data exchange be part of the CMS to allow that to happen.

PROPOSED CMS PROJECT SCHEDULE REVISION

Jeff Hall stated there are four areas to address relating to Rich Flowerree's report.

AOC Organization and Staffing—Mr. Hall indicated he has a high degree of confidence in this area. Mr. Hall stated he is impressed with Mr. Gregg Richmond, noting Gregg's ability to come up to speed and earn the trust and respect of staff in a very short time frame. Mr. Hall then introduced Allen Meyer from LT Court Tech and Sunder Singh from TCS indicating his degree of confidence was heightened based on their abilities as well.

Project Schedule—Over the last several weeks internal discussions have taken place regarding the project schedule. The conclusion of these internal discussions is that the

project schedule needs to move. TCS and LT Court Tech worked to develop a proposed revision to the project schedule.

The original completion date was December 31, 2007. While there was a consensus that a product could be delivered on December 31, there was also agreement that the product would not be satisfactory to the Courts or LT Court Tech. On a number of other tracks, the AOC and courts would be severely pushed to attain that date. The proposal to re-baseline the project is the result of these factors.

Mr. Hall explained that the original schedule included workshops in November for court users to provide a thorough review of the product. The current plan is to conduct workshops more frequently, focused on iterative developments in the product to allow for minor corrections.

Rigorous integration and user testing will begin in March and be completed in May 2008. The testing would be on two levels. One is to load the product in the AOC's test environment and have the technicians run it through its paces in terms of load; integration across the different systems, etc. Following that, the AOC will schedule beta testing workshops where users come in and try to break the system and find any bugs. The implementation phase will begin May 15, 2008.

Justice Bridge stated the Executive Committee met earlier this week via a conference call to review the Gartner report and discuss the issues raised. The Executive Committee agreed that an adjusted schedule was necessary and requested the AOC and the vendors work together to come up with a conservative and realistic schedule since this will be a one-time continuance.

N. F. Jackson stated that data exchange published application program interfaces (APIs) are absolutely necessary for some of the courts to be able to commit to an implementation schedule. Is it contemplated that those APIs will be available to the courts between now and May 15? Mr. Hall responded that before the project can move forward on any of the data exchange pieces, the data model must be locked down. Allen Meyer responded this should happen by next Monday.

Gregg Richmond stated the AOC needs to determine what the requirements are for each court and how the courts use the data. Mr. Hall added the AOC has an inventory of needs at the functional level but needs an inventory at the data level for each court.

Rich Johnson added that the data management part of this project is behind schedule, and it is acknowledged this is a major issue. This revised schedule will go a long way to ensure this work can be completed. There are more processes than the APIs that will be available for use (generic data exchanges, queries against the data warehouse), and the Data Management Steering Committee is trying to figure out all the possible ways available to meet the needs of the courts.

Butch Stussy stated for the record that Randy McKown is the official source for data exchange information.

Justice Bridge added the Executive Committee requested the AOC provide one source for each subject matter so the information disseminated is consistent.

Jeff Hall went on to say that a custom system is not desirable and cautioned the committee to fight the temptation, the demand, the requests, and the pleas. The committee will need to discuss at a future date how change requests will be handled

since the AOC is now working with a vendor as opposed to owning the system. The licensing agreement with LT Court Tech provides for two things: one is the set number of hours at no cost to make changes in the system required to be in place because of legislation; the other is a set amount of hours at a specified cost for system changes at our request. But care needs to be taken in the future that it does not become a customized system.

Mr. Meyer added that LT Court Tech will be forming user groups representing its customers to develop a process for dealing with requests for enhancements as their product matures. As a key customer, Washington courts will be part of this endeavor.

N. F. Jackson stated it was his understanding that version 1 would be implemented in all courts before version 1.1 became available (Butch Stussy concurred). However, there will be some CMS-wide features, and there will be locally-configurable features which will provide for some of the flexibility for the more sophisticated user or those with a different business need.

Greg Banks asked, as a matter of project management, if there is something in place to have a change board that will serve as a filter, stop, or place to consider the change requests that will come in from the various courts, and then ultimately determine which requests would be passed onto the vendor. Cathy Grindle responded that the Core CMS Steering Committee would probably be a good source for filtering the change requests.

Jeff Hall responded that intensive efforts have been taken to make sure the needed requirements are in place, and at this point in the project, the requirements need to be frozen. One reason is so the vendor can meet the revised date. If more changes are requested between now and that date; it will not be met.

Jeff Hall reported the original budget plan was for $29 million; however, the rules regarding the Certificate of Participation (COP) funding place a limit on the ratio of software to hardware financed. There are not enough hardware purchases planned to allow for the total $9.0 million of COP funding originally planned. Based on expected hardware purchases, the amount of COP funding available will not exceed $7.6 million. The JIS Roadmap budget has been adjusted to reflect this change. The new budget plan for this biennia is $26 million, which means we will need to manage the budget aggressively. The primary adjustments are to purchase the LT Court Tech licenses incrementally; to use broadband/VPN connections for courts that sit outside of local government networks; and, to reduce the budget for the Help Desk software.

Mr. Hall explained that in addition to revising the schedule, there will be an adjustment to the contract amount with our partners. The proposal is an increase to $5.875 million which is an $800,000 increase. A lot of this increase is to accommodate data migration issues unforeseen at the beginning of the project. It is anticipated additional contracts will be entered into with our current partners during the testing phase for assistance with the implementations.

Justice Bridge stated the Executive Committee approved the changes presented by Mr. Hall.

CMS PHASE I RECOMMENDATIONS

Cathy Grindle reviewed the CMS Phase I Recommendations. Page 1 is the original proposal to the JISC for the courts being implemented in Phase I. Since that time, a

survey was sent out to the 70 courts that indicated they wanted to be implemented in Phase I. Sixty-six courts responded, and the results are on page 2. Only 25 of those courts passed the assessment without any conditions, and eight of those courts were on the original recommended list. Of the courts on the original list that passed with conditions, most of the conditions revolved around data exchange. Data exchange is critical. Electronic Ticket Processing is a problem, because the courts don't want to go back to the manual way of processing tickets. Page 3 is a recommendation from the AOC for 20 courts that have no conditions and cross all court levels.

What the Committee is proposing is that the AOC's list of 20 courts on page 3 and the courts listed on page 2 be combined into one list for the Phase I rollout of the new CMS. The Committee is asking that any of these courts be considered, and to allow the AOC to put together the most logical geographic combination so training labs can be used. As data exchange becomes more viable, the APIs become available, and the conditions disappear, those courts with conditions could move into the queue for implementation.

Motion: After thorough discussion, Justice Bridge entertained a motion to approve consideration of the courts on pages 2 and 3 of the Core Case management Steering Committee's recommendation for Phase I implementations, adding that it would then be up to the AOC staff, in consultation with the Core CMS Steering Committee, as to how those courts are rolled out. Cathy Grindle so moved; Chief Berg seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Cathy Grindle stated communication is critical at this point. The 66 courts that responded to the assessment were all sent a report for the data they need to clean up. It's imperative the rest of the courts are notified to not undo the changes these courts have been making and to start fixing data that is incorrect.

Justice Bridge added this was discussed in the Executive Committee conference call yesterday, and there needs to be a plan that is more proactive and focused for exactly what this communication is going to contain.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Data Dissemination Committee

Judge Hall reported the Data Dissemination Committee approved amendments to GR 22 for recommendation to the JISC to take into consideration the new requirements of the family law bill SSB 5470 regarding access to JIS records considered by a judicial officer regarding parenting plans. The Committee is also continuing to discuss the federal Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) issues and the broader issues it encompasses.

Data Management Steering Committee

Rich Johnson stated that at the last Data Management Steering Committee meeting, the Committee agreed to develop a survey to be distributed to courts to gather information regarding what data elements are used and how they are used in terms of future data exchange requirements. This will be a committee priority for the next two months.

OTHER BUSINESS

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.