

MINUTES
JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE
June 27, 2008, 09:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
SeaTac Office Center, SeaTac, WA

Members Present:

Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Judge C. Kenneth Grosse, Vice Chair
Mr. Robert Berg
Ms. Cathy Grindle
Judge Glenna Hall
Judge James Heller
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson
Mr. Richard Johnson
Judge Glenn Phillips
Judge Michael Trickey (Ex-Officio)
Ms. Siri Woods

Guests Present:

Mr. Larry Barker
Ms. Leah Ennis
Mr. Chris Shambro
Mr. Kyle Snowden
Mr. Chris Wagner

Staff Present:

Mr. Jeff Hall
Mr. Gregg Richmond
Ms. Ronee Parsons
Ms. Denise Dzuck

Members Absent:

Judge James Heller
Mr. Marc Lampson
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

CALL TO ORDER

Justice Mary Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 09:00 a.m., and introductions were made.

Motion: Approval of the June 6, 2008 meeting minutes as written.

Justice Fairhurst asked Mr. Jeff Hall to provide an update on the RFP process.

Mr. Jeff Hall said that he had met with Mr. John Bell to look at the RFP, and where they were in that process. He said that he was not sure that abandoning the process at that point would get them anywhere any quicker than continuing with it. He said the responses were due on Tuesday, July 2 and they would announce a successful vendor on July 9. He said they could have the vendor on board by July 21. He said that it was already an aggressive schedule and they could work with the vendor on the result date, earlier than August 8, but he did not think they could go a different route and get a quicker result.

Justice Fairhurst said that if there were no objections then they would continue and look to have a meeting in July. She said she could look at moving her morning meeting to the afternoon to make room for the JISC meeting on July 25.

Mr. Richmond asked if they could have two meetings in August since the contract would end on August 8. He said one would be with the results from the vendor and the other would be the budget meeting.

Justice Fairhurst said that made more sense to her.

Mr. Hall suggested that they have a meeting on August 8.

PEER REVIEW (see: *Peer Review Group PowerPoint*)

Mr. Richmond said that he had spoken with: Ed Torentino of DIS, Sam Kurle of Seattle Municipal, David Martinez of King County, Leah Ennis, Rob St. John of DSHS, and Bill Kehoe of DOL. He said that he asked them to look at the information presented and asked them how they would make a decision. He said that the consensus of his peers was to 'Modernize and Integrate'.

Mr. Hall asked where the 'high business value' for the customer was.

Mr. Richmond said that 'Modernize and Integrate' was a high business value because it would allow them to add functionality, Service Enable, and bundle services.

He said they believed it was not cost prohibitive.

Judge Kenneth Grosse said if they wanted to 'modernize and integrate' to get a case management system, it was not going to happen. He said they would have to write it at some point.

Mr. Rich Johnson said that the 'modernize and integrate' was the short-term strategy under the assumption that 'modernize and integrate' would make replacing one of the systems possible. He said staff at the appellate level thought that rewriting might have been the best solution. He said that he did not want to throw those out as their long-term strategy to say that rewriting and replacing might be part of their long-term strategy but the modernizing and integration piece needed to go first.

Justice Fairhurst said that what she heard from Mr. Richmond as the recommendation was to modernize and integrate.

Judge Glenna Hall said that earlier Mr. Richmond said the applications were too interdependent and part of the process was going to be decoupling applications. Mr. Richmond said that was true.

Mr. Richmond said that the information provided was the 'what', not 'how' they were going to do it. He said that was how they were going to proceed from where they were and what they were proposing.

Judge Grosse said there were going to be many 'next steps'.

Ms. Yolande Williams asked how there would be low user impact under 'modernize and integrate'.

Mr. Richmond said that he received a comment from Sam Kurle that he needed to make sure that user's did not expect any increase in functionality during the next 18 months. He said they might receive some but they were not to expect any. He said they believed there would be no impact to the users.

Ms. Siri Woods said she thought Ms. Williams meant there would be an impact to the user if they could not request changes.

Mr. Richmond said that he had not looked at it in that manner.

Mr. Hall said that for the short term, there would be low user impact and business value, but long term there would be high business value and presumably high user, positive impact.

Judge Grosse said there were many strategic decisions underneath that the committee would have to address.

Mr. Johnson said they were not making the decisions about how they were going to deal with the other applications. He said they were gaining a new baseline that would enable them to adopt strategies for each application instead of one strategy to fit all.

Justice Fairhurst said they were positioning themselves and getting the pieces in place so that when the decisions were made they would be able to make them work.

Mr. N.F. Jackson said that he wanted to support Ms. Williams' comment. He said they had received the list of enhancements and he thought some of them could not wait 18 months. He said that if they voted for 'modernize and integrate', then he still wanted the enhancements 'on the table'.

Ms. Woods said she wanted to know what they meant by 'integrate'.

Mr. Richmond said that it would be adding something to an application.

Justice Fairhurst said they needed to ensure that the committee knew the meaning of all the terms being used.

Mr. Richmond talked about the 'Enterprise Architecture' program and that it would establish what needed to go where. He said they also might want to translate 'Natural' code to 'Cobol' code because the cost of Natural was \$300,000 a year. He added that they might want to rewrite in 'Cobol' because it would be easier to extract data and use it as a service. He said Gartner had recommended that in 2005.

Mr. Richmond said the committee wanted AOC to hire an 'Enterprise Data Architect', which they did, but they had no architecture. He said they needed to know; the standards, how to manage data going in and out, and how they would manage interactions between the AOC and all of the courts. He went on to say they wanted to implement a 'master data management solution' but the applications had been built and then tied together and they could not remove one from another because it would bring down the other applications. He said they wanted to create a 'master data management solution' so they could add or change information one time to all systems instead of individually.

Justice Fairhurst asked if there was a need for a 'Data Standards' Committee or was that something that could be done within the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC).

Mr. Richmond said that the peer group validated the recommendation of 'modernize and integrate'. He went on to provide comments from one of his peers that said; 1). The proposed option of migrate focuses on improving existing technology. However, as with many Legacy

Systems that were outdated and the feasibility to transform them beyond their original designs; the limitations might be problematic, risky, and inexpensive [KLS1]. 2). Strongly recommends that they qualify and quantify, at a high level, the objectives and expectations of what they believed were doable during the next 18 months related to the three deliverables outlined in the 'modernize and integrate' option. 3). Consider what business problems the AOC has, as well as what resources needed to be defined within the 18-month period. He added that since it was a technology capability, improvement proposal, he strongly recommended that they identify the business problems they believed could be successfully accomplished. 4). Recommend that the AOC proposal include long-term strategies and recommendations on how to accomplish the business needs of what the AOC/CMS project failed to do.

Mr. Hall clarified that the intent was not to sit on it for 18 months, but that it would be 18 months before they would be able to start implementing. He said AOC is working on vetting what new functionality it would pursue next and gathering requirements for that functionality with a feasibility study that would begin in January 2009. He said they would start moving towards and developing a picture of what they would do next, and would also be making decisions about priorities for enhancements to existing Legacy applications and functionality.

Judge Grosse said they might want to consider addressing case management at their next meeting so they were tracking where they knew they were going. He said they could say whether they needed an ad hoc Case Management Committee at that time.

FULL TIME EMPLOYEES (FTE) STAFFING REQUEST (see: *FTE PowerPoint*)

Mr. Richmond said the eleven FTEs were not to fill additional functions. He said the vast majority of the eleven were to cover additional tasks that they had taken on in the IS Division, where they had used another existing FTE. He said the cost would be around \$1.1 million. He added that they would not be able to hire the FTE's right away, even if the committee said they could. Mr. Richmond said:

- The first requested FTE (Policy Person / JISC Liaison) would assist him and the JISC in keeping them updated, as Mr. Richmond could not possibly keep them updated and run his division at the same time.
- The second FTE was a SharePoint/EPM Administrator. He said that SharePoint was a software that the IS had but he did not have anyone to run it.
- Numbers three and four were based on the committee's direction to 'stand up' the Project Management Office (PMO), which meant hiring Project Managers as well as a PMO Quality Lead (#5).
- He said in order to establish data exchange they needed another JAVA Developer, number six on the list.

He said that they needed someone to work under the 'Data Architecture' so they needed to hire an 'Application Database Administrator'. He added that there had been numerous requests for web applications in which they would need an additional 'Webmaster'. He said while they really needed several 'Testers', they were only asking for one.

Mr. Richmond went on to talk about budget information:

- They started with a \$46 million estimated revenue
- Carried forward from maintenance, last year (keeps the lights on in ISD) was \$18 million
- Infrastructure Startup was \$3.5 million, derived from the \$4.3 million (2/3 in the current Biennium and 1/3 in the next)
- The eleven positions were the \$1.1 million

- Approved Project budget of \$20 million of which they had spent \$11 million
- Local court replacement of hardware at \$1.9 million

He said the ending balance for that fiscal year was \$9.5 million, which would be carried over to the next biennium. He added that Ramsey Radwan believed that the revenue that the AOC would generate was \$34 million. He said the ending balance of \$10.9 million would be for projects through the next biennium.

Judge Grosse said that whether they needed the staff was one problem; the budget discussion was another huge problem. He said there were all kinds of assumptions that might or might not be valid and there were missing pieces, unless they had been funded somewhere else and that was how much the Court of Appeals was going to request for direct support. He added that he wanted to see the detailed budget document that went through the Office of Financial Management to the Legislative staff, and wanted to know where it went and what it was. He also said the Legislature appropriated the money for project purposes. He said they needed to figure out how to work it because the people Mr. Richmond was looking to hire were general maintenance staff, not project related staff.

Mr. Hall said that they had to justify the positions and the budget proviso would essentially be project money that they were spending. He said, as Mr. Richmond had explained, if they go back and look at the past couple of years and why they needed those positions, it was because they were 'robbing Peter to pay Paul'. Mr. Hall referred to a question Judge Grosse had regarding hiring within their authorized FTE level and he said that there were two answers to that; 1) yes they can, and 2) the FTE number was considered more of an advisory number, not a legally binding number.

Ms. Woods said that was the number one concern of the clerks. She said the clerks asked what happened to the staff that had been taken away from maintenance. She said they asked if the 11 people were due to attrition, and would they lose 11 people or did they move those people into new jobs and now they would need to go back and hire people to do what they did.

Judge Trickey asked if there was a set FTE authorization in ISD.

Mr. Hall said that there was an agency wide FTE level, which included Superior Court Judges. He said the FTE number was around 362.9.

Ms. Woods asked if they were asking for 11 more FTE's than the 362.9.

Mr. Hall said no. He said the 362.9 was the number used for calculation such as COLA increases. He said that they also calculated the number in terms of staff months. He said it was 362.9 times 12 units; so if he had a person on staff and counted them as 12 units and they left in September and that position was not filled until the following January then they picked up three months worth of unused FTE. He said that they could add the 11 staff to the agency and not exceed the FTE count that the Legislature used as their baseline. He said the FTE count was not in the Budget Bill so there was no legal barrier in exceeding that.

Justice Fairhurst said that it would be helpful to have a 'picture of ISD', which would show how many employees there were and what they did. She asked that someone go back a couple of years and find out what happened to the people that were doing maintenance. She added that she did not want to micro manage Mr. Richmond's shop but the committee did perform oversight and they needed to have base information from which they could make decisions.

Chief Robert Berg wanted to clarify that the 11 would replace or backfill for staff working on a current project. He asked if those were new staff that would be added to ISD.

Mr. Richmond said 'yes and no'. He said for instance, the Project Management Office (PMO) which IS had never had before, would be a new functionality. He said they also never had an Enterprise Architect or an Enterprise Data Architect. He said they were adding new programs and applications inside of their Web Development, which were not there before either.

Mr. Jackson said he supported the positions but wanted to ensure that they would be used in direct support of their case management and data management business needs.

Justice Fairhurst said she wanted a vote on their decision to 'modernize and integrate'.

Mr. Hall said that the 11 FTE's being requested were staff that Mr. Richmond felt they needed in order to keep functioning, regardless of what they did, going forward.

Mr. Jackson motioned to approve the 'modernize and integrate' proposal. Judge Grosse seconded the motion.

Mr. Jackson motioned to approve the top four positions on Mr. Richmond's FTE list, while they gather the information the committee asked for. Ms. Woods seconded the motion.

Justice Fairhurst asked if there was any discussion on the first motion of 'modernize and integrate'. **Motion approved.**

Justice Fairhurst asked if there was any discussion on the FTE motion.

Ms. Grindle said that 'SharePoint' was not going to benefit the courts.

Mr. Richmond said there was a bi-product of SharePoint that would benefit the court because the AOC would be able to allocate their resources properly.

Ms. Woods asked Mr. Richmond if he thought the first four on the FTE list were the most important for him. He said 'yes'.

Mr. Johnson asked what projects there were that needed to be managed.

Mr. Richmond said AOC had one Project Manager and there were three roadmap items that the committee approved that needed to be planned by Project Managers.

Justice Fairhurst said that by hiring the Project Managers, they would be in place when the projects were identified.

Mr. Johnson said that data exchange had been identified as a priority and number five on the FTE list was a 'Senior Integrator – Data Exchange Developer', which would be a part of data exchange. He asked if that position could be incorporated into the motion.

Mr. Hall said that the top four would be proposed hires for September, and in August they would proceed with other hires and the 'Senior Integrator' could go into that group.

Mr. Richmond said that he did not feel comfortable with 'going back to September 1997' and saying they had 'x' number of employees to do things. He said he had planned to have that there at the meeting, but it did not work out. He said he wanted to show; 1) the functions the employee performed, 2) what the industry 'best practices' said they should have, and 3) the relation to other state agencies with similar needs and requirements.

Justice Fairhurst and Judge Grosse both said 'no' to that.

Chief Berg offered an amendment to the FTE motion. He suggested funding one, two, three, and five. He said the reason he offered that was: 1) He just heard that the Project Managers would develop projects when they were identified and the committee had not identified very much between then and August. 2) He said that he did not want to be caught in 'you have already funded two Project Managers' and what they really needed was number five because that was a data integration thing.

Justice Fairhurst, seconded the motion.

Judge Grosse said he was a little uncomfortable with the FTE labeled as number one (Policy Person) in terms of who and what. He said he endorsed the concept of a position who works with the committee, but he did not want to be 'hemmed in' by the definition.

Justice Fairhurst asked for a motion to amend the FTE request. Two opposed.

Ms. Williams said that she wanted more detail tied to the positions. She said they needed to get better at being more accountable in supporting the recommendations that the AOC was making. She said she saw a continuation of the AOC practices of coming forward with recommendations without any accountability or tying the positions to anything specific.

Mr. Johnson said that he did not feel they had adequate background to approve at that point.

Justice Fairhurst tabled the motion. Judge Grosse seconded the motion.

Mr. Richmond said that the positions indicated were critical functions that needed to be filled.

Ms. Woods asked why the SharePoint person was critical.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Data Dissemination Committee

Judge Grosse said that the policy of the JISC for the past 15 years was that they should not be collecting Social Security Numbers (SSN). He said that this was a reiteration of the policy and that was the proposal.

Judge Hall moved to adopt the proposal. Ms. Woods seconded the motion.

Mr. Richmond said that one of the solutions to the SSNs would be to stop collecting them or erase the field from the screen. He said that erasing the fields would be a six-month effort and he did not have enough employees.

Ms. Grindle said that it did not solve the problem that the SSN was already there and it was already going out on warrants. She said that unless the field was removed from the JIS then they could not completely solve the problem. She said it was a user issue.

Mr. John Bell said the Data Dissemination Committee recommended disabling the field.

Justice Fairhurst clarified that the motion passed, that they should not be collecting the SSN and at some point they needed to remove it from the systems.

Mr. Johnson said they should do an analysis of what it would take to disable it, eliminate it, and decide what it was they wanted done and how long it would take and how much it would cost.

Mr. Hall said that would be a good example for Mr. Richmond to go back, create a 'Concept Overview', and get the detail the committee needed.

Justice Fairhurst said that would help the committee figure out the details they really needed so they could make better decisions.

Ms. Woods said she likened the SSN issue with a legislative mandate or federal mandate in which they were required to take action. She added that when there were fields that were permissible on the screen then it could still be populated.

Mr. Johnson motioned [KLS2] that they directed the AOC/IS to conduct an analysis of what would need to be done to implement the policy.

Judge Grosse said the policy said, 'do not collect the SSN and do not disseminate'.

Mr. John Bell said the original memo was generated due to the Department of Licensing (DOL) notifying the AOC that they were not going to send the SSN to the AOC anymore.

A representative from the DOL said they were going to stop sending SSNs in the near future.

Data Management Steering Committee

Mr. Johnson talked about the Data Management Steering Committee (DMSC). He said that they needed further clarification on the role of the DMSC, what the JISC expects of the committee, and how they needed to go about managing and meeting those expectations. He said there was an issue about a Request for Proposal (RFP) to do some things for Mr. Richmond's shop in relation to the Enterprise Service Bus, BizTalk. He said the DMSC had not seen the RFP and thought they should have been involved. He said that he was not clear on what the role of the DMSC was and what the JISC expectations were.

Mr. Hall said that the JISC should know what was going on with the AOC budget, which they did not know previously.

Judge Grosse said that there had been no budget reports to the JISC or to the Executive Committee in several years, except in a very broad sense. He said that in a governance context they needed to talk about those things because Mr. Johnson needed to know that there was a budget for Data Management, and Mr. Richmond needed to be able to tell them how much of that budget was needed just to keep the business running. He said that when the DMSC went to the JISC, they wanted to know that they had reached a conclusion within their budget. He said if the committee disagreed then they needed to bring it to the JISC to get it resolved.

Justice Fairhurst said that at the next meeting they needed to talk about governance and expectations, they needed to identify standing committees. She said they would need to create

ad hoc committees that would work on some subject areas for an amount of time and then they would go away. She said they should seriously consider having a budget committee as most organizations have. She said they might also need to have an ad hoc committee, for a short time, that would specifically deal with governance. She said the Executive Committee's role and responsibilities needed to be defined so that everyone would be comfortable and know what it was they were and were not doing. She said they would probably need to divide responsibilities and be clear as to what those were.

Mr. Johnson said that he worked closely with Mr. Richmond's staff. He said they had made a concerted effort to educate the members of the DMSC to a level where they were able to understand what was being proposed. He said that the members were becoming subject matter experts on the projects. He said they were in a better position to say "yes that makes sense, let's do it." He said they were missing the accountability and oversight part.

Justice Fairhurst said that she wanted to know what the responsibilities were of the current FTEs in IS so they had an understanding of what functions were being performed. She said they needed to know if FTEs had split job duties.

Justice Fairhurst said she appreciated that members were willing to come back on August 8 for the next meeting and then again on August 22. Both meetings are scheduled from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.