

**APPROVED MINUTES
DATA MANAGEMENT STEERING COMMITTEE
January 17, 2008, 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.**

Members Present via phone:

Mr. Richard Johnson, Chair
Ms. Barbara Miner
Ms. Siri Woods
Mr. Frank Maiocco
Mr. Chuck Ramey
Mr. Larry Barker
Ms. Jeri Cusimano
Mr. William Holmes
Judge Thomas Wynne

Guests:

Ms. Linda Bell
Ms. Cynthia Marr
Seattle Municipal Court
Shirleen Skogseth

Members Absent:

Judge Michael Lambo
Judge Brian Tollefson

Staff Present:

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

CALL TO ORDER

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

The meeting minutes for December 20, 2007 were reviewed and approved.

Mr. Larry Barker asked for a contact number to call, in case a member could not get to a meeting at the last minute.

Action Item: Mr. Randy McKown will e-mail contact numbers to committee members, in addition to adding a contact number to future agenda's.

Action Item: Mr. McKown will include the committee member list with the meeting minutes each month.

CMS REVIEW

Mr. Johnson said that the Core CMS meeting was a result of the vendor indicating they were not going to be able to make the time deadlines for delivery of the Core Case Management System (CMS). He went on to say that, the JISC asked that the committees be informed of a report that will be given by LTCT Tech and TCS. Mr. Johnson added that it was the intent of the Data Management Committee to continue to drive towards architecture and continue to work on the exchanges that have been identified, that need to be put into place.

Mr. Gregg Richmond said that the official decision had not been made to shut down, but a decision had to be made about CMS and then pushed up to the JISC. He said that the Proof of Implementation (POI) had failed and the JISC had said yes, it did fail. He added that the vendors had to propose a way forward. He said if the vendor plan was not accepted by CMS or the JISC, then the AOC would have to make a decision based on that information.

Mr. Johnson said that if there was a delay or if CMS did not go forward, then the exchanges that were needed in the short term would go away. He said they needed to discuss where the focus would be in the interim and if there was still a need to replace the way data exchange was being done, so that the committee would be primed for whatever CMS came up with, down the road.

Mr. McKown said that he does not see a delay in the efforts started with the data exchange. He said the committee could still look at moving the document imaging data exchange from a screen scraping platform to a true data exchange platform.

Ms. Barb Miner said that the committee needed to keep going forward regardless of CMS. She went on to say that in the beginning, Gartner agreed that properly implementing the data exchange will go a long way toward helping create a single system that benefits multiple court levels. This single system could consist of multiple disparate applications that communicate via the data exchange infrastructure.

DATA EXCHANGE PROJECT STATUS REPORT/Strategy and Timeline/Task Review

Mr. McKown said the graph in the status report would remain clear until the project plan was updated. He went on to say that, there had been no changes in the last six months. He also said the deliverables would have new completion dates to be included in the February report.

Mr. McKown said that there is a lot of knowledge in the AOC and good plan would be put together for what needs to be done. He said that after looking at the plan it could be determined if the AOC has the correct skill sets within their staff to get the work done.

Mr. Richmond said that since the committee had redirected them, the AOC would come up with a plan, and if a direction was taken that required more resources, the AOC would get them.

Mr. Johnson said that he did not feel that the committee was the one to tell the AOC how the exchanges would be done. He said that once the plan was put together and the committee had an architectural strategy, then they would know if external validation would be needed. Mr. Johnson asked if the Department of Information Services (DIS) needed to be asked if they have a level of expertise in the data exchange arena that would assist the AOC.

Mr. Richmond introduced John Howe, a new employee to the AOC, who had just come from working at DIS and their data exchanges.

Mr. Howe said that most of the data exchanges at DIS had been wrapped around the JINDEX project and they were still learning. He went on to say that, he had the most knowledge of data exchange at DIS.

Mr. Richmond said that he would not be opposed to asking for assistance or contracting with an entity outside of the AOC.

Mr. Johnson asked for an explanation on the duties of the Data Architect and Enterprise Architect.

Mr. Eric Kruger explained that an Enterprise Architect was half business and half technology, and the primary mission was to bring successful outcomes for business and technology. He went on to say that, an Enterprise Architect for Information Systems

was similar to a master city planner who said how things would be zoned and what the requirements were. He said the Enterprise Architect also gets involved in the nuts and bolts of the technology, how it should be used.

Mr. O'Conner explained that the Data Architect was kind of a sub-component of the Enterprise Architect because the Enterprise Architect covers everything. He said the Data Architecture would deal with how the data was stored and accessed. He went on to say that back in the 1970's the AOC systems were built with simple architectures, and that simple architecture has stuff glued onto it here and there and that was why the architecture needed to be redone and be brought up to date to take advantage of new technologies. He said that it was his job to try to coordinate those technologies and tools into a way that the AOC could accomplish what needed to be accomplished.

Ms. Woods asked if John was talking about XML data and data standards.

Mr. O'Conner said yes, those were components of the architecture, as well as handling role based security, synchronization between different copies of the data, and a number of things that go along with that.

Ms. Woods asked where the AOC currently exchanged XML data.

Mr. Kruger said the AOC currently exchanged XML data with the Department of Licensing, and the Washington State Patrol. He said that it depended on the other agencies level of maturity.

Ms. Woods asked if that was only occurring with JIN.

Mr. Kruger said that was occurring with all data. He said any new exchanges being developed were being sent with XML messages.

Ms. Miner asked how the data architecture related to the data warehouse.

Mr. O'Conner said that the data architecture encompassed the data warehouse. He went on to say that, the data architecture was the architecture for all of the data including; the data warehouse, operational data stores communication, and intermediate stores of data in the AOC.

Ms. Woods asked if the data inside the Data Warehouse had to be converted to XML data or was it changed from the form it was in, to XML data and then marked as a ghost.

Mr. O'Conner said that in order to answer Siri's question, he needed to say something about the architecture; which was the way that the data was viewed from outside of the AOC, was not necessarily the way the data was viewed inside of the AOC. He went on to say that, whether the data was stored as XML or not was a decision that the AOC needed to make as to the best decision on how to deal with the data internally. What the data looked like on the outside would probably communicate with XML.

Mr. Richmond said that at the same time that the data exchanges were being built, the AOC would be trying to build up the infrastructure and modernize so that the AOC had the platform to modernize in the future.

Mr. O'Conner said that one of the key features behind the new architecture is that from the outside, there can be a simple access point; and the inside could be created without having to change those access points or change what happens outside of the AOC.

ARCHITECTURAL OVERVIEW

Mr. Kruger said that he had worked with the AOC since 1987, starting out as a contractor. He said that he wrote a large portion of the DISCIS application as a programmer, was involved in SCOMIS during the rewrite, and CAPS as a designer for the juvenile portion; in addition to Technical Project Lead of the Juvenile Correction Systems, and involvement with ACORDS. Mr. Kruger said that he had been involved in all of the applications that the AOC had developed for case management systems. He said that he was also involved in the previous incarnation of data exchange when Brian Lonardo was with the AOC, in addition to the Enterprise Service Bus.

Mr. Kruger began reviewing the Data Management and Exchange Architecture Overview. He started with the strategy, which he said included supporting existing data exchanges that the AOC already had. He added that they were custom and the strategy was to get to a more open architecture. He also said that there was a need for a long-term vision and strategy. He said, as an example; if case management systems were changed, then the data exchange, would not be affected.

Mr. Johnson asked how long it would take to get the plan that Mr. Kruger talked about.

Mr. Kruger said that a plan should be available by the next meeting.

Mr. McKown said that what was said before was; specific exchanges could not be built with the CMS because nobody knew what the CMS was looking like. He went on to say that what Eric was talking about was a little bit higher strategy.

Ms. Miner said that messages needed to be clearer to the committee, as past information had been very mixed.

Mr. Richmond said that his expectation was that the information would go through him for review and then be reported to the JISC. He went on to say that document drafts needed to be complete before committee meetings so that they could be reviewed.

Mr. Kruger said that he had five specific items that would be reviewed; Strategic Business Plan, Communication Plan, Change Management Plan, Technical Architecture Plan, and Project Management Plan. He said that the goal of all of those was to get to a state where all of the front work was done and the data exchange became a series of mini projects; completing one before beginning another.

Mr. Kruger said that the AOC was aggressively pursuing, building, and maintaining the infrastructure. He went on to say that the infrastructure included all of the hardware, software, and processes/procedures. Mr. Kruger indicated that the last item was about developing partnerships with the courts, which would be a component of the strategy.

Mr. Kruger talked about the element of identifying, developing, and deploying interim solutions. He said the idea was to give the courts value now, to move forward and get things done. He went on to say that, the interim solutions might not be compliant with the final architecture, but exchanges would be built with service oriented concepts so there would be layers of items so those layers could be substituted with new layers without negatively effecting continued service. He said that would be done on the parking exchange.

Mr. Kruger said that the AOC would like to service enable the entire Legacy application so the Legacy would have the equivalent of API's, so data could be consumed and follow the same business rules. He said that some of the technologies may not be top

of the line, but they would work. Mr. Kruger said the generic exchanges would be finished and included and used as building blocks for custom exchanges.

Mr. O'Conner provided his background information; he said that he came to the AOC as an application developer for the DISCIS application on the Wang system in 1985. He said that the AOC has been doing 'baby' versions of data exchange since then. He added that he had been doing configuration management, and had become the Database Administrator (DBA), and in 2006, he became the Data Architect. He went on to say that, the master data management was a strategy for managing data, the concept was not new but the tools and technology had developed over time. He said in order to implement master data management a master data repository needed to be created and built around access points, and a barrier that would let data in and out. He said that over time all systems had converted to DB2 and did well on their own. He said that the problems came when crossing data from one system to another, which created inconsistencies.

Mr. O'Conner said that a master data management plan was necessary in order to build a master data repository. He went on to say that meta data needed to be created in order to access the data in the data repository, which would include what source put the data into the repository.

Mr. Kruger addressed the development of partnerships and service level agreements. The creation of data exchange tools and capabilities at the AOC will get the data halfway there. He said that partnerships with the courts and possibly vendors would be needed for courts to effectively use the data exchange capabilities created by the AOC. AOC might need to assist with technical information, development assistance, education and training. Mr. Kruger said that his vision was to have something similar to commercial software products that vendors have, to support their customers. He said the court staff would need education and training, and in order for all to be successful, the court would need to build the last mile [to the AOC system], which the courts need to know how to do. He said that he sees the AOC as the facilitator for that.

Mr. Richmond said that he attended a meeting for the Association for City and County IT Departments (ACCIS) and extended the offer to develop partnerships.

Ms. Siri Woods said that a partnership with the entity providing the Imaging system was also needed.

Mr. Kruger said that along with the partnerships, a formal service level agreement was usually, entered into. He said the service level agreement would say everything and was a contract between the AOC and the courts which would say; what, when, where, how, why. He said an example in the agreement would be; the courts would agree to keep the confidential data, confidential; the AOC would keep the system running, 24/7.

Mr. Johnson asked about #7 on Eric's handout that said: Migrate to Service Oriented Architecture. He said he did not recall hearing Eric talk about that.

Mr. Kruger said that he skipped #7 because it was more technical information than anything.

Mr. Johnson said that he thought it related to item #3 and the Development of Long Term Vision and Strategy, how service oriented architecture fits in would dictate to him how much information the courts need to understand about what it is and how it fits into the long-term vision and strategy.

Mr. Kruger said the Service Oriented Architecture is the basis for everything that the AOC and Courts want to do.

Mr. Johnson said that the committee needed to educate themselves and document what that means. He went on to say if the Service Oriented Architecture was the crux and nucleus of the strategy, then the committee needed to be educated and have a level of understanding that would allow them to sell that to their constituencies. He asked that that be moved up, as a component, in the documentation of item #3. He said there should be a strategic business plan that has a level of detail that the committee is able to absorb and discuss.

Mr. Kruger asked if the committee would be interested in articles that he had regarding service-oriented architectures. They committee said yes.

Action Item: Mr. Kruger will provide articles/information to the committee.

Mr. McKown addressed the Summary of Local Exchange surveys. He said that it was a cursory review which created some documentation as to; the court name, who filled out the form, and what systems they have. He said a line item was added to the project plan that said the surveys needed to be reviewed for content, and what courts had asked for; combined with the custom requests that were received about a year and a half ago. He added that the AOC would put them together and come up with a plan for custom exchanges.

Mr. Johnson said that something needed to be done about the lack of response. He asked the committee if they wanted to report back to the associations.

Ms. Miner said that the superior court documentation should be divided between clerks and court administrators. She said she thought there were 16 county clerks who have Imaging systems and court administrator offices that had exchanges related to a local CMS.

Action Item: Mr. McKown will separate Administrator and Clerk responses for the statistics.

Ms. Woods said to Randy that maybe he needed to send out individual questions to ask if a court has optical imaging or a stand-alone calendaring system.

Mr. Johnson said that the committee was told that the exchanges could not be built until the courts told the AOC what was needed. He asked how that would be affected by the new direction that is being taken regarding the CMS. He asked how critical it would be to continue to refine, collect, and push on the assessment, in the context of what had been talked about in the meeting.

Mr. McKown said that the content from the exchanges was not driving the fundamental infrastructure that the AOC wanted to put into place. He said that at some point, when building the exchanges, if someone needed an exchange and the AOC did not know about it, then it would not be built unless there was a request for it. He said that current documentation would cover 80% of what was going on, as far as exchanges, and the other 20% would be uncovered.

Mr. Johnson said that he thought a lot of the focus would be on architectural strategy, plan, and vision, which would be focused on the technical and data architecture to do the exchanges. He went on to say that while he thought that was a major component, it was not the only component of the overall Data Management Plan. He added that a

master plan was needed to incorporate item #3, Develop Long Term Vision and Strategy, into it.

Mr. Kruger said that the business plan would incorporate all of those things, and is non-technical in nature.

Mr. Johnson asked if there would be a component of the business plan that would talk to the gathering of business requirements and existing exchange.

Mr. Kruger said, yes.

Ms. Miner said that when the two committees were merged, Data Exchange and Information Access, they took on the public access piece.

Mr. McKown said that would be part of the overall plan.

Mr. Johnson referred to the parking proposal. He said that what was being proposed was that the committee needed to make the parking exchange a priority. He mentioned that Randy's report indicated that Eagle would not apply any resources to testing generic exchanges until the overall architecture had been defined.

Mr. McKown said that he spoke with Bill Forsberg of Eagle Imaging Systems and Bill explained that they could look at the one-way portion of the exchange; but it would not do much good because imaging was a two way data exchange, and the AOC did not have services or exchanges built that Eagle could test in a two-way fashion. Mr. McKown went on to talk about the parking data exchange and how it would allow the AOC to take a small data footprint and create an update, as part of the exchange into the AOC system.

Ms. Woods asked about the tickets in regards to the toll bridge.

Mr. McKown said that toll tickets were part of the plan to create an update.

Ms. Miner asked how many courts were doing E-Parking tickets.

Mr. McKown said that outside of Seattle Municipal there are about one-hundred and fifty thousand a year. He said that not all of the tickets were electronic. He went on to say that, if a city wanted to do it electronically they would have to do it on their own. He said that AOC had no centralized effort for capturing that data electronically. Mr. McKown said that AOC would be providing a standardized XML schema, so data could be sent to AOC, who would process it into JIS.

Mr. McKown said that Everett Municipal Court was the pilot court, but did not have a start date.

Mr. McKown went on to talk about the Project Plan. He said that he thought the order in which things should happen would be; the parking pilot, followed by the document imaging, looking into custom data exchanges, and then the Pierce County piece. He said that whether the tasks could happen in parallel was being reviewed.

DATA WAREHOUSE PROJECT STATUS REPORT/TASK REVIEW

Ms. Jennifer Creighton said there were not a lot of changes in the status report from the previous month. She said that the AOC did receive a warehouse from the Vendors in December, but it was not what the AOC considered a complete warehouse, that there were some items that they had not finished properly. She said they were currently in

negotiations trying to figure out how those items would be completed. She added that staff continued to do testing and to make changes to problems that had been found. She said that Data Marts and some security still needed to be added, so the AOC was trying to figure out who was going to do that.

Mr. Richmond said that the AOC and the Vendor had a deliverable's based contract so they would not be paid until they did the work.

Mr. Johnson asked if the staff resources indicated on the data warehouse were different from those assigned to data exchange. Mr. McKown said, yes. Mr. Johnson asked if John and Eric were included in those numbers. Mr. McKown said, no.

Mr. Johnson asked if there are funds available for outside assistance, if it was needed.

Mr. Richmond said that if more resources were needed, the AOC would get them, but if the AOC could not get resources, because of resource constraints, then they would go back to the committee and describe the situation to them.

Mr. Johnson said that he did not want to discount bringing in an outside source to look at and validate the committee's plan and direction.

Judge Wynne said that he thought that action needed to be done across the board.

Mr. Johnson asked the committee what their position was on this issue.

Ms. Woods agreed that advice was needed.

Mr. Johnson said that he would work with Gregg and Jeff Hall to identify what resources, if any, were available and once the committee got to the point of understanding, had documentation, then they could go to the JISC and ask for oversight by a third party as the committee moves forward.

DATA QUALITY WORK GROUP

Mr. O'Conner said that the group had concluded that they did not have a detailed direction in which to continue. He asked that there be a definition and charter for the Data Quality Work Group, and that the group be inactive until a time when there was specific work to do.

Mr. Johnson said that he thought there was a charter for the Data Quality Work Group.

Mr. O'Conner said that there was a Charter, but the work group did not have specific direction on what they should do next, the recommendation that was given at the Data Management meeting was that the work group should align with the Data Management Steering Committee.

Mr. Johnson said that John, Randy, and Jennifer should get together with what was previously reviewed and approved and make modifications as needed for consideration by the committee.

Action Item: John, Randy, and Jennifer will review the Data Quality Workgroup charter.

Mr. McKown clarified with Mr. Johnson that they were going to take the charter and adapt it to the reality of what the work group currently doing.

Ms. Linda Bell said that the data cleanup effort should have had all of the courts involved because their court went through the effort of cleaning up data and then the

court across the street was undoing what had been done, because they did not know her staff was cleaning up that data.

Mr. Barker said that he thought there were mixed messages going out to the courts on how and what data needed to be cleaned up.

Ms. Miner thought everyone had received the message that went out that said, even if that court was not in the first round, they should be cleaning up their bad data.

Mr. Johnson said that inconsistencies needed to be addressed. He agreed with Barb that courts needed to know what they needed to be doing as far as data clean up.

Mr. McKown said that the AOC would need to figure out who was sending the messages out and work on consistency.

Action Item: Mr. Johnson said that he would like to keep the Data Management Plan in red status, identify some deliverable dates, and retool the status report, altogether.

Mr. Johnson asked for a pre-meeting update with Gregg and Randy to go over information that would be presented at the February 22, 2008 meeting.

Meeting Adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Action Item:	Responsible party:	Date Complete:
Provide call in number for last minute absentees	Randy McKown	
Send out committee roster with monthly meeting documents	Randy/Denise	Included w/meeting minutes.
Provide articles on service oriented architecture	Eric Kruger	
Convey the need for a consistent data cleanup message	Randy	
Review Data Quality Workgroup charter	John, Randy, Jennifer	
Change Data Management Status Plan to red	Randy McKown	
Set up meeting for February 15, 2008 for Gregg, Rich, and Eric	Denise	

Name/Title	Court	Address	Phone/Fax
Rich Johnson / Court Administrator/Clerk richard.johnson@courts.wa	Court of Appeals I	One Union Square 600 University St Seattle WA 98101-1176	(206) 424-7750 (206) 389-2613
Larry Barker / Director Chief Probation Officer LarryB@co.klickitat.wa	Klickitat Co Adult Prob Services	214 W Main St. Goldendale WA 98620	(800) 355-9069 (509) 773-3732
Jeri Cusimano Alternate / Administrator jcusimano@ci.everett.wa.us	Everett Municipal Court	3028 Wetmore Ave Everett WA 98201-4018	(425) 257-8778 (425) 257-8678
Delilah George Alternate / Administrator delilahg@co.skagit.wa.us	Skagit Co Sup Court	205 W Kincaid St Rm 202 Mt Vernon WA 98273-4225	(360) 336-9325 (360) 336-9340
William Holmes Administrator William.holmes@co.kittitas.wa.us	Kittitas Co Juv Court	205 W 5 th Ave Ste 211 Ellensburg WA 98926-2887	(509) 962-7516 (509) 962-7667
Judge Michael Lambo mlambo@ci.kirkland.wa.us	King Co Mun Crt/Kirkland	11515 NE 118 th St / POB 678 Kirkland WA 98083-0678	(425) 587-3178 (425) 587-3161
Frank Maiocco Administrator fmaiocco@co.kitsap.wa.	Kitsap Co Sup Court	614 Division St MS24 Port Orchard WA 98366-4683	(360) 337-7140 (360) 337-4673
Barb Miner / Alternate Director/Sup Crt Clerk Barb.miner@metrokc.gov	King County	516 3 rd Ave Rm E609 Seattle WA 98104-2363	(206) 396-7844
Sharon Paradis Alternate Administrator Sharon_paradis@co.benton.wa.us	Benton-Franklin Co Juv Crt	5606 W Canal Dr Ste 106 Kennewick WA 99336-1300	(509) 736-2724
Chuck Ramey Administrator cramey@co.pierce.wa.us	Pierce County Dist Crt	930 Tacoma Ave S Rm 601 Tacoma WA 98402-2115	(253) 798-7753 (253) 798-6616
Judge Brian Tollefson btollef@co.pierce.wa.us	Pierce Co Sup Court	930 Tacoma Ave S Rm 534 Tacoma WA 98402-2108	(253) 798-7565 (253) 798-7214
Renee Townsley Alternate / Court Administrator/Clerk renee.townsley@courts.wa.gov	Court of Appeals Div III	500 N Cedar St PO Box 2159 Spokane WA 99201-2159	(509) 456-3082 (509) 456-4288
Siri Woods County Clerk Siri.a.woods@co.chelan.wa.us	Chelan County	350 Orondo Ave 5 th Fl PO Box 3025 Wenatchee WA 98807-3025	(509) 667-6380 (509) 667-6611
Judge Thomas Wynne Thomas.wynne@co.snohomish	Snohomish Co Sup.Crt	3000 Rockefeller Ave MS 502 Everett WA 98201-4046	(425) 388-3418 (425) 388-3498
Carl McCurley Carl.mccurley@courts.wa.gov	AOC Research Center	1206 S Quince St Olympia WA 98504	(360) 705-5312