

APPROVED MINUTES
DATA MANAGEMENT STEERING COMMITTEE
April 17, 2008 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
SeaTac Facility, SeaTac, WA

Members Present:

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

Members by phone

Ms. Renee Townsley
Judge Brian Tollefson

Members Absent:

Judge Michael Lambo
Judge Thomas Wynne

Staff Present:

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

CALL TO ORDER

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

The meeting minutes for March 20, 2008 required some revisions at Rich Johnson's request. Acceptance of those notes will be completed at the May 15, 2008 meeting.

Information Services Division (ISD) staff members in Olympia introduced themselves via video conference: John Howe, Aaron House, Michael Dean, Keri Thompson, and Elaine Evans.

HIGH LEVEL PLAN

Mr. McKown referred to the one page document titled: Data Management Steering Committee.

Mr. Johnson said that he had several meetings with Gregg, Randy, and Eric based on the last Data Management meeting. He said they were trying to focus on planning and the document Randy referred to reflected the main components of the Data Management Steering Committee projects.

Mr. McKown said the plan was considered a 'bit of a roadmap' to give the members an idea of all of the things that were going on and to provide education on that type of document. He went on to talk about the previous purchase of an Oracle ESB that did not work in Information Services Divisions (ISD), local environments. He said that in order to get the Oracle Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) to work the ISD would have to create another database and purchase additional Oracle products. Mr. McKown said that Biz Talk will replace the Oracle product.

Mr. Johnson said that it was never clear what role the ESB played in the Data Exchange environment.

Mr. McKown said that a 'bus' was not a single product but a platform that consists of multiple pieces. He said other tools that were purchased would fill in certain gaps in the overall architecture. He said that the ESB had the ability to transfer data from one place to another and it came with some tools that developers could use to create application code to support the transfer process.

Mr. Eric Kruger said that the ESB was described as software that managed databases and applications. He went on to say there was another category of software called 'middleware', which was a variety of components, or what was called a 'messaging manager'. He said that when doing data exchanges there needed to be a one-hundred percent guarantee that the message did not get lost. He said that was done by guaranteed messaging. He added that at

one end of 'the pipe (so to speak)' the message was saved and backed up and then sent to the other end of 'the pipe' and someone there says, 'I have it, saved it, stored it, and it is safe'.

Mr. Johnson said that his understanding was that our current exchanges were hard-coded and custom developed with no 'middleware'.

Mr. Kruger said that was correct, other than ticketing, which had the Biz Talk ESB.

Mr. Johnson asked if customers, such as Barb Miner at King County, would need a product on her end that was compatible with Biz Talk, or could she have the Oracle ESB and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) have Biz Talk and they still be able to communicate with each other.

Mr. Kruger said that messages were product independent. He said that the messages that come out of the AOC have no knowledge that they are produced by Biz Talk. He said it was written in an industry standard protocol that all web services used.

Ms. Barb Miner asked how the generic idea related to 'Service Enabling'.

Mr. Kruger said the ESB suite of products would be the freeway that would be transporting the messages that would go to whatever product the system was service enabled with.

Mr. Richmond asked if an outside system could go into the AOC and extract data without 'Service Enablement'.

Mr. Kruger said yes.

Mr. McKown said that the issue was with data coming into JIS. AOC cannot accept data without editing it first. He said in order to edit the data AOC needs to either write replicated code or service enable (reuse) existing code that will apply business rules to the data before it is updated in JIS.

Mr. Johnson said that dates would not be used at this time, but dates would be added in the future. He said the key was that the plan was fourteen months in length and the graph was a reflection of what they feel could be accomplished in the next year. He added that there would also be individual plans for each of the projects (i.e. eParking Pilot, Document Imaging, etc.).

MASTER DATA MANAGEMENT

Mr. John O'Conner said that the AOC has court data from all around the state, and there is a mandate from the legislature saying that the AOC should be the authoritative source for other agencies and other States in that regard.

Mr. Johnson asked what the Data Warehouse was.

Ms. Jennifer Creighton said the Data Warehouse was a repository for data so that the courts could look at the data in a way different from the way it is in JIS.

Mr. Johnson asked why the Data Warehouse was not the data repository.

Mr. O'Conner said that it was discovered that reporting out of one big database was causing delays in the data entry part of the system. He said there were certain things that were done to a database to make the online transactions go faster and those things make the reporting transactions slower (and the opposite is true).

Mr. Johnson clarified that the Data Warehouse was a second repository that was facilitating reporting transactions and that conceptually his understanding was that there were five repositories; SCOMIS, DISCIS, etc., which were separate entities based on the application.

Mr. O'Conner said that there was only one production database at the AOC. He added that all applications have access to all of the data.

Mr. O'Conner said that there were three things that master data management did: 1) Security, 2) Data Validation (being able to check the data as it goes into AOC), and 3) Synchronization (so that when certain things occur in SCOMIS, something also goes off to the Washington State Patrol.)

Mr. O'Conner said that data was managed in each application, individually.

ENTERPRISE DATA WAREHOUSE

Ms. Creighton asked the committee if they wanted the 'statewide data repository' implemented upon completion, or did they want to wait until an accounting portion could be added to the warehouse, which would put implementation out another 4-6 months.

Mr. Johnson said to implement as soon as it was done and not to wait.

Motion: Bring up the 'statewide data repository'. Siri Woods and Barb Miner, second the motion.

DATA CLEANUP

Mr. Kruger said he had a quick report on data quality. He said the AOC implemented an old process that goes through the database and removes persons not used or identified with a case, relationship, or anything else. He said that twenty percent of the person database qualified for removal. Mr. Kruger added that the data could have gotten into the database because of a speeding ticket (as example) that was archived after 3 years and the person had no other issues, which caused the person data to sit there.

STRATEGIC BUSINESS PLAN

Mr. Kruger said the purpose of the strategic plan was to get the Data Management Steering Committee to a point where they could successfully deliver and execute. He said the plan was a 'sub plan' of the ISD Strategic Plan.

Mr. Kruger said that he thought the 'vision' was to enter the data only one time. He said that his ultimate goal was to have a process of automatically updating data by scanning documents. Mr. Kruger went on to talk about the 'mission' statement in which he said that Ms. Miner asked to have the word 'court' added.

Ms. Miner said her point was that they talk about internal stakeholders not external stakeholders.

The mission was revised to say; "Facilitate the flow of judicial related information among courts and between all stakeholders involved in the judicial system".

Action Item: (Executive Summary) Mr. Kruger to work on #3 to align with the mission statement and change the wording in #4 to say 'provide' instead of 'create' a new service center...

Mr. Johnson said that he wanted to spend the rest of the meeting going over the Executive Summary and adopting that for the upcoming JISC meeting.

Action Item for Eric Kruger:

- Paragraph 3, sentence 4: change 'and' to 'in'
- Paragraph 3, last sentence: 'should be number one priority for the Administrative Office of the Courts Information Services Division'.

Ms. Miner indicated that Paragraph 3 was not an accurate statement as there were two committees that came together to form the Data Management Steering Committee. She also

indicated that the 3 points under paragraph 2 did not indicate anything in regards to data exchange.

Mr. Kruger said the information provided was 'cut and pasted' from the 2005 initiative. He said that after paragraph 2 he would need to talk about the interim step, that a data exchange committee was formed and then consolidated into the Data Management Steering Committee.

Mr. Johnson said that they might need to separate the Executive Summary that was foundational to the strategy, a summarization. He said that page 2 could be removed, if the committee did not want to include it.

Mr. Barker said that he would like to add a bullet item to the bottom of page 3 that said, "Decrease liability as each responsible person or agency will have timely, accurate data during key decision-making processes."

Action Item: Mr. Johnson went back to page 2, paragraph 3 and said to add; "data exchange was identified as a critical component of the JISC Roadmap, and to address that, two committees were established; Data Exchange and Information Access which were later merged into the Data Management Steering Committee".

Mr. Ramey asked if the committee thought they have the authority to enforce quality assurance from the 'mission, goals' statement.

Mr. Kruger said that data quality was not mentioned in the document but needed a similar effort.

Mr. Richmond said that data quality was in the ISD Strategic Plan.

Ms. Miner said that on page 4 there was the use of both 'partners and stakeholders' and neither were definitions.

Mr. Kruger said that he had that marked on his copy to ensure that all of the goals were identical to the mission statement.

Ms. Woods said a list of partners should be provided to the committee.

Mr. Johnson said he wanted 3 pages to the Strategic Business Plan for Data Exchange consisting of: an Executive Summary, a definition page, and then the 'vision, mission, and goals' that the committee adopted.

Mr. Johnson said he was going to present that document to the JISC on behalf of the committee.

Meeting Adjourned.

Action Items:

Action Item: (Executive Summary) Mr. Kruger to work on #3 to align with the mission statement and change the wording in #4 to say 'provide' instead of 'create' a new service center . . .

Action Item for Eric Kruger:

- Paragraph 3, sentence 4: change 'and' to 'in'.
- Paragraph 3, last sentence: 'should be number one priority for the Administrative Office of the Courts Information Services Division'.

Action Item: Mr. Johnson went back to page 2, paragraph 3 and said to add; "data exchange was identified as a critical component of the JISC Roadmap, and to address that, two committees were established; Data Exchange and Information Access which were later merged into the Data Management Steering Committee".