# JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

**JANUARY 21, 2011**
**9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.**
**AOC Office, SeaTac, WA**

**DRAFT - Minutes**

**Members Present:**
Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Mr. Larry Barker
Chief Robert Berg
Ms. Linda Bell
Mr. Jeff Hall
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson
Mr. Rich Johnson
Judge J. Robert Leach
Mr. Steward Menefee
Ms. Barb Miner
Judge Steven Rosen
Judge Michael Trickey
Ms. Yolande Williams
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

**Members Absent:**
Judge James Heller
Mr. Marc Lampson

**Guests Present:**
Ms. Linda Enlow
Ms. Betty Gould
Ms. Cynthia Marr
Ms. Cathy Pashon
Ms. Marti Maxwell
Mr. Kevin Stock
Ms. Aimee Vance
Mr. Joe Wheeler

**Staff Present:**
Mr. Kevin Ammons
Mr. Bill Burke
Mr. Bill Cogswell
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Ms. Kate Kruller
Ms. Heather Morford
Ms. Pam Payne
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Mr. Mike Walsh

## Call to Order

Justice Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. and introductions were made.

## December 3, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any changes or comments to the draft minutes from the December 3, 2010 meeting. Hearing no suggestions or changes Justice Fairhurst deemed the minutes approved.

## Budget Status Report

Ms. Vonnie Diseth presented the forecast for the next six month showing the projected spending for the specific projects. When the biennium began there was a plan. Now that we are 18 months into the plan, there are some initiatives that are under spent as they are now completed. Under spent monies are being reallocated to other project areas. Ms. Diseth explained that on projects that have been completed the amount shown is the actual amount spent for the initiative. Projects not completed have a combined amount that includes what has been spent to date and what is projected to be spent in the next six months. There are projects that have a zero dollar amount in the allocated column. These are initiatives that were completed by internal AOC staff without the use of a contractor --- saving us money. This exercise is meant to show the shifting of funds in areas that we under expended and where money is available to be spent in other areas that need more funding. Funding amounts that are bolded are initiatives that have been identified as projects that will likely cross over into the next biennium and will need a reallocation of funds to carry us forward. *Justice Fairhurst clarified that the amount listed is not the amount that would move forward to the next biennium that funds spent on the project during the next six months would leave a balance difference and that amount would be carried forward.* The final total of $12,614,000.00 is the same amount previously allocated. The allocation amount has not changed.

Mr. N.F. Jackson asked what the “Change Management in Support of JIS” initiative is about. Ms. Diseth explained that when we eventually implement a new case management system, the work

will likely involve changes to the court community. Change Management involves all the work necessary to help organizations prepare for the anticipated changes.

Mr. Rich Johnson asked a question about the IT Service Catalog line item – What is the Service Catalog? Ms. Diseth explained the Service Catalog is a menu of services ISD would provide to the court community. The catalog lists the services and service level agreements available to the courts. Mr. Kevin Ammons further explained that the value of a service catalog includes a defined baseline set of services that each court would have to have for integration. Beyond that, courts of different levels would be able to pick and choose what services best fits their business model. There are two aspects to a Service Catalog: a technical catalog from an ISD point of view and a service catalog from the customer's point of view. The initial effort is to develop a technical catalog --- which is an effort for AOC to alter the way it thinks about how it does business; where its business lines are drawn; and how AOC relates as a service provider to the courts. Following that effort, ISD will take the information and work with the customers to define a service catalog from the customer's point of view. How customers view AOC services is very different from how ISD views the services it is offering. This effort will bridge that gap -- understanding more about the service we offer from the customer's perspective. Mr. Jeff Hall reminded the committee that everything we are doing can be tied back to the JIS Strategy. Justice Fairhurst asked to have a presentation given on the Service Catalog and what we can expect to receive from the effort at the next JISC meeting in March.

Justice Fairhurst stated her appreciation that ISD is taking to review the issues and instances where projects and initiatives can be completed internally, thus freeing up funding to be used in other areas.

Mr. Ramsey Radwan presented financial activity and budget updates. The first report, on the brown sheet, provides a snapshot of obligations and expenditures for the current biennium. This report reflects expenditures through December 31, 2010.

The next report on the green sheet, shows funding and expenditures through December 31, 2010. At the project level, excluding the equipment replacement amount, funds are approximately 54% expended; funds are approximately 82% expended if equipment replacement is included. Mr. Radwan explained that negative amounts in the variance column represent the status prior to Ms. Diseth's recent re-baseline effort. As a result of the re-baseline and shifting of funds, negative amounts are no longer reflected in the variance. It should be noted that although we will lose project spending authority for funding carried into the next biennium, no dollars will be lost from the account balance. A request will be made to the Legislature to have those monies re-allocated for spending after July 1, 2011.

The last report presented was the JIS Account: Estimated Revenue, Expenditure and Fund Balance Report. This report estimates, at a high level, revenue and expenses over the next five biennia (ten years). Ongoing costs include amounts necessary for keeping the lights on and conducting business as usual, as well as costs associated with current projects.

## Legislative Status Report

Ms. Mellani McAleenan reported on the significant changes that have taken place in the legislature. Changes include 25 people who have never been a legislator before, one former legislator returning, and a number of representatives who have moved to the senate.

The legislative session has been in progress for about two weeks. Mr. Jeff Hall, Ms. Vonnie Diseth and Ms. McAleenan have met with a handful of legislators to either teach them about JIS or to update those familiar with JIS on the progress against the transformation plan and to share with them the status of the CMS project and explain the placeholder Decision Package request in the budget before them.

Ms. McAleenan has provided a list of legislators on committees that could touch on JIS in some way and requested that JISC members review the material and notify her if they have any relationships or are willing to establish any relationships with those legislators.

## ISD Monthly Status Update – Priority Project Reports

Ms. Vonnie Diseth pointed out some of the major accomplishments for 2010 listed in the material. The monthly report with status updates on each initiative is included in the material, please read at your convenience and if you have any questions please let me know. I would like to spend the remainder of this time focusing on the important discussion that needs to take place on the major projects we are reporting on.

***Superior Court Management Feasibility Study (SCMFS):***

Ms. Kate Kruller reported that the Executive Sponsor has completed the project charter, work plan and schedule as of the end of December. Meetings with the clerks on business process are wrapping up and interviews with the judges, administrators and clerks have been completed. High level technical and business requirements were completed in January and will be refined as the project moves forward.

A draft High-Level Cost Estimate was reviewed by AOC and the Executive Sponsor Committee (ESC) on January 6. This prompted a dialog regarding the official interpretation on what was in-scope for the SCMFS. AOC responded by taking the conversation off-line to clarify exactly what had been approved by the JISC at the December 4, 2010 meeting. On January 7, the State Court Administrator, Mr. Jeff Hall, AOC ISD Director/CIO, Vonnie Diseth, SCMFS Project Manager, Kate Kruller, SCMFS Project Vendor, MTG and the AOC Court Business Liaison, Heather Morford met and reviewed JISC minutes, the project charter and other documents. A special Sponsor meeting was held on January 10th to report the results to the ESC:

- It was determined that SCOMIS functionality is in scope for SCMFS.
- The project charter will be updated with clarifying statements in the scope section to reinforce this determination.
- The High Level Cost Estimate would be updated to include SCOMIS functionality.

Ms. Vonnie Diseth added that the FAQ document that is being worked on has input from the business liaisons and other stakeholders to formally address the questions in a way that the answers and other information can be disseminated out to all parties. The plan is to present the updated charter and FAQ document at the March 4th JISC meeting.

The high level cost estimate (over a 5 year time frame) is an – $18-$21.5 million effort. Ms. Vonnie Diseth clarified that this is the ***initial*** high level cut we asked MTG to do so that we could update the legislature with this estimate. Mr. Jeff Hall added that this is the first deliverable from MTG to give us a high level budget estimate. Like other budget numbers this is a range and it will likely not be the same exact amount as what comes out of the final feasibility study. There will be a

difference both in terms of the numbers and the construct/assumptions they used to build those numbers.

Mr. Joe Wheeler (MTG) explained a lot of the estimate is based on comparables with what other states that are comparable in size to Washington have implemented. The biggest portion of the cost is not the hardware or software; it is the implementation with all the people. The costs also include rough estimates for county costs. For example, it includes the costs for judges, clerks, administrators to be involved in planning and implementation. Costs include customization and configuration as well.

Mr. Rich Johnson asked for clarification on "SCOMIS functionality". Mr. Jeff Hall responded that there are a lot of nuances to the language we use and while there might be a slight nod to that, we are not going to talk about this in terms of SCOMIS replacement. We are going to talk about it in terms of looking for a system that encompasses the functionality that is in SCOMIS. The goal here is to find a system that judges need and want and also that the clerks need and want. Mr. Hall asked Mr. Johnson if that answered his question – Mr. Johnson stated he understands the words, but it seems this is far beyond what was initially discussed as being a calendaring system.

Justice Fairhurst summarized that she didn't think this was far beyond the original scope and that is why AOC went back and verified in the minutes what was approved by the committee.
Ms. Vonnie Diseth reminded the committee that the scope changed last fall. Initially, the clerks were not involved when the RFP was released. At that time, the judges, the project team, and the vendor all raised a concern that not having the clerks involved was a high risk for the Feasibility Study. In September, Judge Warning went to the clerk's conference and asked them to join the project as an equal partner. The clerks agreed. In November, when the ESC was formed, they began looking at the functionality in the bubble charts and what was not included. If you look at one of the initial bubble chart, there was an L shaped box drawn around the functionality that the study was focused on. But as the Executive Sponsor Committee discussed what needed to be done and included in the study, it encompassed the entire case management functionality. A lot of time was spent working on the functionality chart by the ESC. In December, the ESC brought the revised chart as a recommendation to the JISC depicting what the ESC believed should be included in the scope of the project. Ms. Diseth recommended that the functionality chart be handed out as a reminder when updates are given on the project.

Justice Fairhurst asked for anyone in the room who is not comfortable with what is being presented to speak up. As a committee we have worked very hard to get to a place where we are having trusting open conversations. Justice Fairhurst asked that everyone be open, speak up, and to bring up any concerns or questions so that they can be explained and answered while we have the experts in the room. She stated It is really important to her as chair that we be a success and we are only going to be a success if can have really frank conversations. If anyone feels that they don't understand or their gut is telling them something is not right, please share that with the committee. This is true of every meeting, but especially this project right now.

Judge J Robert Leach stated a concern about understanding the change in the scope of the feasibility study. What happens if the feasibility study comes back and tells us that we should be doing something else entirely?

Mr. Rich Johnson stated there is no doubt the scope of the project has increased significantly and there really isn't any other way to look at it. It went from a small calendar application to a big black box. There is an increase in risk and time. All of these things are red flags in my opinion. We have something that went from a 6-8 month time frame to 5 years and a project estimate of 10

million to a cost of 20 million. While we can't ignore those facts, they have increased the risk and the potential for failure for the scope in general. It also calls into question whether or not our data exchange strategy should be a focus. It is easy to say it would be better if we had one system that does all the things we need and does calendaring as well, that is true, but if it takes twice as long and costs twice as much and the probability of success is cut in half then we have to weigh that against a different way to get the data to support a secondary application while we are still with SCOMIS.

Mr. Jeff Hall responded stating the scope as it is today is a huge relief. This is the scope we should have had from the beginning. There are two reasons for that and they are the same today as they were six months ago which was – one: I had a belief and it started to be confirmed by Joe, that the systems available today that will provide the courts with the calendaring and the scheduling functionality in the market for courts includes the SCOMIS functionality and you can't break the two apart and there are not stand alone court specific calendaring/scheduling systems out there to buy to put on top of SCOMIS. The second piece is managing our overall IT portfolio and adding another system to our already complex portfolio is a big concern and our ability to maintain that. Going from a situation where we are looking to add versus retire a legacy application and have just one application is from a portfolio perspective a very good thing.

Mr. N.F. Jackson stated that we can't presume nothing can be "decoupled". The feasibility comparables should include the question: can this import data and if so what does the data exchange look like?

Mr. William Holmes stated that SCOMIS doesn't stand alone and there is an entry to SCOMIS that follows JIS business rules. DISCIS is also related to the same rules as is JCS – in the discussion of SCOMIS functionality is that relationship being considered. Ms. Kate Kruller responded, yes it is being considered.

Ms. Yolande Williams asked for clarification on the $18-$21 million dollar cost estimate including the primary target of calendaring and scheduling as the first phase. Ms. Kate Kruller clarified that it was not a phased approach but that all the functionality for the courts will be in parallel testing, using both systems at the same time until such a time is determined that the data is accurate and then everyone will be in the new system. Ms. William asked – looking at the applications that have SCOMIS functionality are we still focused initially on our primary objective of calendaring and scheduling, and if so when we get to the point of a second phase or whatever you want to call it – the next question might be "if these applications have the capacity to support SCOMIS functionality" that would be a separate decision – not included in the current 18-21 million dollar cost estimate. Mr. Joe Wheeler responded with – MTG was asked to look at the costs for superior courts, within all capabilities including SCOMIS, not just the acquisition but also the implementation. Ms. Williams asked if the data exchange issue will be revisited. Mr. Wheeler responded, that has to be considered given the way the interaction between systems works now.

Mr. Jeff Hall clarified – there are two pieces to the data exchange that is happening. There are AOC hosted system to system exchanges that have to be accounted for and that is a question of identity management and there is the generic data exchange capability we know all the courts need. It doesn't matter what system we buy, we are always going to need our new systems to exchange data with local systems.

Justice Fairhurst summarized that we could decide that the whole thing is too much and that even if we buy the whole thing, we may only turn on two pieces of it because it can stand alone enough

to support our need. We really can't do the feasibility without looking at the larger picture because of the way the products are integrated in the market.

Mr. Stew Menefee stated he is not comfortable with the term "SCOMIS functionality" and what that means.

Mr. Jeff Hall responded that SCOMIS functionality are the things the clerks do in SCOMIS. For example – the steps clerks take to file a case and process the paperwork from attorneys.

Justice Fairhurst asked again, to take another pulse of the room - is there anyone who is unhappy or has discomfort with where the understanding is at this point.

Judge Steve Rosen stated we had a discussion 6-8 months ago about data exchanges and then a month later we voted on whether we move forward with the idea of data exchanges or one system that works for everyone statewide. I felt rushed and since then rethinking, not changing my mind necessarily, but we are moving forward with an idea of a feasibility study of a statewide system and I don't know that we really gave credence or consideration to the data exchange idea and let local jurisdictions push and pull information to it. I don't know if that is part of the feasibility study or not, but I do have a concern that we have overlooked a possible solution that some of our local jurisdictions might like.

Ms. Kate Kruller responded that data exchanges is a different project, other than knowing what we can interface with, it is not in our mission in a feasibility to lay out a data exchange statewide as part of the case management feasibility study project, we just have to know how to produce information.

Judge Rosen finished with, as a policy we have to decide at some point and maybe we have, are we saying we want the same thing everywhere and we are going to push a COTS to every superior court or are we going to consider what was not a full look at --- should we say no we don't what to do that – we should look at having a central database that counties can design their own system and others without resources can stay with link. Judge Rosen stated he didn't think we looked at it that well.

Mr. N.F. Jackson commented that his understanding was that we would provide a baseline of services and local jurisdictions would hopefully be able to do what they needed to.

Ms. Vonnie Diseth clarified that data exchanges are still a key critical aspect of what we are planning to go forward with. Acknowledging the fact with the implementation or roll out that if we buy a COTS package -- the roll out is not going to be delivered to everyone at once. It would be rolled out to different counties at different times over a period of five years. The ability to have that data exchange in place so that people on the old system and people on the new system are able to talk to a centralized database is critical.

Judge Rosen again voiced his personal concern about an option to just build data exchanges and let the state have the database and the local jurisdictions have individual applications which would mean we don't need a statewide solution. Judge Rosen stated that he lacked presentations and material on the options to drive an informed decision - and that personally it seemed a rushed decision.

Justice Fairhurst wrapped up this discussion by stating that after hearing the next presentation on the superior court data exchange; let's see how we are feeling. As we come back to make a

decision, it's possible to know that the option might be we don't do anything. Given what is out there, that may not be an option.

***Superior Court Data Exchange Project***

Mr. Bill Burke presented the updated project plan. At the December JISC meeting AOC reported the original project was significantly behind schedule and over budget. AOC proposed evaluating the near and long term solutions.

At a meeting with Pierce County LINX team in December four initial Docketing services that would reduce the double data entry by 30% were identified along with how LINX will interface to the data exchange. Testing of the initial four Docketing services is being targeted in the March to June 2011 time frame.

Going forward under the new plan AOC would deploy a Data Exchange that could be used by all local superior courts. By developing a web interface between SCOMIS and the local court systems, using industry standards and leveraging the existing project design work, software redesign is minimized, keeps us within budget and delivers a service sooner rather than later, while eliminating the double entry currently taking place.

Justice Fairhurst asked referencing the 58 docketing services and 2 miscellaneous services – how many docketing services are there? Mr. Burke replied he didn't know for sure, this is a subset of all the services. Justice Fairhurst clarified - this is not like a replace – this is a subset of services that allows LINX to go off and allows other if they want to, to use any or all of the 58 to use them, but doesn't eliminate the other because there are more services available.

Justice Fairhurst asked about the bullet that states "Defer Calendaring and Document Indexing" does this tie in with the SCOMIS functionality being reviewed for the SCMFS project? Is information being gathered by the SCMFS team able to be utilized or accessed by the SCDX team at the point that this would be available in the future?

Mr. Bill Burke responded – there are some docketing services that have a Calendaring component and some that have a Document Imaging component in the current SCOMIS Data Exchange project scope. There are still business requirement issues that need to be resolved for those services and the project team is requesting these be removed from the project scope at this time. This will result in the removal of six services.

Justice Fairhurst stated that she understands the request to have these 2 functions deferred, but followed up with the question; in looking at the "functionality of SCOMIS" is there any link between the SCDX project and the SCMFS that can be leveraged?

Mr. Rich Johnson responded that this is not about SCOMIS per se, when the project was scoped initially it was a Superior Court Data Exchange and there were several local systems the superior courts were trying to support through data exchange, imaging is one that several jurisdictions have and we wanted to include that in the scope. There are also people doing calendaring using CAPS and they are exchanging data between SCOMIS and CAPS. The idea was to support these exchanges with proper technology the proper way. How this relates to the effort we are undertaking with the feasibility study is that by setting this aside now, we will have a better opportunity to merge what we need to exchange between the Superior Court database and the new system. It was decided to take it off the plate for now, while we are doing the feasibility study.

The information from the clerks and the other jurisdictions that have imaging, they are ok for now with the current technological method.

Going back to Judge Rosen's concern with regards to are we still in "a one size fits all environment", theoretically once you have a superior court docketing exchange any Superior Court could come up on any docketing system they wanted to.

Mr. Bill Burke closed his presentation by asking the JISC to approve the revised project plan.

Motion by Judge Wynne to approve the plan as presented, Second was made by Mr. Rich Johnson. The motion passed unanimously by those in attendance. The following members did not vote: Judge Jim Heller, Mr. Marc Lampson, Judge Steve Rosen, Judge Michael Trickey, Ms. Yolande Williams, and Mr. N.F. Jackson.

***VRV – Vehicle Related Violations***

Mr. Mike Walsh presented the update on the on boarding schedule for the VRV project. VRV and the Records Management System (RMS) are inter-dependant and rely on the support of multiple agencies through the Electronic Trip Information Processing (E-TRIP). Mr. Walsh is the project manager leading AOC's participation on both the VRV and RMS projects.

The RMS project was scheduled to go live on March 1, 2011. After an approximate 30 day post implementation shake out period the VRV On-Boarding was scheduled as follows: Group target 1 (Issaquah, Kirkland, and Lakewood municipal courts) was re-scheduled for April 2011. Group 2 (Fife, Tacoma, and Lynwood municipal courts) was re-scheduled for May 2011.

RMS Project Status

The RMS project is currently 30 days behind schedule moving the go live target date from March 1 to April 1, 2011.

Coding is complete for most agencies involved and the project is in the system integration testing phase. System integration testing requires the execution and verification of transactions that have many touch points and it has its' challenges. The E-Trip system integration testing needs the participation of many agencies (Traffic Safety Commission, State patrol, Licensing, Transportation, Everett Parking Enforcement, Issaquah PD, and Courts) and has been taking longer than anticipated.

In addition, a release management process is being defined and implemented by DIS that may have an impact to the number of courts we can bring on board per month.

VRV Project Status

At this time, we expect another 1 or 2 month delay for the VRV On-Boarding project. The project risks have been identified and escalated. We are working with DIS and the other E-TRIP partners to mitigate the risk and review the project commitments.

Work is being done to update the content on the VRV Data exchange portal (www.dx.courts.wa.gov) and these changes will be made in the next two to three weeks.

## Committee Reports

Mr. Rich Johnson reported updates have already been given in the project reports. We do have coming up the ITG request that came from the Data Management Steering Committee to Expand the Data Warehouse to add the accounting data.

Judge Thomas Wynne reported on 3 issues coming from the Data Dissemination Committee.

1. Data Dissemination (DD) Committee asks the JISC to adopt the AOC staff recommendation to resolve ITG #18 through utilizing existing business processes rather than through a technical solution. The Committee recommends that Court Education Services provide education to District and Municipal Court Judges, District and Municipal Court clerical personnel, and County Clerks on existing processes to correct the defendant record when victims of identity theft have been named as defendants in criminal proceedings. The education should be provided successively for the next 2 years at conferences, and through such other possible means.

Motion: Barb Miner move to adopt recommendation by DD committee. Second: Judge Wynne. Motion approved by 11 votes.

2. The Committee again discussed the display of probable cause information on the public website. The Committee does not believe any solution is possible until uniform statewide business practices for displaying probable cause information at each level of court are developed and implemented. The Committee recommends that workgroups be formed at each level of court to develop uniform business processes for displaying probable cause hearing information. AOC should staff these workgroups, which should provide a report to the Data Dissemination Committee.

Motion: Mr. William Holmes moved to adopt the recommendation by the DD committee. Second: Linda Bell.

Ms. Barb Miner commented this is explanation is somewhat vague. The different courts do this differently; it may be difficult to get everyone on the same page.

Justice Fairhurst acknowledged this might be better achieved in a two step process and offered the following amendment to the motion:

"Determine and assess all the business processes being used currently for displaying probable cause hearing and make a recommendation as to if we should develop uniform business processes". This will give us an initial assessment to see if this is feasible. Amendment accepted by motion and second.

Vote: motion passed with 11 yea votes, 0 nays, 6

3. BJA requested the Data Dissemination Committee comment on SB 5019.

Motion: Mr. Jeff Hall moved the JISC committee adopt the Data Dissemination committee's comments on SB 5019 endorsing the comments. Second: Chief Berg.

Mr. Jeff Hall stated this allows Ms. Mellani McAleenan as representative of the BJA to oppose this bill with the endorsement of the JISC.

Judge J. Robert Leach raised the concern about judges on the committee voting on this issue as it advances a legal position that could cause recusal and recommended that the judges might abstain from the vote.

Vote: Justice Fairhurst – all those voting in favor of the motion: let the record reflect 11 voting member are present - 9 yea votes, no nay votes, 2 (Fairhurst/Leach) abstained, 6 members not in attendance to vote.

## JIS Baseline Service Level Workgroup

* Moved to the end of the agenda if time allows for discussion.

## JIS Portfolio

Ms. Vonnie Diseth provided the As-Is landscape as a tool for the ITG discussion. The purpose of the diagram is to depict ours customer and the applications they use. In addition it shows the relationship with our databases and judicial customers. There was discussion on the accuracy of the diagram and it appeared that there were some interactions that were missing. Ms. Diseth said that AOC would revise the diagram and that if anyone has any feedback on what is missing please e-mail Bill Cogswell directly.

## Recommendation for JISC Scheduling Policy of ITG Decisions

Mr. William Cogswell presented a recommendation for scheduling of JISC decisions on IT governance requests. This presentation came out of the table top exercise that occurred back in October. At that meeting, members completed an exercise that highlighted the lack of policy that sets aside a portion of resources for the smaller, delegated projects.

The JISC currently does not have a set policy for scheduling the review of IT governance requests. Because requests over a certain size require a budget request to the Legislature, the JISC may wish to review large requests annually in concert with the legislative budget cycle. Smaller requests could be reviewed more frequently. Setting different decision schedules can allow for optimization of AOC resources for completing projects.

Mr. Ramsey Radwan clarified, we have funding for this biennium, what we are talking about here are new requests.

Mr. Jeff Hall explained we have two kinds of money in JIS, carry forward maintenance level, and project money, money given, subject to a budget proviso. Our carry forward budget does not include any money for projects. The current 12 million we have in project money was appropriated subject to a budget proviso; those funds can be used only for the purpose in which the legislature appropriated it and our authority to use those funds goes away at the end of the biennium. The question is – *do we want to go to the legislature on a carry forward level basis ask for a set amount of money in carry forward spending authority for projects, for us to decide how to spend. The other approach is to go in with a decision package and ask for X $ for X "big thing" and we want X for projects.*

The money currently allocated for "Transformation" has been appropriated for a specific purpose and is subject to a budget proviso.

At this point in the agenda, Justice Fairhurst asked Ms. Diseth her preference on what item to discuss next given the time constraint for the meeting.

Ms. Vonnie Diseth replied – going through the requests and determining the priority is what we need to do. What we are asking this committee to do is look at the requests and give your priority

as to what gives you the best business value. Knowing what the priority is will allow AOC/ISD the ability to determine how to schedule the projects.

The discussion on the policy for IT request review schedule will be carried over to the next meeting.

Justice Fairhurst asked Kevin Ammons to walk us through the requests we can get through in the remaining time.

## Policy for Supreme and Appellate Court Requests

*This agenda item was rescheduled for discussion at the special session meeting that has been schedule on February 18, 2011.

## ITG Status Report

*This agenda item was rescheduled for discussion at the special session meeting that has been schedule on February 18, 2011.

## Prioritization Scheduling Overview

*This agenda item was rescheduled for discussion at the special session meeting that has been schedule on February 18, 2011.

## ITG Requests

Request numbers 13 and 45 were brought before the committee:

#13 came from the Superior Court Level User Group – the group unanimously agreed not to advance the request and declined the request due to the significant amount of time and resources needed to complete it with little return on investment.

Justice Fairhurst asked to have this request brought back to determine the process of how it gets returned to the workgroup. So they understand what was and wasn't resolved and why.

#009 Add Accounting Data to the EDW – (this request does not have scoring).
The solution shall provide accounting data in the data warehouse and create canned reports to provide the reporting capabilities specified in this request.

*Mr. Jeff Hall stated – in the development of the governance process, users said "they did not want the scoring to go to the JISC".

**Justice Fairhurst asked to have the policy verified and communicated back at the next meeting.

Motion: Mr. Rich Johnson move the JISC on the recommendation of the DMSC move this project forward, second: Mr. Larry Barker, motion passed unanimously with 10 yeas. Barb Miner has left the meeting and did not vote.

#045 Appellate Electronic Filing – The appellate courts require a statewide enterprise document management system that interfaces with an appellate case management system to provide an integrated solution to support their business needs.

The proposal before the committee is to approve an internal feasibility study for looking at the market solutions available for the function. Part of the research would determine if the system would integrate with ACORDS. Once that is determined the request can come back for further consideration.

Justice Fairhurst stated that she supports the overall concept, but she would recommend taking only the light green section of the cost summary as an initial decision to start on and then come back with the information gathered from that study and then the JISC can make a decision in favor of "option a or option b", or a no decision.

Motion: Judge J. Leach, move to approve option A and move forward with the internal feasibility study. Second, Mr. William Holmes, the motion passed unanimously with 10 votes.

Justice Fairhurst suggested a special meeting on February 18 and during that meeting we finish the topic's not covered today (agenda item 8) and finish approval of the other requests, and do the prioritization. This meeting is to accomplish only the items that were left unfinished on today's agenda.

## Next Meeting

A special session meeting was called for February 18, to discuss agenda item number 8 – tabs 7, 8 and 11-18

The next regular meeting will be March 4, 2011, at the AOC SeaTac facility; from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

There being no more time, the meeting was adjourned at 3:02 p.m.

## Action Items – From January 21st Meeting

- More information on Service Catalog at next meeting. What it is and what is the value of doing it.
  Owner: Kumar Yajamanam
- On the budget "green sheet" it says that we've expended 1.5 m of the 1.6 m for Superior Court Data Exchange. Vonnie said she would investigate this and report back.
  Owner: Vonnie Diseth
- Superior Court Case Management - Updated Charter and FAQ available for next JISC meeting.
  Owner: Kate Kruller
- A definition for what SCOMIS functionality means that is succinct and clear and how the "functionality" relates to other applications.
  Owner: Kate Kruller
- We need to re-visit whether CLUG scores go up to the JISC.
  Owner: Kevin Ammons