JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

December 2, 2011
9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
AOC Office, SeaTac, WA

DRAFT - Minutes

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

Members Absent:
Mr. Marc Lampson

AOC/Temple Staff Present:
Mr. Kevin Ammons
Mr. Dan Belles
Mr. Bill Burke
Mr. Bill Cogswell
Ms. Jennifer Creighton
Mr. Mike Davis
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Mr. Martin Kravik
Mr. Eric Kruger
Ms. Kate Kruller
Ms. Vicky Marin
Ms. Heather Morford
Ms. Pam Payne
Mr. Ramsey Radwan

Guests Present:
Ms. Betty Gould – by phone
Ms. Marti Maxwell
Mr. Chris Shambro
Ms. Aimee Vance
Mr. Shayne Boyd
Mr. Mike Zanon
Mr. Gary Egner
Ms. Lea Ennis

Call to Order

Justice Mary Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and introductions were made.

October 7, 2011 Meeting Minutes

Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any changes to the October 7th meeting minutes. Hearing no changes, Justice Fairhurst deemed them approved.

Budget Update

Mr. Ramsey Radwan provided an update on the expenditures and obligations through October 31, 2011. Allocations for the following activities were changed: $40,000 was added to item 2.4 Implement IT Portfolio Management; $378,000 was added to item 12.1 Natural to COBOL Conversion; $280,000 was added to 12.2 SCOMIS DX; the entire amount allocated to item 11.1 Change Management in Support of JIS ($320,000) was eliminated as this activity can be completed with in-house staff. Funding was reallocated from item 11.1 and from one-time monies available as a result of pre-payments.

Revenues are coming in a little below anticipation, but are within the $38 million currently projected.

SC-CMS Update

Since the October JISC meeting, the SC-CMS Project completed and signed the project charter for the Request for Proposal (RFP). The SC-CMS Project RFP Steering Committee has been meeting weekly to oversee all stages of the requirements gathering activity currently underway – as well as the RFP development, evaluation process and evaluation criteria development.

During November, the SC-CMS Project team completed six full-day requirements sessions with representatives from key stakeholder groups to validate the business requirements gathered (including King County requirements). To meet the requirements of a legislative proviso, the presidents of the Superior Court Judges Association, Association of Washington Superior Court Administrators and the Washington State Association of County Clerks must affirmatively confirm that it meets the needs of their members in thirty-nine (39) counties before the RFP is issued. This agreement is due December 30, 2011.

AOC's SC-CMS Project Business Analyst Team provided the latest copy of the SC-CMS Business Requirements Document (BRD) and the Glossary of Terms Document to the three associations November 22, 2011. We are reviewing the comments from the association presidents and expect to conclude work on this draft and deliver the document to the proviso team by December 8, 2011.

Next steps for the SC-CMS Project include assisting the proviso document team in meeting the following deadlines:

1. Produce a legislative proviso report draft on December 8, 2011.
2. Confirmation letters due from the associations December 19, 2011.
3. Draft of proviso report to JISC Members for feedback December 20-22, 2011.
4. Final draft of the proviso report goes to the JISC Executive Members for approval December 27, 2011.
5. Final proviso report goes to the Legislature December 30, 2011.

The JISC will be asked to decide on whether or not to release the RFP at the March 2nd meeting.

IT Governance Requests/ Prioritization

Mr. Kevin Ammons presented the ITG Status Report and also discussed the current status of the Information Services Division (ISD) resource utilization. He informed the committee that three small ITG projects had completed in the last two months. The projects that completed were two upgrades to the Judicial Receipting System (JRS) [ITG 50] and a small modification to the Judicial Information System (JIS) [ITG 72].

Justice Mary Fairhurst pointed out that we have been operating within our new governance process for all of our requests. However, that doesn't include the Superior Court Data Exchange (SCDX) project that had already been in process prior to the implementation of the Governance Process. We have always agreed that the Data Exchange project for the Superior Court is our highest priority, but it is not on the JISC priority list. Before us today are requests that need to be approved or disapproved. We need to identify all of our priorities and let AOC come back with a plan of when they might be scheduled based on resource availability.

Ms. Vonnie Diseth agreed that the SCDX project needs to be officially on the list of JISC priorities.

Mr. Kevin Ammons then presented three IT Governance requests for JISC consideration:

ITG 005 – Email/Text Court Date Reminders.
Mr. Ammons explained that this request had been tabled at the May 2011 JISC meeting pending the results of the Baseline Services initiative. After discussion regarding the request, a motion was made and seconded. Justice Fairhurst then called for a vote on the motion.

Motion: Judge Steve Rosen moved to approve a feasibility study on texting.
Second: Judge Jim Heller.
Voting in Favor: William Holmes, Judge Heller, Judge Rosen, Larry Barker, Jeff Hall.
Opposed: Justice Fairhurst, Linda Bell, Chief Berg, Judge Dalton, N.F. Jackson, Rich Johnson, Judge Leach, Stew Menefee, Barb Miner, Yolande Williams, Judge Wynne.
Absent: Marc Lampson.

The motion failed with 11 members voting nay, and 5 members voting yea.

ITG 102 - New Case Management System to Replace JIS/DISCIS.
After discussion, Justice Fairhurst stated that authorizing this request would be establishing a strategic priority on the ITG list which would allow AOC to have some insight into the relative priorities of future efforts. A motion was made and seconded. Justice Fairhurst then called a vote on the motion.

Motion: Justice Fairhurst moved to adopt the CLJ recommendation to do a feasibility study on DISCIS replacement.
Second: Judge Thomas Wynne.
Voting in Favor: William Holmes, Judge Heller, Judge Rosen, Larry Barker, Jeff Hall, Justice Fairhurst, Linda Bell, Chief Berg, Judge Dalton, N.F. Jackson, Rich Johnson, Judge Leach, Stew Menefee, Barb Miner, Yolande Williams, Judge Wynne.
Absent: Marc Lampson.

The motion passed unanimously with all members present.

ITG 085 - JRS Replacement.
The request was discussed by the committee. Justice Fairhurst pointed out that this request was similar in nature to the previous request. After further discussion, a motion was made and seconded. Justice Fairhurst then called a vote on the motion.

Motion: Barb Miner moved to approve a feasibility study on JRS replacement.
Second: Judge Jim Heller.
Voting in Favor: William Holmes, Judge Heller, Judge Rosen, Larry Barker, Jeff Hall, Justice Fairhurst, Linda Bell, Chief Berg, Judge Dalton, N.F. Jackson, Rich Johnson, Judge Leach, Stew Menefee, Barb Miner, Yolande Williams, Judge Wynne.
Absent: Marc Lampson.

The motion passed unanimously with all members present.

Bill Burke presented the Superior Court Data Exchange Update: *see JIS Priority Project Status Reports.*

Mr. Ammons then facilitated the prioritization activity for the approved ITG requests. First, the Superior Court Data Exchange and ITG 081 - Implement Static Risk Tool, STRONG 2 were prioritized in the JISC ITG Priority list. The JISC then prioritized the two new requests.

Justice Mary Fairhurst asked – does everyone think we need to give Superior Court Data Exchange (SCDX) a number and prioritize it? The general consensus was 'Yes – it should be on the list with a real priority number'.

Kevin highlighted the current JISC Priorities. Currently, there are seven requests and the first four are "In Progress". According to the IT Governance rules, all requests that are already underway; are locked in and can't be changed.

Justice Mary Fairhurst stated we have two requests to add to the list: the SCDX and the Adult Risk Assessment (ARA) tool. Prioritization also needs to be done with these in mind. She then asked the committee by a show of hands the following questions:

How many think SCDX should be #1? – 9
How many think SCDX should be #2? – 1
How many think SCDX should be #3? – 4

Given the vote – SCDX will be the new #1 priority. All previously prioritized requests will move down one position.

Regarding the second request (Adult Risk Assessment), Judge Rosen asked for clarification . . . if we were told by the Legislature to fund this with the small projects fund that we were given; then is it true that we can't "unfund" it? Vonnie Diseth responded that we are doing the ARA project in-house with ISD staff. Therefore, there isn't actually a cash expenditure associated with it.

Justice Fairhurst then asked for priority ranking for ARA by a show of hands:

How many think ARA should be #1? – 0
How many think ARA should be #2? – 0
How many think ARA should be #3? – 0
How many think ARA should be #4? – 0
How many think ARA should be #5? – 0

Rich Johnson suggested that ARA should be the last one of the "in-progress" projects. The committee agreed that it should be #6.

Justice Fairhurst stated we are done with prioritizing the "in-progress" projects and they are 1 thru 6 on our priority list. Now, we need to insert the two additional requests – Feasibility Study for JRS Replacement and Feasibility Study for CLJ CMS in our priority list. We have renumbered our list and now we currently have 11 items on our priority list. Not all of these have been started.

Justice Fairhurst asked, based on the priority of the CLUGS and our current list of "authorized projects", whether everyone was comfortable making the current numbers 6 - SCOMIS Field for CPG, and 7 - Prioritize Restitution Recipients and Combine True Name and Aliases for Time Pay our bottom 2 priorities? The committee responded "Yes" and the majority carried.

Justice Fairhurst stated that we now have three requests to prioritize:

- Expanded Seattle Municipal Court Case Data Transfer
- CMS to replace JIS (DISCIS)
- JRS Replacement

How many think Expanded Seattle Municipal Court Case Data Transfer should continue at #1 of this group? Majority passed. Making this our #1 authorized project of these three. How many think the feasibility study to replace CLJ CMS should be #2? Majority passed. By default of our first two votes, that makes the Feasibility Study for JRS replacement our #3.

Justice Fairhurst stated that we now have our priorities. Vonnie can now go work with her team to determine what can be scheduled. Vonnie will come back with a plan for the March 2 meeting.

The JISC's adopted priority list is:

Priority	**ITG #**	**Request Name**	**Status**	**Approving Authority**	**JISC Importance**
1	121	Superior Court Data Exchange	In Progress	JISC	High
2	002	Superior Court Case Management System	In Progress	JISC	High
3	045	Appellate Courts EDMS	In Progress	JISC	High
4	009	Add Accounting Data to the Data Warehouse	In Progress	JISC	High
5	041	Remove CLJ Archiving and Purge Certain Records	In Progress	JISC	High
6	081	Implement Static Risk Tool, STRONG 2 (ARA)	In Progress	JISC	High
7	027	Expanded Seattle Municipal Court Case Data Transfer	Scheduled Feb 2012 – Jan 2013	JISC	High
8	102	New Case Management System to Replace JIS (DISCIS)	Authorized	JISC	High
9	85	JRS Replacement	Authorized	JISC	High
10	007	SCOMIS Field for CPG	Authorized	JISC	Medium
11	026 & 031	Prioritize Restitution Recipients and Combine True Name and Aliases for Time Pay	Authorized	JISC	Medium

DB2 Upgrade Update

Ms. Vonnie Diseth reported that ISD infrastructure staffs are working with IBM to determine the cause of the slow-down that occurred in October in the first upgrade attempt. The plan is to try again on December 8, 2011. E-mails have been sent to listserv's to inform all court staff of what is expected to take place and possible alternative scenarios.

Information Networking Hub (INH) Program Overview and Status

Mr. Dan Belles gave an overview of the transformation activities initiated by the JISC over the last two years that brought about the creation of the Information Networking Hub (INH). Mr. Belles then spoke about the INH program's primary data sharing capabilities and foundation components. The initial primary focus is preparing the INH for the SC-CMS rollout.

Mr. Eric Kruger then provided a non-technical overview of INH: providing a summary of the problems to resolved; program components; and a business focused description of the services to be provided. The primary problem to be solved by the INH is reducing complexity by migrating away from specialized data exchanges to generic multiple purpose reusable exchanges. The INH will also standardize data for consistent decision making and minimize redundant data by providing entry application integration. My Kruger briefly reviewed the INH Program components consisting of: infrastructure, development, support, and business services. He expanded on the business services by describing the seven categories of services to be provided.

Mr. Belles presented an overview of the INH schedule and a discussion of the SC-CMS schedule's milestones. He also discussed the question "What if INH was not ready in time for the SC-CMS?" Mr. Belles explained that the INH was focused on being ready for SC-CMS but was also a separate, stand-alone effort. INH would be needed regardless of whether we continue with the SC-CMS project or not. He discussed the interim contingency plan for connecting SC-CMS directly to JIS in the event that INH was not ready in time. He stated that the work being done by the SCDX project would allow for a direct data exchange connection that could be used as a short term solution until INH is ready.

Mr. Mike Davis used a swim lane diagram to provide an overview of how INH relates to the current architecture, and the SCDX and SC-CMS projects. He described the pinch points where there is the greatest risk of encountering difficulty with each of the projects. He described the need to reconcile the data in the new SC-CMS COTS application with the existing JIS database within the INH.

Ms. Barb Miner, King County Clerk asked a question on whether the INH schedule was dependent on the SC-CMS schedule and what happens if they didn't come together as expected. Mr. Dan Belles responded that the INH project was not dependent on SC-CMS and needed to go forward regardless of whether SC-CMS was on schedule or delayed. Ms. Miner also asked if outside contractors would be needed to do the INH development. Mr. Belles said outside developers would be needed to assist AOC staff to accomplish the INH work. Justice Mary Fairhurst stated that there was an approved budget line item for the INH project funding.

JIS Priority Project Status Reports

ITG 81 Static Adult Risk Assessment (ARA) Project

Mr. Martin Kravik presented an update on the Adult Static Risk Assessment project. He reported that a project Executive Steering Committee has been formed and is meeting on a monthly basis. It is chaired by Judge Kathleen O'Connor of Spokane Superior Court. The project charter was approved by the Executive Steering Committee. Clark County and Spokane County have volunteered to help AOC design the application user interfaces and develop guidelines for system use by jurisdictions. Cowlitz County and Kittitas County are also likely participants. A review draft for system requirements has been finalized. System design is nearing completion and development of court implementation guidelines has begun. Two issues that were raised were 1) the entry and maintenance of STRONG Severity Codes in the JIS law tables and 2) the formation of an AOC program to provide ongoing support to jurisdictions. Both were raised as information only at this point. Each appears to be on their way to being resolved.

Justice Fairhurst asked if there will be a problem handling new laws enacted during legislative sessions. Jeff Hall said that this is a mature process in AOC which will be able to include the addition of Severity Codes.

Next steps include finalizing system design, starting system development, and engaging the implementation courts in reviews and business process discussion

Vehicle Related Violations (VRV) Project

No update given.

Superior Court Data Exchange (SCDX)

Mr. Bill Burke provided the following status for the Superior Court Data Exchange (SCDX) project:

- Four additional web services (functions) were added to project scope. These functions were originally expected to be provided within the current planned (59) web services but as a result of the changes in the implementation approach approved by the JISC in January 2011, these functions will be implement via separate web services.

- The project is currently on-schedule to complete SCDX Production Increment 1. Development and verification testing is expected to be completed by the end of December and AOC QA testing is planned to be completed by the end of January.

- When the AOC has completed SCDX Production Increment 1, the Pierce County Legal Information Network Exchange (LINX) team will need to develop the software interface for the LINX system to use the SCDX web services. The Pierce County LINX team currently estimates this development will occur during the first Quarter of 2012.

Question: Will the SCDX support an interface to multiple local court Case Management Systems (CMS)?

AOC: Yes. While the Pierce County LINX System will be the first CMS to interface to the SCDX; the SCDX is being designed to support interfacing to multiple local court Case Management Systems concurrently, in real-time.

Question: Why does the current scope of the SCDX project not include Calendaring and Document Indexing?

Rich Johnson: The DMSC directed the SCDX project to focus on the web services required to eliminate dual data entry between local court CMS's and SCOMIS.
AOC: The current project scope was approved by the JISC in January 2011 as part of the project re-plan. If the (4) Calendaring and (2) Document Indexing web services need to be added to the SCDX in a follow-on project, a request can be submitted via the ITG process so that these requirements can be prioritized and go through the JISC project approval process.

Question: What will be required for other local court CMS's to interface to the SCDX?

AOC: The local court will need to develop the interface from their CMS to use the SCDX web services. While the AOC has designed the SCDX to support the interface to multiple local court CMS's, an AOC on-boarding process has not yet been developed to identify the time and resources required for the AOC to support a local court in this development.

The JISC requested that AOC Leadership begin discussions with Pierce County on the following:

a) Scheduling of the Pierce County development required for the LINX system to interface to the SCDX, and
b) Phasing out of the AOC payments to Pierce County for dual data entry between the LINX and SCOMIS systems.

The JISC authorized the SCDX project to proceed with implementing SCDX Production Increments 2 & 3 and allocated an additional $533.4K to the SCDX project, for this effort. (Note: The estimate to complete SCDX Production Increments 2 & 3 is $608K. The SCDX project has $74.6K remaining at the completion of Production Increment 1 and requires an additional $533.4K to complete these increments.)

1st Motion: Linda Bell moved to approve increasing the SCDX project funding authorization from $1.6M to 2.32M to complete all phases of the project.
Second: Judge Dalton.
Voting in Favor: William Holmes, Judge Heller, Judge Rosen, Larry Barker, Jeff Hall, Justice Fairhurst, Linda Bell, Chief Berg, Judge Dalton, Rich Johnson, Judge Leach, Stew Menefee, Barb Miner, Yolande Williams, Judge Wynne.
Absent: Marc Lampson, N.F. Jackson.

The motion passed unanimously with all members present.

2nd Motion: Chief Berg, move to allocate 533,400 from the JIS Multi-Project Fund for Increments 2 & 3 of the SCDX Project.
Second: Yolande Williams.
Voting in Favor: William Holmes, Judge Heller, Judge Rosen, Larry Barker, Jeff Hall, Justice Fairhurst, Linda Bell, Chief Berg, Judge Dalton, Rich Johnson, Judge Leach, Stew Menefee, Barb Miner, Yolande Williams, Judge Wynne.
Absent: Marc Lampson, N.F. Jackson.

The motion passed unanimously with all members present.

In prioritizing the AOC project portfolio, the JISC decided that the SCDX project is the highest priority project of the AOC project portfolio.

Appellate Court Electronic Document Management System (EDMS)

Mr. Bill Burke provided the following status for the Appellate Courts Electronic Document Management System (AC EDMS) project:

- The AOC is working with the Appellate Courts in developing Use Cases that define the Courts business requirements for the planned EDMS. These Use Cases will be used to validate the EDMS technical requirements and will also be used in defining the automated document workflow processes.

- While the project is following a process that will capture the Appellate Courts EDMS business requirements, the process takes time and the effort is more than 2 months behind schedule.

Committee Reports

Data Management Steering Committee: Mr. Rich Johnson reported the main focus for their last meeting was the status of the Superior Court Data Exchange and making sure the committee was in support of coming back to the JISC and recommending action on the requested funds.

Data Dissemination Committee: no report

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be March 2, 2012, at AOC SeaTac Facility; from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Action Items:

	Action Items – From March 4th Meeting	Owner	Status
1	At the end of the legislative session, ask the Supreme Court Rules Committee if it wants the Data Dissemination Committee to revisit GR15 in light of *Ishikawa* and *Bone-Club*.	Vicky Marin, Justice Fairhurst	*Postponed*
2	Draft JIS Policy on comment to the BJA/Legislature reflecting JISC consensus from March 4th meeting.	Vicky Marin	*Postponed*
	Action Items – From October 7th Meeting		
3	Confer with the BJA on JISC bylaw amendment regarding JISC communication with the legislature.	Justice Fairhurst	
4	Baseline Service Level Team – Add staff recognition to the Baseline Services Report	Jenni Christopher	Completed
	Action Items – From December 2nd Meeting		
5	Present JIS application portfolio plan to the JISC.	Vonnie Diseth	Planned for May JISC
6	Present to the JISC a schedule for work on ITG projects prioritized by the JISC on December 2nd.	Vonnie Diseth	
7	Discuss with Pierce County reduction of payment for double-data entry following completion of SCDX Increment 1	Jeff Hall	Completed/ In progress