JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

June 22, 2012
9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
AOC Office, SeaTac, WA

Minutes

Members Present:
Mr. Larry Barker
Chief Robert Berg
Judge Jeanette Dalton
Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Mr. Jeff Hall
Judge James Heller
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. Rich Johnson
Mr. Marc Lampson
Judge J. Robert Leach
Ms. Marti Maxwell
Ms. Barb Miner
Judge Steven Rosen
Ms. Aimee Vance
Ms. Yolande Williams
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

AOC Staff Present:
Ms. Tammy Anderson
Mr. Dan Belles
Mr. Bill Burke
Mr. Bill Cogswell
Mr. Keith Curry
Mr. Mike Davis
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Ms. Vicky Marin
Mr. Dirk Marler
Mr. Dexter Mejia
Ms. Heather Williams
Ms. Pam Payne

Members Absent:
Mr. Steward Menefee (by phone from 10-11 for vote)

Guests Present:
Mr. Ken Arnold
Mr. Shayne Boyd
Mr. Gary Egner
Ms. Lea Ennis
Mr. Don Horowitz
Mr. Doug Klunder
Mr. Allen Mills
Mr. Bona Nasution
Mr. Brian Rowe
Mr. Kyle Snowden
Mr. Joe Wheeler
Mr. Mike Zanon

Call to Order

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

May 4, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any changes to the May 4th meeting minutes. With one noted correction, (Aimee Vance was changed to absent) Justice Fairhurst deemed them approved.

Proposed JIS Decision Packages

Ms. Vonnie Diseth presented to the committee the proposed decision packages for the 13-15 biennium. Decision Packages will be presented to the Supreme Court Budget Committee on July 18th. A complete development, review and submittal schedule is included in the meeting material.

Motion: Judge Thomas Wynne
I move that the JISC approve the 2013-2015 Decision Packages for the Superior Court Case Management System, JIS Multi-Project Funding, the Information Networking Hub, External and Internal Equipment Replacement, EDMS Ongoing Support, and that funding for a Limited Jurisdiction CMS Feasibility Study be included in the Multi-Project Fund.

Second: Marti Maxwell

Amendment: Judge Rosen

Move to table approval of the Superior Court Case Management System decision package until after the discussion and vote on the release of the Superior Court Case Management System Request for Proposal.

Voting in Favor: All members present
Opposed: None
Absent: Stew Menefee

ITG #2 - SC-CMS Update

Ms. Maribeth Sapinoso, the SC-CMS Project Manager, is on vacation in Hawaii. Therefore, Ms. Vonnie Diseth, ISD Director, will provide the project update. Ms. Vonnie Diseth began by introducing Keith Curry as the Deputy Project Manager on the project. He will be working hand in hand with Maribeth. Keith comes to AOC with excellent skills and experience with level 3 projects as an IT Project Manager.

Ms. Diseth provided an update on the SC-CMS project. Some of the completed activities include the acquisition plan, establishment of internal collaboration meetings with the project teams for SC-CMS, INH and COTS-Prep. Demonstration Scripts for the clerks, judges and court administrators are being worked on. The demonstration scripts will detail what the business processes are; this will allow the vendors to demonstrate specific functions. RFP Pre-Release Conference was held – approximately 30 different vendors participated. We are ready for release of the RFP.

Motion: Judge Jeanette Dalton

I move that the JISC authorize release of the Superior Court Case Management System Request for Proposal as recommended by the SC-CMS RFP Steering Committee.

Second: Jeff Hall
Voting in Favor: All Members
Opposed: None
Absent: None

Motion: Judge Thomas Wynne
I move to submit the SC-CMS decision package in the budget process.
Second: William Holmes
Voting in Favor: All Members (Stew Menefee by phone)
Opposed: None
Absent: None

Court Business Office (CBO)

Mr. Dirk Marler presented a follow-up presentation on the Court User Work Group (CUWG) concept needed for the SC-CMS project. The CUWG will work directly with the Court Business Office (CBO) on validating business processes, identifying opportunities for standardization, analyzing impacts of process change, and defining the configuration specifications for the new case management software.

Mr. Marler described the draft of the guiding principles for the CUWG. The guiding principles included pursuing the best interests of the court system at large while honoring local decision making authority and local practice, making timely decisions, being open to changing practices when it makes sense, recognizing that there will conflicting processes, stakeholder views and that they will not be ignored and will be discussed to address and resolve everyone's concern.

Mr. Marler also highlighted some of the CUWG's key responsibilities to include identifying common court business processes that could be packaged for configuration, identifying opportunities for refining court business processes, ensuring that court business processes and requirements are complete, and providing insight on potential impacts, opportunities and constraints associated with transforming court business processes and transitioning to new systems.

The discussion then moved into the CUWG's proposed membership and decision-making process. JISC members and guests provided suggestions on the membership to include diversity (both geographic and court size), representatives from the Access To Justice (ATJ) community, representatives from the courts of limited jurisdiction (the DMCMA), representatives from the appellate court, and representatives from the WSBA. There was discussion of whether those should be voting or consulting members.

A suggestion was made for the membership to be structured in a way that the detailed discussions can be participated in by appointed line-staff or subject matter experts (who may not be comfortable making policy level decisions), but the decision making is made by executive level members.

JISC members made a number of suggestions regarding the decision-making process and review of CUWG decisions. The JISC discussed that the goal of the CUWG should be decision making with the goal of unanimity and consensus, but using the standard of consent and majority vote as a backup.

Regarding review of CUWG decisions, some members suggested that CUWG disputes be resolved by the Project Steering Committee, rather than the JISC. Another suggestion was to have the CUWG be the final arbiter of decisions. Other members suggested that there should not be an appellate review of CUWG decisions, but that the group should report their decisions to the JISC.

The presentation concluded with a motion to approve the formation of the Court User Work Group (CUWG), with representatives from county clerks, superior court judges and administrators, AOC, the District and Municipal Court Management Association (DMCMA), the Access to Justice Board (ATJ), and the Washington State Bar Association (WSBA), to make configuration decisions for the new Superior Court Case Management System (SC-CMS). The motion passed unanimously, of those members present.

Motion: Judge Leach
Second: Judge Heller
Voting in Favor: All Present
Opposed: None
Absent: Stew Menefee

A second motion was made to have the SC-CMS Steering Committee develop the charter for the CUWG, including the determination of which members will have voting rights, what the appeal process would be, and any other conditions, and bring that charter for approval by the JISC at the next meeting.

Motion: Judge Leach
Second: Barb Miner
Voting in Favor: All Present
Opposed: None
Absent: Stew Menefee

The request was made that the superior court associations approve the CUWG charter before it is brought back to the JISC.

A request was also made to include in the CUWG charter that the group will report to the JISC.

ITG #45 – Appellate Court EDMS Update

Mr. Burke presented the current status of the Appellate Courts EDMS project and proposed an alternative EDMS system design. The proposed system design would incorporate the required ACORDS functionality into the EDMS, eliminating the need to develop a custom interface to ACORDS. This approach has less risk and provides a more stable solution than linking the EDMS to the ACORDS system. ACORDS is currently the most fragile system in the AOC portfolio and there is no design documentation for this system. The original proposed system design of interfacing the EDMS to ACORDS would have constrained the EDMS to work within the ACORDS business processes and resulted in maintaining Case Document metadata on both ACORDS and the new EDMS system. Mr. Burke stated that while there is some uncertainty about the cost for the new EDMS system but based upon current available information we believe that this system can be completed within the current budget authorization.

Question: What happens to the legacy data currently in ACORDS?

Answer: All the current Case Document data in ACORDS is also stored in the AOC Data Warehouse. Once the EDMS is operational, this ACORDS data in the Data Warehouse will be accessible from within the EDMS application. In addition, the associated Case Document data for all new Case Documents that are entered into the EDMS will also be stored in the Data Warehouse. The AOC Data Warehouse is intended to be the repository for all Appellate Court Case Document data, regardless whether the Case Document data was stored in ACORDS or the new EDMS.

Question: What does the AOC funding request for the Appellate Courts EDMS system in the 2013-2015 biennium include?

Answer: The $400K request includes the annual EDMS software licensing costs and the cost for operational support for this system following the completion of the development project. This additional support is required for administrative support for this new EDMS system and to provide Appellate Court support for modifying their automated workflows. Current AOC staff does not have the necessary skills required for this new position.

Motion: Judge Rosen

I move to adopt the Appellate Court EDMS Project Executive Steering Committee recommendation to proceed with the recommended system design of a standalone electronic document management system that contains all the required business functionality of ACORDS.

Second: Judge Leach
Voting in Favor: All Present
Opposed: None
Absent: Judge Dalton, Stew Menefee

ITG #121 Superior Court Data Exchange Update

Mr. Bill Burke presented the current status for the Superior Court Data Exchange (SCDX) project. Project QA testing of SCDX Increment 1 is approximately 80% complete but Increment 1 QA testing will not be completed until late July. The lead SCDX QA Tester recently left the agency and this will delay the completion of testing. The QA team is in the process of adding (2) contractors to perform SCDX QA testing through the end of 2012. These contract Testers are not expected to be available to start project testing until late July. The SCDX project will require additional JISC funding authorization for these contract Testers.

The SCDX project team has identified some enhancements to the QA test tools being used by QA team on the SCDX project. These test tool enhancements are expected to significantly reduce the amount of time required to test each SCDX web service. Currently, testing of each SCDX web services takes approximately 40 hours to complete. These enhancements are expected to reduce this time by about 30%. There are still (56) SCDX web services that will need to be tested after Increment 1 and that these tool enhancements can also be used for testing INH web services. The AOC has received a fixed price proposal of $22K to implement these enhancements. The development necessary to enhance these QA tools is not in the SCDX budget and requires JISC funding authorization.

The SCDX project has completed Increment 4 planning. The AOC will develop (13) web services and Sierra Systems will develop (12) web services. Sierra Systems has submitted a fixed price proposal of $236K to complete their web services. While the JISC provided funding authorization for SCDX Increment 4 at the December 2011 JISC, the project is requesting JISC funding allocation.

Justice Fairhurst asked Ms. Vonnie Diseth to contact Mr. Kevin Stock and ask that the Pierce County technical team to come to the September 7 meeting and provide the committee with an informational update on the project from their side. She then asked Mr. Bill Burke and the project team to work with the Pierce County team to do a joint presentation of how the two sides are coming together and any potential concerns.

The JISC approved funding for the following for the SCDX project: a) (2) contract Testers through the end of 2011, b) $22K for QA test tool enhancements, c) $236K for Sierra Systems Increment 4 development.

Motion: Barb Miner
I move to approve allocation of $236,000 from the JIS Multi-Project Fund to fund the development of 12 web services by Sierra Systems in Increment 4 of the Superior Court Data Exchange Project.
Second: unknown – not repeated

Voting in Favor: All Present
Opposed: None
Absent: Stew Menefee, Judge Dalton, Yolande Williams

JIS Policy on Local Automated Court Record

Judge Rosen, Chair of the policy workgroup, presented the draft policy to the committee for review. He presented a primary and an alternate draft, and explained that the differences were in paragraphs one and four, centering around the issue of whether AOC or the local court will pay for double-data entry until AOC has the resources available to remove the court from JIS and implement a data exchange. Judge Rosen said that the workgroup had reached an impasse, and was looking to get guidance from the JISC. The committee discussed the issue of paying for double-data entry before or after the Information Networking Hub (INH) is in place. The committee directed the workgroup to revise the policy to include what will be required before the INH is built, then consider options for revising the policy after the INH is in place. The committee also gave the following specific feedback: All references in the policy should be to "local court," the maintenance section should say the JISC will review the policy at least annually, and paragraph nine should say that the local system must "comply with all ISD standards, including, but not limited to…"

Natural to COBOL Project Update

Ms. Vonnie Diseth provided an update to the committee on the decision to cease continued work on the project. It was explained that the contractor was not able to produce converted code that could be tested to ISD's satisfaction and that the internal efforts required for testing and quality checking the converted code was exceeding the acceptable limits expected in the business case financial analysis. Meetings with the vendor to attempt to resolve the issues were ongoing for several months. The problems were delaying other work for which ISD had made commitments. As a result, the determination was made that ISD was not going to achieve the stated goals or return on investment for the project and decided to end the contract.

CLJ courts are the principle users of the Natural programming. They have asked for a CLJ case management system like SC-CMS. Therefore, the window of opportunity to eliminate Natural, switch to COBOL is no longer viable, as the ITG process to move CLJ to a new case management system is now underway. Eventually, the Natural programs will be replaced with CLJ Commercial Off-the-Shelf (COTS) systems.

Information Networking Hub (INH) Program Overview and Status

Mr. Dan Belles, Project Manager, provided an update on the Information Networking Hub (INH) Project. Mr. Belles gave an update on current project activities including the Pilot Services, SC-CMS business services and the central database. Mr. Belles also reviewed the INH project schedule and major milestones. He stated that the first deliverable would be the two Pilot services, Get ADR and Get Person. He shared they were on track to be completed by the end of June. Mr. Belles informed the committee the primary focus of INH over the next twelve months will be to complete the documentation and services needed for the SC-CMS vendor and have them ready when they came on board in April 2013. Mr. Belles concluded his presentation by covering the next steps in the project, which would focus on continuing requirements development and design of the Electronic Data Repository (EDR) and completion of the Pilot services.

Judge Thomas Wynne asked what the backup plan for INH is in case it is not ready for the SC CMS. Mr. Mike Davis, PMO Manager responded a point-to-point connection would be the final backup solution for INH.

Justice Mary Fairhurst asked for a clarification of what was meant with the term “requirements” as used by the INH. Mr. Belles responded that requirements were the technical and business requirements needed to build the services and EDR. Justice Fairhurst asked who would be providing that information. Mr. Belles responded that they would be seeking input from business stakeholders, like the Data Management Steering Committee.

Rich Johnson, asked if the data exchange services being built are specific to the superior courts or are they INH services that can be used by other courts as well? Mr. Belles stated ‘no’, the INH services being built are intended to work for systems at all court levels and were not specific to just Superior Courts.

Committee Reports

Data Dissemination Committee:
Judge Thomas Wynne reported a meeting was held on May 30th. The committee approved the following requests: from Special Commitment Center, DSHS at McNeil Island for fee waived JIS link access and from Snohomish County Office of Public Defense for access to JABS for the purpose of doing the Risk Assessments. These are level 22 access. Judge Wynne shared that he has used the Risk Assessment tool and it works great.

The committee is working on a policy for Adult Static Risk Assessment (ASRA) and JABS access.

The committee also adopted a recommendation that a court be able to print out a “view” of the DCH (defendant case history) screen for the defendant or the defendant’s designee that does not include information about the existence of sealed juvenile cases. This would satisfy the provision in RCW 13.50.050 (14) that states that an agency may not give out information about the existence or nonexistence of a sealed juvenile case. The committee will be submitting an ITG request to implement this recommendation.

Data Management Steering Committee:

Mr. Rich Johnson reported that Accounting Data in the Data Warehouse Reports are on schedule and good progress is being made.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be September 7, 2012, at AOC SeaTac Facility; from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Action Items

	Action Items – From March 4th 2011 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*
	Action Items – From October 7th 2011 Meeting		
3	Confer with the BJA on JISC bylaw amendment regarding JISC communication with the legislature.	Justice Fairhurst	
	Action Items – From December 2nd 2011Meeting		
4	Present to the JISC a schedule for work on ITG projects prioritized by the JISC on December 2nd.	Vonnie Diseth	Postponed
	Action Items – From March 2nd 2012 Meeting		
9	Check on whether it is possible to reload archived CLJ cases into active tables without making them available to web search on the public website.	Kate Kruller	
	Action Items – From May 4th 2012 Meeting		
10	Create a document showing the difference between the costs associated with COTS-Prep versus INH.	Mike Davis	Completed 6/22/12
	Action Items – From June 22nd 2012 Meeting		
11	Document the overall governance structure for the SC-CMS project.	Maribeth Sapinoso/ Keith Curry	
12	Clarify the amount expended on the Natural-to-COBOL project.	Vonnie Diseth/ Ramsey Radwan	
13	CUWG Charter approved by Associations before it is brought back to the JISC	Heather Williams	