JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

March 04, 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
Judge James Heller
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson
Mr. Rich Johnson
Mr. Marc Lampson
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:
None

Guests Present:
Mr. Shayne Boyd
Mr. Gary Egner
Ms. Cynthia Marr
Ms. Marti Maxwell
Mr. Jake Taylor
Ms. Aimee Vance
Mr. Joe Wheeler

Staff Present:
Mr. Kevin Ammons
Mr. Bill Burke
Mr. Bill Cogswell
Ms. Jennifer Creighton
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Mr. Martin Kravik
Ms. Kate Kruller
Ms. Vicky Marin
Ms. Heather Morford
Ms. Pam Payne
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Mr. Mike Walsh
Mr. Kumar Yajamanam

Call to Order

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

1. January 21, 2010 Meeting Minutes
2. February 18, 2011 Meeting Minutes

Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any changes to the two sets of minutes; 1 from the regular January meeting and 2 the February special session. Hearing none the minutes were voted and deemed approved.

During the discussion of the IT Governance agenda item, it was determined that the prioritization was presented incorrectly in the February minutes. The minutes will be amended to reflect the corrected prioritization and the corrected documents will be posted with the meeting material.

Budget Status Report

Mr. Ramsey Radwan presented the budget update. The amounts shown in the allocated column now reflect the re-baseline exercise that was done by Ms. Vonnie Diseth. These are the current numbers for projects for the 09-11 biennium. Spending is currently tracking according to plan. The update that will be given at the May 6 meeting will be a quarterly update.

Mr. Rich Johnson asked when putting a decision package (DP) in for these ongoing efforts associated with the modernization; how does that relate to the decision package discussed at the last meeting that was a “bucket decision package”?

Mr. Ramsey Radwan clarified, there are 3 decision packages going to the legislature:

1. A request for carry forward for the modernization projects identified in the re-baseline that were not completed in this biennium.
2. A request for the small to medium projects.

3. A revised DP for the case management system amount for the two year period of 11-13 – based on the MTG high-level cost estimate.

Mr. Rich Johnson asked for clarification about the prioritization of the Appellate Court e-Filing request, and the submission of a decision package – is that amount included in the $2 million bucket, it was not mentioned specifically as being included in one of the three decision packages stated by Mr. Radwan.

Mr. Ramsey Radwan explained the decision package does not specify projects.

Mr. Rich Johnson asked: are we looking at the funding for that project as part of the $2 million unidentified DP" or should there be a fourth decision package specifically for the project?

Mr. Ramsey Radwan: will the monies be needed prior to 2012? Ms. Vonnie Diseth reminded everyone that what was approved was the feasibility study to determine what the options and costs would be.

Mr. Rich Johnson agreed, as discussed at previous meeting this is the same thing that was approved for the superior court calendaring system was the feasibility study and we have a budget/decision package going forward to fund that project. This is the same scenario – we have approved the feasibility study for the appellate filing project as well, but it doesn't do much good if the feasibility study comes back and says yes move forward but we haven't requested any funds to fund the project.

Mr. Jeff Hall: there is a pretty broad range in terms of what we might get back from the feasibility study and what the right approach would be. There are two pieces to when this feasibility study comes back – 1 will be dollars and 2 is level of effort.

Justice Fairhurst summarized this is a fair point and the issue is that this is the first time we have had this. All we had before was the case management study and it was on its own track prior to setting up the governance process. This is a good example of how we are going to do this and do we need put in a place holder so the legislature knows that depending on how the feasibility study goes that we will be wanting money to beyond that to do the project. I also recognize that we are not in our normal cycle yet, that we will be in because we will be looking at money and different things. We are still a little bit in the stop gap place of how this will play out in the future. Given the priorities that were identified and approved last time, with Vonnie coming back this meeting to tell us how she plans to schedule these.

Ms. Vonnie Diseth: based on the cycle would it be more appropriate for the request to be a supplemental request in the fall for next year, because at that time we will know what the feasibility study result is, we know what option we are taking and we know what we are going to do.

Mr. Jeff Hall agreed that for the purposes of a decision package we start looking at it in terms of the supplemental budget, this would be a big question - but assuming we would get the $2 million mid biennium major project money – whether or not we would begin work using that pot of money on something like this to bridge us until we actually got an appropriation to finish it. That would depend on the size and the scope. Based on the timing of the final feasibility study, when the RFP goes out and when we can actually schedule the project, we could expend money in this current fiscal year so it would be appropriate to ask for the remainder in the supplemental budget.

It is the timing of projects as we engage in the new governance process and this new timing and budgeting process.

Justice Fairhurst: much like the legislature; until there is money attributed to it you don't really think it is going anywhere. In my view – once we vote on these and do the prioritization as we did in the special

February meeting "they are on the list" and they don't go off the list. So getting the money just depends on how we are working the legislature and also the timing of when we are going to get things done. I want to give reassurance once we start working on it – it doesn't get reprioritized once it is on the list. Going forward, as we are making decisions, we have to communicate clearly with Ramsey decisions that affect money so that we can use his expertise as to when and how to ask for funding. I am comfortable in the very near short term that we don't need it, because we can do the feasibility study with money we have and then we would come back with a better understanding and either make a request as a supplemental or as a part of a bigger process. I want to reassure the court of appeals level that we will take whatever steps necessary once we have the recommendations from the feasibility study and the JISC makes a decision to move forward.

Mr. Rich Johnson: I am concerned about that as a strategy – as it is a different strategy than what we use for other projects. I haven't heard any downside or reason why we would not put in a DP for this project if we prioritized it and it is simply a matter of how big it is going to be similar again to the SC project. There is no downside to putting in a request, in fact as we have reviewed the budget we see many project/initiatives that we have asked to have earmarked funds for two years ago that we are still rolling over and we are going to ask for money next biennium to roll them forward. It seems to me there is no downside to having the request be part of the budget and if we don't expend the funds in the time period then we can reallocate those funds at a later date as opposed to waiting for the supplemental process where now we are asking for something we didn't ask for the first time. It seems to me we are approaching this differently and I don't hear any rational reason why we should.

Justice Fairhurst: as a process matter it is important we decide what our process will be – the case management was an anomaly so the fact we did it there does not mean that is how we should do it going forward. The other part as we approve these we should, as part of that decision, figure out where we expect to ask for the money and where it fits into the process so we don't have this uncertainty, and that was something that we did not do last month but would be a good thing to add to our decision making going forward.

Mr. Jeff Hall: one of the things I struggle with in response to why we don't go forward with a DP right now is - I don't know how much money to ask for and I don't have a basis for asking for any particular amount. One of the things we did recognizing that problem very specifically to the CMS feasibility study was to ask the vendor with an early estimate so we could with some degree of confidence with some basis to back it up ask for funding for the CMS project and we don't have that in place for the COA project. I understand depending on the solution it is a pretty big range.

Mr. Rich Johnson: but we do – we had it at the last meeting and the meeting before – the range is 650k to 1.3 million. We did go through that process; it was as part of the analysis that was provided by AOC we used when we approved the project and made it our number 1 priority. We do have that – it is no different than the 5m to 20m, while the process was different the outcome is the same – it will be somewhere in that range.

Mr. Jeff Hall: How much should we ask for?

Mr. Rich Johnson responded: I suggest using the low and high range.

Ms. Vonnie Diseth: I don't feel like we know for certain what we are asking for because there is a wide range. Are we asking for a replacement for ACORDS or an interface for ACORDS? That hasn't been decided and jumping the gun a bit on the scheduling discussion coming up – this is one that isn't scheduled to start until April.

Mr. Ramsey Radwan: I am very nervous about submitting a placeholder DP at this time. We have built up a tremendous amount of credibility through Jeff, Justice Fairhurst, Mellani and others with the new process. I think that the CMS DP was a bit of an anomaly but right now it doesn't feel good to put in a placeholder for this. I think what we want to do is keep dialog going, keep talking to the legislature both at the staff level and the member level and remind them every chance we get that these are capital projects. We have to have some money for planning, for development, for design and implementation so I think our base for requesting money is pretty solid and if we start inserting more placeholders it makes me nervous, legislature doesn't have the stomach for that that is my opinion on that.

Justice Fairhurst: are there pro's and con's between asking for it in the regular funding or the supplemental vis a vis JISC. Do they expect to get something from us each year or are we better to buy a placeholder telling them that this is coming?

Mr. Ramsey Radwan: the legislature sees placeholders as money grabs – as opposed to a logical sequence of events. That is why I think we need to be more active or at the same level of activity reminding them that these are coming through the pipeline – and market the Governance process.

Mr. Jeff Hall asked: so we get the feasibility study back and it is $1.3 million dollars and we actually have the resources to schedule and we are going to start before the next fiscal year – we have the $2 million mid major project monies – we start to spend some of that money on that project and then we are going back to the legislature with a DP and that says – we started this project with some of our mid major funding you gave us but we can't cover the entire project we start with that money – we want another amount of money for the next fiscal to finish this project we started with this other pot of money. How would they react to that? Would they give us a supplemental budget to finish it?

Mr. Ramsey Radwan: yes I think they will because what were requesting for the small to medium project funding is not specific to any one project. I give examples from the list and when I talk to staff on the decision packages I talked about the Governance process. I don't see a problem going forward with – we took an amount of money from the small to medium size project money to do the feasibility study to jump start the project, so we will know where we are at – we will have a tremendous amount of information to go back to the legislature with a solid proposal. Letting them know we know what the plan is and here is how we want to implement it.

Mr. Jeff Hall: I think it would be helpful to have a clear articulation of this what the result of this conversation has been, so we are clear for staff about what we are doing. What I think I have heard and the consensus in the room is that we are not going forward with a decision package for the Appellate Court project at this time.

Justice Fairhurst – I have no such motion to that effect so that is what I am taking away…….

Mr. Rich Johnson: I will make such a motion – I believe we should submit a separate decision package for the Appellate Electronic Filing Project as part of the 11-13 budget request for JISC.

Second: Judge J Leach.

Justice Fairhurst – Any further discussion:

Mr. N.F. Jackson asked – where did the range of $650k to $1.3m range come from?

Mr. Rich Johnson - In the analysis portion of the ITG request documentation – as part of the analysis there was an estimate on the cost of the project.

Mr. Kevin Ammons provided clarification (Vicky Marin confirmed – actual numbers from the ITG request being $520K to $1.6M) this range was developed by our solution architect in Mr. Kumar Yajamanam's group after discussion with companies that provide these types of services. On the low end those functionalities are readily available; it is a very mature market so he was able talk with the vendors and get a good idea about how much it would cost to provide it and to provide the interface with the courts. As Mr. Johnson said – the Court of Appeals was not asking for the upper estimate on replacing ACORDS but that was provided and developed based on the fact we do have previous studies saying ACORDS is not stable and we would have trouble integrating. It was more a matter of capturing a range of how much would it cost to provide this functionality no matter what.

Justice Fairhurst: does your motion have a dollar amount attached to it Rich?

Mr. Rich Johnson: no, but I would be happy to provide one.

Judge J. Leach made a friendly amendment: the decision package amount be limited to the cost of providing the system that integrates with ACORDS. We made it pretty clear that we were not asking this group to go forward with an ACORDS replacement.

Mr. Rich Johnson: I understand the timing issue and when we will actually be ready to hit the ground running on this assuming we have a result from the feasibility study we can live with, but I think there is value in putting the DP that is why I made the motion. It doesn't have to be for the full amount, I don't think we are going to accomplish it all in the time period, it seems to me that the $525K low end would be a reasonable amount to put in for. Whatever methodology the budget office decides is best, I think there is value there – we will have the money earmarked for the project if it requires more we will have to go back and ask for more. But at least that way it is reflective of the action this body took and it also has a funding source set aside as opposed trying to plan on using the money designated for small projects.

Justice Fairhurst – any more discussion?

Mr. Jeff Hall: I am going to speak against the motion. Particularly if it is at the $500K range, I think that is within what we would pick up mid process from the smaller project money. Until we get the feasibility study and we know not just what the cost is going to be but our ability to schedule it – I think our ability to schedule that particularly if the CMS project moves forward is going to be impacted if it is a full ACORDS replacement, so the question is not going to be about the money, it will also be about bandwidth.

Judge Tom Wynne: I also speak against the motion – if we were three months earlier on this I would say go ahead with the decision package, but as Ramsey said – it is an issue of credibility with the legislature and we are trying to build credibility after having a big failure with the last project and credibility is very important here when asking for money, we need to have that credibility – that is the tipping point for me in terms of this motion, so I am opposed to the motion.

Judge J. Leach: I think we can establish credibility with the legislature if we explain why the level of the request is $550K and that we have this decision tree and we are not going to go to the larger project without coming back to the legislature and my concern about using the $2M dollar bucket is this: we have talked about the gorilla in the cage swallowing up all the money for the small projects and it seems to me that we are setting ourselves up for this if we plan to use that two million dollars with a quarter of it allocated to a single project. I think that is a bad way to go.

Justice Fairhurst – any further discussion?

Judge Steve Rosen asked: does anyone have an idea of what the feasibility study would cost for this project?

Mr. Kevin Ammons answered: it is about a 200 hour effort with internal staff. It can be accomplished by our business analysts and solution architects and a few other small resource allocations within ISD.

Voting in favor: Judge J. Leach, Mr. Marc Lampson, Ms. Yolande Williams, Mr. Rich Johnson
Opposed: Justice Mary Fairhurst, Mr. Jeff Hall, Mr. Larry Barker, Chief Robert Berg, Ms. Linda Bell, Mr. William Holmes, Mr. N.F. Jackson, Judge Steve Rosen, Judge Michael Trickey, Judge Thomas Wynne, Judge Jim Heller
Not voting: Mr. Stew Menefee, Ms. Barb Miner

Legislative Status Report

Ms. Mellani McAleenan reported legislative session is half over. The house of origin cut off is Monday March 7. That means that bills have to be out of their original house by 5pm.

Ms. McAleenan reported on a few specific bills:

HB 1794/SB 5046 – Assault/court-related employee – The bills have passed both original houses and switched to be heard in their opposite houses.

HB 1236/SB 5170 – Request for new judge in Grant Co. district court – the senate bill has been heard in the house.

SB 5630 – Municipal Elections Bill – requiring court judges be elected – the senate bill is sitting in senate Rules, we are working to get it to the floor for a vote.

SJR 8202 – Salary reductions for elected officials – requests salary commission to reduce elected official salaries during their term of office – requires a constitutional amendment – this bill originally included judges, but changed in senate Rules Committee to exclude judges and moved forward covering other elected officials. It is currently sitting in senate Rules awaiting floor action.

In regard to bills that may affect JIS – or be of interest to the committee, there are about 4.

HB 1793 – Access to Juvenile Records: this would now require a consumer protection violation for consumer reporting agencies that disseminate juvenile information and it would also require AOC to convene a workgroup to discuss the automatic sealing of juvenile records. The idea of automatic sealing has been around for a couple years, but is one the clerks have issue with because nothing can be done automatically. What is meant is without court order, there is a lot of information that would have to be found before sealing can take place. This bill has the most potential for passing in some form and would likely include the workgroup requirement. It is in house Rules at this time.

SB 5019 – Non-conviction Records – has died in Ways & Means and does not appear to be moving.

SB 5558 – Juvenile Records – has been amended and in its current form includes the consumer protection acts previously mentioned, and also appears to require that we sell our data to public agencies and give the data for free to consumer reporting groups, which is probably not what they meant. Ms. McAleenan has met with bill sponsor and the staff person working on the bill and they

understand our concerns. The bill is currently sitting in senate Rules and appears to not be moving forward.

SSB 5056 – Bail and Pretrial release - which included the Adult Risk Assessment tool in the bill, that bill died in Ways & Means – with a substantial fiscal note. The request for money for the risk assessment can be done via budget proviso, so it shouldn't be considered dead – just the original form.

ISD Monthly Status Update – Priority Project Reports

Monthly status reports will now be posted each month, around the 15th of each month on the same website as meeting documents. An email notice will go out to members and stakeholders to communicate the report has been posted. The most current available report will be included in a JISC meeting packet that goes out prior to a JISC meeting.

Superior Court Management Feasibility Study

Justice Fairhurst has asked any vendor that may bid on this project to leave the room. Gary Egner from AMCAD has left.

Ms. Kate Kruller presented an update on the status of the project. Ms. Roni Booth joined the team as a subject matter expert to research and report on "what is SCOMIS functionality". Roni and the business analysts are combing through workflows to gain understanding in how SCOMIS is used and why it is used in a particular capacity and any other ways it is not currently being used. SCOMIS has calendaring function; there are also aspects of SCOMIS that courts don't use because courts haven't been trained. This will give AOC the knowledge of what SCOMIS functionality does and best apply that knowledge to the project.

When the feasibility study comes back an ideal outcome would be to have a complete SCOMIS functionality match. Another outcome would be a partial match, and still another would be functions that we have never thought about that would be enhancements to our current business process and may bridge some of the things that may not be available. This is our current search as we go through the feasibility study. There are a number of different outcomes – which we won't know about until we finish the feasibility study.

Some of the completed activities include a project website, initial high level cost estimate, refined technical requirements and feasibility study business requirements.

Activities underway include project charter amendment approval by the ESC, review of MTG's deliverables, continue alternative analysis with software service providers, and finalize gap analysis and migration strategy. Next steps are completion of analysis and other elements of the feasibility study, prepare feasibility study for presentation at the June 24 JISC meeting for a go/ no-go decision and work on RFP preparation.

Justice Fairhurst stated – one element we need to discuss is the expectation we don't make a decision at the time of the presentation, we in fact come back to make the decision at the next meeting. That time frame is 2 months. We have the option of moving the August meeting to earlier in August to make the decision sooner and allow work to begin on the RFP.

Judge J. Leach stated moving the meeting to a sooner date would allow us to make a decision soon, if the feasibility study affects the cost and we have to go back to the legislature, we can come closer to the ordinary cycle for a supplemental request.

Mr. Michael Trickey asked – what is the feasibility study going to tell us? Will it be an assessment of our current business practices and then compare it to existing systems? And will it come with a recommendation?

Mr. Joe Wheeler (MTG) responded the feasibility study will not recommend a specific system, the other question – does it compare to current or future practices? Since future practices are not fully conceived to a great level of detail it can't be done to that level of detail – however we are looking at a common court policies and business processes as a basis for the functional requirements (the capabilities) the application should provide for.

Ms. Marti Maxwell asked – in the timeline do you anticipate the feasibility study going to the associations for some review and comments?

Ms. Kate Kruller responded – there will be drafts and we will vet the drafts.

Justice Fairhurst clarified – "so you will vet the drafts before it comes before the JISC in June"?

Ms. Kate Kruller responded yes – we have to.

Justice Fairhurst – that will ensure you are on target! That leads to the question- will we be getting those drafts too, so we are all thinking about it in anticipation or would we receive it later?

Mr. Jeff Hall asked – will the vetting of the associations be through the representative on the ESC?

Ms. Kate Kruller – responded it will go through the ESC and the discussion with each association will occur through the business liaisons.

Superior Court Data Exchange Project (SCDX)

Mr. Bill Burke presented an update on the SCDX project. The new technical approach approved by the JISC in January avoids a SCOMIS redesign and will deploy a Data Exchange that can be used by all local Superior Courts. SCOMIS services will be provided via web messaging to enable any local Superior Court computer system to interface to SCOMIS. The January JISC also approved deferring Calendaring and Document Imaging services from current project scope.

The SCDX project team evaluated two development products (Jagacy and RDz Service Flow) for performing data pull/push between SCOMIS and the SCOMIS Data Exchange. The project team selected Jagacy and completed a proof of concept using the Jagacy development tool. The proof concept consisted of performing a Docket Insert service using Jagacy and performing a number of iterations of this service. Mr. Burke was asked whether this approach consisted of "screen scraping" to perform this data pull/push with SCOMIS. Mr. Burke confirmed that both Jagacy and RDz Service Flow utilize "screen scraping" to pull/push data from SCOMIS. The SCOMIS system is 34 years old and does not provide access to services other than through 'screen scraping'. Mr. Burke stated that the only other approach to accessing these SCOMIS services required the redesign of the SCOMIS user interface and this was determined to be significantly more expensive.

The procurement plan has been completed and approved – there are two solicitations that need to move forward:

1. RFQQ – this will bring in a web expert to do the web messaging.
2. RFP – this will produce a contractor team with expertise in Jagacy and BizTalk development

The team is reviewing project documents required to complete the project and on functional specification for performing SCOMIS data push/pull.

Next steps include completing the detailed project plan and continue work on the RFQQ and RFP requests.

VRV – Vehicle Related Violations

Mr. Mike Walsh presented an update to the committee; the VRV On-Boarding project was still in a holding pattern due to DIS resources being tied up with the RMS project. He presented a picture of the server-to-server components that make up the eTRIP solution highlighted the touch points that are owned by different agencies. The emphasis in the presentation is that the DIS server component JINDEX is the hub of all message routing and delivery activity.

eTRIP challenges

Mr. Walsh described some of the challenges facing the project team; since all agencies have a share of the delivery responsibility no one agency has authority/oversight over another. This is considered a non-traditional project organization which has presented difficulties when trying to monitor and control schedules.

Record Management System (RMS) issues affecting VRV

Testing has taking much longer than planned. This can mainly be attributed to coordinating issues collaborating with multiple agencies. The schedule delays have been escalated. Ms. Vonnie Diseth has been in discussion with members of the eTRIP Executive Steering Committee for the purpose of communicating the VRV dependency on the timely completion of the RMS project.

The revised Go-Live target date is now late April 2011. Following the RMS implementation is a two month window of system stabilization where no new business will be implemented with JINDEX. These dependencies push the tentatively planned VRV courts on-boarding target date to July 2011.

VRV Current Status

While we wait for the RMS testing schedule to stabilize we are ensuring that the operational readiness system changes are ready to handle the additional volume of VRV ticketing transactions. Mr. Walsh is communicating with the six additional courts in the pilot as to RMS progress and availability of the updated JINDEX specifications.

Committee Reports

Mr. Rich Johnson reported on the Data Management Steering Committee: The DMSC is in a sit back and wait mode – given the reports we have just heard. The report given on the SCDX is a much more thorough report and the committee hasn't been given that report yet, our next meeting is on March 17. The next tier of courts to be brought on board have been identified and as soon as we work through these issues.

Judge Thomas Wynne reported on the Data Dissemination Committee: nothing new to report since the last meeting.

JIS Portfolio

Mr. Craig Wilson presented what IT Portfolio Management is, where we are today and more importantly where we want to be in the future.

ITPM is a best practice approach for managing IT investments – it is a management tool for decision makers to plan, measure, manage and communicate investment decisions. The goal with this initiative is to develop and implement a framework that will - Align IT investments with strategic business plans and goals, and maximize return on investments within acceptable risk.

AOC's current IT Portfolio consists of: Primary JIS applications, other applications, active projects and planned projects. Next steps include completing the application portfolio, capture infrastructure data, complete a quarterly review and prepare an annual report.

JIS Baseline Service Level Workgroup

Mr. Kumar Yajamanam presented an update on the JIS Baseline Workgroup. Since the last update the workgroup completed documentation of the business functions. The draft criteria and scoring matrix has been completed and validated.

The next step is to score all the business functions using the criteria and produce a draft report with recommendations.

Service Management Transformation Initiatives

Mr. Kumar Yajamanam presented a definition of Service Management. Service Management is a set of specialized organizational capabilities for providing value to customers in the form of Services. Service Managements manifests its influence in delivering a superior experience of value to every customer.

Service Management has two sides. From a customer perspective it highlights the value of service to customers and results in a positive customer experience. And from a provider perspective it establishes tasks and process associated with providing service to customers and results in value for the customer.

The goals of Service Management are customer satisfaction, providing satisfaction, consistency and predictability for the customer, efficiency to improve the IT organizations agility, makes the organization compliant to meet growing demands and holds itself accountable. And last is cost effectiveness, this improves the quality of service without adding cost and focuses on identifying and managing costs.

The service catalog initiative consists of three areas - service catalog development & management including baseline catalog, service level management framework, and enterprise requirements management.

Service Catalog is the common thread and is the foundation for a Service Management Organization. The service catalog will define services from the customer perspective, is a communication tool between the organization and its customers and business partners and builds a common terminology across the organization.

In summary:
The Service Management transformation initiatives will help ISD focus on:

- Delivering consistent value to customers and

- Improving efficiencies in the services delivery
- Setup a foundation for JIS services based on consumption model

Service catalog is the strategic tool that works within service portfolio to establish the foundation for service management.

IT Governance

Mr. Kevin Ammons handed out a summary of the prioritized requests from February 18 meeting and provided an update on the schedule for beginning the work. It was noted and corrected that the first 2 requests #009 and #045 were in fact listed in the wrong order. *The correct order of priority should be #045 then #009.*

The schedule for request #045 Appellate Electronic Filing – the feasibility study is being done in house by AOC and will run from April to July of 2011.

Requests #009 Adding Accounting Data to the Data Warehouse and #041 Remove CLJ Archiving and Purge Certain Records are large efforts and have tentatively been scheduled to begin in August of 2011 and will be approximately a two year effort.

Requests #026 and #031 – were not scheduled because they require the same resources as request #041.

Request #007 is not scheduled at this time due to resource constraints.

Mr. Bill Cogswell presented an updated IT Governance Policy. The amendments to the policy are shown on page 4 of the materials.

Mr. Jeff Hall ask for clarification on #12c (Introduction of a new service) – per previous discussion, whether or not a project added a new service outside the baseline could only be done on an annual cycle. It could be a small project, but would be a new service at the AOC level. Do we really want that limitation if it is not a big project?

Mr. Hall suggested that standard #12c should be its own line and become #15 and should read: *"Introducing a new service outside the AOC Baseline Services must be approved by the JISC"*

Motion: Judge Thomas Wynne asked Mr. Hall if that was a motion. Mr. Hall replied yes. Second: Judge J. Leach.
Voting in Favor: Ms. Linda Bell, Mr. Stew Menefee, Mr. Rich Johnson, Mr. Larry Barker, Mr. Jeff Hall, Judge Thomas Wynne, Judge Michael Trickey, Mr. William Holmes, Mr. Marc Lampson, and Judge J. Leach.
Not present to vote: Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chief Robert Berg, Mr. N.F. Jackson, Judge Steve Rosen, Ms. Barb Miner, Ms. Yolande Williams, and Judge Jim Heller.

Motion: Judge Wynne asked if there is a motion to approve the policy as amended – Moved by: Mr. Rich Johnson Second, Mr. Williams Holmes.

Voting in Favor: Ms. Linda Bell, Mr. Stew Menefee, Mr. Rich Johnson, Mr. Larry Barker, Mr. Jeff Hall, Judge Thomas Wynne, Judge Michael Trickey, Mr. William Holmes, Mr. Marc Lampson, and Judge J. Leach.

Not present to vote: Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chief Robert Berg, Mr. N.F. Jackson, Judge Steve Rosen, Ms. Barb Miner, Ms. Yolande Williams, and Judge Jim Heller.

Ms. Vicky Marin reported – Justice Fairhurst asked if the is any documentation in the framework that required the JISC take the CLUG scores into consideration in their deliberations. There is language for how the CLUG's will apply the criteria in their scoring, but nothing about how the JISC will use the information.

Mr. Shayne Boyd clarified the question of the scoring and the worksheet etc, were intended to be a tool within a specific meeting. They are useful in the moment, once the meeting is over that score is no longer valuable.

Mr. Stew Menefee commented – there is nothing that prevents the committee from seeing the scores. Having the scoring information would be helpful in understanding how the CLUG arrived at the priority decision. Mr. Menefee made the motion to have the information available, but not make it a requirement for JISC priority decision.

Judge Wynne asked for a second: Mr. William Holmes responded in favor.

Voting in Favor: Mr. Stew Menefee, Mr. Rich Johnson, Mr. Larry Barker, Judge Thomas Wynne, Judge Michael Trickey, Mr. William Holmes, Mr. Marc Lampson, and Judge J. Leach.

Opposed: Ms. Linda Bell, Mr. Jeff Hall,

Not present to vote: Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chief Robert Berg, Mr. N.F. Jackson, Judge Steve Rosen, Ms. Barb Miner, Ms. Yolande Williams, and Judge Jim Heller.

Pending Legislation – Should JISC have a Policy – (moved to end of meeting due to time)

Mr. Jeff Hall – this discussion is prompted by two bills that have come before the Board for Judicial Administration (BJA). The BJA referred the bills to the Data Dissemination (DD) committee for comment. One of the interesting things about judicial branch government within Washington State is there are not a lot of formal relationships or lines of communication amongst the various governance bodies we have.

This raises the question of legislation and what the role of JISC is regarding legislation vis a vis the role of BJA. This summarizes the context for this discussion.

The BJA does a number of things with a piece of legislation – they can support it, oppose it, voice concerns, watch particular bills, meaning they care about it, but don't take an official position initially or have no position, which means no opinion or there are opinions, but it doesn't affect the administration of justice so it is a policy call for the legislature. Then there is actual requested legislation that is submitted on behalf of BJA.

That is the role of BJA and the reason this has come up is the two pieces of legislation that were related to the DD, and the BJA realizing they are not the experts pass requests on to the JISC. The question here, is how is that made to that happen more effectively?

Judge Wynne asked – should there be a policy in place on how we deal with these questions in the future? Do we have a motion?

Mr. Jeff Hall – I did not come with a motion.

Judge Wynne clarified the question: – do we have a consensus; we should proceed as we have this legislative session? Ms. Vicky Marin will draft a response to reflect the consensus of this committee from this discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be May 6, 2011, at the AOC SeaTac facility; from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

	Action Items – From January 21st Meeting	**Owner**	**Status**
1	More information on Service Catalog at next meeting. What it is and what is the value of doing it.	Kumar Yajamanam	Complete
2	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.	Vonnie Diseth	Complete
3	Superior Court Case Management - Updated Charter and FAQ available for next JISC meeting.	Kate Kruller	
4	A definition for what SCOMIS functionality means that is succinct and clear and how the "functionality" relates to other applications.	Kate Kruller	
5	We need to re-visit whether CLUG scores go up to the JISC.	Kevin Ammons	Complete
	Action Items – From March 4th Meeting		
6	Determine the timeline for requesting "placeholder" funding for implementation of projects that the JISC approves as feasibility studies.	Vonnie Diseth	
7	Determine the timeline for requesting "placeholder" funding for implementation of projects that the JISC approves as feasibility studies.	Pam Payne	Complete
8	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	Pending end of legislative session.
9	Draft JIS Policy on comment to the BJA/Legislature reflecting JISC consensus from March 4th meeting.	Vicky Marin	
10	Amend JIS ITG Policy per JISC vote on 3/4/11	Vicky Marin	