ITG Request 005 – Email/Text Court Date Reminders

Presented to the JISC for
Authorization decision

IT Governance Request #10-004:002

Title	**Court Date Reminders**
Date	**06/01/2010**

Request History

Contact Name	Status	Status Date	Other
Judge Steven Rosen	Initiated	04/15/2010	
Bill Cogswell AOC - ISD	Received	04/27/2010	
C. Kevin Ammons AOC - ISD	Analyzed	05/14/2010	
Bill Cogswell AOC - ISD	Comments, revisions	05/25/2010	
C. Kevin Ammons AOC - ISD	Analysis revised to include text messaging at the request of Judge Rosen	06/01/2010	
Detail:			

Request Summary

Business Challenge/Opportunity Detail

AOC – ISD received a customer request asking that:

> ***…AOC consider adding a court date reminder function to the website and/or JIS functionality so that criminal and traffic ticket defendants and witnesses can be programmatically emailed and/or text-messaged reminders of their upcoming court date.***

AOC – ISD has performed an initial analysis of this request. The following analysis assumes that this application would only be available to the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction. The analysis is divided into two sections. The first section deals with emailing court date reminders to defendants while the second deals with sending text messages with court date reminders to defendants.

Section 1: Email Court Date Reminders to Defendants

This would create a process where emails would be sent to defendant's email addresses stored in JIS on the person record. It would involve email addresses being collected at the time of citation, or later, and court employees subsequently entering the email addresses on page 2 of the person record. If no email address is entered, no email will be generated for that defendant.

A query would be designed to extract scheduled proceedings a specified number of days prior to the hearing date. A scheduled task or application would then submit the query, prepare and send an email, and log the action.

This analysis only addresses sending an email message to defendants; it does not address text messages.

Sizing Estimate

AOC – ISD estimates that this approach would require:

Group	Hrs Required	Task
Maint- JIS	200 hrs	Modification to enable email
Maint-SCOMIS	0 hrs	
Maint-JCS	0 hrs	
Maint-eTicket	0 hrs	
Maint-Web	100 hrs	Design and build application
Info Access/DW	0 hrs	
Testers-JIS	40 hrs	Test application prior to release
Testers-SCOMIS	0 hrs	

Testers-JCS	0 hrs	
Testers-eTicket	0 hrs	
Testers-Web	40 hrs	Test application prior to release
Testers-InfoAccess/DW	0 hrs	
Documentation	40 hrs	Create documentation for new application
BA Analysis	10 hrs	
DBA Support	10 hrs	
Research	0 hrs	
JIS Education	10 hrs	
Project Management	50 hrs	
Total	**500 hrs**	

Sizing Notes:

1. Changes may be required to the uniform traffic citation and the eTicketing application. Those changes are not included in this estimate.
2. Any email address entered into JIS would become a matter of public record and subject to public disclosure.
3. Reporting requirements are not included in this analysis as they were not specified in the original request. If courts do wish to have reporting the sizing of that portion would be over and above the estimates provided here.
4. JIS currently supports sending proceeding notices via US Postal Service to defined case participants. See http://inside.courts.wa.gov/index.cfm?fa=cntlManuals.showJisPage&manualid=userman&sectionid=202&folder=Calendaring&file=drcalendar-04 for more information on proceeding notifications.
5. Depending upon the specific solution selected, the effort required to gather requirements may significantly increase the estimate provided.
6. The estimate does not include ongoing maintenance and support costs.

The magnitude of work required to implement this alternative will require approval and prioritization by the JISC before AOC – ISD could schedule the request. The following open questions could impact the work effort required to complete the request.

Open Questions and Issues:

1. Will there be reporting requirements that were not specified in the original request?

2. Will courts be able to opt in or out of the process?

3. This approach will record the email address in the person record. Emails change frequently and are subject to input error. The reliability of email addresses in terms of actually notifying participants will be affected by these factors.

4. How many jurisdictions are interested in this type of service? In order to quantify the benefits that may come from this proposal, it would be important to estimate the adoption rate for courts.
5. Email messages have security vulnerabilities. Will there be any sensitive data included in the messages? Also, will any solution have to be approved by the Data Dissemination Committee?

Section 2: Text Message Court Date Reminders to Defendants

AOC – ISD has determined that sending text messages to defendants is technically feasible, but cannot easily determine the solution that would best meet the business needs of the courts. A feasibility study will be required to provide the analysis necessary to select a technical solution.

AOC – ISD estimates that the feasibility study would cost between $5,000 and $15,000. Work done by AOC to implement a feasible solution would be above and beyond that initial cost.

Two distinct approaches are possible, but each presents questions and issues that require feasibility study to resolve. The two possible approaches are:

Option 1: "Push" Text Messages to Defendants

In order to send a text message to a mobile telephone two pieces of information are required: the telephone number and wireless carrier. The wireless carrier information is needed as each carrier uses a different format for its domain name which in turn is used to receive text messages. When individual text messages are sent from a mobile telephone, only the telephone number is required as the sender's wireless provider "looks up" the wireless provider in the Number Portability Administration Center's database.

While the uniform infraction form and the uniform citation form have a space for the mobile phone number, it does not have a place to capture the wireless carrier. There are solutions possible to allow text messages to be sent without knowing the wireless carrier, but each presents difficulties that would need to be addressed.

Option 2: Defendants "Pull" Text Messages from www.courts.wa.gov

AOC – ISD could establish functionality on the public internet site similar to that available to attorneys. Defendants and witnesses could request a time-sensitive text message be sent to their mobile telephone. They would have to provide their mobile phone number, possibly their wireless carrier, and a unique identification number or the case number for which they wish to receive reminders. This approach would alleviate the issues surrounding the identification of the mobile phone provider.

An issue that will arise with this approach would be determining a unique identification number for defendants to use on the website. Possibilities for the number include the citation number, the case number, or the IN number. Each possibility would need to be

reviewed to find the best solution.

Open Questions and Issues:

1. Most wireless carriers charge users for receiving text messages. Will defendants and witnesses need to be informed that text messages will be sent and charges may apply?

2. Will there be reporting requirements that were not specified in the original request?

3. Will there be a requirement for defendants to opt in or opt out of the service?

4. This approach will record the email address in the person record. Email addresses change frequently and are subject to input error. The reliability of email addresses in terms of actually notifying participants will be affected by these factors.

5. Many carriers aggressively block unsolicited text messages, aka spam, since messages are in some cases charged to the end user. Any solution selected by AOC – ISD may be blocked due to policies and procedures of some wireless carriers.

6. Many major carriers limit text messages to 160 characters, which includes the sender's email address, receiver's email address, subject line, punctuation, formatting characters and spaces. The following message is an example:

   Receiver: 3601234567@messaging.sprintpcs.com
   Sender: process@courts.wa.gov
   Subject: Court Reminder
   Body: You have an appearance in the Black Diamond Muni Court on May 22, 2010 at 3 PM in room 12.

   The portions that would make the message are highlighted in yellow and are 167 characters long. This message would be truncated on many systems. On other systems, it would be broken into two messages, thereby doubling the cost of receiving the message.

7. How many jurisdictions are interested in this type of service? In order to quantify the benefits that may come from this proposal, it would be important to estimate the adoption rate for courts.
8. Changes may be required to the uniform traffic citation and the eTicketing application. Those changes are not included in this estimate.
9. Any text mobile telephone number entered into JIS would become a matter of public record and subject to public disclosure.
10. Reporting requirements are not included in this analysis as they were not specified in the original request. If courts do wish to have reporting the sizing of that portion would

be over and above the estimates provided here.

11. JIS currently supports sending proceeding notices via US Postal Service to defined case participants. See http://inside.courts.wa.gov/index.cfm?fa=cntlManuals.showJisPage&manualid=userman&sectionid=202&folder=Calendaring&file=drcalendar-04 for more information on proceeding notifications.
    Depending upon the specific solution selected, the effort required to gather requirements may significantly increase the estimate provided here.
12. Text messages have security vulnerabilities. Will there be any sensitive data included in the text messages? Also, will any solution have to be approved by the Data Dissemination Committee?

Communities Impacted

District and Municipal Court Administrators, District and Municipal Court Judges, AOC and the public.

AOC Analysis & Specifications

System Problem	*Change/ Enhancement*	*New System*	*Mandated*	
NO	***YES***	***NO***	***NO***	
Preliminary Analysis Completed	*Alternatives Analyzed*	*Aligns w/ Enterprise Architecture*	*Aligns with Standards*	*Risk Assessment Completed*
YES	***NO***	***TBD***	***TBD***	***NO***
Cost Benefit Analysis	*Return on Investment*	*Feasibility Study Required*		
TBD	***TBD***	***YES***		

Potential Systems Affected:	www.courts.wa.gov
High Level Requirements:	TBD

Email/Text Court Date Reminders

Request Detail

Requestor Name:
Ammons, Kevin

Origination Date:
07/22/2010

Requestor Email:
kevin.ammons@courts.wa.gov

Requestor Phone:
360-704-4085

Recommended Endorser:
District and Municipal Court Judges' Association

Request Status: Awaiting Authorization
Request Type: Change or Enhancement
Which Systems are affected? Judicial Information System (JIS)
Business Area: Other
Communities Impacted: CLJ Judges
CLJ Managers
Impact if not Resolved: Medium

Request Attachments
Email-Text Reminders Original Request.pdf

What is the Business Problem or Opportunity

Important Note This request was originally submitted as part of a pilot of the IT Governance process. The processing of this request took place before the IT Governance Portal was developed. As such, the information related to this request is being included in the portal for completeness. The history entries in this record are not indicative of either the actual processing dates or the bodies that performed the various steps of the governance process. ***The original request follows*** AOC should consider adding a court date reminder function to the website and/or JIS functionality so that criminal and traffic ticket defendants and witnesses can be programmatically emailed and/or text-messaged reminders of their upcoming court date.

Expected Benefit:
By implementing this request, courts could significantly reduce Failure to Appear issues at all courts. This would, in turn, reduce costs and inefficiencies associated with issuing warrants, rescheduling procedings, and other functions.

Any Additional Information:
This request was initiated on April 15, 2010 by Judge Steven Rosen of Black Diamond Municipal Court.

Endorsement Detail

Endorsing Committee
District and Municipal Court Judges' Association

Endorser Name:
Ammons, Kevin

Origination Date:
07/27/2010

Endorser Email:
kevin.ammons@courts.wa.gov

Endorser Phone:
360-704-4085

Endorsing Action: Endorsed

Endorser's Explanation and Comments
Important Note This request was originally submitted as part of a pilot of the IT Governance process. The processing of this request took place before the IT Governance Portal was developed. As such, the information related to this request is being included in the portal for completeness. The history entries in this record are not indicative of either the actual processing dates or the bodies that performed the various steps of the governance process.*** This request was endorsed by the DMCJA on April 15, 2010.

Endorsement Detail

Endorsing Committee
District and Municipal Court Judges' Association

Endorser Name:
Ammons, Kevin

Origination Date:
07/27/2010

Endorser Email:
kevin.ammons@courts.wa.gov

Endorser Phone:
360-704-4085

Endorsing Action: Endorsed

Endorser's Explanation and Comments
Important Note This request was originally submitted as part of a pilot of the IT Governance process. The processing of this request took place before the IT Governance Portal was developed. As such, the information related to this request is being included in the portal for completeness. The history entries in this record are not indicative of either the actual processing dates or the bodies that performed the various steps of the governance process.*** This request was endorsed by the DMCJA on April 15, 2010.

AOC Analysis Detail

Analysis Date: 09/09/2010

Request Rationale

Key Business Objectives:

Email/Text Court Date Reminders

Request Rationale

Aligns with JIS Business Priorities, IT Strategies & Plans:	Yes
Aligns with applicable policies and with ISD Standards:	Yes
Breadth of Solution Benefit:	Wide

Cost Estimates

Cost Benefit Analysis Complete?	No
Cost to Implement?	Uncertain
Positive Return on Investment?	No
Projected Maintenance cost?	Uncertain
Feasibility Study needed?	Yes

Court Level User Group

Multi-level CLUG

The original request from Judge Rosen asked for both email and text messaging. Judge Rosen and the DMCJA later clarified that their primary request was fot sedning text message reminders to defendants.

Benefits and Business Value:

Adding text message reminders has the potential to reduce Failure to Appear (FTA) issues at the affected courts. It would also reduce the effort spent on processes to deal with the FTAs.

AOC Analysis - Proposed Solution

AOC does not have the expertise required to determine the best approach to deliver the functionality requested.

AOC Analysis - Proposed Approach

A feasibility study is required.

Addtional Court Communities Affected

Superior Court Judges
County Clerks
Superior Court Administrators

AOC Analysis Attachments

10-04 002 ITG - Court Date Reminders - Email and Text.pdf

Confirmation of Endorsing Action Detail

Endorsing Committee

District and Municipal Court Judges' Association

Endorser Name:

Marin, Vicky, on behalf of Judge R.W. Buzzard

Origination Date:

11/19/2010

Endorser Email:

vicky.marin@courts.wa.gov; rw.buzzard@mail.courts.wa.gov

Endorser Phone:

(360) 704-4068

Endorsing Action: Endorsed

Endorser's Explanation and Comments

The DMCJA confirms endorsement of Section 1 of the request, as analyzed by AOC, for email court date reminders to defendants. The DMCJA will consider Section 2, text messaging court date reminders to defendants, at its December 10, 2010 meeting.

On December 10, 2010, the DMCJA confirmed endorsement of Section 2 of the request: Text Message Court Date Reminders to Defendants.

Court Level User Group Decision Detail

CLUG	Multi-level CLUG
Chair of Group	Rich Johnson
Date of Decision	02/16/2011

Decision

Approving Authority	CIO
Decision to Recommend for Approval	Forwarded to the approving authority without recommendation

Scoring Detail	Score / Possible
Business Value	5 / 10
Relative Priority	3 / 10
Cost	3 / 5
Complexity/Level of Effort	5 / 10
Risk	3 / 5
Benefit / Impact	3 / 5
Impact of Doing Nothing	1 / 5
Total Score	23 / 50

Pros & Cons (*if vote is not unanimous*)

MCLUG Positions on ITG # 005

Pros for whole request

- This request is reflective of societal changes in the delivery and notice of information moving away from delivery of mailed to electronic noticing. Along with society, Courts are allowing, and even requiring, electronic filing of certain pleadings and notice.

  This request acknowledges those changes and expectations and create inefficiencies by decreasing FTA rates. – Cynthia Marr (DMCMA) and Lynne Jacobs (DMCJA)

Cons for whole request

- This request is outside the scope of JISC responsibilities under chapter 2.68 RCW and the JISC rules. – Judge Wynne (SCJA and Data Dissemination)

Pros for part 1 (Email)

None submitted

-

Cons for part 1 (Email)

- None submitted

Pros for part 2 (Text)

- I was cautioned by Judge Wynne's questioning the authority to address the issue and feel that needs resolution. I do not have the technology savvy to know if emails and texting are Washington's new method of common communication but reaching a vast number of people to enhance the efficiency of CLJ's makes it worth the consideration (for feasibility study at least.) That and having such ability may become a tool for other court function uses as yet undetermined. For that reason I supported the feasibility study. That and the estimated cost. (However the cost forecasted for the feasibility study seemed very low compared with the others JISC has considered.) - William Holmes (WAJCA)

Cons for part 2 (Text)

- None submitted

Additional Notes

After this request was endorsed and sent to the MCLUG, the initiator of the request, Judge Rosen stated that he was not interested in pursuing the email portion of the request, which is section 1 of the request. The MCLUG members voted on both parts of the request and were not unanimous in voting on either portions of the request or on the request as a whole.

Section 1 Email average score for request was 19 out of 50 with a low priority

Section 2 Email average score for request was 18 out of 50 with a low priority

However the overall scores submitted on the top are the averaged scores for BOTH sections of the request together.