

JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

October 7, 2011
9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
AOC Office, SeaTac, WA

Minutes

Members Present:

Mr. Larry Barker
Ms. Linda Bell
Chief Robert Berg
Judge Jeanette Dalton – by phone
Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Mr. Jeff Hall
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson – by phone
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:

Judge James Heller
Mr. Marc Lampson

AOC/Temple Staff Present:

Mr. Kevin Ammons
Mr. Bill Burke
Ms. Jenni Christopher
Mr. Bill Cogswell
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Mr. Martin Kravik
Mr. Eric Kruger
Ms. Kate Kruller
Ms. Vicky Marin
Ms. Cheryl Mills
Ms. Heather Morford
Mr. Mark Oldenburg
Ms. Pam Payne
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Mr. Mike Walsh
Justice Charlie Wiggins
Mr. Kumar Yajamanam

Guests Present:

Ms. Betty Gould
Ms. Marti Maxwell
Ms. Aimee Vance

Call to Order

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

September 9, 2011 Meeting Minutes

Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any changes to the September 9th meeting minutes. Hearing no changes, Justice Fairhurst deemed them approved.

2009 – 2011 Budget Update

Mr. Ramsey Radwan presented summaries of the revenue forecast.

- Since February 2010 General Fund revenue collection estimates have been decreased by \$1.9 billion (5.9%). The reduction is primarily due to economic changes.
- Revenue growth is expected to be about 7% greater than last biennium (approximately \$2.1 billion more in anticipated revenue collections).
- The projected deficit for the state general fund is now \$1.3 billion.

Revenues are projected to be down again in November. The Governor and OFM are indicating that the target reduction is now \$2 billion and have asked that executive agencies submit additional reduction scenarios. While a formal response has not been drafted, agencies of the judicial branch will not submit reduction targets through OFM. Additionally, we are not likely to offer reduction targets to the legislature, but will most likely state that we've been cut beyond our ability to carry out our core constitutional functions and therefore should not be subject to further reductions.

The Governor has called for a special session beginning November 28, 2011, after the Thanksgiving holiday and the November 17th economic and revenue forecast.

As noted above, the Washington state judicial branch is unlikely to offer reductions. We will, however, begin to meet with legislative leadership to educate them regarding our budget, our constitutional mandates and the policy choices they will have to make if reductions are implemented.

Mr. Radwan shared he has not looked at the caseload forecast, he will look at that information and be prepared provide an update regarding caseload impact that may impact future statewide expenditure levels.

Mr. Radwan provided the ISD summary expenditure report that contains both the operational and estimated project funding for the 2011-2013 biennium. In addition, he provided an overview of the anticipated project expenditures for the current biennium and the estimated expenditures for the superior court case management system implementation through fiscal year 2017. These reports will be periodically updated and presented to the JISC.

JISC Bylaw Amendment

Ms. Vicky Marin presented the background on a draft JISC bylaw amendment based on a JISC vote at its March 4, 2011 meeting to have a policy regarding legislative comment. The JISC took action after the Board for Judicial Administration (BJA) asked the JISC Data Dissemination Committee to comment on some pending legislation. At that point, it was noted that the JISC did not have an official policy or process for comment on pending legislation. In March, the JISC approved the following clauses:

1. The JISC should not support or oppose legislation directly to the legislature.
2. The JISC should respond to BJA requests for comment and will only recommend a position to the BJA.
3. The JISC will comment only on matters pertaining to JISC business.
4. If the legislation pertains to Data Dissemination Committee business, the Data Dissemination Committee will make recommendations directly to the BJA on behalf of the JISC.
5. For legislation on any other issues, the JIS Executive Committee will comment on behalf of the JISC.

The JISC discussed whether the language limited the JISC's ability to comment directly to the legislature on budget issues. The members discussed the JISC's authority independent from the BJA and the need to speak with one voice to the legislature.

Justice Fairhurst agreed to consult with the BJA and report back to the JISC.

A motion was made and seconded to confer with the BJA to clarify the relationship, and table the bylaw amendment to a later date.

Voting in favor: Justice Fairhurst, Jeff Hall, William Holmes, Linda Bell, Judge Leach, Larry Barker, Judge Dalton, Stew Menefee, Judge Wynne, Chief Berg, Yolande Williams, Rich

Johnson, Barb Miner

Absent: Marc Lampson, Judge Rosen, Judge Heller

JIS Policy on Implementing Local Court Record

Linda Bell presented a request for guidance to the JISC from the JISC-appointed workgroup drafting a JIS policy to provide guidance on the approval of local court systems. The work group has met several times, and asked the JISC for some broad-based direction on the following questions:

1. Costs and Responsibilities –
 - Who pays for AOC costs associated with removing a court from the statewide system and setting up a data exchange?
 - Who pays for associated local costs?
2. Which system is the official court record—the statewide database or the local system?
3. What is the recourse if a court does not agree with an AOC interpretation of how a business rule should be applied in the system?

Feedback from the committee:

Question 1: There was quite a bit of discussion on this question, but the JISC committee members were unable to reach consensus on guidance.

Question 2: The JISC responded that there is a long-standing Data Dissemination policy that the official record is in the local court.

Question 3: The clause in the current draft is better, but the request for review should come from the county clerk or the presiding judge.

Where the JISC was unable to provide guidance, they asked that the committee keep working to provide recommendations on the issue.

JIS Baseline Services Report

Mr. Eric Kruger introduced the JIS Baseline Services Report, and Ms. Jenni Christopher provided an overview of the Workgroup's results and recommendations. In June, 2010, the JISC established a Workgroup to:

1. determine which business functions should be made available centrally to all courts in the state, and
2. develop a set of criteria that will be used to guide future investments.

Mr. Larry Barker, Ms. Linda Bell, Mr. William Holmes, Mr. N. F. Jackson, Mr. Rich Johnson, Ms. Barbara Miner, and Mr. Dirk Marler served on the Workgroup.

Over the course of a year, the Workgroup met 13 times and conducted extensive examinations, culminating in the current report and recommendations to the JISC. The Workgroup developed 10 criteria and established a methodology for applying those criteria to the 65 sub-functions. Forty high-level sub-functions were unanimously identified as central. An additional 16 sub-

functions were analyzed, but consensus was not achieved, signaling complexity that recommends further study.

The Workgroup made the following recommendations:

1. The 40 high-level services unanimously identified by the Workgroup should be adopted as baseline services. (Report Appendix F)
2. These baseline services should be referenced in planning of all court information technology projects.
3. Both the baseline services and the associated methodology should be reviewed on a regular cycle.
4. The ten criteria and associated measurement questions should be adopted for future examination of baseline services. (Report Appendix A)
5. Criterion #1 (mandated requirements) should be examined as crucial context for baseline-service identification, but not employed directly in the scoring grid.
6. This methodology, with appropriate revisions, should be employed to impose rigor, precision, and objectivity on the process of baseline-service identification
7. Guidelines and principles developed in this effort should be adopted for use in future baseline-service investigations.
8. The workgroup recommends that the JISC authorize it to do additional study on the 16 not-unanimous services, as well as further refine the criteria and services by court level.

Feedback from stakeholder groups was presented, and a number of issues were discussed. In response to questions concerning the role of baseline services relative to the Superior Court Case Management System, Mr. Kruger indicated there was only one discrepancy: management of exhibits was determined to be local, but is a CMS requirement. AOC staff will provide an illustration detailing the recommended baseline services relative to the current JIS portfolio. In response to policy concerns raised by Spokane County stakeholders, JISC discussion yielded general agreement that baseline services do not prohibit data exchanges with local applications already built for those services. In response to Mr. Jeff Hall's concern about prioritization and resourcing of the full set of services, Workgroup members responded that the baseline provides a guideline for the evaluation of technology requests – it does not dictate a work plan. The authority for prioritizing new development continues to reside with the JISC.

The next step will be for the Workgroup to reconvene to resume examination of the remaining sub-functions.

Motion: Ms. Yolande Williams moved that the recommendations be adopted.

Second: Judge Thomas Wynne

Voting in favor: Justice Fairhurst, Jeff Hall, William Holmes, Linda Bell, Judge Leach, Larry Barker, Judge Dalton, Stew Menefee, Judge Wynne, Chief Berg
Yolande Williams, Rich Johnson, Barb Miner

Absent: Marc Lampson, Judge Rosen, Judge Heller

JIS Priority Project Status Reports

Superior Court Case Management System (SC-CMS) Project

Ms. Kate Kruller stated that the SC-CMS RFP Development phase has started. This effort will include separate project initiation documentation, a new website and the development of a Request For Proposal (RFP).

The SC-CMS RFP Steering Committee has been created. Members are: Betty Gould, Barb Miner, Kevin Stock, Judge Jeannette Dalton, Paul Sherfey, Frank Maiocco, Jeff Hall and Vonnie Diseth. The Washington Association of Juvenile Court Administrators (WAJCA) appointed Brook Powell as a liaison, and the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (CLJ) appointed Amy Vance as liaison.

The SC-CMS RFP Steering Committee will meet October 12, 2011. The first order of business will be for members to review a draft of the SC-CMS RFP Steering Committee Charter and to agree upon a regular meeting schedule. The Charter is based on the currently approved JISC project scope. Any scope changes will be at the direction of the SC-CMS RFP Steering Committee and presented to the JISC in December for final approval as part of the project requirements and recommendations set.

Justice Fairhurst sent letters to all RFP Stakeholders outlining ethics guidelines relevant to the procurement process. Anyone contacted for information is asked to forward all inquiries to: Cheryl Mills, Vendor Relations Coordinator, AOC.

Current project work has been focused on working with King County to review existing project requirements and gathering additional requirements. There will be a number of onsite visits in October to King County to observe administrator and clerk processes – as well as reviewing the additional King County requirements submitted. The SC-CMS Project Team will map all requirements to the current project scope and complete a requirements gap analysis. The team will then conduct multiple stakeholder sessions to confirm that the requirements meet King County and the three professional associations' needs. The schedule and logistics of any requirements stakeholder sessions will be established via the presidents of the three professional associations.

ITG 81 Static Adult Risk Assessment (ARA) Project

Mr. Martin Kravik presented an update on the ARA project. He reported that a draft of the project charter is complete and ready for review. In addition, requirements analysis has begun. The project Executive Steering Committee has been formed and their first meeting is on October 14, 2011. Agenda items include review of the project charter and discussion of higher level requirements issues. Selection of pilot courts will also be discussed.

Larry Barker made a motion that a representative of the Misdemeanant Corrections Association be included in the Executive Steering Committee as a nonvoting member. The motion was passed. ISD was asked to forward the decision to the Chair of the committee.

Next steps include completing the project schedule, finishing requirements analysis, performing system design and engaging the pilot courts.

Vehicle Related Violations (VRV) Project

Mr. Mike Walsh reported the Tier 1 VRV Courts, Lakewood, Kirkland, and Issaquah, are close to implementing their VRV on-boarding solutions. They are in the process of establishing the correct Uniform Resource Locator (URL) and security certificates as well as testing the point to point web service connections. The release group schedule has slid 3 weeks with the new expected production target date set from October 12th to November 4th.

The Department of Enterprise Services (DES) has acknowledged that there have been some underestimations with respect to the Justice Information Data Exchange (JINDEX) initial set up processes. As a result this has been, and continues to be, a learning process for all involved. There is much to be gained from this learning experience that will be applied to streamline future release schedules. Another significant step for implementing new JINDEX partners is the need to limit releases to a quarterly schedule. This has pushed our VRV Tier 2 partners from an expected November 2011 release date to March 2012.

At the conclusion of the report, Chief Robert Berg commented that the JINDEX release schedule slippage is creating scheduling problems for Law Enforcement Agencies who are planning to utilize JINDEX to implement their Police Department Record Management Systems (RMS). He asked Mr. Walsh what his level of confidence in JINDEX handling the additional load. Mr. Walsh replied; he could not speak specifically to JINDEX load thresholds but did say that the RMS upgrade implemented earlier in the year by DES was done specifically to handle the expected large load of messages.

Superior Court Data Exchange (SCDX)

Mr. Bill Burke provided a summary of project scope and the current status of the SCDX project. The AOC has engaged Sierra Systems to begin the development and implementation of the first ten (10) SCDX web services that will be delivered in December. The Sierra Systems team completed and delivered the project plan and a preliminary draft of the SCDX Application Design document. The Sierra Systems development team will begin rapid prototype in October of the SCDX web services.

Mr. Burke also presented a slide that outlined the fundamental differences between the SCDX and Information Networking Hub (INH) projects. A more detailed description of the INH project will be presented at the December JISC.

Mr. Burke was asked why Calendaring and Document Indexing are not included in the current project scope. Mr. Burke stated that when the project was re-planned in January 2010, the six (6) web services associated with Calendaring and Documenting Indexing were removed so that the project could focus on the Docketing services. There was a discussion of potentially adding these web services to the INH project scope.

Appellate Court Electronic Document Management System (EDMS)

Mr. Bill Burke provided the current status of the Appellate Court EDMS project. The project is currently documenting the business requirements for the Appellate Court EDMS. These requirements are documented via Use Cases, identifying how the Appellate Courts intend to use EDMS. These business requirements will be used to validate the EDMS technical requirements that were developed during the AC EDMS Feasibility Study and will also be used to define the criteria for Appellate Courts acceptance of the EDMS system. Use Cases development is taking approximately six (6) weeks longer than was expected. A Change Request has been drafted to document this schedule impact.

IT Governance Status Report

Mr. Kevin Ammons presented the IT Governance Status report for the month of August. He highlighted the fact that both the Supreme Court and the Washington State Association of Juvenile Court Administrators had endorsed their first requests since the IT Governance Process was initiated.

Committee Reports

None.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be December 2, 2011, 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 <i>Ishikawa</i> and <i>Bone-Club</i> .	Vicky Marin, Justice Fairhurst	<u>Postponed</u>
2	Draft JIS Policy on comment to the BJA/Legislature reflecting JISC consensus from March 4 th meeting.	Vicky Marin	<u>Postponed</u>
3	Amend JIS ITG Policy per JISC vote on 3/4/11	Vicky Marin	Completed
	Action Items – From June 24th Meeting		
4	AOC staff will collect the questions and answers from the SCMFS public sessions and post them on the SCMFS web page after each session	Heather Morford	Completed
	Action Items – From October 7th Meeting		
5	Confer with the BJA on JISC bylaw amendment regarding JISC communication with the legislature.	Justice Fairhurst	
6	Baseline Service Level Team – Add staff recognition to the Baseline Services Report.	Jenni Christopher	
7	Will loop back to SCJA with the information on the match /mismatch between Baseline Services and CMS requirements.	Heather Morford	
8	AOC staff will provide an illustration detailing the recommended baseline services relative to the current JIS portfolio.	Jenni Christopher / Eric Kruger	Completed
9	Forward JISC decision to add a non-voting MCA member to the Adult Risk Assessment Project Executive Steering Committee.	Martin Kravik	Completed