

MINUTES
JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE
February 22, 2008, 10:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
SeaTac Office Center, SeaTac, WA

Members Present:

Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Judge C. Kenneth Grosse, Vice Chair
Mr. Greg Banks (via telephone)
Mr. Robert Berg
Ms. Cathy Grindle
Judge Glenna Hall
Judge James Heller
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson
Mr. Richard Johnson
Judge Clifford L. Stilz
Mr. N. A. "Butch" Stussy
Ms. Yolande Williams
Ms. Siri Woods

Guests Present:

Ms. Barbara Miner
Mr. Sam Kurle
Mr. Larry Barker

Staff Present:

Mr. Jeff Hall
Mr. Gregg Richmond
Ms. Ronee Parsons
Ms. Jody Graham
Ms. Celeste Maris
Mr. John O'Conner
Mr. Eric Kruger
Mr. Randy McKown
Mr. Dennis Longnecker

Members Absent:

Mr. Marc Lampson
Judge Michael Trickey (Ex-Officio)
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

CALL TO ORDER

Judge Kenneth Grosse called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m., and introductions were made.

Motion: Judge Kip Stilz asked to be added to the 'Members Present' in the December 7, 2007 meeting minutes; then a motion was made, seconded, and unanimously carried to approve the December 7, 2007 meeting minutes.

CORE CASE MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Gregg Richmond presented a PowerPoint presentation from the Case Management System (CMS) vendor, Tata that provided three solutions to go forward and a fourth impromptu one. The three were first to continue on the current path by balancing more time and money; the second was to do product specific requirements gathering; the third was non-specific--does not matter which product was chosen--get requirements and purchase or build, or do a combination, thereof. Mr. Richmond continued that the fourth was to get all JIS requirements, feed them over to C-Track let C-Track build them over 'x' number of months/years; they would come back with a product and the committee could choose whether to accept or not accept it. Mr. Richmond said the CMS recommendation was that Proof of Implementation (POI) had failed, to date. The requirements that were in the POI phase had not been met. The second point was that the AOC needed to create requirements, JIS-wide.

Ms. Cathy Grindle said that the Core Case Management Steering Committee realized that there were many things that the CMS did not include. One of those was the whole issue around program management; she said they felt they needed to gather requirements at a very low level.

Ms. Barb Miner said that probation was actually like program management; it was requirements from a sentence or pre-resolution that someone was tracking. She added that it was mid-project of CMS that probation/detention awkwardly attached.

Judge Heller said many of the program requirements had been offered. He said it would help to answer the questions, in depth.

Judge Grosse said he wanted to express his concerns with regard to that. He said he was reluctant to take it on, even at the requirements gathering level because it proposed an expansion of the effort that got them where they were. He said he did not want to pre-suppose that just because it was determined by the committee to take it on from a requirements standpoint, it pre-supposes that they would undertake an effort in respect to including that within the case management system. He said he had two levels, one being predacious and he was open to the second, he was very skeptical that they could undertake anything in that regard except long term. He said they were not going to undertake the whole thing at once, again. He said it would be done in pieces, if they do it at all.

Justice Fairhurst said that her understanding was the requirements had to be identified and known for everything. She said it was also her understanding that there were no expectations and no decisions made as to what would be done with those, other than a recognition that they had to have them for any future decisions.

Ms. Yolande Williams said the Core Case Management Steering Committee had not really talked about how they would go about gathering [requirements probation/detention or others but it was important that they had all of the requirements before going forward and making any long-term decisions. She said they did not talk about how they would go about doing it, just recognized that they needed to be gathered.

Ms. Grindle said the pieces of probation/detention, and program management, whether it was Family Court or drug court, etc., really was an essential part of the case.

Judge Grosse said they needed to be careful about the add-on concept. He added that corrections was a whole different piece and he did not want to see the AOC getting into that as an add-on to a case in terms of the information that came from the correction side.

Judge Hall said that some of the courts have detentions, so it was a court function. She said if they were going to go forward at all, clearly they were in the situation they were in because they thought they had put together business requirements. She added that if they were ever going to go forward they should look at what was needed and what pieces should go in the system if they want one at all.

Justice Fairhurst said she thought it was important for the committee to have these discussions and clarifications so that their expectations did not get out in front of their realities. She said the advice she was getting from Gregg Richmond and AOC was that it was essential for any good decision-making by the committee.

Mr. Richmond talked about the timeline, from February to June 2008, the things that the committee already expected that the AOC had done; Program Management and Enterprise Architecture, would be done in a methodical and logical approach. He said they would look at all aspects; but the committee needed to define how big "it" would be. He said the RFP would be released in June, and in September, a contractor would come in and start working and

gathering requirements. He said the decision point in December - if that was how long it would take - would be whether a feasibility study was done.

Judge Grosse asked what it was that they did not know about the data architecture and other issues. He said he had a broad view of data architecture and enterprise architecture. Unless the AOC knew what the business requirements were, of the courts that use the system, then how could the committee assess what was wrong with the "jury rigged" data architecture, on both counts. He said he needed to know what detailed requirements people wanted as far as the business was concerned, and then they could look at the gaps and how much of that could be cross platform transport. He said they could do anything, but they needed to know what the business requirements were.

Judge Heller asked what the RFP would do for the level, breadth, and scope. Mr. Richmond said that would get the requirements so they would have them.

Justice Fairhurst said that she wanted to clarify for Judge Heller, anyone coming in to work on the business requirements would be working with the courts so it would not be someone coming in and acting on their own; it would be someone working in conjunction with the users and going into more detail than what they got the first time.

Mr. Richmond said that the AOC would recommend that the vendor take the high level BP that was already done, validate that, go through the volume of requirements at the AOC, go through programs and extract the code to see what all the programs do, and then say to the courts, "that is what we think you should do" and then bring the users in and ask them if that was what they do. He said it would not be a vendor coming in to see what the court did.

Ms. Glenna Hall said that she thought it needed to be known, maybe with examples, what was meant by requirements.

Ms. Woods said that, as an example; when writing a receipt the court had to say the receipt could be for an obligation where there were five different people with five different cases associated with it. She said that she thought the vendor needed to be told that kind of detail.

Mr. Richmond said the vendor presentation was pretty much on point; one of the things they talked about was that the courts did not know what many of their processes were, because they were built over time and had been added on to. He said that his personal view was that the business process was only done halfway and the scope was too large.

Justice Fairhurst said that it was critical for some group from the committee to look at that and then make decisions - because some may be so far "jury rigged" - to determine what was basic, or basic plus. She said that until they have a sense of what was being done, desired to be done, or what could be done; it would not necessarily be a Lexus, it might be a SUV; something that would take them where they need to go.

Ms. Woods said that one of the things they did for the process before, was that they agreed to eighty percent of what the requirements were. She said she thought they needed to start with the premise that they would do 100% of what the courts have now, otherwise it was not worth doing. She said they needed to define where the big gaps were to begin with.

Mr. Jackson said he respectfully disagreed with Siri. He said he thought part of the problem was that they wanted to go 100% and that would or would not be. He said he thought they needed a simultaneous effort, and to figure out what could be concurrent and what could be a

blend of using the accounting system while they put in a new Calendaring system. He asked Gregg if they could continue to use the usable portions of the Legacy applications.

Judge Grosse said he thought they jumped ahead, he said he did not necessarily agree with the parallel part. He said they needed a definition of core functionality and if the simple answer was what they have now, then that was a simple answer. He said yes, to what Mr. Jackson was saying, but maybe not simultaneously. Mr. Jackson said that would be part of the decision point after the requirements had been gathered.

Judge Grosse said that it had to happen, because if there were things that were common then they needed to keep those as a standard with regard to what Gregg acquires or designs so that the common functionality was preserved.

Judge Hall said that what occurred to her when she was listening to Siri and N.F. was that they needed to define the percent of what and who was 'we'. She said that one of the reasons that a statewide system was needed was to supply the needs of the small courts who could not afford to do a case management or calendar system themselves. She asked if 100% meant of what everyone has access to now, no matter how little money they have put into it (i.e. SCOMIS).

Ms. Woods said that she agreed with Judge Hall that they needed to identify probation, judge's module, and other things that are not in the system. She said that when they talk about the JIS system they should not give up any functionality or what they want to do in the future, plus filling in any gaps.

Judge Grosse said he agreed up to the point of saying that for the purpose of defining requirements, "yes, absolutely right" as long as everybody understands that there are a limited amount of resources and they may have to compromise.

Mr. Butch Stussy asked how to decide to what level they needed to go down in depth, breadth, and so on. He said they were already talking about solutions in terms of what they wanted to do once they have all of the requirements, but need some direction before it could be said how requirements would be done. He added that he did not know what information Gregg needed as feedback from the committee to scope the RFP that would get a vendor to come in.

Mr. Richmond said it was up to the committee to decide what they want to do.

Mr. Stussy said that the AOC could not turn it back to the committee because they do not know to what depth or breadth they need to go. He said the committee needs help from the AOC.

Mr. Richmond said that whatever the committee decided, the AOC would have to build something - even if they buy a product - the AOC would have to build on top of it.

Mr. Jackson said what they needed was a level of detail sufficient to give a developer and have them build, or measure against the existing application, the scorecard, that was what they need. He said they did not have the expertise, and he was not sure if the AOC had the expertise.

Ms. Williams asked if it would be prudent to go back and validate the original expectations and how they got to this point. She asked if they should go back and decide if the goal was to address the needs of small courts as one issue or if the goal was to address the needs of larger courts for sharing information.

Justice Fairhurst said that she had a couple of thoughts on the discussion: 1) it was clear to her that they need help from someone to determine the level needed; and 2) that the group has an understanding of the vision, and what they want. She said that she could see the need for a

facilitated discussion to help them have an in depth discussion on their suppositions. She asked where they were, what information did they have, and what was the information that they needed. She said they needed someone with Gregg's assistance and leadership as their Chief Information Officer at the AOC to help them know and have a much clearer and specific plan, so the committee could determine the next steps. She added that they needed someone to help them think through what that meant. She said they needed to have extended discussions about statewide and individual needs. Mr. Richmond said that was what he put out the first time; what was the business problem they were trying to solve.

Ms. Miner said that as a participant in the original Roadmap development in 2005, she thought that was what they were attempting to do and it might be worthwhile to go back and check on that. She believed they addressed both of those things; small court issues and big court issues by saying the project should have been data exchange.

Justice Fairhurst said she thought it was a very good starting point for them, so they were not just going into a room with a blank page; they would be going through and looking at the good work that was done and saying yes or no, and making sure there were no other things that were essential that should be part of the solution.

Mr. Richmond said that he sent out the 120-page roadmap bulletin, by which the Roadmap was built. He said that from a new person's perspective, he looked at where they were currently and what they were trying to do. He said it goes back to the document and there was a fundamental disconnect between where they were now and where it pointed them to go. He said it was hard for him to define what the business problem was, that they were trying to solve.

Mr. Stussy said that he had not seen the document that Gregg sent out, but there were contradictions in the document; one was the "go after a Quick Hit (COTS) for Calendaring." He said data exchange was in there clearly as number one, but that was not number one for the AOC when Tim Bates was there.

Judge Grosse said that everyone was saying, "here was the solution" but nobody knew what he or she was trying to solve.

Mr. Stussy reminded everyone that since 1999, there had been five CIOs at the AOC and at least that many separate efforts to bring up a solution. He said it was a little embarrassing for him that they still did not have anything. He said that he hopes they start with requirements, and not worry about the solutions, yet.

Mr. Jackson said he thought there was a five-point plan; 1) the need to adopt and commit themselves to reinvent a roadmap; 2) the need to lay the groundwork for the future by laying their effort to the data architecture; 3) data exchange; 4) write the requirements; and 5) service enabling.

Mr. Richmond said that for the past seven years, the AOC has done nothing but fix the system. He said they knew that there were things that they could do, should have done, and asked the committee to let the AOC work on the Legacy system; but the rule was to do nothing to Legacy. Mr. Stussy said he believed that the decision came from the 120-page Roadmap bulletin.

Mr. Richmond said there were three choices: continue to keep Legacy running and fix things when they broke; enhance the existing systems; or service enable. He said each choice had costs and benefits. He said keeping the Legacy system running was the least cost but did not solve the problem of being able to have new functionality to support business needs. He added that it would also delay the inevitable; the system would not last forever and would require a

replacement strategy. Mr. Richmond said that enhancing the existing systems would provide some immediate benefit; small-scale enhancements and usability enhancements would add value; large-scale enhancements would be costly and would not resolve long-term technical architecture replacement needs. He said service enabling the Legacy system would allow the importing of data into the system for other local systems. Service enabling was an interim method to allow data exchanges to reuse the program logic already built.

Mr. Richmond said the AOC recommended a hybrid approach to using the choices. The first method “keeps things running” could be used when resources were focused on replacement activities; the second method, “minor maintenance and enhancements” could be used when resources were available and there were low-cost items with larger business benefit to be completed. The third method, “service enablement” should be pursued independently of the first two choices so that data exchanges could be completed. He said the service enablement of the Legacy applications was also needed to support the transition period during the time a new system started deployment in the first court until the final implementation in the last court.

Mr. Jackson asked what it would mean to a clerk, judge, or user. Eric Kruger said that it would eliminate dual data entry. He went on to say, as an example; if someone wanted to see a defendant case history screen, docket screen, and others for one person, that it could be done without having to access screens individually, and that a program could be created to get that information at the push of a button.

Justice Fairhurst said she thought it was too soon for a decision; she saw that as a beginning of thinking and recognizing the option.

Mr. Stussy asked if a Calendaring system could be brought in quicker if the AOC did service enabling. Mr. Richmond said yes, that the point of service enabling was to get an external program, attach it as a service, and not have to rewrite every application to point to the data.

Mr. Jeff Hall said there were a number of decisions that needed to be made. He said one of those was to take action on the recommendations of the Core Case Management Steering Committee whose suggestion was to bring in a facilitator to assist the JISC in making a decision about moving forward, etc.

Justice Fairhurst spoke in regards to the Core Case Management Steering Committee recommendation that the Proof of Implementation (POI) phase had failed, “to date.” Mr. Hall said the “to date” verbiage came up in the CCMSC meeting in the context of the licensing agreement and the contract with LT Court Tech and TCS. He said that during the discussion it seemed to make sense to include the “to date” qualifier on it because it appeared to the AOC that it would be another six months in terms of when they could purchase the current license price from LT Court Tech. He said that if they allowed the current contracts to expire then that would, in effect, be the conclusion of the POI phase. He said that adding the “to date” qualifier does not gain anything. Mr. Jackson said that was the recommendation. Mr. Hall said that the conclusion for the JISC was that the POI was concluded, period.

Motion: Judge Grosse motioned that at that juncture, the JIS accepts the notice received from the contractor that they were unable to meet the requirements of the contract regarding the POI and hence terminate the agreement in the context of the contracts provisions. Judge Glenna Hall seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Ms. Grindle motioned to do requirements gathering at a detailed level, for each court level, for all court functions, and include any program management such as unified family court, juvenile detention, adult probation, and a variety of problem solving courts.

Justice Fairhurst asked for a discussion. She said she thought that was where they would ultimately get, but rather than decide at that time, she suggested that they defer it, presuming they were going to have a facilitated discussion where they would clearly or comprehensibly refine the recommendation.

Judge Grosse moved to table the discussion to step four.

Motion: Justice Fairhurst moved to table the discussion until they have their facilitated discussion. Judge Stiliz seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Ms. Williams asked if the facilitated discussion was designed to help them define the business case that would then inform the roadmap and the requirements in the RFP. Justice Fairhurst said that was the desire but they were only tabling to that point.

Motion: Ms. Williams moved that the JISC engage the services of a facilitator to help define the business case, revisiting the Roadmap, that would inform the requirements gathering and subsequent RFP. Judge Grosse seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Justice Fairhurst asked if Mr. Richmond needed any direction from the committee as to next steps as to what he was doing just to keep them operating and going, not knowing when exactly they would have the facilitated discussion.

Mr. Richmond said that if the committee had not said that the AOC could not enhance current applications, then he was okay with that. He said he thought they needed to start enhancing applications.

Mr. Kruger said that within the JIS database there were post office boxes and sometimes warrants were printed with the post office box; and warrants could not be served on a post office box.

Judge Grosse said the historical context of no enhancements was people coming around the backdoor and asking for something to be built or added on. He said what Mr. Kruger referenced was maintenance and that was keeping the system functioning the best that it could by doing the job it was required to do. He said that making the system do something better was an enhancement and that was not what the committee meant.

Mr. Jackson asked what the cost of service enabling would be. Mr. Richmond answered that there would be a cost to bring current applications up to a certain level so they could be serviced enabled. Mr. Stussy asked if they went the route of service enablement, what would be the timeframe of the first data exchange. Mr. Dennis Longnecker said that service enabling would require infrastructure upgrades that needed to be completed anyway because the main operating systems, DISCIS and SCOMIS, were at end of life. He said that when that upgrade was done, then the applications would be service enabled. He added then that choices had to be made, for instance if someone wanted defendant case history service enabled, then someone has to make changes to defendant case history in order to make it service enabled. He said that it would take time to make an application service enabled and that was where the cost would be. Mr. Longnecker also commented that the hardware infrastructure was fine; it was just the software that would require a monthly service charge that had to be paid anyway.

Mr. Stussy asked if Mr. Richmond needed a decision to move forward on data exchanges. Mr. Richmond said that there should be no rush to a solution, the committee needed to be informed of what the AOC wanted to do, Eric Kruger would help inform the committee, and then the

committee could make a decision. He said that the Enterprise Service Bus was being configured, doing all the legwork, it was just a matter of when and how they do it.

Motion: Justice Fairhurst moved to make Data Exchange a priority. Motion carried.

Justice Fairhurst said she wanted to ensure that the group agreed with Judge Grosse's statement regarding maintenance and having the systems run as well as they could. She said that if there were improvements that needed, should, or could be done, it should be completed.

Judge Hall asked that the materials that were given to the Executive Committee be made available to the JIS Committee.

SERVICE ENABLEMENT PRESENTATION

Mr. Kruger provided a presentation regarding Service Enablement. He said there would be a cost savings. He said service enabling would cost about \$4,000 and custom development would be around \$38,000.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Did not report, ran out of time.

OTHER BUSINESS

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.