

MINUTES
Special Session
JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE
June 6, 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. Robert Berg
Ms. Cathy Grindle
Judge Glenna Hall
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson
Judge Glenn Phillips
Judge Michael Trickey (Ex-Officio)
Ms. Siri Woods
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

Guests Present:

Mr. Larry Barker
Ms. Barbara Miner
Mr. Chris Shambro
Mr. Kyle Snowden

Staff Present:

Mr. Jeff Hall
Mr. Gregg Richmond
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Ms. Ronee Parsons
Ms. Denise Dzuck

Members Absent:

Judge James Heller
Mr. Richard Johnson
Mr. Marc Lampson

CALL TO ORDER

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

Motion: Approval of the April 25, 2008 meeting minutes as written.

RECAP OF RETREAT

Mr. Jeff Hall said they would provide detail of the budget along with a review of the feasibility of doing enhancements to the Legacy applications. He said they would also review the strategic plan. He added that he would add in the budget information while reviewing the strategic plan. He said that Mr. Gregg Richmond would go over several Concept Overviews, which would provide background that would better enable the committee to be in a position to make a decision on June 27 regarding the strategic direction for the Judicial Information System (JIS).

Mr. Gregg Richmond talked about the budget detail (JIS Roadmap Expenditures, handout) which was requested during the retreat. He said the total expended was \$11.2 million, with a remainder of \$9.1 million. He said that it was broken down by JIS versus the cost of the Enterprise Warehouse, versus the cost of Data Exchange.

Mr. Jackson asked if there were any ongoing contract requirements that would take away from the remaining balance.

Mr. Hall said that there would be some limited debt payment.

Mr. Ramsey Radwan said that on the 'out biennia' it would be about \$240 thousand a year. He added that from the \$9.2 million there would be one debt payment of \$240 thousand. He said there would still be around \$9 million left over.

Judge Thomas Wynne asked about the Oracle license recorded under the reusable box on the spreadsheet. He asked how that was reusable.

Mr. Richmond said that it was a caveat since they own the license. He said if they decided on an Oracle solution, they could use it again.

Ms. Barbara Miner indicated that under the Proof of Implementation there was \$1.3 million in the reusable column. She asked if that was the Business Process Engineering (BPE) work.

Mr. Richmond replied that those were data migration, data exchange, SharePoint, DB2 conversion, and documentation of the existing, which was reusable.

Mr. Hall said that under the Enterprise Data Warehouse, the \$631 thousand was still outstanding and was being dispersed as that vendor completed the work. He said they do not have a solid budget for the remainder of the biennium on the data exchange.

Ms. Yolande Williams asked what the \$5.1 million under Implementation-Infrastructure was.

Mr. Radwan said that was the planned amount in October of 2006. He said that only \$1.7 million was expended during the project.

Mr. Richmond talked about the Application Enhancement Feasibility study. He said that the document was not a representation of what they should do or in what order. He said the list represented what was in their Help Desk list of court requests. He recommended that the user groups dictate the order in which they wanted them done.

Justice Mary Fairhurst asked Mr. Richmond to explain the approximate number and priority total at the top of the spreadsheet.

Mr. Richmond said there were 400 outstanding things that the courts wished to have done to the JIS. He added that 20 were in the highest priority.

Justice Fairhurst clarified that they were capturing, just under JIS, the number of requests there were and of the 400, 20 would make the priority total.

Mr. Richmond said that the 20 on the sheet were a subset of the top 20 priorities. He said they were broken out and the Business Analysts went through each one and put them in the order in which they thought the user's would like to see them done.

Justice Fairhurst asked if all of the items listed as being completed in six months, could be done in six months.

Mr. Richmond said no, the fixes would be sequential. He added that logical groupings had not been completed.

Mr. Hall asked (as an example) if they looked at social security numbers and the timeframe was six months, was that based on one or two staff members working on that issue. He asked if the number of staff members was dependent on the project being completed prior to six months.

Mr. Richmond said that he did not have that information.

Mr. Hall said the choices would be discussed while they discussed the budget and what they would do 2009 through 2011.

Ms. Woods asked if the committee wanted responses from the associations by June 27.

Justice Fairhurst said she was not sure. She said the budget would play into that decision.

Mr. Richmond said that they wanted it made clear that the JIS Architecture document was their interpretation of what was in the queue. They said they were not comfortable with the priority that they were in. They said they wanted the user groups to go back and determine the priority.

Mr. Jackson said there were about seven thousand requests on the original list.

Mr. Richmond said that the Judicial Information System Advisory Committee (JISAC) reduced the list to seven hundred items prior to the Case Management System (CMS) implementation. He said the list he provided took into account the seven hundred plus the outflow of the users group and the BPE sessions.

NCSC STRATEGIC PLAN REVIEW

Mr. Hall said that he wanted to discuss the action items. Mr. Hall provided a chart and said it was not a commitment to any timelines; the chart was a representation of the current thinking of what it might possibly be. He said that as they pulled together all of the things that the AOC was doing and what the report recommended that the AOC do, then placed that into the context of the state budget cycle. He said those were their initial thoughts on how it would all piece together.

Justice Fairhurst said she thought it was important for them to do a reverse calendar in the interim. She said they have to have their budget submissions to the state Supreme Court at the September En Banc. She said they needed to work backwards from there. She said they would need to determine what the next step would be and have peer reviews of those options. She added that they needed to maintain and enhance their credibility with the Legislature and the Executive so they still have the ability to oversee and guide the process.

Mr. Hall talked about the Budget Development (in green, bottom of chart) on the NCSC Report Timeline. He said the Budget Development for the Supreme Court process began in March, with the release of instructions and it would theoretically end at the first of October when the budget was developed for presentation to the Legislature in the January 2009 session for funding to begin in July 2009 and run through the end of the biennium in June of 2011.

Mr. Hall referenced the Budget Development (in blue, bottom of chart) which depicted the second half of the next biennium. He said they wanted to go with a supplemental budget for things they would not know about until later. He said the chart was based on the committee's need to know where they were at in the cycle and what decisions need to be made and when. He said with that in mind they tried to take the action steps coming out of the retreat, where they were, and what decisions needed to be. He added that there were budget implications that needed to be considered fairly soon (in green, body of chart). He said those needed to be reviewed for the budget submission, for the first half of the next biennium.

Justice Fairhurst said there might be other things that they might need to identify. She asked Mr. Radwan and Mr. Hall if it would be possible for them to put in a placeholder for the second half of the biennium so they would have time to make the decisions.

Mr. Radwan said he would recommend making that decision in September because they would have the second revenue forecast. He said the first revenue forecast would be on June 16 so that would give them a better idea of the current and next biennium. He added that the second report would be out on September 12. He said if the economy was slowing down then they

could go to the Legislature and say that even though they did not have an exact plan they would be able to tell them what they think it would cost.

Mr. Hall said that it was clear that they would not have a good idea of what they would be spending money on and how much it would cost in the second half of the biennium between June and September of 2008.

Judge Grosse said that even if the budget stayed the same there would still be a major problem. He said if they were working off the JIS account, with gas at \$4 to \$5 a gallon, the result in terms of citations written would go down, because traffic goes down effecting revenue. He said it happens every time, and this time it would be even more significant. He said that AOC would be projecting out against a declining number.

Mr. Radwan said that the forecast for fund balance in revenue in the ensuing biennium had been pushed down quite a bit. He said that might mitigate the impact of people driving less and having fewer infractions. He said they would not see the effects until September or October.

Ms. Siri Woods mentioned that the requests for 'waiver of fees' were also up.

Mr. Hall said that the next step was an assessment of the current systems. He said that it would probably progress in the twenty-one days following that meeting.

Action Item: Ms. Woods asked if they could get a list of every program running at the AOC and the language it was running in.

Mr. Richmond provided the names of those he had asked to be a part of the peer review: St. Peter's Hospital (PAC CAR), DSHS, DOL, King, Thurston, and Pierce Counties. He said he was open to whomever else, but he wanted to keep the audience small.

Mr. Hall said that Mr. Richmond was talking about bringing the Chief Information Officers (CIO's) and technical staff from those organizations to sit down with Gregg and his group, prior to the next JISC meeting and review the AOC proposal and validate the proposal to move forward in Master Data Management, Service Oriented Architecture. He said maintaining the Legacy Systems with the functionality that they were intended to provide was a good long-term strategy for the JIS. He said that would be the key decision.

Judge Grosse said he did not think they could do that in the way they were proposing to do it. He said he thought they needed to get outside assistance, a contractor to go in and do that for them. He said the two reasons he thought they needed to do that were: 1) for the committees comfort level, and 2) to validate the committee's position with the Legislature and the Executive. He said the committee was in a world of hurt with the both of them. He said that he could not stress how much trouble they were in with the Legislature at that point.

Mr. Hall said the first three bullets under 'Next Steps' in the 'NCSC' Report needed to be done but the fourth one was more of a discussion to be done esoterically about policies that the JISC wanted to adopt for how they would do projects in the future and how that related to the budget cycle in the long term.

Judge Grosse said they may have needed a second set of experts for that but they were a way's away from that. He said, in terms of the first three, he thought they should do both at the same time.

Justice Fairhurst clarified that Judge Grosse's suggestion was that they needed to find another group aside from the peer group that Mr. Richmond was forming.

Mr. Hall said Mr. Richmond had drafted a Request for Proposal (RFP) for someone to go out and do those things. Mr. Hall had told Mr. Richmond that he did not think that they had time for that.

Judge Grosse said they might be right.

Justice Fairhurst said they might not have that answer in June. She said with the peer group they may have an initial assessment that they would then be able, in July or August, to have the other group speak to which would either validate or invalidate what the AOC would like to do. She said that would still give them time before they present their budget information.

Mr. Richmond said that his staff could do it, have a peer group review it, and then have an outside entity go in and validate the work the AOC had done by looking in their systems and talking to staff who built them. He said another way would be to have the peer group go in and look at the whole picture without the AOC staff having done anything prior.

Mr. Hall said that at the August 22 JISC meeting the committee would probably give their approval on what would go to the budget committee the following week.

Justice Fairhurst said that was an option and they had to know what they would do in that case in the short term. She said if that was what the budget committee was thinking then they needed to know that.

Mr. Jackson said the RFP for the consultants said to 'assess and make recommendations', so they did not have to start from scratch if the budget committee did not like their plan.

Justice Fairhurst said that they were asking for the recommendations.

Judge Hall said they had been told (over the past ten to fifteen years) that the Legacy systems would not continue to function and they would need something new. She asked for clarification on that.

Mr. Hall explained that ten years prior, the technology that was needed to keep the Legacy systems running, was not available. He added that new technology had been created, such as Service Enabling, and currently there were ways to keep the Legacy systems running that were not available before.

Ms. Yolande Williams asked if a representative from Seattle Municipal Court could be part of the peer review that Mr. Richmond had set up. Mr. Richmond said 'yes'.

Ms. Woods said that everyone (courts/AOC) recognized that the business that they wanted to do could not be done on the mainframe and that if they wanted to do those things in a modern fashion other applications would be needed.

Mr. Hall continued to review the NCSC Final Report. He commented on 'Item B', page 7. He said that at the June 27 JISC Meeting, a detailed project plan for data exchange would be presented. Mr. Hall continued on with 'Item D' and said that some of the system upgrades were occurring; Cobol 4.1 to Cobalt 5 and the data management and SOA which would also be dependent upon the decision made by the JISC. Mr. Hall moved onto 'Item E' and said that his understanding of it was that it was an assessment of what would be done as far as new functionality. He said that would be part of the long-term planning cycle.

Justice Fairhurst said that the most important decisions to be made were for the short-term; how they would keep running. She added that they needed to concentrate on the immediate work and dedicate their attention so they were in a position to have concrete reviews that were justified recommendations to go forward.

Mr. Hall moved onto 'Item F', which talked about Governance. He said that he thought the time allotted for the JISC meetings was too short.

Justice Fairhurst said they did need to get together more often.

Mr. Hall said that he highlighted policies and standards where he thought they needed more focus. He talked about 'Item G' and the top five enhancements to the system, one of those things was the rescreen of priorities and getting with the committee to decide what the top five were and what they should start working on. Mr. Hall said that he added Project Management Office status to the report. He felt that was an important addition.

Mr. Hall explained that Mr. Richmond had a list of positions that he believed were necessary to go forward to do anything. He said that Mr. Richmond was 'robbing Peter to pay Paul' in regards to moving staff around to cover work. He said that Mr. Richmond had looked at staffing within the AOC and came up with a set of positions that he felt were necessary in order for the AOC to move forward to do anything. Mr. Hall drew a rough outline demonstrating the use of the Project Money to pay for those positions, but if the Legislature would not allow them to roll those positions into permanent staffing under ISD Maintenance then those staff members would go away when the Project Money ran out.

Justice Fairhurst said it would be important for the committee to know why it would work to their benefit to ask the Legislature to include money for those Full Time Employees (FTE's).

Judge Grosse said that would not happen.

Justice Fairhurst said that if the Legislature did not allocate that new FTE's, they would still have the option of using the 'Project Money' to keep those staff on as 'Project Staff'. She said that Judge Grosse's concern was that the Legislature would not give the AOC more FTE's. She said that it would not hurt to ask.

Mr. Hall said that the justification needed to be made by the AOC to the JISC regarding new staff.

Mr. Hall said that he wanted to put into context about the budget situation, decisions that needed to be made, and additional thinking of how all of it would layout over time, relative to the action items from the NCSC Report from the JISC Retreat.

Note: Justice Fairhurst asked if the Data Dissemination Committee needed to meet on June 27. Judge Grosse said 'no'. Justice Fairhurst told the committee to plan on meeting from 9:00 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. on June 27 and they would have a working lunch around 11:30 a.m.

CONCEPT OVERVIEW

Mr. Richmond said that he wanted them to know that he was not 'blindly running down the path' of Service Enabling and Master Data Management. He said the ISD had gone through due diligence to figure out what they could do to get from where they were to where they need to be as far as functionality for the courts. He said that they could only maintain what they had and hope something better would come along in the future. He said they could: selectively replace

the applications they have, recode or re-factor from COBOL, Natural, and Java and convert those to .NET and put those on Servers, but that would not get the courts any increased functionality.

Mr. Richmond said that all of the applications were so intertwined at the database level that they could not pull one out and insert another. He said that was attempted with the Case Management System and it did not work. He said that he was proposing three concepts; 1) Data Management (Concept Overview provided in handouts). He said that the data management and data exchange infrastructure modernization had been delivered to the Data Management Steering Committee. He said in order to have clean data and be able to uncouple it from the applications and have it as a data set that any other application that they might buy in the future could hook into it and take data in and push data out and ensure that it was clean. He said the cost of \$1.5 million was high. 2) Data Exchange Infrastructure Modernization; he said that service enabling would allow them to take current services and bundle them into one service. He said they could modify screens. He said they have had vendors say that they can do the service enabling. He said the cost would be \$1.5 and \$1.75 million. 3) ISD Internal System Upgrades; he said that would be more internal to ISD. He said they need the PMO to monitor projects. He said the total came to \$7 million.

Ms. Woods asked if there were certain projects within those enhancements that Mr. Richmond would recommend which would better enable them to do data exchange or new projects.

Justice Fairhurst clarified if the AOC should come back with a list of priorities based on the three proposals that would be successful or provide a positive benefit to the users.

Mr. Richmond said that he was not sure what they wanted. He said if they Service Enabled they did one or two parts at a time.

Justice Fairhurst said that whatever the recommendations were, that they needed to be sure that they had the capacity or capability to do whatever the priorities were, in addition to what was on the wish list.

Justice Fairhurst said the JISC needed to decide what groups they needed in order to make the decisions in the short term. She said some decisions may require committees, and those would need to work hard in order to be prepared when the JISC got together to have input. She said the right people would need to be at the meetings so decisions would need to be made and so no one would be coming back or second-guessing. She said they would need a consensus.

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