

JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE
Special Session

August 8, 2008
9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
AOC Office, SeaTac, WA

Minutes

Members Present:

Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Judge C. Kenneth Grosse, Vice Chair (via phone)
Ms. Cathy Grindle
Mr. Jeff Hall
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson
Mr. Rich Johnson
Mr. Marc Lampson
Judge Glenn Phillips
Judge Michael Trickey (via phone)
Ms. Yolande Williams
Ms. Siri Woods

Guests Present:

Mr. Larry Barker
Mr. Shayne Boyd (Sierra Systems)
Ms. Barbara Miner
Mr. Chris Shambro
Mr. Joe Siegal (Sierra Systems)
Mr. Chris Wagner (Sierra Systems)

Staff Present:

Mr. Gregg Richmond
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Ms. Ronee Parsons
Ms. Denise Dzuck
Ms. Tiara Zimmerman

Members Absent:

Chief Robert Berg
Ms. Glenna Hall
Judge James Heller
Judge Thomas J. Wynne
Mr. Greg Zempel

CALL TO ORDER

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

A motion was made to approve the minutes of June 27, 2008 with the removal of Ms. Barb Miner from the list of guest attendees; the motion was seconded and passed.

Justice Fairhurst commented on Mr. Hall's selection by the Supreme Court to be the new State Court Administrator. She added that he was also formally appointed to JISC. She said that Judge Richard McDermott, Superior Court Judges' Association Chair, named Judge Michael Trickey as an official member of the JISC and Greg Zempel would be joining them from WAPA, taking Greg Banks' position. She continued that former Judge Glenna Hall was going to continue in an ex-officio member status.

ISD BUDGET DETAIL – Ramsey Radwan (“Budget Overview Summary” handout)

Mr. Radwan briefed the committee on the biennium proposal (budget status) and how decisions that day would affect the ensuing biennium. He said the ISD had about a \$48 million dollar

biennial budget, which was broken down into two pieces, one being the Ongoing Operations and the JIS Roadmap (or CMS project). Projections are that \$27 million will be spent in operations for staffing, computer room and equipment; most of that would be spent through the biennium with few exceptions (vacancy rate savings as staff go through the system). Mr. Radwan said they project spending close to 99% of that \$27 million. He added that there would be about \$15.5 million spent in salary and benefits and about \$11.6 million spent in the "Other" category.

He referred to the CMS Roadmap expenditures in which the state legislature appropriated \$20.5 million. The proposed cost for the 11 staff members being requested will be about \$1 million. If approved, he said the 11 FTE's would be phased in over the next several months, with 11 FTE's by June 30, 2009.

Mr. Radwan moved on to the summary for the next biennium beginning July 1, 2009. He estimates that the 09-11 biennium would be about \$52 million that would come from remaining money from the current biennium, ongoing revenue from the PSEA and ongoing revenue from the JIS Account. He said they were above projections to date in the current biennium by approximately a million dollars.

Mr. Radwan referred to the "2009-11 Potential Legislative and Revenue Changes." He said there was a \$3 million fund shift and about a \$240,000 reduction in PSEA. He added that by tossing in the 3% reduction in JIS revenue that would take the \$52 million to about \$47.7 million available. He said that included all resources and had not been requested yet.

Judge Grosse indicated an error on page 2 of the summary. The 3% of \$43 million was not \$870,000. Mr. Radwan clarified the project reduction in JIS revenue during the 09-11 biennium. The figure noted (\$870,000) was correct. This amount represented a 3% reduction in anticipated revenue as opposed to a 3% reduction in the JIS fund balance.

Mr. Radwan continued there were 81.4 approved staff positions in the ISD; with internal transfers there are 84.4. Those transfers were Help Desk positions, which were moved into the JSD. He said that the 84.4 was the approved number would not change until changed in the budget.

Mr. Radwan touched on "Court Equipment Growth" and the \$3.4 million for growth and the normal replacement cycle that was previously approved. There is approximately \$5.4 million in what he called "Previously Approved." He added that they were looking at \$6 million in mandatory, non-discretionary expenditures to add to the \$29 million.

They have about \$47.7 million dollars available after taking out the revenue reductions; around \$29.5 million is needed for operations and another \$6 million to enhance equipment and augment the maintenance level. Another \$4 million is needed, which has not yet been approved, to continue with the staff and the contracts. There would be \$7.7 million left out of that \$47 million if everything was approved that was put on the table that day. They were going to have about \$29 million in ongoing costs, another \$5 million in previously approved costs and about \$10 million in new costs.

Mr. Radwan said they have a little bit of constraint on how they can spend the \$20.458 million. The proviso was for the Roadmap CMS, data exchange and the data warehouse - the package was sold as a core package. His concern was spending the money too far out of scope.

SIERRA SYSTEMS

Mr. Richmond explained that Sierra Systems was hired to perform an assessment of the JIS applications and analyze the soundness of the overall Judicial Information System. The analysis would include the network environment, the configuration, server platforms and application software. He added that the objectives were to obtain an assessment of the sustainability of the portfolio – the entire package of all the applications (hardware, structure, etc.).

Mr. Boyd said there were a number of key elements that had to be addressed and a number of deliverables that had been produced. He said the committee was provided with the “Deliverable Four” which was the Findings & Recommendations.

He said they looked at the ability of the organization to sustain individual applications. Its current state suggested that the functionality they had would be maintained and kept. It was the extension or the ability to extend the application to do new things that were significantly different.

Mr. Boyd talked about their definition of sustainability. They defined it as an 18-24 month window, with the exception of three applications, the applications were sustainable. It did not mean they could be left alone for an indefinite period of time. But within that window, the AOC had an opportunity to do other things. All applications had the ability to be maintained over a longer period. With the three that had been identified, the problems became greater and the difficulty in maintaining them increased over time, some of the applications truly were challenged to support that change.

Mr. Boyd went on to talk about the infrastructure, which they defined as the hard elements or the hardware of the network. The AOC was (as of that day) sustainable, maintainable and extensible. It was where it should be; it was appropriate for the organization.

The beginning of the Executive Summary, “Deliverable Four,” said, “*There are few best practices across the organization – AOC/ISD as a whole.*” The application portfolio was the encompassing hardware/software/technology equals processes. It was essentially sound in the critical elements for sustainability. The AOC had an opportunity to set the framework for change – to take those good practices and select the best and ensure that they were followed consistently across the organization.

Mr. Jackson asked for clarification on the fifth slide in Mr. Boyd’s presentation. He said the slide indicated that applications were sustainable in the near term (18-24), the exceptions being ACORDS, JRS, and BRIO.

Mr. Siegal said users would eventually need to change and have demands for better performance or better responsiveness, from a functionality perspective. With proper care they

could be sustained for a long time, but it was the demand for change and the demand for more from the systems that would threaten sustainability.

NEXT STEPS: Mr. Boyd said some of this was theoretical; many of those items were very specific because of what they had seen from the AOC environment. They broke it into a vertical grouping of Tactical Considerations, Best Practices, Business Needs, and then the horizontal extension of the Architectural Guidance, Planning the Roadmap and the Transitional Activities.

Our First Steps were drawn specifically from their assessment. Under Tactical Considerations there were three areas that they identified that were risks. He said *ACORDS* was difficult to do much more with; left alone as it is, maintained and supported appropriately, it was stable. However, there were major significant impediments to making it do more – the AOC needed to revisit it and determine what the next activity should be.

Mr. Boyd said that when the assessment was completed in the middle of September, they would know more about the application and areas in which it would be brittle.

Mr. Johnson said he thought that was exactly right on in the sense that they knew that they were going to have to do something with it eventually, and spending that time and effort to figure out what those options were is critical.

Mr. Boyd continued that the CAPS problems were not necessarily the same ones that *ACORDS* had.

Mr. Siegal addressed how the AOC could be positioned to meet some of the long-term challenges. They were going to categorize that preparation in four areas: 1) looking at best practices – are there ways that best practices can be improved for the future; 2) what the real requirements were; 3) coming up with an architectural framework or architectural guidance that would enable technology to meet those business needs; and 4) a way to actually approach this problem. The six areas of best practices are: requirements, development, release management, support, business continuity, and guidance and architecture; those were looked at as part of the assessment.

Requirements: Sierra Systems talked to the different ISD groups that support the applications. There was a lot of variability; different approaches, different governance structures. When they were talking to the JCS folks it sounded like there was an effective communication mechanism, where ISD was getting those requirements in there and being able to respond to them.

Development: Mr. Siegal said there was a similar mix of different approaches across technical platforms. Some of that was appropriate as different technologies would require different development methods. Once best practice principles were established, he thought it was a matter of having the leadership of ISD see that those best practices were followed.

Release Management: There was a release management process in place that they observed and they questioned different areas. The adherence was a less consistent, so there was opportunity to make sure that the best practices are followed.

Support. They observed an effective Help Desk; which seemed to be in good order.

Business Continuity: The practice was there as far as having off-site backup locations which seemed quite strong.

Guidance and Architecture: They broke that out into three specific categories, one was the area of external governance – which was a key part of the requirements question. How do we get requirements in from the user community out there and how are priorities established? Were there effective methods for hearing what those priorities should be, ruling on them, and then feeding that back so everyone was clear? What is really important within each of the respective functional areas? That area could use some attention to grow forward. *Internal Leadership* – the recent changes at AOC were exciting and he thought there was a great opportunity to build on the momentum and the opportunities for change.

Mr. Hall said that the final piece was that the architectural guidance was the “To Be” state, as in where would they want to be. As they add new functionality, new toolsets internal to ISD, does that conform to where they want to go.

Mr. Siegal said that what they were suggesting was that after the business needs and the guidance were established, then come up with some sort of a roadmap to actually evolve towards the new framework.

FTE STAFFING REQUEST

Ms. Cathy Grindle moved that the JISC accept Mr. Richmond’s recommendations for the 11 FTEs. With Mr. Johnson and Ms. Williams opposing, the motion was passed.

SSN-FEASIBILITY DECISION – Gregg Richmond

Justice Fairhurst said the remaining question isn’t whether we’re going to collect it or not. The remaining question is how or do we remove it from what’s already there? She believes the committee has voted that we are not going to collect it. Business needs or no business needs, that decision is made. Someone would have to come back and make a new motion that we will collect it because there are business needs, or that we will do it in certain instances.

Justice Fairhurst suggested in light of that, should this group look at it? We’re meeting again in two weeks, and while we may not be giving it to the IRS, the IRS may be accessing it because it’s available to them.

Mr. Hall said that he and Mr. Richmond need to discuss this more and maybe the committee will need to discuss it again. However, once we get the directive and direction, we need to put that in the context of everything else that we have going on and the resources available.

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE LEGISLATURE – Jeff Hall

Mr. Hall and Ms. McAleenan have met with a set of legislators in committee along with Judge Grosse. We are now approaching the point in time where we are going to have enough

information and enough of an idea about what it looks like moving forward, to begin conversations with the legislature. We have two pieces in front of us. One is where we are at and what we are doing; and the next piece is what it looks like for the next session (i.e., what the budget request going to be). We may want to meet with them once on progress-to-date and then again about what we are asking for next session. Activities will begin to increase as we get to a point where we can have some effective and meaningful communication.

FUTURE MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for August 22, 2008, at the AOC SeaTac facility.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.