FILED SUPREME COURT STATE OF WASHINGTON JULY 2, 2025 BY SARAH R. PENDLETON CLERK

THE SUPREME COURT OF WASHINGTON

)

)

IN THE MATTER OF THE SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO JISC RULE 13—LOCAL COURT SYSTEMS

O R D E R

NO. 25700-A-1645

The Judicial Information System Committee, having recommended the suggested amendments to JISC Rule 13—Local Court Systems, and the Court having approved the suggested amendments for publication;

Now, therefore, it is hereby

ORDERED:

(a) That pursuant to the provisions of GR 9(g), the suggested amendments as attached hereto are to be published for comment in the Washington Reports, Washington Register,

Washington State Bar Association and Administrative Office of the Court's websites in January 2026.

(b) The purpose statement as required by GR 9(e) is published solely for the information of the Bench, Bar and other interested parties.

(c) Comments are to be submitted to the Clerk of the Supreme Court by either U.S. Mail or Internet E-Mail by no later than April 30, 2026. Comments may be sent to the following addresses: P.O. Box 40929, Olympia, Washington 98504-0929, or <u>supreme@courts.wa.gov</u>. Comments submitted by e-mail message must be limited to 1500 words.

Page 2 ORDER IN THE MATTER OF THE SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO JISC RULE 13—LOCAL COURT SYSTEMS

DATED at Olympia, Washington this 2nd day of July, 2025.

For the Court

Stepne, C. J. CHIEF JUSTICE

GR 9 COVER SHEET

Suggested Amendment to

Judicial Information Systems Committee Rule 13

Submitted by the Judicial Information Systems Committee

Α.	Name of Proponent:	Judicial Information Systems Committee (JISC)
В.	Spokespersons:	Justice Barbara A. Madsen, Chair Judge John Hart, Vice-Chair

C. <u>Purpose</u>:

These revisions to the language of the Judicial Information Systems Committee (JISC) Rule (JISCR) 13 are proposed to provide guidance to Washington State Superior Courts, Superior Court Clerks, Courts of Limited Jurisdiction and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) when a local court intends to use an alternative electronic court record system in lieu of using the statewide court record system and to facilitate sharing of statewide court data relied on for judicial decision making and public safety. This rule also acknowledges that the Judicial Information System Committee (JISC) and the AOC set statewide information technology (IT) priorities through a JISC-adopted IT governance process.

The JISC considered the revisions proposed to this rule at its regular meeting. These changes was considered by the committee and unanimously approved. The changes proposed represent the consensus of the committee on updates needed to bring this rule into line with developments that have occurred since this rule was last updated.

We seek to amend, delete, and add language to JISCR 13 to provide guidance to Washington State Superior Courts, Superior Court Clerks, Courts of Limited Jurisdiction and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) when a local court intends to use an alternative electronic court record system and to clarify that the Judicial Information System Committee (JISC) and the AOC set statewide information technology (IT) priorities through a JISC-adopted IT governance process.

- D. <u>Hearing</u>: A hearing is not requested.
- E. <u>Expedited Consideration</u>: Expedited consideration is not requested.

1	Judicial Information Systems Committee Rules
2	
3	
4	
5 6	LOCAL ELECTRONIC COURT RECORD SYSTEMS
6 7	Preamble
8	This rule provides guidance to Washington State Superior Courts, Superior Court
9	Clerks, Courts of Limited Jurisdiction and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)
10	when a local court intends to use an alternative electronic court record system in lieu of
11	using the statewide court record system and to facilitate sharing of statewide court data
12	relied on for judicial decision making and public safety.
13	
14	(a) An "electronic court record system" is any electronic court data technology system
15	that is a source of statewide court data identified in the JIS Data Standards for
16	Alternative Local Court Record Systems Policy ("JIS Data Standards Policy").
17	
18	(b) If an alternative electronic court records system is implemented in a superior court
19 20	jurisdiction, the presiding judge and county clerk will be consulted and included for
20 21	purposes of compliance with this rule.
21 22	(c) Counties or cities may implement alternative electronic court record systems in
22	compliance with procedures established by the Judicial Information System Committee
23	(JISC). Courts wishing to establish implement automated alternative electronic court
25	record systems shall provide advance notice of the proposed development their intent to
26	the Judicial Information System Committee JISC and the Office of the Administrator for
27	the Courts AOC at least 90 days prior to the commencement of such projects start of
28	the procurement process for the purpose of review and approval coordination.
29	
30	(d) Courts implementing an alternative electronic court record system shall meet the
31	requirements outlined in the JIS Data Standards Policy. AOC, on behalf of the JISC,
32	will provide the courts and/or clerk with all necessary information and requirements
33 34	needed to support the local court's implementation of the alternative electronic court record system and data exchange into the statewide data repository.
35	record system and data exchange into the statewide data repository.
36	(e) As soon as practicable after selection of an alternative electronic court record
37	system, the court will provide AOC with a project schedule and detailed plan for
38	integration with the statewide data repository and will also provide ongoing updates and
39	changes to the project schedule and plan.
40	
41	(f) The local court and/or county clerk agree to coordinate with AOC on data mapping to
42	ensure data quality standards are met for successful data exchange between the
43	alternative electronic court record system and the statewide data repository.
44	
45	(g) AOC, the court and/or clerk will meet to establish an agreed upon timeline for
46	transfer of data into the statewide data repository which should not exceed more than

- 47 two months after implementation of the alternative electronic court records system,
- 48 <u>unless agreed upon by the court, clerk, and AOC.</u>
- 49
- 50 (h) Individual courts and/or county clerks are responsible for arranging resources for
- 51 implementing and maintaining locally procured electronic court record systems and for
- 52 programming and testing local systems that interface with the statewide data repository.

53

- 54 (i) The court, clerk, and AOC agree to address and resolve any identified issues that
- 55 may impact implementation of the alternative electronic court record system and
- 56 successful exchange of data into the statewide data repository.
- 57
- 58 (j) The AOC will provide sufficient notice to the courts and clerks using alternative
- 59 electronic court record systems to allow for adoption of any necessary changes to the
- 60 JIS Data Standards Policy, legislative requirements, or required business and technical
- 61 <u>changes.</u>
- 62
- 63 <u>Comments:</u>

64

- 65 This rule recognizes that early and frequent communication and collaboration between
- 66 the local court and the AOC is essential for success. This rule also acknowledges that
- 67 the Judicial Information System Committee (JISC) and the AOC set statewide
- 68 information technology (IT) priorities through a JISC-adopted IT governance process.