

**Electronic Filing Committee
Meeting Minutes
March 3, 2010**

Members Present:

Hon. Marla Luckert, Chair	Debi Schrock
Hon. Dan Biles, Vice Chair	Greg Cox
Kelly O'Brien	Stephanie Theel
Steve Berndsen	Tim Mulcahy
John Steelman	Todd Heitschmidt
Kathleen Collins	Kevin Beckwith
Angela Callahan	Larry Zimmerman
Alice Adams	Kathie Garman
Mark Kahrs	Steve Grieb
Hon. R. Wayne Lampson	Gordon Lansford
Hon. Edward Bouker	Don Troth
Ron Keefover	Virginia Taylor

Guests:

Ernie Segó, Justice Systems, Inc.
Jim Mortenson, Justice Systems, Inc.
Jason Oldham, Appellate Clerks' Office
Karen Braun, Office of Judicial Administration
Carrie McGinley, Office of Judicial Administration
Heather Wilke, Department of Labor

This meeting was called to allow Ernie Segó and Jim Mortenson of Justice Systems, Inc. to make a presentation on how E-filing will work with the FullCourt case management system and to provide details on the FullCourt Enterprise software.

During committee member introductions, Justice Luckert made note that Justice Systems would be making a condensed presentation to the Supreme Court that afternoon. Also, that the interim report would be presented to the entire Supreme Court at its administrative conference on Thursday, March 4.

The presentation began by discussing the architecture of the current FullCourt system and how it would work with e-filing and also the architecture of the FullCourt Enterprise system and its capabilities with e-filing.

The components involved with e-filing were outlined:

- Filer Interface (EFSP) – This is the portal the e-filer would enter through a website.
- Clerk Review Interface (EFM) – Clerks would review cases e-filed through this component.

- Case Management System (CMS) – This component would interact with e-filed cases (currently FullCourt in 103 Kansas counties).
- Document Management System (DMS) – This is the imaging or storage component of the system.
- Fee Collection – This the component the e-filer would use to pay the filing fees.

It was pointed out that Kansas already has some of the components in place for e-filing. They include the case management system, document management system, and a fee collection system for credit cards. At this point, all Kansas needs is the filer interface and the clerk interface components.

The FullCourt Enterprise system was presented. This is a web-based system as opposed to the FullCourt system currently being used which is client server based. The web-based environment allows multiple systems to share data with each other without having to hardwire connect the pieces on each side. This data sharing is achieved by using the Enterprise Service Bus (ESB). It was recommended by JSI that if Kansas decides to move to the Enterprise system that the implementation occur before the e-filing system.

Some differences between FullCourt and FullCourt Enterprise include:

- Enhanced Security
- Centralized/Regionally Controlled
- Real Time Information Sharing
- Improved Public Access

In FullCourt the security is screen level only, allowing users to access specific screens. With Enterprise the security is field level, meaning it can be set up so users can access certain fields without viewing secure fields on a given page. Because it is a web-based system, it runs in local area networks, meaning that the data is present in every court. All data would be sent to one server. Currently, 108 databases are being supported. It could also be set up regionally, which would include servers in more than one location. With web technologies available and with the enhanced security it will allow greater public access and also allow court personnel to be able to look up a person's case history statewide.

JSI differentiated between the two systems (FullCourt and Enterprise). Currently, FullCourt Version 5 is a two tier system. The application resides on the PC and the data is then transferred to a database server. With Enterprise the application runs on an application server, and the data is on a database server. The biggest benefit of this multi-tier system is that you only need a web browser to communicate with the servers. In other words, it can be used from any computer with a web browser and can be integrated with any entity you choose to share data with. Also, with the Enterprise system, each court would have its own identifiers attached to its data. This would allow for local court issues with multi-court functionality.

The subject of how a centralized system would affect continuity of operations was discussed. Currently with the fully distributed system, if one server goes down, only the county it resides in would be affected. With a centralized system, if the server goes down, it could

potentially affect the whole state. JSI recommends having another backup server in at least one other location. Two options they presented were: 1) OJA as a central site for the main server with one active standby site (i.e. Sedgwick County) where the central database is replicated; 2) OJA as a central site for the main server with independent systems in three sites (i.e. Sedgwick, Shawnee, and Wyandotte Counties). Another benefit of the web-based system is that it would provide 24/7 access for e-filers. Even if the database is down, no cases would be filed but the information submitted by e-filers would be stored and then accessed when the system is working again. The current system is only available as long as the PC running the application is on.

JSI then discussed what the steps would be to implement the Enterprise system.

1. Identify functional requirements (meet with a user committee).
2. Pilot implementation with an urban court.
3. Pilot with two or three additional urban courts.
4. Implement OJA central system courts.
5. Implement statewide repository.

E-filing should be implemented between steps three and four.

The question was raised if e-filing could be implemented with the existing FullCourt system. JSI said it could, but an additional component would need to be purchased for the front end and could potentially be a lost investment if Enterprise is purchased at a later time.

JSI explained that there are three ways to purchase software products in the current IT environment.

- | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| Perpetual: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purchase on license to use FullCourt (To be used in perpetuity.) - Maintenance and Support - Upgrades - Professional Services (Modules) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paid license fee upfront - Pay Annually - Pay as performed. - Pay as performed. |
| Subscription: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monthly/Annual Payments (Includes software license, maintenance and support, software updates and upgrades.) - Professional Services (Modules) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paid monthly or annually. - Pay as performed. |
| Software
As a
Service: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monthly/Annual Payment (Includes software license, maintenance and support, software updates and upgrades.) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pay monthly or annually |

The concept of Cloud Computing was introduced. This is where the user would pay the vendor for the amount of computer usage, very similar to an electric company charging the customer for amount of kilowatt hours used.

Meeting adjourned.