

**Electronic Filing Committee
Technology Subcommittee
Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2010**

Subcommittee Members Present:

Greg Cox, Co-Chair
Stephanie Theel, Co-chair
Tim Mulcahy
Todd Heitschmidt
Kevin Beckwith

E-Filing Committee Members Present:

Justice Marla Luckert
Kelly O'Brien
Steve Berndsen
Steve Grieb
M.J. Willoughby

Subcommittee Members Absent:

Larry Zimmerman
Kathie Garman
Tyler Adams

Guests Present:

Sarah Crick, Kansas.gov
Wayne Dirks, Kansas.gov

The meeting commenced at 10:00 a.m.

Topics for Discussion

- I. Discuss Draft RFP
- II. Discuss Standards Related to RFP for Inclusion
- III. Grant Availability Update – Byrne/JAG
- IV. Demonstration by Kansas.Gov of Sample E-Filing Web Port

Discussion Notes

I. *Discuss Draft RFP*

The Request for Proposal (RFP) drafted by the Division of Purchases was reviewed. The following changes were recommended.

Page 4 – Currently states that vendors should submit their own cost proposal forms. The committee felt that one should be created for the vendors to complete so that all the information submitted would be uniform among vendors and would include everything we are looking for.

Page 9 – The third paragraph talks about not communicating with any other vendors about this project. Committee members thought that a potential vendor would need to communicate with JSI (the FullCourt Case Management System vendor) in order to produce an accurate cost proposal on a product that would interface with their system. However, it was felt that a meeting with all the vendors submitting a proposal and JSI should be coordinated in the question and answer phase of the RFP process.

Page 19 – Section 5.0 – Paragraph 3 – It was felt that the words “similar statewide” regarding previous judicial environments a vendor has experience may be better stated as similar judicial environments.

Page 20 – Statement of Work Table, the following changes were recommended:

Item 2 – Changes to include developing interfaces to and from DMS and CMS systems. Acceptance criteria was simplified to state “Successful acceptance test of systems’ integration.”

Item 3 – Deliverable changed to include “participation in weekly project status meeting” from “attendance in weekly project status meeting.”

Item 4 – Changed to using a train-the-trainer approach with court staff and system administrators. Attorneys were deleted from this item.

Item 5 – This item was added to include the same parameters as Item 4 without the previous changes mentioned above for external court users only (not the train-the-trainer method).

Item 7 – Eliminated requirement for assistance with installation only for pilot courts to include other courts as well.

Item 9 – This item was added to require external user support from the vendor.

Page 23 – Section 6.0 – General Project Goals and Objectives – Add the sentence “These goals and objectives will be used to evaluate vendor proposals.” Also, the committee

recommended splitting the list into two separate parts. The first subheading should be “General Goals” and includes the first 14 bullet points. The second subheading should be “General Objectives” and will include the remaining bullet points.

Page 24 – The new General Objectives subheading had several changes to bullet points.

The third item should now read “The EFS should be a web-based system.” Prior language stated that it should “based” on a web-based system.

The fourth item changed the word “comply” to “conform” with established data exchange formats.

Item 5 will now read “The EFS should accommodate state and federal statutes as well as Supreme Court and District Court Rules.”

Items 8, 9, and 10 were added.

Item 8: “The EFS should be able to integrate with an electronic payment solution, or provide an electronic payment solution.”

Item 9: “The EFS should provide an electronic signature method.”

Item 10: “The EFS should be flexible to allow table updates as required.”

Page 27 – Section 7.4.1 – Replace “local agencies and customers” with “court staff and external users.”

Page 27 – Section 7.4.2 – Delete “List three agencies that have attended similar classes. Discuss how graduates of such training are certified upon completion.” This language did not apply to the Judicial Branch.

The revised RFP will be sent via e-mail to the entire E-Filing Committee for input. After that, it will be sent to the Division of Purchases. Steve will also speak to Purchases about whether or not the organization of the document can be rearranged.

II. *Discuss Standards Related to RFP for Inclusion*

Changing the fourth bullet in Section 6.0 from “comply” to “conform” with established data exchange formats covered this agenda item.

III. *Grant Availability Update – Byrne/JAG*

The application is due June 18. Grant funds are committed based on the federal fiscal year (November through October) but administered during the state fiscal year (July through June). One thing the committee felt was important is that the match be kept at 25% throughout the whole grant timeline, if possible.

IV. *Demonstration by Kansas.Gov of Sample E-Filing Web Port*

Sarah Crick from Kansas.gov gave a demonstration of the sample web page they created for the Kansas E-filing project. They created the initial “jump” page. It was based on the current format currently used for Kansas Judicial Branch website. It will include links to the main website, to the online payments page, and to public access for district court records. There will eventually be functionality to file to Supreme Court, Court of Appeals, and the District Courts. The District Courts link will have a drop down box that will list all the counties that have e-filing access. Counties will be added as they become available.

The next meeting will be scheduled at a later date in conjunction with the review of Request for Proposal responses.