

Judicial Information Systems Council Meeting (JIFFY)
Meeting Minutes

Judge Karen Mitchell, Chair

Judicial Information Division
505-476-6900
Thursday, May 19, 2016
8:09 - 12:00 p .m.

JIFFY Voting Members Present:

Judge Karen Mitchell, Chair
Judge Duane Castleberry
Judge Henry Alaniz
Tobie Fouratt
Judge J. Miles Hanisee
Brenda Castello
Judge Sarah Singleton
Jim Noel
Judge Mark T. Sanchez
Ian Bezpalko
Lynne Rhys
Jason Jones (phone)
Dennis Jontz (phone)
Judge Alan Kirk

Non-Voting Members Present:

Gregory Saunders
Artie Pepin
Justice Petra Jimenez Maes
Julie Wheeler

Guests Present:

Orlando Ulibarri (video)
Jonathan Ash
Frank DiMaggio (video)
Oscar Arevalo
Colleen Reilly
Phil Gallegos
Sankalpita Nighya
Rosemary McCourt

Staff Present:

Genevieve Grant
April Sessions
Carlos Cordova
Pat Mente
Renee Cordova
Laura Orchard
Margarita Terrell
Tim Elsbrock
Marsha Davis
Steve Harrington
Annie Hall
Shawna Hochanadel

I. Approval of Agenda. Judge Mitchell called the meeting to order at 8:09 a.m.

Judge Alaniz moved to accept the agenda as presented. Judge Singleton seconded. No opposition noted. Motion carried.

II. Approval of April Meeting Minutes. Jim Noel stated that he did not feel the minutes of the April meeting represented what had been said at the meeting with regards to the IT Budget Strategy Committee's report. Mr. Noel wanted to know exactly what the recommendation was from JIFFY to CJC concerning the IT Budget Strategy Committee's report. Mr. Noel wanted to know if there was a written report and if so would like to see the report. If the matter is moving forward as an approach to funding JID, Mr. Noel assumed that JIFFY was going to do a great deal of the work on that task and it would be presented to either Budget Committee or CJC after JIFFY had a chance to work out the principles that Judge Alaniz and Judge Sanchez came up with concerning funding for JID. Mr. Noel would like to be part of that process.

- Judge Alaniz explained that there was no written report presented to CJC. Whatever IT Budget Strategy produces, it will first come to JIFFY for analysis before it goes to CJC. There are three different options that were presented at CJC, the first being that an assessment would be taken of each person in NM Judiciary for services that they are receiving and future services. The second option was to separate JID when going before the legislature as a single entity with regards to finance, so that the legislators can see how IT is an integral part of NM Judiciary. The third idea was to see if JID could be funded separately out of the NM Judiciary budget.
- Justice Maes noted that CJC voted IT funding as their third priority.
- Judge Mitchell clarified that the wording of the motion on page 9 of the JIFFY April 21, 2016 meeting should read *“the IT Budget Strategy Committee report to CJC at the May meeting requesting that IT be considered a priority”* rather than *“the Budget Strategy Committee's report be communicated to CJC at the May meeting to be considered at priority”*. Instead of the motion reading *“the report proposes the strategy to adequately fund JID”* it should read *“the IT Budget Strategy Committee proposes the strategy to JIFFY to adequately fund JID”*.

Judge Singleton moved to amend the minutes to reflect the changes indicated by Judge Mitchell. Those changes are that the wording of the motion on page 9 of the JIFFY April 21, 2016 meeting should read “*the IT Budget Strategy Committee report to CJC at the May meeting requesting that IT be considered a priority*” rather than “*the Budget Strategy Committee’s report be communicated to CJC at the May meeting to be considered a priority*”. Instead of the motion reading “*the report proposes the strategy to adequately fund JID*” it should read “*the IT Budget Strategy Committee proposes the strategy to JIFFY to adequately fund JID*”. Jim Noel seconded. No opposition noted. Motion carried.

- Judge Mitchell welcomed Julie Wheeler who has been appointed to replace Renee Cascio as the JID staff representative.

III. Working Session of JIFFY.

Overview Presentation. Tim Elsbrock mentioned that at the April meeting there was a presentation which illustrated all the projects that come in to JID and how JID might prioritize the projects. The two groups being highlighted today are the Application Team or Odyssey Team and the Development Team. These two groups have the longer more complex projects, are booked at least six months out and are over capacity. The Application Team includes fifteen people who are involved with every aspect of Odyssey including testing, development, configuration, training, rollout support and Odyssey reporting. The Development Team consists of seven programmers who do application development, support of every application that has been developed in JID over the years, website support, report creation and troubleshooting. The Client Team consists of ten people who deliver installations of equipment, network support and application support. The Systems Team consists of eleven people who provide data base support, Odyssey system support, statewide network support, system security and infrastructure including email and file shares for AOC and Supreme Court. The Video Network Operations Center (VNOC) consists of five people who support all of the audio visual services around the state. The goal is to review the JID projects every quarter and to communicate a level of detail that will help JIFFY decide on project priorities.

- Mr. Elsbrock referred to page 3 of the JID Workload Study power point and explained that the chart represents a three year time frame broken down by quarters. Even if there were no new projects or completion of ongoing projects, 17.5% of JID's time would be spent merging data, handling records and basic maintenance of the Odyssey system. In a year, JID needs to know what projects to take on within the Odyssey environment. Odyssey 2014 is on the Current Project Breakdown (p4) Odyssey 2014 is on the map and must take place before and during the Odyssey implementation of Court of Appeals as well as the Supreme Court workflow. The Maintenance and Support Break Down (p5) includes party merging, offense code, judge reassignments, event codes, DWI reporting and a great deal of data management.
- Mr. Elsbrock introduced the Parking Lot Items (p7) which totals 16,550 staff hours or eighteen months of work for JID. The Development Team (p8) is not booked to capacity, however 30% of their hours are spent on website maintenance, Odyssey forms maintenance and software maintenance. The application development parking lot totals 8700 staff hours which translates to a year of work for the Development Team plus the projects that are already in progress.
- Mr. Elsbrock explained that JID is overbooked for the next six to nine months trying to finish the Odyssey Appellate Court rollout. The plan for today is to define a process for prioritization and to confirm that committees such as CEOC, OJUG and OMUG need to champion projects for JIFFY.
- Over the last four or five years, Mr. Elsbrock explained that Odyssey has been paid through SCAF which is decreasing. SCAF pays for some employees and pays for \$850,000 worth of data lines per year. At the end of this fiscal year it is predicted that carryover SCAF will be down over \$1,000,000 from three years ago.
- Greg Saunders explained that basic Odyssey maintenance is paid through File & Serve; however any new projects or upgrades must be paid out of SCAF or a special appropriation. One of the considerations when

prioritizing needs should be whether a new project will add to the maintenance level and if so how much will it add to that level?

- Mr. Elsbrock described how JID would like anything that went on the roadmap to first go through some other party such as CEOC or OJUG. That project would then be brought to JIFFY and JID would explain to JIFFY the timeline, resources and funds needed to complete the assignment.
- Judge Sanchez brought up the idea that some projects may have to be discarded and some projects may have to be completed by the courts.
- Mr. Elsbrock agreed that both of those scenarios were possible due to lack of funds or time limitations.
- Justice Maes clarified that everyone in NM Judiciary needs to understand that there is a process for JID to manage their resources so that projects can be completed. JIFFY must be the gatekeeper for NM Judiciary and understand what the impact is of adding a specific undertaking to the Parking Lot. Some of the requests will need to go the Supreme Court for a decision.

Facilitation of Discussion. Deborah Dungan stated that the two goals of the working session is first to establish a project request process. This process will have to be tested to find out if there are parts of the process that will need to be changed or discarded. The second goal is to take the framework from the project request process and try to apply it to the application development parking lot. Ms. Dungan noted that part of her role at JIFFY today was to make sure that everyone had a chance to speak and that the meeting moves in the right direction so that JIFFY can accomplish the aforementioned goals.

- Judge Mitchell would like JIFFY to discuss JID core functions that are needed to keep NM Judiciary running.
- Mr. Saunders presented the two graphs which show the hierarchy of the management teams on the first graph and the lists the members of each team

under the managers on the second graph. A position was taken out of Network and Programming and moved to Applications because the workload on the Odyssey Team is very heavy. A staff member cannot be moved from one team to another team because they don't have the same expertise.

- Mr. Saunders referred to the handout entitled “*Typical Project Decision Workflow (proposed)*” and explained that this or another version of this process should be the way that a project ends up on the Parking Lot or Active List. Sideways projects are those that never come before JIFFY and they need to be done immediately due to an emergency or any number of other reasons. Presently there are many sideways projects in the JID workload. The project workflow would allow Mr. Saunders to hand out a specific procedural process to some who wished to champion a project. There has to be an individual with an idea to go before a group such as CEOC or OJUG. If the idea is rejected then it goes no further. If one of those groups agrees that the idea should be pursued, they elect a Business Owner who will champion the proposal and bring it before the Chair of JIFFY and Mr. Saunders and they would decide when and how it would be added to the JIFFY agenda. When the business owner presents the concept to JIFFY and explains why it is needed, JID will then say what it will take to accomplish the task and the impact of adding it to the JID list. JIFFY will accept, reject or modify the request. If it is accepted it will be added to the Active List or the Parking Lot. If it is added to the Active Project List then all of the current timelines have to be adjusted to compensate for the impact of the new project. In some instances, JIFFY will ask questions that may send the request back to the beginning to be re-vetted and the business owner will have to start the process over again. This workflow would be applicable to new additions to Odyssey, new applications or new functionality not common core functions.

- Judge Mitchell asked if the project decision workflow process would also involve items on the Parking Lot especially ones that have been on the Parking Lot for an extended period of time?

- Mr. Saunders replied in the affirmative and added that in the future all items on the Parking Lot should come back through the project decision workflow process.
- Mr. Elsbrock pointed out that all of NM Judiciary IT including JID will need to go through the project decision workflow process as well.
- Mr. Saunders related that before the proposed task is put on the JIFFY agenda, the business owner will have to find out from JID approximately how much time, staff resources and money it will take to complete the project. For some projects the assessment alone may take up to one hundred hours.
- Judge Mitchell asked who decides which committee vets the idea before it comes to JIFFY?
- A discussion ensued on the topic of who should decide which entity a person with a request should approach. Mr. Saunders made it clear that JID would not be able to direct the business owner to the entity or committee they should contact for approval before coming to JIFFY.
- Judge Mitchell suggested that a one page summary would have to be submitted before the idea generator went to a subcommittee to explain the basics of the project.
- Brenda Castello added that a checklist denoting the requirements might be given to everyone requesting a project in order to insure that it is a realistic undertaking at the very beginning of the process.
- Ms. Dungan added that JIFFY needs to decide what specific information the committee wants the business champion to report at the appropriate JIFFY meeting.
- It was agreed by the members of JIFFY that there needs to be a process in place to screen new projects that JID will implement and that the project

decision workflow developed by Greg Saunders was a good template for developing that process.

- Lynne Rhys mentioned that is important for the idea generator to know what constitutes a project so they know if they need to go through the process.
- Mr. Saunders defined a project as enhancements to Odyssey, enhancements to a business process, new applications that people want built, specific data requests that will involve a great deal of time to produce and anything that will modify, change or add to the business process.
- Genevieve Grant informed JIFFY that JID has put together a project request form and some of the questions include: what the business need is for the project, is it an enhancement or modification to an existing application and is there budget money available for the project?
- Mr. Pepin suggested that in some cases the person championing the new idea may only need to go to JIFFY without presenting to a body such as CEOC first and Mr. Saunders agreed. At times, someone outside of NM Judiciary will have a project request that will have to be vetted through an entity or committee before being brought to JIFFY.
- Ms. Dungan clarified that if the project is not going to impact some entity or system in NM Judiciary, then it can be brought directly to JIFFY. If the project will impact some business process, application or group then it must be brought to the appropriate committee or group for approval before it goes before JIFFY.
- Justice Maes reminded JIFFY to include the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals in the project request process that JIFFY decides to implement.
- Mr. Pepin advocated for a limit on the number of hours being five to six hours maximum that JID will devote to figuring how long a project will take, the resources needed and the cost. If a project assessment will take more time than five or six hours for JID, then the decision whether JID will make the assessment should go to JIFFY.

- Judge Mitchell stated that the idea developer after submitting the request form will add 1A (between 1 and 2) contact Mr. Saunders and if needed, will ask the JIFFY Executive Committee (Justice Maes, Judge Mitchell, Artie Pepin and Greg Saunders) which group the request should go too initially. The purpose of the initial screening of the request by another committee or entity is for them to decide if the request makes sense from an enterprise system, is there a better way to do it, or if they need more information.

- Ms. Dungan summed up the preliminary steps 1) the idea developer fills out the project request form 2) the developer takes the request to a judiciary business group or directly to Mr. Saunders to review if the developer feels that it does not need to go to a business group 3) the project request form goes back to Mr. Saunders if it has been accepted by the judiciary business group (if rejected that will end the project)
 Judge Mitchell clarified that the responsibility of the committee or business entity that the idea is brought before (# 2 on the chart) is to decide if the idea makes sense and if it is it a benefit to the whole judiciary.
 4) the accepted idea will come back to JID to evaluate how much time it will take JID to estimate the timeline and resources to implement the project. (if it takes JID more than five or six hours to complete that estimate, it will be brought to JIFFY to decide if the idea merits the number of hours it will take JID to create a timeline and estimate resources for the proposal. JIFFY Chair or JIFFY Executive Committee) accepts or refers the proposal back to the developer for more information. 5) Business owner presents to JIFFY and JID would follow with the impact it would have on the current JID roadmap.

- Mr. Saunders estimated that the process to have an idea brought before JIFFY for consideration would take a minimum of two months.

- Mr. Elsbrock pointed out that the analysis of the new idea could take three or four months to complete.

- Julie Wheeler suggested that an attachment be added to the project request form with a short description of the judiciary business groups that the idea

developer can pick from to approach for approval. A project is often rejected when the idea developer does not have enough information, and the project request form template may need to be revised.

- Mr. Elsbrock noted that at this time, the Applications Team has at least a year's worth of Odyssey projects and the Development Team has six months to a year's worth of projects before either of those teams can begin a new assignment, unless JIFFY decides to put a new task ahead of some of the current projects.
- It was agreed that after the business owner presents the project to JIFFY, JIFFY will either reject the idea, tell the business owner to do modifications and bring it back to JIFFY or JIFFY will authorize JID to invest additional hours to find out the cost in time and resources.
- Judge Mitchell asked when JID would do the analysis of the impact in time, money and effect on other active projects?
- Mr. Saunders responded that JID may have the analysis ready when the business owner presents to JIFFY or JID may have to come back at a later meeting with their impact statement of the idea.
- Judge Singleton felt that the business owner needs to present in all situations where the estimate of time is going to take more than five hours, because JIFFY needs to be able to instruct JID whether to invest the time to prepare an impact statement. If JIFFY decides to reject the project, it should be before JID invests numerous hours on an impact statement.
- Mr. Saunders explained that every quarter JID will bring the Parking Lot and any other new project that was not part of the JIFFY decision process to JIFFY for review.
- Judge Mitchell noted that JIFFY will need to develop formal criteria for deciding which ideas to accept, which ideas to reject and which ideas to refer back to the business owner for modifications.

- Mr. Saunders updated the “*Project Decision Workflow*” chart during the break and explained that the idea developer will be given a project request form and sent to the proper committee or entity to initially vet the process (1A). The idea developer will present his/her proposal to the committee or entity (2). It is then accepted or rejected (3) by the entity and if rejected (4) that will end the project. If accepted (5) the business owner will present it to JIFFY. If JID can do the assessment in under five hours (6) it can go on the JIFFY agenda (with three weeks prior notice) (7). If the assessment will take JID over five hours (6) the business owner will have to come to JIFFY (7) to explain why the project is important enough for JID to spend more than five hours assessing the time and resources needed to complete the project. The JIFFY Chair will then accept (8) or reject (9) for more information. If rejected the business owner is sent back to the beginning (1). In the case of acceptance, the business owner presents the project at JIFFY (10). Projects that are accepted will go to JID for further information (11) or modifications. Projects that are rejected by JIFFY will end (12). If JIFFY authorizes JID to move forward on the project (13), JID will investigate budget requirements, contingencies on other projects and impact on other items. If there are projects introduced that will not have a significant impact on JID time or budget, then JID will bypass the investigation (13) and the project will be assigned to the Active List or the Parking Lot (14). Projects that will have a substantial impact on JID time and budget will likely go back on the JIFFY agenda for a second discussion (10) and then JIFFY will once again accept or reject the project (11). If accepted by JIFFY (14) JIFFY will then add it to the Active List (16) or Parking Lot (15). If active the project will begin after JIFFY assigns it to the Active List (17).
- Justice Maes stated that JIFFY needs to develop criteria for prioritizing projects as well as acceptance criteria for projects.
- Judge Singleton suggested that a rejection box be added under the Accepted Projects box (14) for projects that will require more time or funds than is available for JID to complete the project (14A).
- Laura Orchard noted that (13) JID Deep Dive should be dropped down under the line as it is a separate process to determine to degree of difficulty

of the project so that projects with minimum impact could go directly to Accepted Projects (14).

- Judge Singleton pointed out that there should be a provision that states that the business entity cannot get ahead of IT's ability to meet what it wants as a business model. Business owners should not be able to implement new projects unless they go through the project decision workflow process.

Application Development Parking Lot. Ms. Dungan referred to the handout entitled "*Application Development Parking Lot*" and after discussion an agreement was reached that the Legacy Jury System should be moved to the bottom of the list.

- Steve Harrington gave an explanation of each of the items on the Application Development Parking Lot and JIFFY voted on the priority of each item, 1-5 with 1 being the highest.
- The projects that are given a 1 are ready to be implemented by JID and at the next JIFFY meeting JID will update JIFFY on the progress being made on those projects. The projects rated 2-5 will be assigned a business owner who will go through the process of the finalized Project Decision Workflow.

RCS. The Reconciliation Cash System is an outdated tool used to reconcile cash between the courts and is a big risk to rely on for a system that is used every day. Oscar Arevalo has requested funds through C2 for the past several years and explained that anytime some part of the system is disturbed, will cause a blackout of RCS and it has to be reinstalled. (1)

Conservatorship. Conservatorship is software that tracks conservatorship, guardianship and assets that Patricia Galindo would like to utilize. It is currently being used in Minnesota however it will take significant effort to adopt it to New Mexico's Odyssey system. (5) Business Owner – Patricia Galindo to OJUG

Attorney Logs. Attorney Logs is a software program for the child welfare group so that attorneys can track their time and mileage in order to be reimbursed by the courts. (1) Currently in progress.

Case Lookup v2.0. The project is to recreate Case Lookup. (4) Business Owner – Tim Elsbrock to OAS

Bench Warrant Tax & Rev, Intercept. This project is for the Warrant Enforcement program and it has to do with fines and fees. When a person files their taxes and is eligible for a refund, Taxation and Revenue would have the ability to intercept the refund in order to collect past due fines and fees. (3) Business Owner –Cynthia Pacheco to OMUG

Courtroom Hearing Display. (5) Business Owner-Katina Watson to CEOC

Case Lookup Direct Queries to Odyssey. There is a complicated process that runs every night to convert Odyssey data to another format which takes 6-8 hours to run and is very fragile. If it breaks down, Case Lookup and the Consolidated Offender Query go down. (1)

Consolidated Offender Query Direct Queries to Odyssey db. This project is linked to the Case Lookup direct queries to Odyssey. (1)

E-citation – Traffic: flow data to DPS. The Development Team is working on E-citation for Albuquerque PD filing in BCMC which is in progress. This project would be an additional flow for other agencies and part of the funding is coming from DOT. (3) Business Owner- Artie Pepin to OMUG

Consolidated Offender Query (COQ) v2.0. DPS is rewriting their end of COQ and if JID is going to send DPS data for the COQ, JID will have to rewrite the other part of the program. Mr. Pepin remarked that both the district courts and the magistrate courts will benefit from the revamping of the COQ clearing house. (1)

Bench Warrant Magistrate Collections Software v2.0. This is used to track collections. (3) Business Owner- Cynthia Pacheco to OMUG

Judgment & Sentencing. Judge Mitchell commented that this project should be vetted through Odyssey Magistrate Users Group (OMUG). (3) Business Owner- ? to OMUG

Water Websites: Conversion to RTS Platform. This project is on hold for pending funding from the Water Adjudication group at AOC. If the funding comes through, JID will convert AOC's website over to the new platform. The goal is to have everyone on the new platform. (1)

Security Updates for Performance Plan & SESV Applications. It is a small project and simple for JID to accomplish. (1)

Performance Plan Enhancements. The current performance plan is unacceptable to a large number of managers. (4) Business Owner- Lynette Paulman-Rodriguez to CEOC

Legacy Jury System to DFA/Share (reconciliation). This project was moved to the bottom of the list with the hope that it will not need to be implemented.

Judge Mitchell questioned whether RCS needs to be a 1 or if NM Judiciary should attempt to get funding for the project?

Mr. Arevalo explained that the only option is to look at several Commercial Off the Shelf (COS) systems and most are linked to larger accounting systems. JID is ready to put new switches into the Supreme Court building and anytime there are any changes with the switches, the system will go down.

Mr. Harrington noted that if Windows is upgraded, there is a very high risk that RCS will not run on the new version of Windows.

Judge Mitchell asked how JIFFY decided which items merited a 1.

JIFFY agreed that some projects were already in process, systems were about to break and needed immediate attention, no one disagreed with the people who wanted certain items to be given a 1 and JIFFY relied on Mr. Harrington for his expertise about each of the projects to decide which of the projects should receive a 1.

- Mr. Elsbrock stated that the items on the “*Application Development Parking Lot*” handout that had been rated 1 will be on the roadmap and JID will provide JIFFY with an estimate of when each of those projects will be completed.
- Ms. Dungan pointed out that JIFFY needs to examine the process of how the ratings of the projects were decided on so that guidelines can be developed.
- An agreement was reached that Judge Mitchell, Justice Maes and Mr. Saunders would revise the current IT Project Request Form and Judge Mitchell will send the revised form to the business owners of the projects rated between 2 and 5.

Action Item: JID to come up with criteria for decision making points to be discussed at the June JIFFY meeting.

Action Item: JID to make the changes that were agreed on at this JIFFY meeting to the “Application Development Parking Lot” handout and bring back to JIFFY at the June meeting for approval.

Action Item: JID to include the items on the “Application Development Parking Lot” that were given 1 on the Development Team current roadmap and Project Breakdown Chart in order to have a visual of how those projects have impacted the Development Team’s workload.

- Mr. Saunders reiterated that every quarter JID will bring their workload to JIFFY to reconsider and revise.

Action Item: JIFFY to conduct another working session in late fall to refine the process of prioritizing JID’s workload.

Justice Maes reiterated that all of the courts need to be made aware that JIFFY is in control of the IT enterprise of NM Judiciary and that all of the courts must be accountable to JIFFY with regards to new projects that they wish to implement.

Action Item: JIFFY to discuss at a future meeting how the courts with IT staff fit within the proposed project decision workflow.

Action Item: JIFFY to discuss the impact of courts who implement their own projects outside of JID, as well as the question of oversight, at the June meeting.

IV. For Information Only

Update on the Jury Management Implementation. Mr. Saunders explained that JID went through an RFP process and found three vendors. Contract negotiations were started with the first vendor which completely fell apart. Contract negotiations are now in progress with the second vendor. JID will provide an update to JIFFY on the negotiations with the second vendor.

JID Revenue Pipeline. Oscar Arevalo reported that the MVD transfer for last month has not come in as of this date.

V. Future Meetings. The next meeting will be held on Thursday, June 23, 9:30 a.m. at the Judicial Information Division in Santa Fe.

VI. Adjourn. Judge Mitchell adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.