



Walker, Beth

From: Walker, Beth
Sent: Thursday, February 8, 2018 9:55 PM
To: Workman, Margaret
Cc: Loughry, Allen; Davis, Robin; Ketchum, Menis
Subject: Re: 10 am conference call

Margaret,

I look forward to discussing these issues tomorrow morning. In advance of the meeting, I offer the following:

1. The state of the Court's technology when I arrived a year ago was surprising to me, after having practiced law in a paperless and secure environment for more than a decade. The complete lack of the most basic security policies and procedures was shocking. I am quite relieved that we hired David Graves and that these and other issues are being addressed by a qualified technology leader.
2. It is clear to me that the e-filing initiative has failed. I am not interested in assessing blame or criticizing what I believe has been poor technology leadership in the past. I am interested in moving forward as expeditiously, economically and efficiently as possible with a system that meets the future needs of litigants, lawyers and court personnel across the State.
3. I am convinced that the plan presented by the NCSC provides the most logical, comprehensive way to assess our needs and eventually purchase a system we need to move forward. The proposed approach is very consistent with initiatives in which I have been involved with my employer and clients in the past. Change will be very difficult, but I believe Paul and his colleagues have the knowledge, experience and tools that are essential for our success in the future.
4. Respectfully, there are no facts in your email or in the memo from Justice Davis today that cause me to doubt my conclusion in No. 3 above.
5. I admire and agree with your professed interest in collegiality. I regret that you did not afford me the same respect as our other colleagues by discussing your concerns with me personally.

Beth

On Feb 8, 2018, at 7:00 PM, Workman, Margaret <Margaret.Workman@courtsww.gov> wrote:

>

> Hi Beth,

> Let me preface this message by saying that during my career, I have laid awake many nights worrying about family and friends, but rarely about the office. But over the last few days, I HAVE stewed and worried about the status of our efforts to bring technical modernization to the court system. While I do not profess to be techno-savvy, I have been part of a long process (some parts of which had already started before I got here in 2009) wherein we have spent literally millions of dollars on efforts to modernize court records from a technical perspective. I voted for the proposal the NCSC presented last week, because frankly, I am unsure what the right path is. I am told that we are on the eve of being able to actually start receiving substantial fees in both the e-filing and the UJA systems.

We have been ready to receive substantial fees in UJA for a long time, except for the mix-ups on getting into place a system to actually collect those fees. I cannot place all the blame in the context on these issues on the Canterbury administration. And I don't think all the blame can be placed on Olis. The bottom line is that, when Robin sent her memo around today, I had been thinking of either abstaining, because I do not feel at all confident that it is the right decision, or casting my vote against it for the same reason. What I decided to do instead is to request that the RFB process be delayed long enough for us to get a real overview/update of where the Olis project and the UJA stand. IT MAY BE THAT, after hearing this full information, I will vote to move forward with the recommended course of action. I had an extensive and constructive conversation with Allen and Robin today, essentially requesting that, as a professional courtesy, he delay the initiation of the \$500,000 RFP process until we can get the updates/status reports I have requested. There are two members of our five-member Court who are simply asking for more information before we go down a path that will cost at a minimum \$500,000 and if ultimately approved, will result in scrapping millions of dollars worth of work. I just want to make sure that we are, as Justice McHugh always said, "on solid ground." Since we will continue to use Olis, UJA, and associated contractors for quite some time even if the RFP STARTS RIGHT AWAY, I CANNOT FATHOM HOW A COUPLE OF WEEKS DELAY TO GET THE REQUESTED INFORMATION CAN POSSIBLY HARM THE PLANS IN ANY WAY. (Sorry...wasn't trying to be over-the-top emphatic with the all caps...just didn't notice the cap button was on... LOL). So this is not a tech issue... it is a collegiality issue. I can't see any good reason why, after the millions of dollars, two or three weeks additional would make any difference on the substantive issues; and as I keep trying to say, the building of consensus to the greatest degree possible, on significant decisions on a multi-member Court, is vital to our success. Thanks for listening. M.

> PS I ALREADY SPOKE WITH THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COURT ABOUT THIS PERSONALLY, SO THAT IS WHY I AM DIRECTING THIS MSG TO YOU, but will copy to them.

>

> Sent from my iPad