**ECF Compliance for AZTurbocourt**

On August 17, 2012, the Arizona courts, through the Administrative Office of the Courts was requested by the Electronic Court Filing (ECF) Technical Committee (TC) of OASIS to provide a statement of compliance in the following requested format:

To the OASIS Electronic Court Filing Technical Committee:
 
[Name of Organization] is successfully using the Electronic Court Filing Version 4.01 specification and schemas in accordance with the conformance clauses specified in Section 7 of the specification. Our use [has|has not] included the interoperation of multiple independent implementations.

[Optional description of the usage and/or the independent implementations that interoperated]
 
 
[Name of Submitter]

[Organization]
[Contact Information]



Section 7 from the ECF 4.01 specification is shown below:

7. **Conformance**

*An implementation conforms with the Electronic Court Filing Version 4.01 if the implementation meets the requirements in Sections 1-6 including conformance with the XSD schemas and* **[Genericode]** *code lists* referenced in Section 3 and 4*.*

Conformance by Section:

Only requirements that are clearly identified in the ECF 4.01 specification at mandatory (e.g. MUST or normative) are included. Mandatory requirements for optional features or functions that are not currently implemented in Arizona (e.g. Bankruptcy Case, Record On Appeal, etc.) are not included.

1. **Introduction**

No required compliance items found.

2. **ECF 4.0 Architecture**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference Num** | **Requirement Description** | **Arizona Compliance Comment** | **Compliant** |
| 2.1  Pg 15 | In order to be compliant, an implementation of the ECF specification MUST implement the core specification and at least one service interaction profile and one document signature profile. | Have implemented FAMDE, FRMDE and CRMDE using draft MQSIP.  Not using or specifying document signature profile (should be specified in …/ecf:DocumentRendition/ecf:DocumentSignature/ecf:SignatureProfileID). | No |
| 2.2  Pg 15 | a complete ECF 4.0 system MUST include at least one each of the Filing Assembly, Filing Review and Court Record MDEs. | Have implemented FAMDE, FRMDE and CRMDE. | Yes |
| 2.2  Pg 15 – 16 | When multiple MDEs are implemented by a single court, vendor or application, the application MUST maintain the ECF 4.0 specified operations between each MDE  Note: the mandatory operations are identified in section 3.1 as: ReviewFiling, RecordFiling, NotifyDocketingComplete, and NotifyFilingReviewComplete. | All four required operations have been implemented, however not all operations are invoked using ECF XML messages. There are no XML messages (e.g. CoreFilingMessage and PaymentMessage) communicated between the FAMDE and the FRMDE; communication is through internal application programming. Similarly, there are no XML messages (i.e ReviewFilingCallbackMessage and PaymentMessage), again internal application programming is used for this communication. | Partial |
| 2.2  Pg 16 | In order to be compliant with ECF 4.0, an MDE must support all messages required for that MDE. | Required messages are understood to be those for minimum mandatory operations (e.g. ReviewFiling, RecordFiling, NotifyDocketingComplete, and NotifyFilingReviewComplete).  MessageReceiptMessage is not used since this message is not needed with MQSIP. | Yes, pending finalization of MQSIP |
| 2.4  Pg 20 | The court MUST have only one active, authoritative version of its policies at a given time; both the human-readable and the machine-readable statements of those policies MUST have the same release dates for the court. | ‘Policies’ are not managed using ECF Court Policy (e.g. the GetPolicy operation is not supported). There are no release dates associated with ‘policies’. | No |
| 2.4  Pg 20 | The court’s human-readable and machine-readable court policies MUST each have a version numbering method associated with it. | No published ECF compliant human-readable policies, and GetPolicy operation is not supported. No version numbering utilized for policy information. | No |
| 2.4.1  Pg 20 | To be compliant with the ECF 4.0 specification, each court MUST publish a human-readable court policy that MUST include each of the following:   1. The unique court identifier 2. The location of the machine-readable court policy 3. A definition of what constitutes a “lead document” in the court 4. A description of how filer identifiers are to be maintained during electronic communications regarding the case 5. A description of how the court processes (dockets) filings 6. A description of any instances in which the court will mandate an element that the ECF 4.0 schema makes optional 7. A description of any restrictions to data property values other than code list restrictions. (This restriction may be removed in later versions of the ECF specification) 8. Any other rules required for electronic filing in the court | No ECF compliant human-readable policies published for the seven implemented courts. | No |
| 2.4.4  Pg 22 | If a court does not define allowable values for any of the above code lists in court policy, then any value MUST be considered acceptable for that code. | There are 31 code lists listed in section 2.4.4. Most of these lists are not used. For those lists which are used (e.g. CourtLocationCode, ErrorCode) valid value lists have not been published in Court Policy.  The courts do not accept any value provided. | No |
| 2.4.5  Pg 22 | If court-specific constraint schemas are used, instance documents MUST validate against both the ECF schemas and the court constraint schemas. | Court-specific constraint schemas are not used. | Yes |

3. **ECF 4.0 Process Model**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference Num** | **Requirement Description** | **Arizona Compliance Comment** | **Compliant** |
| 3.1  Pg 23 | The operations in bold are required and MUST occur in every successful filing as long as sending and receiving MDEs are implemented.  The bolded operations are:  **ReviewFiling**  **RecordFiling**  **NotifyDocketingComplete**  **NotifyFilingReviewComplete** | Equivalent functions supported by the four operations have been implemented. These equivalent functions do occur in every successful efiling.  The RecordFiling and NotifyDocketingComplete have been implemented in an ECF like manner using the draft MQSIP. Although a WebServices call is not used to invoke these two operations, ECF XML messages are passed through MQ.  The ReviewFiling and NotifyFilingReviewComplete operations are not implemented in an ECF like manner – the MQSIP is not used and ECF XML messages may not be passed. | Partial |
| 3.2  Pg 25 | ECF 4.0 includes an <ecf:ErrorCode> element for returning errors in response to a query request. Successful queries MUST return an <ecf:ErrorCode> of “0”. Failed queries MUST NOT return an <ecf:ErrorCode> of “0” and SHOULD return an appropriate <ecf:ErrorCode> value as defined in court policy. | The ecf:ErrorCode element is used and does return a value of ‘0’ for successful queries and does not return ‘0’ for unsuccessful responses.  Standard Error Codes are defined but are not published in an ECF compliant Court Policy manner. | Yes |
| 3.2.7  Pg 26 | **NotifyDocketingComplete**  If the Court Record MDE rejected the filing, an explanation MUST be provided. If the Court Record MDE accepts the filing, the docketing information (e.g. date and time the document was entered into the court record, judge assigned, document identifiers and next court event scheduled) MUST be provided. | Filings rejected or marked deficient are accompanied by a reason.  When accepted, docketing information (e.g. date and time, document identifiers, status, case number, case title, etc.) is passed to the FRMDE. | Yes |
| 3.2.8  Pg 26 | **NotifyFilingReviewComplete**  If the clerk rejects the filings or the Filing Review MDE receives the Notify Docketing Complete message, the Filing Review MDE MUST invoke the NotifyFilingReviewComplete operation on the Filing Assembly MDE as a callback message to the ReviewFiling operation to indicate whether the filing was accepted and docketed by the clerk and court record system. | An equivalent operation is invoked, but not in an ECF like manner (see above); e.g. there are no ECF XML messages passed through MQ or WebServices. | Partial |
| 3.3.1.1  Pg 27 | **Attachment Identifiers**  Attachment identifiers MUST be unique within a message transmission. A convention for assigning identifiers to each message and attachment in a message transmission has to be defined in each service interaction profile. | Attachments are understood to be ‘a series of bytes in the message stream transmitted between MDEs that constitutes, in whole or in part, an electronic document whose conventional equivalent would be a document on paper’ (see section 2.3.2).  Arizona is using the draft MQSIP. Each document binary is carried in a separate MQ message within an MQ message group for the submission. The MQ message which contains the binary content for a specific document rendition is specified in the ecf:AttachmentSequenceID element. | Yes |
| 3.3.1.2  Pg 27 | **Case Identifiers**  Case identifiers (case numbers) are assigned by the court record system and MUST be unique within a court. | Case numbers are typically assigned by the CRMDE during the ‘ingestion’ function (e.g. RecordFiling operation). In some instances, the case number is issued by the CRMDE (e.g. Case Management System), but entered onto the efiling submission within Clerk Review, then passed to the CRMDE within the CaseTrackingID element of the RecordDocketingMessage. | Yes |
| 3.3.1.3  Pg 27 | **Court Identifiers**  Court identifiers are locally assigned by the court administrator for a region (typically a state, provincial or federal court administrator) and MUST be universally unique to a court but not necessarily to a particular court house, branch or subunit of a court. Court identifiers MUST conform to following convention:  <Internet domain of the court administrator>:<unique identifier within the court system>. | It is not clear what ‘*universally unique’* means in this context. Unique court identifiers are assigned to all courts within Arizona. These identifiers are unique within Arizona, but not necessarily unique within the United States of America, or the globe. These identifiers represent a court, but not a court house (e.g. Yavapai Superior court maintains two locations, the old court house in Prescott, and a remote office in Verde Valley. Only a single court identifier is assigned to Yavapai Superior Court).  Arizona efiling court identifiers comply with the ECF convention:  <nc:IdentificationID>courts.az.gov:1000</nc:IdentificationID> | Yes |
| 3.3.1.4  Pg 27 | **Document Identifiers**  Document identifiers are assigned by the court record system and MUST be unique within a court | Does ‘*court record system’* mean the CRMDE? It is assumed that it does.  Document Identifiers appear in many messages (e.g. CoreFilingMessage, RecordDocketingMessage, RecordDocketingCallbackMessage, etc.). A single specific document may have multiple document Identifiers as it progresses through the efiling process. When the document is first tendered in the CoreFilingMessage (say as a FilingLeadDocument), it has a Document Identifier that is assigned by the FAMDE. When this document gets clerk reviewed in the FRMDE, then this document is assigned another document identifier in the RecordDocketingMessage by the FRMDE. The document in the RecordDocketingMessage (e.g. ReviewedLeadDocument) must be cross referenced to its original reference within the CoreFilingMessage (e.g. FilingLeadDocument). When the RecordFilingRequest is processed by the CRMDE, then the document is typically assigned a unique identifier value within the CMS and possibly a second unique document identifier within its companion EDMS. When the NotifyDocketingCompleteCallbackMessage (NDC) is sent, the document identifier received in the RecordDocketingMessage is returned as the document identifier in the callback, and the CRMDE document identifier (e.g. CMS document copy ID) is communicated in ecf:DocumentDocketID. When the document is requested later in GetDocument, it is identified using the NDC ecf:DocumentDocketID value within the …/ecf:Document/ ecf:DocumentRendition/ nc:DocumentIdentification/ nc:Identification element.  The document identifiers provided in the ecf:DocumentDocketID element within the NDC are, at a minimum, unique to a court, and in some instances, are unique to a jurisdiction or cluster of courts. | Yes |
| 3.3.1.5  Pg 27 | **Filing Identifiers**  Filing identifiers MUST be unique within a court and will be generated by the court in response to a ReviewFiling operation. | The term ‘Filing’ is defined in section 1.4 terms and Definitions. Filing is defined to be: ‘*An electronic document (with any associated data, attachments and the like) that has been assembled for the purpose of being filed into a specified court case*.’  As defined, a ‘Filing Identifier’ is seemingly synonymous with a ‘Document Identifier’. However, perhaps instead ‘filing identifier’ is intended to refer to a unique identifier assigned to the entire efiling submission.  Assuming the latter, a unique e-filing submission reference number is assigned, but not in the FRMDE but instead is provided by the FAMDE. The FAMDE assigned reference number must be provided/returned in the NotifyDocketingCompleteCallbackMessage to be able to correlate this message with the initial submission.  Additional unique identifiers are generated and assigned by the clerk review component of the FRMDE; this ‘filing identifier’ is assigned to a RecordDocketingMessage. As such, if a CoreFilingMessage contained multiple FilingLeadDocuments, then multiple unique ‘filing identifiers’ will be assigned in the FRMDE Clerk Review component; one to each resulting RecordDocketingMessage. | No, filing ID is assigned by FAMDE and not FRMDE. |
| 3.3.1.6  Pg 28 | **MDE Identifiers**  The address of an MDE MUST be unique within a given communications infrastructure. The convention for defining MDE identifiers will be defined in each service interaction profile. | Compliant using draft MQSIP. | Yes |
| 3.3.1.7 | **Filer and Party Identifiers**  Identifiers for filers and parties to a case, both persons and organizations, MUST be unique within a case and will be generated by the court in response to a ReviewFiling operation. | Arizona employs a variety of Case Management Systems which vary in their specific implementations regarding the recognition of parties, attorneys and other case participants. All CMSs support unique party and participant identifiers within a case; some CMSs support unique identifiers that span multiple cases and are system wide. These unique party/participant identifiers are not assigned by the FRMDE, but instead are assigned by the CRMDE during the RecordDocketing operation. | No |
| 3.3.2  Pg 28 | **Code Lists**  The following normative code lists are normative for all ECF 4.0 implementations.   * ECF Code Lists * [Bankruptcy Case Type](../../../AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/I0LESE3V/xsd/casetype/ECF-4.0-BankruptcyCase.xsd) * [<DebtorTypeCode>](../../../AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/I0LESE3V/gc/ECF-4.0-DebtorTypeCode.gc)\* * [<EstimatedAssetsValueLevelCode>](../../../AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/I0LESE3V/gc/ECF-4.0-EstimatedValueLevelCode.gc)\* * [<EstimatedDebtsValueLevelCode>](../../../AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/I0LESE3V/gc/ECF-4.0-EstimatedValueLevelCode.gc)\* * [<NatureOfDebtCode>](../../../AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/I0LESE3V/gc/ECF-4.0-NatureOfDebtCode.gc)\* * [<NumberOfCreditorsValueLevelCode>](../../../AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/I0LESE3V/gc/ECF-4.0-NumberOfCreditorsValueLevelCode.gc)\* * [Common Types](../../../AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/I0LESE3V/xsd/common/ECF-4.0-CommonTypes.xsd) * [<FilingStatusCode>](../../../AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/I0LESE3V/gc/ECF-4.0-FilingStatusCode.gc)\* * [Court Policy Response Message](../../../AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/I0LESE3V/xsd/message/ECF-4.0-CourtPolicyResponseMessage.xsd) * <MajorDesignElementNameCode> * <OperationNameCode> * [Service Receipt Message](../../../AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/I0LESE3V/xsd/message/ECF-4.0-ServiceReceiptMessage.xsd) * [<ServiceStatusCode>](../../../AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/I0LESE3V/gc/ECF-4.0-ServiceStatusCode.gc)\* * NIEM Code Lists * [ANSI NIST](../../../AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/I0LESE3V/xsd/constraint/niem/ansi-nist/2.0/ansi-nist.xsd) * <FingerPositionCode> * [JXDM](../../../AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/I0LESE3V/xsd/constraint/niem/domains/jxdm/4.0/jxdm.xsd) * <ChargeNCICCode> * <DrivingIncidentHazMatCode> * <DrivingJurisdictionAuthorityNCICLSTACode> * <IdentificationJurisdictionNCICLISCode> * <WarrantExtraditionLimitationCode> * [NIEM Core](../../../AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/I0LESE3V/xsd/constraint/niem/niem-core/2.0/niem-core.xsd) * <DocumentLangageCode> * <DriverLicenseCommercialClassCode> * <DrivingRestrictionCode> * <LanguageCode> * <LengthUnitCode> * <LocationCountryFIPS10-4Code> * <LocationCountyCode> * <LocationStateUSPostalServiceCode> * <PersonCitizenshipFIPS10-4Code> * <PersonEthnicityCode> * <PersonEyeColorCode> * <PersonHairColorCode> * <PersonRaceCode> * <PersonSexCode> * <PersonUnionCategoryCode> * <PhysicalFeatureCategoryCode> * <VehicleColorPrimaryCode> * <VehicleMakeCode> * <VehicleModelCode> * <VehicleStyleCode> * <WeightUnitCode> | Arizona does not employ any of these normative code lists. | No |
| 3.3.3.1  Pg 29 | A CoreFilingMessage MUST express the name or names of the party or parties on whose behalf a document is filed, and the party whose document is the subject of a responsive document being submitted for filing. | The party or parties on whose behalf a document is being filed is only implicitly provided. The ecf:FilingPartyID element is not used. When the filer is an attorney, and FilingAttorneyID is used, and the parties represented by this attorney are specified in the CoreFilingMessage (typically only in a case initiation submission), then an assumption may be possible. When the attorney represents more than one party, then this assumption may be incorrect if the filing is not on the behalf of all parties represented by the filing attorney.  The party whose document is the subject of a responsive document is not identified. | Limited Partial |

4 **ECF Schemas**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference Num** | **Requirement Description** | **Arizona Compliance Comment** | **Compliant** |
| 4  Pg 32 | The Court Filing XSD schemas are implementations of the ECF 4.0 exchange content models (see Appendix B.3 below). They are the only normative representations of ECF 4.0 messages. | ECF schemas are used unaltered. Extension schema is used to provide court specific additions. | Yes |

5 **Service Interaction Profiles**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference Num** | **Requirement Description** | **Arizona Compliance Comment** | **Compliant** |
| 5.1  Pg 35 | To be compliant with the ECF 4.0 specification, a service interaction profile MUST satisfy the following non-functional requirements:   1. **Transport protocol** – A service interaction profile MUST define how messages are physically transported from a sending MDE to a receiving MDE. In so doing, a profile may identify factors that restrict the range of environments in which the profile is applicable. 2. **MDE addressing** – A service interaction profile MUST include a convention for uniquely addressing each MDE. 3. **Operation addressing** – A service interaction profile MUST describe a convention for uniquely addressing each MDE operation. 4. **Request and operation invocation** – A service interaction profile MUST describe a mechanism for a sending MDE to invoke an operation on the receiving MDE. 5. **Synchronous mode** **response** – A service interaction profile MUST support synchronous operations in which the response to an operation is always returned immediately, typically within a matter of seconds, to the invoking MDE. 6. **Asynchronous mode** **response** – A service interaction profile MUST support asynchronous operations in which the response to an operation may not necessarily be returned immediately to the invoking MDE. Instead, the response may be returned at some later time through a callback from the MDE that received the operations to the invoking MDE. The callback MUST include a reference to the invoking message transmission. 7. **Message/attachment delimiters** **–** A service interaction profile MUST define how the receiving MDE distinguishes messages from attachments within a message transmission. 8. **Message identifiers** – A service interaction profile MUST provide a means for a sending MDE to assign a unique identifier to each message (including any attachments) within a message transmission. | Arizona is using the draft MQ SIP. | Yes |

6 **Document Signature Profiles**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference Num** | **Requirement Description** | **Arizona Compliance Comment** | **Compliant** |
| 6.1  Pg 38 | Except for the Null Document Signature Profile, to be compliant with the ECF 4.0 specification, a document signature profile MUST satisfy the following non-functional requirements:   1. **Signer name assertion** – A document signature profile MUST make an assertion regarding the name of the person who signed a document. 2. **Signed date assertion** – A document signature profile MUST make an assertion regarding the date the person signed a document. 3. **Multiple signatures** – A document signature profile MUST allow multiple signatures to be associated with the same document. | Arizona is not using any Signature Profile. | No |