## Background

The action item as documented on the OASIS site cites the following scenarios:

* A secured case, thereby documents are secure
* A public case, with certain documents secured
* A public case with public documents with redacted information
* A public case whereby certain parties’ attachment to the case is private

Consider a flag/indicator vs. codification to represent various levels of security

The current ECF 5 scope calls for only two:

* Case security
* Document security

## Questions

1. Case parties – was this purposefully deemed out of scope for ECF 5?
2. Secured filings into an otherwise unsecured/public case – was this considered?
	* Example: A proposed order for protection, where it is likely that the filing would fall under some level of security in the interest of preventing disclosure for fear of retaliation.

## Proposed Values

ECF 4 allowed for a single Boolean indicator (FilingConfidentialityIndicator).

The ECF 5 proposal is to abandon the Boolean approach. Instead, each of the proposed entities would feature a codified field along with ECF base code values for the field. Implementers could simply use the ECF base code values, or alternatively, provide their own more granular values each with a mapping to the appropriate ECF base code value.

The implication of a security level of an entity can vary by system, but for the purposes of ECF, the bare minimum is the equivalent of the Boolean of ECF4. That is:

* Non-Secured – access is available to all filers
* Secured – access is unavailable to all filers

It seems that only one other possible level would be appropriate. That is, to reflect some level between the Boolean extremes. Thus, we believe the TC should consider:

* Restricted – access is available to a subset of filers. All other filers have some form of limited access. For instance:
	+ A case search may acknowledge the existence of the restricted case, but certain case details are not available, and/or the case is not available for e-filing
	+ A restricted party is known to be exist on a case, but all or a subset of party details are not available