**ECF5 Spec Feedback and Considerations – 21**

This document provides additional ECF-5 feedback, questions, and commentary. This feedback is based on review of the Electronic Court Filing Version 5.0 Working Draft 27, unless otherwise noted.

1. **RecordDocketingRequestType (and others) are empty**

MessageWrappers.xsd has been renamed as wrappers.xsd. Apparently in this process, a few things were left out:

RecordDocketingRequestType has no element content in wrappers.xsd:



In WD26 it appears in MessageWrappers.xsd as:

 <xs:complexType name="RecordDocketingRequestType">

 <xs:sequence>

 <xs:element ref="docket:RecordDocketingMessage" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>

 <xs:element ref="payment:PaymentMessage" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="2"/>

 </xs:sequence>

</xs:complexType>

There are many other complex elements in wrappers.xsd that also are absent content.

As a result of the errors in wrapper.xsd, the Civil-ReviewFilingRequest-01.xml example is not valid:

1. **6.2.4 Message and Filing Identifiers**

In 6.2.4 the following now appears a s separate bullet:

* The message identifier MUST be assigned by the Filing Review MDE and identify a unique filing in the court.

Strike the above. A similar bullet is correct for filing identifiers, but message identifiers are assigned by the message originator, not necessarily the Filing Review MDE. Message Identifiers need not uniquely identify a filing; their purpose is to uniquely identify a message.

1. **Typos:**

6.2.2

. If multiple ecf:CaseTrackingID elementsare provided, the MDE that issued each identifier SHOULD be indicated using nc:IdentificationSourceText

6.2.5

Documents are elements derived from nc:DocumentType other than the messages identified in the previous section. Document identifiers are assigned by the MDE that initially introduces the document into the transaction. and MUST be returned to the originating MDE in anyasynchronous responses to that message.

1. **6.2.2 Case identifiers**

Seems contradictory:

Case identifiers/numbers, labeled by ecf:CaseTrackingID, are assigned by the court record system and MUST be unique within a court. If multiple ecf:CaseTrackingID elementsare provided, the MDE that issued each identifier SHOULD be indicated using nc:IdentificationSourceText. The following is a non-normative example of a case identifier “123456ABC”:

If case identifiers/numbers (i.e. ecf:CaseTrackingID) “are assigned by the court record system”, then won’t the value for nc:IdentificationSourceText always be “CourtRecordMDE”?

Or does “court record system” not necessarily mean Court Record MDE? Note: the example in 6.2.2 shows ‘CourtRecordMDE’.

If ‘court record system’ does not mean ‘CourtRecordMDE’, then what else might comprise “court record system”?

1. **DocumentFiler in FilingMessage, RecordDocketingMessage, NotifyDocketingCompleteMessage and NotifyFilingReviewCompleteMessage**

The element ecf:DocumentFiler (definition: “An attorney, judicial officer, or a pro se (self-represented) litigant who electronically provides filings (combinations of data and documents) for acceptance and filing by a court, or who has successfully filed filings with a court.”) was present in csprd01/wd26 in filing:FilingMessage (and others listed above).

In WD27, ecf:DocumentFiler has been removed, and has apparently been replaced by ecf:CaseParticipantID (definition: “A unique identifier for an entity participating in a case”).

Why was this done?

This issue has been previously considered and I thought it had been concluded (see Feedback #16, item 2).

Prior to WD21, the element ecf:FilingPartyID had been provided. As of WD 21, ecf:DocumentFiler replaced ecf:FilingPartyID. Why has ecf:DocumentFiler again been reverted back to an IdentificationType rather than an EntityType?

1. **MessageStatusAugmentationType**

The cardinality for nc:Documentidentification in ecf:MessageStatusAugmentationType is still maxOccurs=1.

It was my understanding that we had agreed that it should be ‘unbounded’. [see Feedback #20, items 2 & 9]

You may recall that there is a requirement to return message identifiers (i.e. 6.2.4 Message and Filing Identifiers: “Message identifiers are assigned by the MDE sending each message and MUST be returned to the originating MDE in any synchronous and asynchronous responses to that message”). There is also a requirement for the FRMDE to produce and return a Filing Identifier to the FAMDE (i.e. 6.2.4 Message and Filing Identifiers: “A filing identifier is issued by the Filing Review MDE upon receipt of a valid ReviewFilingRequest to identify the unique filing in the court”). This filing identifier is also provided to the FAMDE in the ReviewFilingResponse (which wrappers cbrn:MessageStatus). Since both message identifiers and filing identifiers utilize nc:DocumentIdentification elements, the maxOccurs must be greater than one. (see the example in Feedback #20, item 2).

You may recall that the TC agreed to use the nc:IdentificationSourceText values (i.e. originating MDE identifier conforming to IdentificationCategory.gc) as illustrated in this example.

1. **GetCaseRequest**

The purpose for GetCaseRequest is to request information about a single specific case. The element j:CaseNumberText (maxOccurs = 1) has been added for this purpose. This makes complete sense.

However, maxOccurs for ecf:CaseTrackingID is unbounded. This make no sense.

When multiple CaseTrackingIDs are provided on the GetCaseRequest, this may result in multiple different cases which satisfy the request. This is not consistent with the purpose of the GetCaseRequest message.

If multiple case results for the GetCaseRequest are to be supported, then what is the result?

Since GetCaseResponse only supports at most one Case element, then are multiple GetCaseResponse messages contemplated?

If multiple case responses are not contemplated, and at most results for a single case should be returned, then not only should the maxOccurs for ecf:CaseTrackingID be constrained to one, but there also needs to be a rule that requires that if both ecf:CaseTrackingID and j:CaseNumberText are provided, they must specify the exact same case.

While on this topic, observe that the definition for GetCaseRequestMessage is incorrect. The definition is: “A message requesting a list of cases from a court case management information system conforming to the parameter or parameters identified in the message.”

The above definition is fundamentally the definition for GetCaseListRequestMessage (actual definition: “This is a query for a list of cases that match a set of criteria including case participants, case classification, case status, and date of the case was initiated”). [yes, the word “of’ should be removed].

Observe that the maxOccurs for nc:Case in GetCaseListResponseMessage is unbounded, thus truly supporting a list of cases.

1. **CaseTrackingID**

Now that j:CaseNumberText has been added to ECF5 and the structure and purpose of CaseTrackingID has been changed, the definition for ecf:CaseAugmentation needs to be revised. The current definition is:

“Information needed to initiate a court case. The presence of caseTrackingIdentifier is the indicator of whether this is an existing case (present) or a new case (absent). For existing cases caseTrackingIdentifier and shortCaseTitle are mandatory; caseTypeCode is not allowed. For new cases, shortCaseTitle and caseTypeCode are mandatory; caseTrackingIdentifier is not allowed”.

There are several issues with the above definition, including:

1. Does the presence or absence of caseTrackingID still signal case initiation or subsequent filing? Or is it now the presence or absence of j:CaseNumberText the new indicator?
2. Should shortCaseTitle be mandatory for subsequent filings as stated in the definition above?
3. Why is shortCaseTitle mandatory for case initiations when the definition for ecf:CaseShortTitleText states “no title exists when the message is initiating a new case”?
4. Why is caseTypeCode not allowed for subsequent filings? Isn’t ecf:CaseTypeCode essentially required (e.g. “SHOULD be indicated”; see section 4.2) for all filings?
5. Should processing rules be contained within element definitions? [See Feedback #18, item 10]
6. **Table in 6.5 Case Participant Rules**

Table 7 Case Participant Roles is improperly formatted. This was fixed once, but has regressed.

1. **xxx**