**Real ECF 4.0 WS-SIP v2.01**

It is not clear which ‘version’ of ECF 4.0 WS-SIP v2.01 is the authoritative/definitive version.

By ‘authoritative/definitive’ version, I am referring to a version that has sufficiently proceeded through the ECF TC review and approval process, thus becoming a TC recommended version. The official designation may be Committee Draft, Committee Specification or OASIS Specification, in reverse order of importance.

As new versions emerge each gets get a new version number, e.g., the core ECF specification went from ECF v3.0, to ECF v3.1, then ECF 4.0, then ECF 4.01, then ECF 5.0, etc.

A version moves through an OASIS/TC track. First as one or more unapproved working drafts (wd01, wd02, etc.) then through one or more committee specification drafts (e.g., ‘csd’ but sometimes labeled as just ‘cd’, such as cd01, cd02, etc.), then through one or more public review drafts[[1]](#footnote-1) (e.g., csprd01, csprd02, etc.), then finally, upon TC approval, by ballot, it becomes a Committee Specification (e.g., CD01). Some specifications, such as ECF 4.0 go on the become OASIS specifications (os).

New version tracks sometimes complete a full cycle to become committee specifications and other version tracks fall short and become abandoned or officially terminated. Some tracks end with just a committee draft 9and do not achieve committee specification status).

Given this OASIS defined TC work product track and the corresponding paper trail, it seems that it should be easy for implementers to determine the most definitive version of the TC standards track work product.

Sometimes it is easy.

From the TC Public Page, the ‘Standards’ choice (top of page) permits selection of ‘View Standards & Releases’.

If the standard you are looking for is listed here, then accessing the appropriate files should be easy.

Electronic Court Filing Version 4.01 is listed in the OASIS Standards & Releases listing, but the ECF Web Services SIP for ECF 4 is not (Electronic Court Filing Web Services Service Interaction Profile Version 5.0 is included).

A TC’s Public Page may also provide a current listing of specifications and other non-specification track work products.

For example, the UBL TC’s Public Page provides ‘Technical Work Produced by the Committee’ which lists multiple standards versions, such as ‘UBL 2.3 OASIS Standard’, ‘UBL 2.2 OASIS Standard’, ‘UBL 2.1 OASIS Standard’, etc. including a section titled ‘Obsolete UBL Specifications’.

Since multiple versions of UBL are listed outside of the ‘Obsolete UBL Specifications’ listing, then presumably an implementer may elect any of the non-obsolete versions, perhaps preferring the most recent version, identifiable by version number and date, or perhaps electing an older version.

A version can be selected, such as UBL 2.3, then by clicking on a URL link provided on the Public Page (as shown below)

**Universal Business Language Version 2.3 (UBL v2.3) is now an OASIS Standard**

On 15 June 2021 the UBL 2.3 OASIS Standard was published at:

<http://docs.oasis-open.org/ubl/os-UBL-2.3/UBL-2.3.html>

All resources can be downloaded from the main UBL 2.3 subdirectory:

<http://docs.oasis-open.org/ubl/os-UBL-2.3/>

And the complete OS in a ZIP file package can be downloaded at:

<http://docs.oasis-open.org/ubl/os-UBL-2.3/UBL-2.3.zip>

A user can access the specification document or access all version artifacts. The middle link provides access to the work product version folder and the bottom link allows the full zip file to be downloaded.

The ECF TC also has a menu on its Public Page that provides ‘Technical Work Produced by the Committee’.

The ‘Technical Work Produced by the Committee’ section provides the following:

* [3.0 Electronic Court Filing Committee Draft](http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v3.0/)
* [3.0 ECF XML Signature Document Signature Profile Committee Draft 1.0](http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v3.0/)
* [3.1 Electronic Court Filing Committee Draft](https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/29599/ecf-v3.1-spec-cd01.zip)
* [4.0 Electronic Court Filing Committee Draft](http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-spec/)
* [4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile](http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec/)
* [4.0 Portable Media Service Interaction Profile](http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-portablemedia-spec/)
* [4.01 Electronic Court Filing OASIS Standard Plus Errata 01](http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.01/ecf-v4.01-spec/errata01/os/)
* [4.01 Electronic Court Filing OASIS Standard Plus Errata 02](http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.01/ecf-v4.01-spec/errata02/os/)
* [Electronic Court Filing Version 5.0](https://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/ecf/v5.0/cs01/ecf-v5.0-cs01.html) Committee Specification 01
* [Electronic Court Filing Web Services Service Interaction Profile Version 5.0](https://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/ecf-webservices/v5.0/cs01/ecf-webservices-v5.0-cs01.html) Committee Specification 01

Unfortunately, the ECF Public Page is not as well organized as the UBL Public Page. Clicking on ‘4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile’ reveals the ‘Index of /legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec/’ folder which appears to intermix artifacts for multiple WS-SIP versions, such as v2.0 and v2.01. A v2.01/ subfolder is also provided, and within it there other ‘versions’ including csd02/ and csd03/.

By version numbers and dates, it suggests that ECF WS-SIP v2.10 csd03 (Aug. 9, 2011) is the most recent TC approved committee draft specification. There is no indication of any Committee Specification (cd) for ECF 4.0 Web Services SIP v2.01.

The first Public Review has been posted for both ECF 4.1 and ECF 4.1 Web Services SIP (on 2-2-2023). The referenced specification document ([Electronic Court Filing Web Services Service Interaction Profile Version 4.1 (oasis-open.org)](https://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/ecf-webservices/v4.1/csd01/ecf-webservices-v4.1-csd01.html) specifies that the newer version of the specification replaces or supersedes:

*Electronic Court Filing 4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile Version 2.01*. Edited by Adam Angione. 10 May 2011. <http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec/v2.01/csprd01/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec-v2.01-csprd01.html>

The above referenced document is designated as ‘Committee Specification Draft 02/ Public Review Draft 01’ [ECF-v4.0-WS-SIP-v2.01]. This suggests that the Web Services SIP for ECF 3 never achieved Committee Specification status.

There appears to be a couple of problems with this:

1. A Public Review Draft is not a Committee Specification (it’s a Committee Specification Draft). As such, how can a Public Draft be replaced since it has not yet completed the Committee Specification cycle? One would expect that the current Public Draft, upon successful completion of the Committee Specification track, would replace a prior/older Committee Specification.

Do other TC’s publish Committee Drafts intended for implementer use?

2. The ‘Committee Specification Draft 02/ Public Review Draft 01’ (which is being replaced or superseded by ECF-WS-SIP-v4.1) would be reasonably expected to be the most recent ECF WS-SIP v2.01 specification. However, this does not appear to be the case. As provided above, there appears to be a Committee Specification Draft 03 in the ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec/ folder.

After a thorough review of the history of ECF 4 Web Services SIP, it appears that this work product, either as WS SIP v2.0 or as WS SIP v2.01, has never progressed beyond Committee Draft Specification (i.e., has never achieved Committee Specification status).

Similarly, it appears that WS SIP for ECF 3.0 and ECF 3.1 also never achieved Committee Specification standing (previously referred to as Committee Recommendation).

So, when a specification work product never becomes a Committee Specification and remains as a Committee Draft (e.g., working draft), and there are multiple versions of the committee draft (e.g., wd01 of CD01, wd02 of CD01, wd01 of CD02, csprd01, csprd02, etc.), then which of these drafts should be considered as the ‘definitive’ version?

For Web Services SIP for ECF 4.0, it appears that it began as a committee working draft (cd01) designated as v2.0. A short while later, still designated as Cd01, it became v2.01.

It was formally approved, by Ballot on Aug. 20, 2009. However, from the ballot information, it is not clear what the approval designated (e.g., was it approved as a committee draft or as a committee specification).

The current OASIS TC Process only requires the use of a ballot (referred to as Special Majority Vote) to approve Committee Specifications (committee drafts can be approved by Full Majority Vote, which can occur at a TC meeting and must be documented in meeting minutes).

I would normally presume a Ballot vote on Aug. 20, 2009, to be a vote for Committee Specification status, however no record of public review can be found. Therefore, I must instead presume that the ballot was for approval as a committee draft specification (the Ballot attached specification document is labeled as Committee Draft 01).

When subsequently published (10-14-2009) by OASIS (Mary McRae) it continued to be designated as Committee Draft 01.

Following formal ECF TC approval, ECF 4.0 WS SIP v2.01 continued to be revised. Revision #1 was submitted to OASIS Admin on May 6, 2011. The document revision history states: “Made minor changes to conformance section and corrected several broken links.” These changes are presumed to be minor (e.g., non-material) and therefore no public review required.

A 30-day Public Review for ECF 4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile V2.0 was announced on June 1, 2011. Note that it was announced as v2.0 Committee Specification Draft 01 / Public Review Draft 01, but the attached document and artifact references indicate v2.01 csprd01.

A 15-day Public Review followed (Oct. 1, 2011), designated as v2.01 csprd02. Revision #2 (dated 8-8-2011)

Corrections were made to respond to public review comments on Oct. 18, 2011 (designated v2.01-csprd02-jec-revisions). This version is labeled “Committee Specification Draft 02/ Public Review Draft 02” and is dated 18 October 2011. The document revision history designates the 10-18-2011 change as Rev. Csd-02 – “Updated UBL reference version 2.1.”

The “Approved Work Products” document folder (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/documents.php?folder_id=2485>) lists ‘ECF 4.0 Web Services SIP v2.01 CSPRD02” (10-01-2011, Chet Ensign). This 10-01-2011 version of the WS-SIP specification document has a different Revision History than the 10-18-2011 jec-revisions version.

It appears another Public Review was attempted for Mar/Apr 2012. This was to be a 15-day Public Review for both ECF 4.01 and ECF 4.0 WS-SIP v2.01. In correspondence on this matter, between Chet Ensign and Jim Cabral, Chet refers to a statement in TC Meeting Minutes that these specifications need to be approved as “revised committee specifications.” This seems to suggest that both specifications were already considered as Committee Specifications.

This correspondence also refers to the jec-revisions version. Chet also notes that “the document provided for Web Service SIP specifications (ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-csprd02.doc) appears to be identical to the version that was publicly reviewed last October. I ran a file compare and found no differences. Is that correct? If so, why send it

for another round of public review?”

Finally, in recap Chet asks: “For Web Services, please let me know if there is really a need to proceed with the public review. If the wsdl is the only file that has changed, I don't see a need to do that.”

To this, Jim Cabral responded (3-19-2012) “I will close the request for a CSD and Public Review for the Web

Services SIP since it appears that the draft specification has not changed.”

Note that now the term CSD (Committee Specification Draft) is used and not CS (Committee Specification).

This quest to identify the definitive version of ECF 4 Web Service SIP is further complicated by the GRA SSP effort which began in 2012. At one point, this effort was designated as WS-SIP v2.02. Later it was designated as SIP\_RS\_WS\_1.2, and then as ECF\_SSP\_v\_4.01 or ECF\_SSP\_v\_4.01.1. At one point (7-7-2015) the TC voted to publish the completed work product as WS-SIP v2.1, then settling for WS-SIP 3.0 for ECF 4 and as WS-SIP 5.0 for ECF 5 (4-12, 2016).

In an email dated 1-8-2013, Jim Cabral provided a link to the then current ECF 4.0 WS-SIP v2.01, i.e., <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43733/ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-csprd02.zip>. It seems reasonable to understand that this was believed by Jim Cabral to be the definitive version at that time. This version is labeled as ‘Committee Specification Draft 03 / Public Review Draft 02’. The document Revision History does not reflect any changes after ‘csd02’ 2011-08-08 (Revised reference format). Note that this Revision History matches the history in the 10-1-2011 Chet Ensign version and not the jec-revisions version – see above).

It is not clear what version of the ECF 4.0 Web Services SIP was used in the IJIS Springboard project.

Would the ‘real/definitive’ WS-SIP v2.01 specification please come forward?

Based on the history provided herein, I have come to the following conclusions:

It appears that no version of ECF 4 Web Services SIP has ever been designated as a Committee Specification.

Publicly Reviewed Committee Draft status appears to be the furthest the ECF 4 WS SIP has progressed. It appears that Committee Draft status has been achieved twice.

For Committee Drafts,

As v2.0

An ECF 4 WS SIP v2.0 appears to have been approved by the TC as a Committee Draft (Oct. 2008). This v2.0 WS SIP was never publicly reviewed.

As v2.01

There appears to be two Committee Drafts of v2.01. The first (cd01), was published Oct. 15, 2009. The second (variously designated as csprd01, csprd02, csd02) was approved in October 2011.

It seems that this second v2.01 Committee Draft is the most recently TC approved Web Services SIP for ECF 4.0 (i.e., the 10-1-2011 csprd02 version, see History Item #4 below). Perhaps this should be (or is) known as CSD02 as designated by Paul Knight.

The CSD02 version of the Web Services SIP v2.01 is available in the /legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec/v2.01/csd02/ folder and this folder does include a zip file.

It is not clear whether public persons/implementers would know to access csd02 as the TC’s most recently approved version of the ECF 4.0 Web Services SIP v2.01, since other, prior versions are intermixed within the /legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec folder, and given that within the v2.01/ subfolder, there are 4 status/versions presented (i.e., csd01, csd03, csprd01, and csprd02). In particular, it is not understood how an implementer may know to choose csd02 rather than the more recently versioned csd03.

With respect to a prior Committee Draft version (e.g., cd01), it is concerning that the WS SIP on the Public Page (TC Public Page, Technical Work Produced by the Committee, 4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile) is also not the same as either the 8-20-2009 Ballot version or the 10-15-2009 published version.

The recent Public Review for ECF 4.1 Web Services SIP Committee Specification Draft (announced 2-2-2023) only lists one version of the ECF 4 Web Services SIP under the heading “This specification replaces or supersedes”, i.e.:

*Electronic Court Filing 4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile Version 2.01*. Edited by Adam Angione. 10 May 2011. <http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec/v2.01/csprd01/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec-v2.01-csprd01.html>

Should all TC approved versions of ECF 4 Web Services SIP be listed in this section?

**Appendix A – History**

The following history details significant events related to Web Service SIP for ECF 4.

1. The first reference to the ECF 4.0 Web Services SIP appears in the F2F Meeting Minutes, Salt Lake City, Aug. 18, 2008, to Aug. 19, 2008:

**Web Services SIP**

The members present agreed that we will produce two versions of the Web

Services SIP.

The first version will include the following stack: - SOAP 1.1

- WSDL 1.1

- WS Addressing 1.0

- SOAP 1.1 Binding for MTOM

- WS-I Basic Profile 1.1 for SOAL 1.1

- WS Security 1.0

- WS-I Basic Security Profile 1.0

- WS Reliable Messaging 1.1

The second version will substitute WS Security 1.1 and WS-I Basic Security

Profile 1.1.

The first version is immediately implementable. WS-I Basic Security Profile 1.1

is still a Working Group Approval Draft, issued in February 2007. It does not yet

have supporting applications. However, WS Security 1.1 offers many advantages,

including use of SAML 2.0, and is needed to support the federated identity

initiative which has generated significant interest within law enforcement. WS

Security 1.1 was approved in 2006; we expect the WS-I Basic Security Profile 1.1

to be approved soon. Consequently, we concluded that it would be worth the

effort to provide two SIPs – one that is immediately implementable and the other

that will be implementable as soon as the WS-I profile is approved

2. Web Services SIP v2.0 for ECF 4.0 was first approved as a Committee Draft (cd01) on 10-8-2008, following approval by ballot on 9-20-2008 of wd03. It is this version that is made available on the ECF TC’s Public Page, under the heading ‘Technical Work Produced by the Committee’ and identified as ‘4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile’.

This version (cd01) may not be the most recently TC approved version of the Web Services SIP for ECF 4.0. When accessed from the ‘4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile’ link, the ‘ecf-v4.0-webservice-spec’ folder is opened. This folder contains multiple versions of the WS SIP (e.g., v2.0 cd01, v2.01 cd01). The first ECF 4.0 version, i.e., v2.0 would correspond to the following URL:

<http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec-cd01.zip>

This ECF 4.0 Web Services SIP v2.0 specification is designated as ‘Committee Draft 01’ and replaces or supersedes ECF Web Services SIP Profiles v 1.0 and v 1.1.

Since this is a Committee Draft and has not been through public review and approved by ballot, and is therefore not a Committee Specification yet, the statement regarding ‘replaces or supersedes’ is understood as intent upon approval as a Committee Specification.

3. In 2009, corrections were made to the WS SIP, designated as v2.01. The revision history within the WS SIP specification document (Appendix B) shows that, following working draft 3 (wd03) on 9-3-2008, corrections were made on 7-14-2009 to fix conformance issues with WS-I Basic Profile 1.1. Additional corrections were made on or about 7-20-2008, including changing all references to “WebServiceMessagingProfile” to simply “WebServicesProfile” (see email #300610).

This version (2.01) was voted on by ballot on 8-20-2009, approved and announced on 8-26-2009, then published on 10-15-2009 as cd01. Although the specification documents are available in the folder accessed from the Public Page (as ‘4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile’), no zip file is available which includes all SIP artifacts.

ECF-4.0-WebServicesProfile-Definitions-v2.1.wsdl (July 20, 2009) is available as a separate artifact (<http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec/ECF-4.0-WebServicesProfile-Definitions-v2.1.wsdl>). There are no differences between the 7-20-2009 version of ECF-4.0-WebServicesProfile-Definitions-v2.1.wsdl accessed from the Public Page and the version included on the 8-20-2009 ballot (v2.01).

It is not clear why the above 7-20-2009 wsdl was numbered v2.1, perhaps this was just an error.

4. Following the publication of WS SIP v2.01 cd01 on Oct. 15, 2009, additional SIP changes were made, culminating in csprd02 (public review #2 of the committee draft) dated 10-1-2011 (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/43733/ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-csprd02.zip>).

The specification document is dated Aug. 9, 2011, and the revision history in Appendix B provides:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Revision | Date | Changes Made |
| Cd01 | 2011-04-18 | Made minor changes to conformance section and corrected several broken links. |
| Csd02 | 2011-08-08 | Revised reference format. |

The revision history for the ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec.zip document (ID 43136) lists two revisions. Revision #1 (2011-05-06) presumably corresponds to the 2011-04-18 change in Appendix B. Revision #2 (2011-08-08) appears to be Csd02 in the Appendix B revision history.

Although there was a 30-day public review (as csprd01) and a 15-day public review (csprd02) there does not appear to be any formal TC vote using the OASIS Ballot process (as was done for cd01, 8-20-2009).

However, the ‘CSD Creation / Upload Request for ECF 4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile’ TC Admin request (TCADMIN-489) of May-11, 2011 ([[TCADMIN-489] CSD Creation / Upload Request for ECF 4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile - OASIS Technical Committees Issue Tracker (oasis-open.org)](https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TCADMIN-489)) provides that ECF TC meeting minutes show:

Motion 2 to approve the working drafts in Kavi as Draft Committee Specifications moved by Jim Harris and seconded by Robert O'Brien. Passed without dissent.  
Motion 3 to approve releasing the CSDs for a 30 day public review moved by Robert O'Brien and seconded by Jim Harris. Passed without dissent."

Note minutes do not include reference to specific URI in Kavi, which is recommended.

Note URIs provided in request do not use publicly-accessible URI format as requested in May 5 message, copied to TC list:  
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/legalxml-courtfiling/201105/msg00002.html>

Proper URI formats would be:  
[2] <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/42035/ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec.zip>  
[3] <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/42104/ECF%20May%2010%20Minutes.docx>

The TC Admin request was clarified by Paul Knight:

Request should be for development of CSD02, since previous file CD01 exists:

<http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec/ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec-cd01.doc>

It appears that csprd02 is the most recently TC approved Web Services SIP for ECF 4.0. Perhaps this should be known as CSD02 as designated by Paul Knight.

The CSD02 version of the Web Services SIP v2.01 is available in the /legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec/v2.01/csd02/ folder and this folder does include a zip file.

It is noteworthy that there is also a csd03 subfolder (09-Aug-2011). The Aug 9, 2011, date on this folder and its contents are prior to the CSD02 approval date of 10-1-2022, but it does line up well with the ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec.zip Revision #2 date of 8-8-2011. This csd03 subfolder does not contain a zip file within the folder, but does provide a zip file URL (<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43733/ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-csprd02.zip>) within the Public Review Notice. This folder only contains 3 versions of the 9-Aug-2011 specification document (i.e., doc, html, and pdf).

There was subsequent WS-SIP activity, following the 10-1-2011 approval of CSD02, as further detailed in the GRA SSP efforts described below. At one point Jim Cabral referenced these efforts as csprd03 (presumably ECF\_SSP\_ … v4.01). This effort does not appear to have ever resulted in a TC approved version for ECF 4.01.

5. A review of TC communications (documents and email) suggest that awareness of WS SIP problems may have surfaced around 2015 or 2016. This realization appears to have been initially promulgated by an effort to align ECF with GRA (Global Reference Architecture). This effort appears to have begun in 2012 (see ‘GRA Assessment and Alignment’, 2012-11-09, (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/47428/ECF%20GRA%20Alignment.pptx>) which was presented to the TC on Nov. 13, 2012.

6. Jim Harris began an effort to create a draft SSP (Service Specification Package) which was noted as “needed for IJIS Springboard project” (see slide 9 in ‘ECF TC F2F 120912.ppt’, <https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/47671/ECF%20TC%20F2F%20120912.ppt>). At the Dec. 9, 2012 F2F meeting, the TC approved action to “update ECF web services SIP to conform with the latest versions of the GRA Web Services SIP, Execution Context and Service Specification Package (SSP) specifications” (see ECF TC Meeting Minutes (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/48221/ECF%20TC%20Dec%202012%20F2F%20meeting%20notes.docx>).

7. A new ECF Web Services SIP v2.02 was planned (see slide 14, in ‘ECF TC F2F 092013.ppt’, <https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/50780/ECF%20TC%20F2F%20092013.ppt>).

8. Finding from the IJIS Springboard project appear to first highlight deficiencies in the ECF v4.0 WebServices SIP v2.01 – “WSDL files not clearly linked to schema files” was reported (see ‘OASIS ECF TC Preliminary Springboard Findings.pptx’, slide 6, Sept. 2013, <https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/50782/OASIS%20ECF%20TC%20Preliminary%20Springboard%20Findings.pptx>).

9. As a “Roadmap for Web Services SIP”, version 2.02 planned to “address gaps identified by Open Networks” and to “publish it as an GRA SSP” (see ‘BaltimoreECF TC Mtg Minutes 092013.docx’ (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/50804/BaltimoreECF%20TC%20Mtg%20Minutes%20092013.docx>). Open Networks is the vendor for IJIS for conformance tests for ECF springboard project.

10. On Oct. 16, 2013, SIP\_RS\_WS\_1.2.zip was posted (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/51051/ECF_SSP_v_4.01.0.zip>). This zip file includes ‘ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-csprd03.doc’. Also provided as ECF-4.0-WebServicesProfile-Definitions.wsdl and ECF-4.0-WebServicesProfile-ImplementationExample.wsdl ECF\_SSP\_v\_4.01.0/(schemas/SIP\_RS\_WS\_1.2/). These wsdl are only very slightly revised from ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-csprd02.zip (schemaLocations are revised and csprd02 allows ‘unbounded’ maxOccurs for docket:DocketRecordDocketingMessage).

11. Open Networks (IJIS Springboard Project vendor) provided ‘ECF\_Springborad\_Quality\_Assurance\_Review\_v.1.0.1.docx’ (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/51684/ECF_Springboard_Quality_Assurance_Review_v.1.0.1.docx>) on 2013-12-20. In particular, note:

* I-1 Package Structure (“the WSDL files provided in the ECF v4.0 WS SIP 2.01 package are not clearly linked to the schema files contained in the ECF v4.01 package”), and
* I-8 Incorrect Parameter Reference (“consider moving the full type declaration from the WSDL to a message schema”).

12. The Meeting Minutes for the ECF TC meeting on Dec. 10, 2013 indicate, under the heading ‘ECF WS SIP 2.01 updates’, that ‘Jim Harris and Jim Cabral updated the SIP with changes discussed at the Sep F2F’ (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/51680/ECF%20TC%20Agenda%20121013.docx>).

13. Meeting Minutes from Jan. 14, 2014, address issues raised by Open Networks. This includes:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Disposition** |
| **Issues** |  |
| **I-1.  Package Structure** | We have obtained the clarification necessary, so we are able to continue the Springboard test tool design & implementation. **Clarified.** |
| **I-8.  Incorrect Parameter Reference** | In lieu of any other guidance, we presume that the parameters CoreFilingMessage and PaymentMessage are both optional. We all agree that the payment message is optional and the non-normative sections of the core specification need to updated. We debated whether the container for both messages should be defined in the core spec (e.g., always via XML schema) or in the SIPs (e.g., via WSDL in WS SIP and XML schema n the MQ SIP ). This item was not resolved completely. |

The clarification mentioned in I-1 above was not provided. See <https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/51954/ECF%20TC%20Minutes%20011414.docx>

14. Additional, subsequent Springboard feedback is included in the Feb. 11, 2014 ECF TC Meeting minutes (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/52182/ECF%20TC%20Minutes%20021114.docx>).

15. The TC Meeting Minutes for Mar. 11, 2014, identify that the “ECF 4.01 Web Services SIP formatted as SSP with Springboard feedback for approval as Committee Specification/Public Review Draft” and provided the following link: <https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/52445/ECF_SSP_v_4.01.1.zip>. This link provides access to SIP\_RS\_WS\_1.1.zip (see above v1.2 zip). Even though the zip file is named with WS\_1.1, it contains a subfolder named ‘SIP\_RS\_WS\_1.2’. ECF-4.0-WebServicesProfile-Defintions.wsdl includes soapActions but the prior version does not.

16. The SSP SIP was updated on Oct. 16, 2014 (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/54334/ECF_SSP_v_4.01.1.zip>).

17. The ‘Incorrect Parameter Reference’ issue reported in the IJIS Springboard feedback, was provided an additional update in the Dec. 15, 2014., meeting minutes (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/54747/ECF%20TC%20Minutes%20121514.docx>). The update is “The parameter reference issue (action item #50) is still pending. Suggestion was as part of Springboard project to consider updating tables in sections C.1.1, C.2.1 and C.3.1 to properly reflect the base types, and to consider moving the full type declaration from the WSDL to a message schema. The TC decided these changes should be included in ECF 5.”.

18. ECF\_SDD\_v\_1.0.0.doc was posted by Jim Harris on March 14, 2015 (with the internal document date April 2015) (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/55435/ECF_SDD_v_1.0.0.doc>).

19. The above action was announced at the March 14, 2015 ECF TC meeting (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/55448/ECF%20TC%20Minutes%20041415.docx>) with the note “the SSP will be ready for consideration in advance of the next TC call”.

20. Various updates were posted in May 2015.

21. Review and approval discussions were conducted during the June 9, 2015 TC meeting (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/55826/ECF%20TC%20Minutes%20060915.docx>). During this review and discussion, it was noted that the SOAP examples were not compliant with section 2.5 of the WebeServices SIP. TC approval was deferred until the issue with the SOAP examples is resolved.

22. Additional consideration on the Section 2.5 (operation-named Soap Body root-element) are included in the meeting minutes for the July 7, 2015 meeting minutes (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/56114/ECF%20TC%20Minutes%20070715.docx>). For convenience, these are copied below:

* Only remaining issue is compliance of SOAP samples with WS-SIP section 2.5
* Naming of operations
* Best practice is to name operation the same as 1st element in the XML
* Current examples do not do that correctly
* Problem – current implementations, including Springboard – which are aligned to current schemas
  + Change to elements could break implementations
  + Raised question with implementers on the call as to how they would be impacted
  + Bryant – followed WSDL vs. spec
  + Eric – responding to customers use; Tyler’s implementation may be only impact
  + Gary – AZ using wrap method with 2.5 conformant name
  + Springboard – aligned with WSDL;
  + Right way would be to change WSDL to align with spec section 2.5
  + Much discussion re implications
* Motion by Jim Harris and seconded by Gary Graham to change the WSDL so that it conforms with section 2.5 and publish the new SIP as version WS-SIP v2.1
  + Motion carried with no one opposed
  + Jim Harris will make changes to the WSDL and post the updated SIP as a v2.1 draft SSP

23. During the Dec. 8, 2015 TC meeting, Jim Harris reported that the WSDL changes had been completed (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/57285/ECF%20TC%20Minutes%20120815.docx>).

24. At the Feb. 9, 2016, TC meeting it was suggested that having SOAP examples would make it easier to confirm the wsdl changes. Tools suggested to use to creates the SOAP examples were ‘WSDL to SOAP or ‘SoapUI’. Jim Harris agreed to post the revised WSDL and to generate SOAP messages (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/57627/ECF%20TC%20Minutes%20020916.docx>).

25. Jim Harris posted the revised WSDL on March 3, 2016 (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/57674/ECF-4.0-WebServicesProfile-Definitions(new).wsdl>).

26. ‘Document/Literal Wrapped WSDL.zip’ was posted by Greg Zarkis on Mar. 8, 2016 (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/57702/ECF-4.0-WSDL-DocLitWrap.zip>). The TC meeting minutes for the same date specify that this Document/Literal proposal is targeted for ECF v5.0 (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/57707/ECF%20TC%20Minutes%20030816.docx>).

27. Further commentary is document in the TC Meeting Minutes from Mar. 12, 2016, (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/57923/ECF%20TC%20Minutes%20041216.docx>). Provided below:

Eric: Wrappers worked well.

Philip: Tyler agrees

Gary: WS-SIP is separate from the ECF version so the SIP could be a new version without a new version of ECF?

Jim: The consequence - Implementers would need to be specific about which SIP they are using.

Jim: Options: wait and include only in ECF 5, or also publish new SIP that is an additional option for ECF 4 implementations

Jim: Publish as WS-SIP 3.0 for ECF 4 and WS-SIP 5.0 for ECF 5

Gary: Suggests volunteers put together a list of options/pros/cons.

Eric: Will write it up so that we can discuss and decide next month.

28. Additional discussion is summarized in the May 10, 2016, TC Meeting Minutes (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/58099/Minutes%20for%20ECF%20TC%20Agenda%20051016.doc>):

* Eric’s thoughts echo what Jim Cabral emailed after last meeting.
* SIP 2.1 is ready for ECF 4 but does not address these Document/Literal updates. Do we also postpone/cancel SIP 2.1?
* Consensus is that the SIP with document/literal is good for ECF 5 but for ECF 4, a committee draft would be sufficient.

Note: the email from Jim Cabral referenced by Eric above is not found in the TC’s email archive.

29. The meeting minutes for the July 14 – 15, 2016 F2F meeting (Pittsburgh) notes:

* + Will need to updated WS-SIP developed for ECF 4

30. The Nov. 8, 2016, Meeting Minutes include a reference for ECF5.0 Web Services SIP, to format Web Services SIP as an SSP. The minutes specify: Done in ECF 4.01, adopt for ECF 5. See: <https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/59317/ECF%20TC%20Agenda%20110816%20-%20Minutes.docx>

No further discussion regarding any ECF 4 SIP v2.1 (or as suggested on 3-12-2016 as WS-SIP 3.0) or committee draft can be found. From this point forward, TC focus was on the development of ECF 5. All Web Services SIP focus was directed to the ECF v5.0 Web Services SIP.

**Appendix B – relevant email**

9-20-2008 (265758)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/200809/msg00009.html>

Subject: Results of ECF 4.0 vote

From: "John Greacen" <greacenjmg@earthlink.net>

To: <legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org>

Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 07:16:46 -0600

Although the vote does not close until this evening, I am pleased to report that ECF 4.0 and the two revised SIPs have been approved unanimously as committee specifications by the TC’s voting members.

Congratulations to all.

John M. Greacen

Although no Ballot can be found, then Chair John Greacen announced that the WS SIP had been approved as a Committee Specification.

In retrospect, this may only have been committee draft approval.

9-22-2008 (265893)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/200809/msg00011.html>

Subject: Groups - ECF 4.0 Web Services SIP Committee Draft 01 (ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec-cd01.zip) uploaded

From: jcabral@mtgmc.com

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: 22 Sep 2008 21:55:44 -0000

The document revision named ECF 4.0 Web Services SIP Committee Draft 01

(ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec-cd01.zip) has been submitted by Mr. James Cabral

to the OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing TC document repository. This

document is revision #4 of ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec-wd02.zip.

Document Description:

ECF 4.0 Web Services SIP v2.0 which supports WS-I Basic Profile 1.1, WS-I

Basic Security Profile 1.0, and WS-Reliable Messaging 1.1.

View Document Details:

<http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/document.php?document_id=29414>

Download Document:

<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/29414/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec-cd01.zip>

Revision:

This document is revision #4 of ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec-wd02.zip. The

document details page referenced above will show the complete revision

history.

PLEASE NOTE: If the above links do not work for you, your email application

may be breaking the link into two pieces. You may be able to copy and paste

the entire link address into the address field of your web browser.

-OASIS Open Administration

Even though Chair John Greacen had announced that the WS SIP had been approved as a Committee Specification, it was still referred to as a Committee Draft (e.g., working draft)

10-9-2008 (267244)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/200810/msg00002.html>

Subject: Groups - ECF 3.1 Web Services SIP Committee Draft 01 (ecf-v3.1-webservices-spec-cd02.zip) uploaded

From: jcabral@mtgmc.com

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: 9 Oct 2008 08:14:27 -0000

The document revision named ECF 3.1 Web Services SIP Committee Draft 01

(ecf-v3.1-webservices-spec-cd02.zip) has been submitted by Mr. James Cabral

to the OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing TC document repository. This

document is revision #3 of ecf-v3.1-webservices-spec-wd01.zip.

Document Description:

The 3.1 version of the Web Services SIP adds support for MTOM. It uses

WS-I Basic Profile 1.1 but replaces the Simple Soap Binding in the WS-I

Attachments 1.0 Profile with the Simple Soap 1.1 Binding for MTOM.

View Document Details:

<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?document_id=29600>

Download Document:

<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/29600/ecf-v3.1-webservices-spec-cd02.zip>

Revision:

This document is revision #3 of ecf-v3.1-webservices-spec-wd01.zip. The

document details page referenced above will show the complete revision

history.

PLEASE NOTE: If the above links do not work for you, your email application

may be breaking the link into two pieces. You may be able to copy and paste

the entire link address into the address field of your web browser.

-OASIS Open Administration

Note: It appears that ECF 3.01 WS SIP and ECF 4 WS SIP activities overlapped.

10-9-2008 (267227)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/200810/msg00005.html>

Subject: Groups - ECF 3.01 Web Services SIP Committee Draft 01 (ecf-v3.01-webservices-spec-cd01.zip) uploaded

From: jcabral@mtgmc.com

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: 9 Oct 2008 08:20:29 -0000

The document revision named ECF 3.01 Web Services SIP Committee Draft 01

(ecf-v3.01-webservices-spec-cd01.zip) has been submitted by Mr. James

Cabral to the OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing TC document

repository. This document is revision #1 of

ecf-v3.01-webservices-spec-cd01.zip.

Document Description:

View Document Details:

<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?document_id=29603>

Download Document:

<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/29603/ecf-v3.01-webservices-spec-cd01.zip>

Revision:

This document is revision #1 of ecf-v3.01-webservices-spec-cd01.zip. The

document details page referenced above will show the complete revision

history.

PLEASE NOTE: If the above links do not work for you, your email application

may be breaking the link into two pieces. You may be able to copy and paste

the entire link address into the address field of your web browser.

-OASIS Open Administration

6-5-2009 (294286) – chain of email

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/200906/msg00000.html>

Subject: ECF 4.0 web services SIP conformance issue with WS-I Basic Profile

From: "Cabral, James E." <JCabral@mtgmc.com>

To: "Eric Dimick Eastman" <erice@doxpop.com>

Date: Fri, 5 Jun 2009 13:11:55 -0700

Eric,

I’m just happy to be getting this sort of feedback so that we can (hopefully) improve the interoperability of the spec.

I’m CCing the TC and attaching the corrected WSDL again so that they everyone is aware of this issue. We should talk about this at the next TC meeting and decide how we want to handle it. At a minimum, this would be errata to the 4.0 web services SIP but a bug-fix release (e.g. 4.01) is probably in order.

Thanks,

Jim Cabral

James E. Cabral Jr.

MTG Management Consultants, L.L.C.

From: Eric Dimick Eastman [mailto:erice@doxpop.com]

Sent: Friday, June 05, 2009 4:07 PM

To: Cabral, James E.

Subject: Re: [legalxml-courtfiling] Ohio Judicial Conference

Jim,

Thanks for getting back to me. That WSDL looks a lot like my work-around version. I'm sure that it will work for us. Our production system is still based on 3.0, but I'll be working on 4.0 soon. I'll let you know.

Too bad that it looks like a flaw in the 4.0 SIP, but the good news is that I'm not crazy.

Assuming that this works out well, do you think it would be included in a 4.0.1 version of the SIP? We claim that WS-I compliance is required for ECF WS SIP 4.0 compliance so I assume that we would not want this conflict out there.

Thanks again,

Eric

On Fri, Jun 5, 2009 at 3:41 PM, Cabral, James E. <JCabral@mtgmc.com> wrote:

Eric,

This looks like it is an issue of nonconformance of the ECF web services SIP with Section 4.4.1 of the WS-I Basic Profile spec. While the WSDL and SOAP specs clearly allow messages with multiple parts, Section 4.4.1 of the WS-I Basic Profile spec (http://www.ws-i.org/Profiles/BasicProfile-1.1.html#Bindings\_and\_Parts) includes these restrictions:

4.4.1 Bindings and Parts

There are various interpretations about how many wsdl:part elements are permitted or required for document-literal and rpc-literal bindings and how they must be defined.

R2201 A document-literal binding in a DESCRIPTION MUST, in each of its soapbind:body element(s), have at most one part listed in the parts attribute, if the parts attribute is specified.

R2209 A wsdl:binding in a DESCRIPTION SHOULD bind every wsdl:part of a wsdl:message in the wsdl:portType to which it refers with a binding extension element.

R2210 If a document-literal binding in a DESCRIPTION does not specify the parts attribute on a soapbind:body element, the corresponding abstract wsdl:message MUST define zero or one wsdl:parts.

For document-literal bindings, the Profile requires that at most one part, abstractly defined with the element attribute, be serialized into the soap:Body element.

To bring ECF into conformance with WS-I Basic Profile 1.1 , we need to define new elements for the body of each of the WSDL messages that have multiple input parameters, namely NotifyFilingReviewCompleteRequest, RecordFilingRequest, and ReviewFilingRequest. I have tried this approach in the attached WSDL file. Please try it out and let me know if this works for you.

Sorry it took me a week to get back to you.

Thanks,

Jim Cabral

James E. Cabral Jr.

MTG Management Consultants, L.L.C.

From: Eric Dimick Eastman [mailto:erice@doxpop.com]

Sent: Monday, June 01, 2009 4:27 PM

To: Cabral, James E.

Subject: Re: [legalxml-courtfiling] Ohio Judicial Conference

Jim,

Thanks for the presentation. It served as a great jumping off point. I'm attaching the drawings I made in case they are any use to you. Amateurish, I know, but I never claimed to be an artist. I know that ServeFiling isn't required, but the Service MDE is fairly useless without it. I added a "if you have one" caveat to the talk.

Also, I'm having a problem with the WSDL's for the webservices SIP. About a year ago I noticed that I was getting an error when I tried to implement the messages that have more than one part. I only needed the CoreFilingMessage at the time, so I just commented out the other parts and didn't think too much about it. Now we need to include a PaymentMessage and I've put a fair amount of effort into it and I still can't get it to work. I've read the SOAP spec and I believe that the SOAP body needs to be one root XML element.

This is the section of the WSDL I'm having problems with. This example is from version 4.0, but the same problem exists in 3.0 and 3.1:

<input name="ReviewFilingRequest">

<soap:body parts="CoreFilingMessage PaymentMessage" use="literal"/>

</input>

When I try this with Java's wsimport tool I get a message that goes something like "More than one message part bound to SOAP body. Skipping..."

The only work-around I've been able to complete is to create a <ReviewFilingRequest> element to surround the CoreFilingMessage and the Payment message and then redefing the message to have only one part.

I have one more straw to grasp at which is changing the "use" attribute from "literal" to "encoded". I don't have much hope for it and it would also require a change to the WSDL.

I wasn't a part of any discussions about how to construct the SOAP bindings. I was hoping you might have some insights or at least know whom to ask.

Any thoughts?

Thanks again,

Eric

6-9-2009 (294714)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/200906/msg00006.html>

Subject: RE: ECF 4.0 web services SIP conformance issue with WS-I Basic Profile

From: "Cabral, James E." <JCabral@mtgmc.com>

To: <legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org>

Date: Tue, 9 Jun 2009 10:19:03 -0700

ECF TC:

During the TC call today we decided to plan to release this update as a 4.01 bug fix release of the web services SIP by the end of the month. The TC requests any implementers of the web services SIP to test with the attached WSDL and report any additional issues to this list by June 23rd. Otherwise, we will move ahead with a vote to release the 4.01 version.

Thanks,

Jim Cabral

7-13-2009 (from ggraham@courts,az,gov, this email is not found in ECF TC email archive)

ECF TC:

I attach the proposed patched web service spec. Note that it is actually v2.01 of the web service spec (not 4.01). Hopefully, we can either vote on it during the TC call tomorrow or at least decide on a schedule for bringing it to a vote. Then we’ll need to request the OASIS staff to post it to the docs.oasis-open.org site which may take some time.

Thanks,

Jim Cabral

Attachment:

ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec-cd01.zip

Saved as:

C:\Users\ggraham\Documents\ECF-4\ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec-cd01-7-13-2009.zip

7-20-2009 (300610)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/200907/msg00005.html>

Subject: RE: ECF 4.0 web services SIP - possible adiitional errors

From: "Cabral, James E." <JCabral@mtgmc.com>

To: <legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org>

Date: Mon, 20 Jul 2009 13:04:05 -0700

ECF TC:

Thanks to Gary for identifying a few spelling and namespace issues in the revised WSDL. I addressed the spelling issues and, for consistency, I changed all references to “WebServiceMessagingProfile” to simply “WebServicesProfile”. The latest version of the 2.01 web services SIP is attached.

Thanks,

Jim Cabral

Note: the attachment is not available in the TC Email Archive, but is available on the [ggraham@courts.az.gov](mailto:ggraham@courts.az.gov) email below:

7-20-2009 (from ggraham@courts,az,gov)

ECF TC:

Thanks to Gary for identifying a few spelling and namespace issues in the revised WSDL. I addressed the spelling issues and, for consistency, I changed all references to “WebServiceMessagingProfile” to simply “WebServicesProfile”. The latest version of the 2.01 web services SIP is attached.

Thanks,

Jim Cabral

Attachment:

ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec-cd01.zip

Saved as:

C:\Users\ggraham\Documents\ECF-4\ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec-cd01-7-20-2009.zip

8-21-2009 (from ggraham@courts,az,gov, this email not found in ECF TC email archive)

Gary,

The updated web services SIP that addresses the issues you reported was approved by the TC. It takes some time to be posted to the public web server so I have attached it.

Let me know if there is anything you need from me.

Jim Cabral

-----Original Message-----

From: Cabral, James E.

Sent: Friday, August 21, 2009 2:59 PM

To: 'mary.mcrae@oasis-open.org'

Subject: FW: Groups - oasis - Ballot "Approval of ECF 4.0 Webservices SIP 2.01" has closed

Mary,

Please post the attached specification to <http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/>

Thanks,

Jim Cabral

Attachment:

ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec-cd01.zip

Saved as:

C:\Users\ggraham\Documents\ECF-4\ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec-cd01-8-21-2009.zip

Question: Did Mary McRae post the specification to the folder identified by Jim Cabral above, and if so, was it only the specification document or the whole zip file?

Ans: The folder specified by J.C. contains three subfolders: 1) ecf-v4.0-portablemedia-spec, 2) ecf-v4.0-spec, and 3) ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec. Presumably Mary McRae would have understood to place the specification into the ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec subfolder.

The v2.01 artifacts in this subfolder are dated 10-1-2009 and 10-15-2009. It’s hard to image that it took Mary 7 or so weeks to post the specification. There is a v2.01 subfolder, but all artifacts contained in it are from 2011. My conclusion is that Mary would have posted the specification in August on or about Aug. 21st and, since the most relevant artifacts are dated Oct. 2009, either Mary did not post the specification, or it was removed or replaced subsequently (e.g., when the specification was published 10-15-2009). Even if the Oct. 2009 artifacts are the same as the Aug. artifacts (internal date is July 14, 2009), the full zip file is not provided (only doc, html, and pdf versions of the specification document are available).

The 8-20-2009 Ballot (<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/ballot.php?id=1754>) does include a URL to a full ecf-4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec.zip file (8-10-2009). If there were no modifications following the ballot, then this zip file may contain the published version (cd01).

The revision history for the above 8-10-2009 document (ID 33712, accessed from the Ballot, via ‘details’ choice from the ‘Actions’ button in the ‘Referenced Items’ section) shows that it has been revised twice since 8-10-2009. First in 5-6-2011, then again on 8-8-2011. Both revisions are marked as Committee Draft.

The 5-6-2011 version may correspond to the version submitted to OASIS Admin on the same date (see email #371551), and the 8-8-2011 version may correspond with the csprd02 15-day public review on 8-9-2011.

8-26-2009 (305144)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/200908/msg00003.html>

Subject: Notification of Ballot Results: "Approval of ECF 4.0 Webservices SIP 2.01"

From: Robin.Gibson@courts.mo.gov

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Wed, 26 Aug 2009 10:01:11 -0500

Robin

Robin Gibson

Information Technology Division

Office of State Courts Administrator

573-751-4377

"Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary

safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

Benjamin Franklin, Historical Review of Pennsylvania, 1759

----- Forwarded by Robin Gibson/OSCA/Courts/Judicial on 08/26/2009 09:59 AM

-----

To: robin.gibson@courts.mo.gov

08/20/2009 04:01 PM

Subject> Groups - oasis - Ballot "Approval of ECF 4.0 Webservices SIP 2.01" has closed

OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing TC member,

A ballot presented to OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing TC has closed.

The text of this closed ballot is as follows:

---

"Approval of ECF 4.0

Webservices SIP 2.01"

This SIP has been revised and is ready for approval.

Please refer to James Cabral's email of 7/20/2009 to see what has been

updated.

Quick Summary of Voting Results:

- Yes received 7 Votes

- No received 0

Votes

7 of 10 eligible voters cast their vote before the deadline.

Thank you,

OASIS Open Administration

Note: The actual specification and accompanying artifacts are not linked or attached to the Ballot Notification. Only a reference to “James Cabral’s email of 7/20/2009” has been provided. This July 20, 2009, email is not included in the ECF TC Email Archive, but is available on 7-20-2009 [ggraham@courts.az.gov](mailto:ggraham@courts.az.gov) email. However, the email from Jim Cabral to Mary McRae on 8-21-2009 does provide a folder location into which the specification artifacts are to be placed.

10-15-2009 (311599)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/200910/msg00004.html>

Subject: RE: [legalxml-courtfiling] work product review ECF 4.0 Webservices SIP 2.01

From: "Cabral, James E." <JCabral@mtgmc.com>

To: <legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org>

Date: Thu, 15 Oct 2009 06:20:09 -0700

FYI. The ECF 4.0 WebServices SIP 2.01 is now published.

Jim Cabral

MTG Management Consultants, L.L.C.

From: Mary McRae [mailto:mary.mcrae@oasis-open.org]

Sent: Wednesday, October 14, 2009 10:32 PM

To: Cabral, James E.

Subject: Re: [legalxml-courtfiling] work product review ECF 4.0 Webservices SIP 2.01

Hi Jim,

Everything should be all set now.

<http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec/ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec-cd01.html>

Regards,

Mary

Note: the link above only provides access to the WebServices SIP specification document and does not provide access to other WS SIP artifacts or zip file.

5-6-2011 (371551)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201105/msg00003.html>

The document revision named ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec.zip has been

submitted by Mr. James Cabral to the OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing

TC document repository. This document is revision #1 of

ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec.zip.

Document Description:

View Document Details:

<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?document_id=42035>

Download Document:

<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/42035/ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec.zip>

Revision:

This document is revision #1 of ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec.zip. The

document details page referenced above will show the complete revision

history.

PLEASE NOTE: If the above links do not work for you, your email application

may be breaking the link into two pieces. You may be able to copy and paste

the entire link address into the address field of your web browser.

-OASIS Open Administration

5-11-2011 (372112)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201105/msg00012.html>

Subject: CSD Creation / Upload Request for ECF 4.0 Web Services ServiceInteraction Profile

From: Paul Knight <paul.knight@oasis-open.org>

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Wed, 11 May 2011 16:03:16 -0400

The following request has been submitted to the OASIS TC Administrator on 11 May 2011:

>

Submitter's Name

Jim Cabral

TC Name

LegalXML Electronic Court Filing

TC Email Address

[1]legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Work Product Title

ECF 4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile

Working Draft Number

cd01

Working Draft URL

[2]<http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/42035/ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec.zip>

Committee Specification Draft ##

csd01

Authoritative

editable source

Approval Link

[3]http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/42104/ECF%20May%2010%20Minutes.docx

>

Thank you for your request. We will confirm receipt and schedule the QC review shortly. You can follow the progress at:

<http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/TCADMIN-489>

The Standards Development team.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

[1] mailto:legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

[2] http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/42035/ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec.zip

[3] http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/42104/ECF%20May%2010%20Minutes.docx

Regards,

Paul

--

Paul Knight - Tel: +1 781-861-1013

OASIS - Document Process Analyst

6-1-2011 (373599)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201106/msg00001.html>

Subject: 30-day Public Review for ECF 4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile V2.0

From: Chet Ensign <chet.ensign@oasis-open.org>

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org,members@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 2011 10:44:14 -0400

The OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing TC [1] members have produced a Committee Specification Draft (CSD) and submitted it for 30-day public review:

ECF 4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile Version 2.0

Committee Specification Draft 01 / Public Review Draft 01

Specification Overview:

The ECF 4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile defines a transmission system that supports the functional requirements of electronic filing as defined in section 5 of the LegalXML Electronic Court Filing 4.0 (ECF 4.0) specification. The Web Services Service Interaction Profile may be used to transmit ECF 4.0 messages between Internet-connected systems.

Public Review Period:

The public review starts today, 1 June 2011 and ends 30 June 2011.

This is an open invitation to comment. OASIS solicits feedback from potential users, developers and others, whether OASIS members or not, for the sake of improving the interoperability and quality of its technical work.

URIs:

The prose specification document and related files are available here:

Editable Source (Authoritative):

<http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec/v2.01/csprd01/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec-v2.01-csprd01.doc>

HTML:

<http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec/v2.01/csprd01/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec-v2.01-csprd01.html>

PDF:

<http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec/v2.01/csprd01/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec-v2.01-csprd01.pdf>

ZIP distribution file (complete):

For your convenience, OASIS provides a complete package of the prose specification and related files in a ZIP distribution file. You can download the ZIP file here:

<http://docs.oasis-open.org/legalxml-courtfiling/specs/ecf/v4.0/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec/v2.01/csprd01/ecf-v4.0-webservices-spec-v2.01-csprd01.zip>

Additional information about the specification and the OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing TC may be found at the TC's public home page located at:

http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/legalxml-courtfiling

Comments may be submitted to the TC by any person through the use of the OASIS TC Comment Facility which can be accessed via the button labeled "Send A Comment" at the top of the TC public home page, or directly at:

http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/comments/form.php?wg\_abbrev=legalxml-courtfiling

Feedback submitted by TC non-members for this work and for other work of this TC is publicly archived and can be viewed at:

http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/legalxml-courtfiling-comment/

All comments submitted to OASIS are subject to the OASIS Feedback License, which ensures that the feedback you provide carries the same obligations at least as the obligations of the TC members. In connection with this public review of ECF 4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile Version 2.0, we call your attention to the OASIS IPR Policy [2] applicable especially [3] to the work of this technical committee. All members of the TC should be familiar with this document, which may create obligations regarding the disclosure and availability of a member's patent, copyright, trademark and license rights that read on an approved OASIS specification. OASIS invites any persons who know of any such claims to disclose these if they may be essential to the implementation of the above specification, so that notice of them may be posted to the notice page for this TC's work.

----------------

Chet Ensign

Director of Standards Development and TC Administration

OASIS: Advancing open standards for the information society

http://www.oasis-open.org

Primary: +1 973-378-3472

Mobile: +1 201-341-1393

========== Additional references:

[1] OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing TC

http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/legalxml-courtfiling/

[2] http://www.oasis-open.org/who/intellectualproperty.php

[3] http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/ebxml-msg/ipr.php

http://www.oasis-open.org/who/intellectualproperty.php#s10.2.3

RF on Limited Terms IPR Mode

8-8-2011 (378898)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201108/msg00000.html>

Subject: Groups - ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec.zip uploaded

From: jcabral@mtgmc.com

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: 8 Aug 2011 21:34:56 -0000

The document revision named ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec.zip has been

submitted by Mr. James Cabral to the OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing

TC document repository. This document is revision #2 of

ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec.zip.

Document Description:

View Document Details:

<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?document_id=43136>

Download Document:

<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43136/ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec.zip>

Revision:

This document is revision #2 of ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-spec.zip. The

document details page referenced above will show the complete revision

history.

PLEASE NOTE: If the above links do not work for you, your email application

may be breaking the link into two pieces. You may be able to copy and paste

the entire link address into the address field of your web browser.

-OASIS Open Administration

8-17-2011 (379629)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201108/msg00009.html>

Subject: FW: ECF to SSP

From: James E Cabral <jcabral@mtgmc.com>

To: "legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org"<legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org>

Date: Wed, 17 Aug 2011 14:33:21 -0700

ECF TC:

We will need to make a minor correction to a reference to the WS-I Basic Security Profile (BSP) in the Web Services SIP 2.01 spec. The reference should be to the BSP 1.0 rather than 1.1. I have already submitted the specifications for 15 day public review so we can apply the fix after the review completes. See below for details.

Jim Cabral

10-18-2011 (384009)

[Groups - ecf-spec-v4.01-csprd02-jec-revisions.zip uploaded (oasis-open.org)](https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201110/msg00011.html)

Subject: Groups - ecf-spec-v4.01-csprd02-jec-revisions.zip uploaded

From: James Cabral<jcabral@mtgmc.com>

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Tue, 18 Oct 2011 18:15:29 -0700 (PDT)

Document Name: ecf-spec-v4.01-csprd02-jec-revisions.zip

Description

Minor corrections in response to public review feedback on CSPRD02 of the

ECF 4.0 Core Specification

Download Latest Revision

Public Download Link

Submitter: Mr. James Cabral

Group: OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing TC

Folder: Specifications

Date submitted: 2011-10-18 18:15:11

10-18-2011 (384010)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201110/msg00012.html>

Subject: Groups - ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-csprd02-jec-revisions.zip uploaded

From: James Cabral<jcabral@mtgmc.com>

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Tue, 18 Oct 2011 18:16:38 -0700 (PDT)

Document Name: ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-csprd02-jec-revisions.zip

Description

Minor corrections in response to public review feedback on CSD02/PRD02 of

the ECF 4.0 Web Services SIP Specification

Download Latest Revision

Public Download Link

Submitter: Mr. James Cabral

Group: OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing TC

Folder: Specifications

Date submitted: 2011-10-18 18:16:33

2-7-2012 (390926)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201202/msg00000.html>

Subject: Groups - ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-csprd02-jec-revisions.zip uploaded

From: James Cabral<jcabral@mtgmc.com>

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Tue, 7 Feb 2012 09:55:38 -0800 (PST)

Document Name: ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-csprd02-jec-revisions.zip

Description

Minor corrections in response to public review feedback on CSD02/PRD02 of

the ECF 4.0 Web Services SIP Specification

Download Latest Revision

Public Download Link

Submitter: Mr. James Cabral

Group: OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing TC

Folder: Specifications

Date submitted: 2012-02-07 09:55:32

Revision: 1

2-7-2012 (390927)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201202/msg00001.html>

Subject: Groups - ecf-spec-v4.01-csprd02-jec-revisions.zip uploaded

From: James Cabral<jcabral@mtgmc.com>

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Tue, 7 Feb 2012 10:04:41 -0800 (PST)

Document Name: ecf-spec-v4.01-csprd02-jec-revisions.zip

Description

Minor corrections in response to public review feedback on CSPRD02 of the

ECF 4.0 Core Specification

Download Latest Revision

Public Download Link

Submitter: Mr. James Cabral

Group: OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing TC

Folder: Specifications

Date submitted: 2012-02-07 10:04:31

Revision: 1

Note: The email above may only be related to the main ECF specification (i.e., v4.01) and not the Web Services Sip v2.01.

3-16-2012 (393271)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201203/msg00001.html>

Subject: Issues with the requests for public review

From: Chet Ensign <chet.ensign@oasis-open.org>

To: James E Cabral <jcabral@mtgmc.com>, ECF List <legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org>

Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2012 15:23:31 -0400

Hi Jim,

We started work on the two ECF requests, 15-Day Committee

Specification Draft Public Review Request for OASIS LegalXML

Electronic Court Filing TC

(<http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/TCADMIN-874>) and 15-Day

Committee Specification Draft Public Review Request for Electronic

Court Filing 4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile Version 2.01

(<http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/TCADMIN-875>) and we have

run into some issues that I need to review with you all.

1) The approvals in the minutes simply say: "Jim Cabral has updated

ECF 4.01 core and web service SIP specifications– we need to approve

as revised committee specifications. A vote was held to approve the

revised committee specifications as noted above and the motion to

approve was passed."

I need to have the URL to the document(s) being approved in Kavi

included documentation of motions to approve working drafts for

processing and the same URLs included in the ticket. That way, anyone

who wants to follow the steps in a spec's development can connect the

dots from what the TC approved to what we ultimate publish in the

OASIS Library. Language like...

"Does the TC approve updated ECF 4.01 core (contained in

<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/45046/ecf-spec-v4.01-csprd02-jec-revisions.zip>)

and web service SIP specifications (contained in

<http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/download.php/45045/ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-csprd02-jec-revi>)

as Committee Specification Drafts and further approve releasing them

for public review? A vote was held to approve the revised committee

specifications as noted above and the motion to approve was passed."

… will meet my need perfectly and make sure that everyone can follow

what the TC has voted upon.

2) The document provided for ECF 4.01 core

(<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/45046/ecf-spec-v4.01-csprd02-jec-revisions.zip>)

contains the doc file from the last public review with change control

turned on. Please in future send me final copy with all changes

accepted. I have a hard and fast rule not to touch the content

prepared by the TC so that there is never any confusion about where

changes to that content came from. If I accept all the changes and

subsequently a problem is found in the content, the question of where

the problem came from is muddied by my having touched the file.

In addition, you used the same filename as the last public review

which makes it more confusing for me to keep this copy clear from its

predecessor. Please in future use a new name with -wd## so it is

clearly labelled as a TC working draft and not a file produced by us.

E.g. ecf-spec-v4.01-wd02-jec-revisions.doc.

Last, you included a -diff.pdf, html and pdf files and some others.

Please only provide us with the editable source and other related

files (xsds, etc.) that are actually part of the specification.

Otherwise, I have to throw out files and risk throwing out something

that you intend to be part of the specification. Such as the

metadata.xml.

For this release, I will throw out the html, pdf, -diff.pdf and

~angelog.doc and assume that all the other folders and files are

intended as part of your specification. But I really don't like doing

this lest I throw out something by accident that you intended to be

included.

3) The document provided for Web Service SIP specifications

(ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-csprd02.doc) appears to be identical to

the version that was publicly reviewed last October. I ran a file

compare and found no differences. Is that correct? If so, why send it

for another round of public review?

4) I need to have the the Committee Specification Draft ticket as well

as the Public Review ticket in my queue to cover both actions -

creating the csd and creating the csprd and launching the public

review.

So, to recap:

1. Please enter the Committee Spec Draft tickets for me at

http://www.oasis-open.org/resources/tc-admin-requests/committee-specification-draft-creation-upload-request

2. For ECF Core, I will accept all changes to the .doc file, throw out

the pdf, html and -diff.pdf and prepare a CSPRD for public review.

Going forward, please accept all changes and send me a finished

document and only the other component files that are part of the spec.

3. For Web Services, please let me know if there is really a need to

proceed with the public review. If the wsdl is the only file that has

changed, I don't see a need to do that.

4. Going forward, please create a new copy of the spec with a new

working draft filename and include that and associated files in your

ZIP. You don't need to create HTML, PDF or -diff files as we do that

ourselves.

5. Going forward, please include the link to the URL in Kavi in your

motions when you approve work products to be processed to CSD or other

stages so that I have that connect-the-dots linkage in the public

record.

Apologies for the length of this but it has taken Paul and I both

several hours to sort this all out and I want to help you avoid any

delays in processing your requests in the future.

Please let me know if you have any questions on any of this.

Best,

/chet

----------------

Chet Ensign

Director of Standards Development and TC Administration

OASIS: Advancing open standards for the information society

http://www.oasis-open.org

3-19-2012 (393278)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201203/msg00002.html>

Subject: RE: Issues with the requests for public review

From: James E Cabral <jcabral@mtgmc.com>

To: Chet Ensign <chet.ensign@oasis-open.org>, ECF List <legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org>

Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2012 22:51:08 +0000

Chet,

I submitted the CSD requests. Based on your recommendation, we can skip the public review of the web services SIP.

I apologize for leaving the link to ZIP files out of the agenda and minutes. I wasn't sure how you wanted to handle the PDF and HTML or the tracked changes. Please accept the changes and replace the PDFs and HTMLs with the updated versions.

I appreciate the specific recommendations for going forward. We'll do better in the future.

Thanks,

Jim Cabral

MTG Management Consultants, L.L.C.

3-19-2012 (393371)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201203/msg00003.html>

Subject: Re: Issues with the requests for public review

From: Chet Ensign <chet.ensign@oasis-open.org>

To: James E Cabral <jcabral@mtgmc.com>

Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2012 13:45:32 -0400

Jim, ok. I will do the following today.

- I will close the request for a CSD and Public Review for the Web

Services SIP since it appears that the draft specification has not

changed.

- I will produce an updated ECF csprd and put that out for public

review. That should be started by tomorrow.

Thanks,

/chet

1-8-2013 (410265)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201301/msg00006.html>

Subject: MQ SIP (410265)

From: James E Cabral <jcabral@mtgmc.com>

To: "Gary Graham (GGraham@courts.az.gov)" <GGraham@courts.az.gov>

Date: Tue, 8 Jan 2013 17:56:13 +0000

Gary,

Thanks for volunteering to help finish drafting the MQ SIP. Here's the latest version of the MQ SIP and associated documents that I have. Although it is labeled a Committee Draft, it was never approved by the TC so it officially remains a Working Draft. You will see references to needing message samples - hopefully the samples Sergeui provided will work for that.

As an example of a complete SIP, you may want to refer to the web services SIP:

<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43733/ecf-v4.0-webservices-v2.01-csprd02.zip>

James E. Cabral Jr., Partner

MTG Management Consultants, L.L.C.

1111 Third Avenue, Suite 3010

Seattle, Washington 98101-3292

www.mtgmc.com

(206) 442-5010 Phone

(502) 509-4532 Mobile

(206) 442-5011 Fax

jcabral@mtgmc.com

Helping our clients make a difference in the lives of the people they serve.

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

Attachment: ecf-v4 0-MQ-SIP-cd01.doc

Description: ecf-v4 0-MQ-SIP-cd01.doc

Attachment: MQ SIP.pptx

Description: MQ SIP.ppt

9-24-2013 (428855)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201309/msg00059.html>

Subject: Groups - Action Item "Update Web Service SIP 2.01" added

From: James Cabral<jec@mtgmc.com>

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Tue, 24 Sep 2013 21:52:59 -0700 (PDT)

Action Item Subject: Update Web Service SIP 2.01

Item Number: #0042

Description

Update Web Services SIP 2.01 with changes identified by Bob Slaski, Open Networks. Specifically:

- Publish it as an GRA SSP

- Link to UBL 2.1 consistently

- Link to ECF 4.01 consistently

- Replace references to WS-Reliability, etc. with simple reference to WS-I Basic Profile 1.1 (confirm version #)

Owner: Mr. James Cabral

Status: Open

Priority: High

Due Date: 07 Oct 2013

Referenced Items

OASIS ECF TC Preliminary Springboard Findings.pptx (344K) 2013-09-20 Download | View Details

BaltimoreECF TC Mtg Minutes 092013.docx (24K) 2013-09-24 Download | View Details

10-16-2013 (430806)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201310/msg00021.html>

Subject: RE: ECF WS SIP and Reliability

From: James E Cabral <jec@mtgmc.com>

To: Bob Slaski <slaski.bob@gmail.com>, Scott Serich <Scott.Serich@ijis.org>

Date: Wed, 16 Oct 2013 14:14:19 +0000

Bob and Scott,

FYI. Please find links to drafts of ECF 4.01 Errata 01 and the ECF WS SIP that address all feedback the TC has received from Springboard to date. The TC will wait to finish and approve these changes to allow for more feedback from Springboard.

ECF 4.01 Errata 01

<https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?document_id=51046&wg_abbrev=legalxml-courtfiling>

ECF WS SIP

<https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?document_id=51051&wg_abbrev=legalxml-courtfiling>

Thanks,

Jim Cabral

MTG Management Consultants, L.L.C.

3-10-2014 (440257)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201403/msg00004.html>

Subject: Groups - Action Item "ECF 4.01 - WDL soapAction" added

From: James Cabral<jec@mtgmc.com>

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 2014 14:54:53 -0700 (PDT)

Action Item Subject: ECF 4.01 - WDL soapAction

Item Number: #0054

Description

The empty WSDL ?soapAction? is acceptable when the web service relies on simple url-based addressing. If the web service leverages WS-Addressing (WSA), however, an empty ?soapAction? will cause web service communication issues because the ?wsa:Action? element is required and cannot be empty.

Owner: Mr. James Cabral

Status: Open

Priority: Medium

Due Date: 11 Mar 2014

Comments

Mr. James Cabral 2014-03-10 21:54 UTC

? Update the ECF v4.0 WSDL to include a soapAction value that is unique across the service definition.

o Consider using a \\ naming syntax:

? ?urn:oasis:names:tc:legalxml-courtfiling:wsdl:WebServicesProfile-Definitions-4.0\FilingReviewMDEPort\ReviewFiling?

? Since the ECF v4.0 WS SIP references specifications, such as Reliable Messaging, that include WS-Addressing, we recommend updating the WS-I Basic Profile reference from 1.1 to a newer version (1.2 or 2.0), which includes WS-Addressing.

? If the soapAction is added to the WSDL, existing sites will need to update their service definition to use the new WSDL.

3-10-2014 (440278)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201403/msg00016.html>

Subject: Groups - Action Item "ECF 4.01 - Update Web Service SIP 2.01" Closed

From: James Cabral<jec@mtgmc.com>

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 2014 19:59:07 -0700 (PDT)

Action Item Subject: ECF 4.01 - Update Web Service SIP 2.01

Item Number: #0042

Description

Update Web Services SIP 2.01 with changes identified by Bob Slaski, Open Networks. Specifically:

- Link to UBL 2.1 consistently

- Link to ECF 4.01 consistently

- Replace references to WS-Reliability, etc. with simple reference to WS-I Basic Profile 1.1 (confirm version #)

Owner: Mr. James Cabral

Status: Closed

Priority: High

Due Date: 07 Oct 2013

Referenced Items

OASIS ECF TC Preliminary Springboard Findings.pptx (344K) 2013-09-20 Download | View Details

BaltimoreECF TC Mtg Minutes 092013.docx (24K) 2013-09-24 Download | View Details

ECF 4.01 - ECF SSP 2012-06-12 View Details

3-10-2014 (440279)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201403/msg00017.html>

Subject: Groups - Action Item "ECF 4.01 QA - WSDL soapAction" Closed

From: James Cabral<jec@mtgmc.com>

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 2014 20:04:00 -0700 (PDT)

Action Item Subject: ECF 4.01 QA - WSDL soapAction

Item Number: #0054

Description

The empty WSDL ?soapAction? is acceptable when the web service relies on simple url-based addressing. If the web service leverages WS-Addressing (WSA), however, an empty ?soapAction? will cause web service communication issues because the ?wsa:Action? element is required and cannot be empty.

Owner: Mr. James Cabral

Status: Closed

Priority: Medium

Due Date: 11 Mar 2014

Comments

Mr. James Cabral 2014-03-10 21:54 UTC

? Update the ECF v4.0 WSDL to include a soapAction value that is unique across the service definition.

o Consider using a \\ naming syntax:

? ?urn:oasis:names:tc:legalxml-courtfiling:wsdl:WebServicesProfile-Definitions-4.0\FilingReviewMDEPort\ReviewFiling?

? Since the ECF v4.0 WS SIP references specifications, such as Reliable Messaging, that include WS-Addressing, we recommend updating the WS-I Basic Profile reference from 1.1 to a newer version (1.2 or 2.0), which includes WS-Addressing.

? If the soapAction is added to the WSDL, existing sites will need to update their service definition to use the new WSDL.

Mr. James Cabral 2014-03-11 03:04 UTC

Updated the soapActions in each of the bindings in the ECF SSP v4.01

7-14-2014 (448643)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201407/msg00039.html>

Subject: Groups - Action Item "ECF 4.01 - ECF SSP" Modified

From: James Cabral<jec@mtgmc.com>

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Mon, 14 Jul 2014 23:26:51 -0700 (PDT)

Action Item Subject: ECF 4.01 - ECF SSP

Item Number: #0005

Description

Jim Harris will contact Jim Douglas at SEARCH to obtain the latest version of the GRA Service Specification Package (SSP) for ECF.

Owner: Mr. Jim Harris

Status: Open

Priority: Medium

Due Date: 11 Aug 2014

Comments

Mr. Jim Harris 2013-06-11 15:34 UTC

This task was tabled for a time after the IJIS Springboard initiative indicated a preference to use the actual OASIS specs rather than GRA SSP(s). However, the TC decided it would still be useful to proceed with this effort. Jim Harris will coordinate with Jim Cabral, Jim Douglas, Joe Mierwa and Di Graski to assist with next steps and an action plan for completing the SSP(s). Updates will be shared in monthly TC calls, but setting target date for completion before the September F2F.

Mr. Jim Harris 2013-10-08 21:14 UTC

Posted draft SSP with all current ECF artifacts organized in appropriate locations within the SSP structure. Need to finish the SSP SID and SIDD documents, and update as needed with ECF WS-SIP updates arising from Springboard feedback. Changing due date to target completion by Oct 31, 2013.

Referenced Items

ECF GRA Assessment and Alignment (89K) 2012-10-23 Download | View Details

ECF 4.01 - Update Web Service SIP 2.01 2013-09-25 View Details

ECF\_SSP\_v\_4.01.0 (4MB) 2013-10-08 Download | View Details

10-16-2014 (453239)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201410/msg00004.html>

Subject: Groups - ECF\_SSP\_v\_4.01.1.zip uploaded

From: James Cabral<jec@mtgmc.com>

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Thu, 16 Oct 2014 20:29:16 -0700 (PDT)

Document Name: ECF\_SSP\_v\_4.01.1.zip

Description

Updates to the ECF 4.01 Web Services SIP that includes:

- Provision of soapAction for each binding in the WSDL

- PaymentMessage is now optional ReviewFiling message in WSDL

- Revisions to use of SOAPfaults

- Inclusion of SOAP samples

- Reorganized to follow latest GRA Service Specification Guidelines

Download Latest Revision

Public Download Link

Submitter: Mr. James Cabral

Group: OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing TC

Folder: Specifications

Date submitted: 2014-10-16 20:28:54

Revision: 2

10-16-2014 (453240)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201410/msg00005.html>

Subject: Groups - Action Item "ECF 4.01 - ECF SSP" Modified

From: James Cabral<jec@mtgmc.com>

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Thu, 16 Oct 2014 20:32:38 -0700 (PDT)

Action Item Subject: ECF 4.01 - ECF SSP

Item Number: #0005

Description

Jim Harris will contact Jim Douglas at SEARCH to obtain the latest version of the GRA Service Specification Package (SSP) for ECF.

Owner: Mr. Jim Harris

Status: Open

Priority: Medium

Due Date: 11 Aug 2014

Comments

Mr. Jim Harris 2013-06-11 15:34 UTC

This task was tabled for a time after the IJIS Springboard initiative indicated a preference to use the actual OASIS specs rather than GRA SSP(s). However, the TC decided it would still be useful to proceed with this effort. Jim Harris will coordinate with Jim Cabral, Jim Douglas, Joe Mierwa and Di Graski to assist with next steps and an action plan for completing the SSP(s). Updates will be shared in monthly TC calls, but setting target date for completion before the September F2F.

Mr. Jim Harris 2013-10-08 21:14 UTC

Posted draft SSP with all current ECF artifacts organized in appropriate locations within the SSP structure. Need to finish the SSP SID and SIDD documents, and update as needed with ECF WS-SIP updates arising from Springboard feedback. Changing due date to target completion by Oct 31, 2013.

Mr. James Cabral 2014-10-17 03:32 UTC

I updated the ECF 4.01 SSP to include SOAP samples and to align with the most recent GRA Service Specification Guidelines. The only remaining tasks should be to finish the ECF Service Description Document (SDD) and ECF Service Interface Description Document (SIDD).

Referenced Items

ECF GRA Assessment and Alignment (89K) 2012-10-23 Download | View Details

ECF 4.01 - Update Web Service SIP 2.01 2013-09-25 View Details

ECF\_SSP\_v\_4.01.0 (4MB) 2013-10-08 Download | View Details

ECF\_SSP\_v\_4.01.1.zip (4MB) 2014-10-16 Download | View Details

6-9-2015 (45376)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201505/msg00001.html>

Subject: WS SIP SOAP samples

From: James E Cabral <jec@mtgmc.com>

To: Gary Graham <GGraham@courts.az.gov>

Date: Tue, 9 Jun 2015 21:53:49 +0000

Gary,

On the TC call today, you reported an incompatibility between Section 2.5 of the WS SIP specification and at least some of the SOAP samples, including GetCaseRequest.soap. I’m hoping you elaborate more on what you see as the incompatibility. The relevant snippets are included below. Are you saying that you would expect to see “GetCaseRequest” instead of “CaseQueryMessage” inside of the soapenv:Body?

-------------------------------

WS SIP Section 2.5:

Each message transmission MUST identify the operation being invoked within the SOAP Body only; the (qualified) operation name MUST be the qualified name of the first child element of the SOAP body element, as called for in section 7.1 of the [SOAP 1.1] specification.

An MDE implementation MAY allow message transmissions that include a SOAPAction HTTP header.

In compliance with the [WSI-I BP 1.1] specification, a receiving MDE MAY NOT rely on the value of the SOAPAction HTTP header in processing the message.

-----------------------------

GetCaseRequest.soap:

<soapenv:Envelope xmlns:soapenv="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/soap/envelope/">

<soapenv:Header xmlns:wsa="http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing">

<wsse:Security soapenv:mustUnderstand="1" xmlns:wsse="http://docs.oasis-open.org/wss/2004/01/oasis-200401-wss-wssecurity-secext-1.0.xsd" xmlns:wsu="http://docs.oasis-open.org/wss/2004/01/oasis-200401-wss-wssecurity-utility-1.0.xsd">

…

</wsse:Security>

<wsa:Action>urn:oasis:names:tc:legalxml-courtfiling:wsdl:WebServicesProfile-Definitions-4.0\CourtRecordMDEPort\GetCase</wsa:Action>

<wsa:ReplyTo>

<wsa:Address>https://JEC-SURFACEPRO2:8080/mockFilingAssemblyMDEPortSOAPBinding</wsa:Address>

</wsa:ReplyTo>

<wsa:MessageID>uuid:48a86134-9712-451b-a4ee-036d408b4f07</wsa:MessageID>

<wsa:To>https://JEC-SURFACEPRO2/mockCourtRecordMDEPortSOAPBinding</wsa:To>

</soapenv:Header>

<soapenv:Body wsu:Id="id-53204E93D7C96443EC141342618529211" xmlns:wsu="http://docs.oasis-open.org/wss/2004/01/oasis-200401-wss-wssecurity-utility-1.0.xsd">

<CaseQueryMessage xsi:schemaLocation="urn:oasis:names:tc:legalxml-courtfiling:schema:xsd:CaseQueryMessage-4.0 ../../schemas/information/message/ECF-4.0-CaseQueryMessage.xsd" xmlns="urn:oasis:names:tc:legalxml-courtfiling:schema:xsd:CaseQueryMessage-4.0" xmlns:ecf="urn:oasis:names:tc:legalxml-courtfiling:schema:xsd:CommonTypes-4.0" xmlns:j="http://niem.gov/niem/domains/jxdm/4.0" xmlns:nc="http://niem.gov/niem/niem-core/2.0" xmlns:xsi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance">

…

</CaseQueryMessage>

</soapenv:Body>

</soapenv:Envelope>

\_\_

Jim Cabral

6-9-2015 (465386) Reply

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201506/msg00006.html>

Subject: RE: WS SIP SOAP samples

From: "Graham, Gary" <GGraham@courts.az.gov>

To: James E Cabral <jec@mtgmc.com>

Date: Tue, 9 Jun 2015 16:20:42 -0700

See below

From: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org [mailto:legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org] On Behalf Of James E Cabral

Sent: Tuesday, June 09, 2015 2:54 PM

To: Graham, Gary

Cc: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Subject: [legalxml-courtfiling] WS SIP SOAP samples

Gary,

On the TC call today, you reported an incompatibility between Section 2.5 of the WS SIP specification and at least some of the SOAP samples, including GetCaseRequest.soap. I’m hoping you elaborate more on what you see as the incompatibility. The relevant snippets are included below. Are you saying that you would expect to see “GetCaseRequest” instead of “CaseQueryMessage” inside of the soapenv:Body? No, there are no ECF operations named GetCaseRequest or CaseQueryMessage. However there is an operation named GetCase that takes CaseQueryMessage as a parameter (see C.3.1 of the ECF specification). Hence, the first child element of <soapenv:Body> MUST be GetCase since ‘GetCase’ is the operation name.

6-11-2015 (465453)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201506/msg00007.html>

Subject: Re: WS SIP SOAP samples

From: James E Cabral <jec@mtgmc.com>

To: Gary Graham <GGraham@courts.az.gov>

Date: Thu, 11 Jun 2015 15:21:11 +0000

ECF TC,

It appears that we have 2 normative parts of the ECF 4.01 Web Services SIP that are in conflict with each other - the WSDLs and Section 2.5 of the specification. As Gary summarizes below, the naming of the first element in the soap Body as defined in the WSDLs is inconsistent with Section 2.5 and the SOAP specification.

In ECF 5.0, we should plan to update the WSDLs to conform with the SOAP specification. The question is which fix to the ECF 4.01 WS SIP will cause the minimum disruption to existing implementations and the Springboard testing framework. Here are 2 options:

Update the WSDLs (and possibly the schemas in the Core Specification) so that the names of the messages defined in the WSDL (and/or schemas) align with the operations named in the specification.

Update the WS SIP specification to relax the requirements in Section 2.5 about element naming. If necessary, we could provide a mapping between operation names and the schema/WDSL elements.

Are there other options?

Which would be least disruptive to existing implementations of the ECF 4.01 WS SIP?

\_\_

Jim Cabral

6-10-2015 (465483)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201506/msg00008.html>

Subject: Re: [legalxml-courtfiling] Re: WS SIP SOAP samples

From: James E Cabral <jec@mtgmc.com>

To: Eric Eastman <eric@greenfiling.com>

Date: Wed, 10 Jun 2015 19:37:45 +0000

Eric,

The latest version of the SIP is the zip file attached to action item 60.

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/members/action_item.php?action_item_id=3449>

The document we are referencing is the original SIP document included in the SSP zip at the following location:

artifacts\various artifacts\ecf-v4.0-webservice=v2.01-csprd03

Note: it is not clear what “action item 60” is. Action #0060 is “ECF 5.0 – validate or improve approach to extensions”. The URL references Action Item 3449.

\_\_

Jim Cabral

502 509-4532

From: Eric Eastman

Sent: ‎Wednesday‎, ‎June‎ ‎10‎, ‎2015 ‎3‎:‎19‎ ‎PM

To: James E Cabral

Cc: Gary Graham, legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Gary, Jim,

I downloaded ECF\_SSP\_v\_4.01.1.zip from the OASIS website. That contains the WSDL and XSD, samples and more but it doesn't seem to contain the Document where you are quoting Section 2.5. Should it? Exactly which version of which document are we talking about?

Comparing the WSDL & schema from the SSP to the contents of this email, the sample XML conforms to the WSDL (visual comparison, I may have missed something)

This section of the WSDL:

<message name="GetCaseRequest">

<part name="CaseQueryMessage" element="casequery:CaseQueryMessage"/>

</message>

specifies that the "GetCaseRequest" message (the input parameter to the GetCase operation) is implemented by the "CaseQueryMessage" xml element.

Section 7.1 of SOAP1.1 does seem to back up the wording of Section 2.5 quoted above. However it would be a major undertaking and a disruptive change to bring our WSDL into compliance with 2.5. I don't think any of our operations currently follow that convention.

<http://www.w3.org/TR/2000/NOTE-SOAP-20000508/#_Toc478383533>

Here are a couple tiny (by SOAP/WSDL standards) examples.

<http://www.w3.org/2001/03/14-annotated-WSDL-examples.html>

My suggestion: Delete section 2.5 in it's entirety. It's better to say nothing than to say wrong things. Create an action item for 5.0 to make some intentional choices in this area.

Eric

6-10-2015 (465486)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201506/msg00009.html>

Subject: RE: WS SIP SOAP samples

From: "Graham, Gary" <GGraham@courts.az.gov>

To: James E Cabral <jec@mtgmc.com>

Date: Wed, 10 Jun 2015 13:00:35 -0700

I do not think that relaxing the wording in section 2.5 of the WebServices SIP is the correct answer.

Even though Appendix C is non-normative it is correct (the TC has discussed making it normative in ECF 5). Even though Appendix C is currently non-normative, the operation names are normative.

This issue was raised previously (see attached email). The answer you provided was:

“The names of the operations are defined in the main body of the core specification so the names are normative.”

I understand that element names consistent with ECF operation names are not defined in ECF provided schema. Hence it is incumbent upon implementers to define these in local exchange schema or perhaps in wsdl. This is the approach we have taken in Arizona working with efiling vendors.

The requirement expressed in section 2.5 (Request and Operation Invocation) goes back a long way and is unrevised since ECF 3 with the Web Services Messaging Profile 1.0 (Nov. 15, 2005). Compliant implementers would be undoubtedly harmed by such a revision. Such an approach should also harm the Test Bench ECF certification testing.

I do not think that section 2.5 was carelessly worded or mis-worded. As noted, section 2.5 states:

Each message transmission MUST identify the operation being invoked within the SOAP Body only; the (qualified) operation name MUST be the qualified name of the first child element of the SOAP body element, as called for in section 7.1 of the [SOAP 1.1] specification.

This requirement is reinforced in the referenced section 7.1 of SOAP 1.1 which provides (highlighting added):

SOAP 1.1 –section 7.1 RPC and SOAP Body:

“RPC method calls and responses are both carried in the SOAP Body element (see section 4.3) using the following representation:

* A method invocation is modelled as a struct.
* The method invocation is viewed as a single struct containing an accessor for each [in] or [in/out] parameter. The struct is both named and typed identically to the method name.
* Each [in] or [in/out] parameter is viewed as an accessor, with a name corresponding to the name of the parameter and type corresponding to the type of the parameter. These appear in the same order as in the method signature.
* A method response is modelled as a struct.
* The method response is viewed as a single struct containing an accessor for the return value and each [out] or [in/out] parameter. The first accessor is the return value followed by the parameters in the same order as in the method signature.
* Each parameter accessor has a name corresponding to the name of the parameter and type corresponding to the type of the parameter. The name of the return value accessor is not significant. Likewise, the name of the struct is not significant. However, a convention is to name it after the method name with the string "Response" appended.
* A method fault is encoded using the SOAP Fault element (see section 4.4). If a protocol binding adds additional rules for fault \_expression\_, those also MUST be followed.

As noted above, method and response structs can be encoded according to the rules in section 5, or other encodings can be specified using the encodingStyle attribute (see section 4.1.1).

Applications MAY process requests with missing parameters but also MAY return a fault.

Because a result indicates success and a fault indicates failure, it is an error for the method response to contain both a result and a fault.”

If as you suggest there are only two alternatives for correction (e.g. “relax wording”, or “update schemas”) then I suggest we should pursue the latter (i.e. “update schemas”).

Gary Graham

Arizona Supreme Court

6-11-2015 (456616)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201506/msg00012.html>

Subject: Fw: [legalxml-courtfiling] Re: WS SIP SOAP samples

From: James E Cabral <jec@mtgmc.com>

To: "legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org" <legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org>

Date: Thu, 11 Jun 2015 18:12:20 +0000

I’m forwarding Eric’s response.

\_\_

Jim Cabral

502 509-4532

From: Eric Eastman

Sent: ‎Thursday‎, ‎June‎ ‎11‎, ‎2015 ‎1‎:‎34‎ ‎PM

To: James E Cabral

JIm,

I still can't reply to list. I'm working with OASIS, but they are not responsive.

I did some more research and I may have been wrong. I'm looking into it more, but I think that wrapper element MAY be added automatically when the server publishes the webservice. Unfortunately I have a LOT of experience consuming webservices but much less publishing them (I prefer more RESTful approach to webservices when I have control). It may be early next week before I can get back to it, but it's possible that the example just needs an extra element.

Eric

6-15-2015 (465749)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201506/msg00013.html>

Subject: RE: [legalxml-courtfiling] Re: WS SIP SOAP samples

From: "Graham, Gary" <GGraham@courts.az.gov>

To: James E Cabral <jec@mtgmc.com>, "legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org" <legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org>

Date: Mon, 15 Jun 2015 08:46:34 -0700

The wsdl binding that provides the operation name as a wrapper element is the document/literal wrapped pattern. This pattern appears to be the only approach that is both conformant with WS-I Basic Profile 1.1 and section 2.5 of the WebServices specification. It appears that some modifications will be needed to the wsdl to provide this pattern (e.g. the wrapper element is not automatically added). The attached document shows the wsdl modifications that would need to be made to support the document/literal wrapped pattern.

Gary Graham

7-6-2015 (467200)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201507/msg00001.html>

Subject: FW: Web Services SIP Follow-Up Inquiry

From: "Price, Jim" <JPrice@courts.az.gov>

To: "legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org" <legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org>

Date: Mon, 6 Jul 2015 12:45:02 -0700

All,

Gary raised an issue during the June 2015 TC conference call indicating that there was a conflict between two normative parts of the ECF 4.01 Web Services SIP specification: the WSDLs and Section 2.5 of the 4.01 specification. To address the conflict and minimize the disruption to existing implementations and the Springboard testing framework, Jim Cabral suggested:

Updating the WSDLs (and possibly the schemas in the Core Specification) so that the names of the messages defined in the WSDL (and/or schemas) align with the operations named in the specification; and/or

Updating the WS SIP specification by relaxing the requirements in Section 2.5 of the 4.01 specification about element naming. If necessary, we could provide a mapping between operation names and the schema/WDSL elements.

Following the June 2015 conference call, Gary provided a document titled “ECF Web Services SIP Operation Invocation” that provided a specific example addressing Jim’s first suggestion outlined above showing the WSDL modification necessary to support a ‘document/literal wrapped’ pattern that would make the WSDL conformant with section 2.5 of the Web Services SIP. (see attached)

There have been no further conversations among the TC on the topic since Gary distributed his write-up. Is Gary’s proposal the course of action that the TC should be adopting?

Thanks,

Jim

10-2-2015 (472587)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201510/msg00020.html>

Subject: Groups - Action Item "ECF 4.01 - ECF SSP" Modified

From: James Cabral<jec@mtgmc.com>

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Fri, 2 Oct 2015 07:35:18 -0700 (PDT)

Action Item Subject: ECF 4.01 - ECF SSP

Item Number: #0005

Description

Development of Global Service Specification Package (SSP) pursuant to SSP Guidelines and using Global provided SSP templates.

Owner: Mr. Jim Harris

Status: Open

Priority: High

Due Date: 10 Nov 2015

Comments

Mr. Jim Harris 2013-06-11 15:34 UTC

This task was tabled for a time after the IJIS Springboard initiative indicated a preference to use the actual OASIS specs rather than GRA SSP(s). However, the TC decided it would still be useful to proceed with this effort. Jim Harris will coordinate with Jim Cabral, Jim Douglas, Joe Mierwa and Di Graski to assist with next steps and an action plan for completing the SSP(s). Updates will be shared in monthly TC calls, but setting target date for completion before the September F2F.

Mr. Jim Harris 2013-10-08 21:14 UTC

Posted draft SSP with all current ECF artifacts organized in appropriate locations within the SSP structure. Need to finish the SSP SID and SIDD documents, and update as needed with ECF WS-SIP updates arising from Springboard feedback. Changing due date to target completion by Oct 31, 2013.

Mr. James Cabral 2014-10-17 03:32 UTC

I updated the ECF 4.01 SSP to include SOAP samples and to align with the most recent GRA Service Specification Guidelines. The only remaining tasks should be to finish the ECF Service Description Document (SDD) and ECF Service Interface Description Document (SIDD).

Mr. Jim Harris 2015-03-10 16:59 UTC

Revising SDD to break out business process flows and scenarios into separate business process description document (BPDD) and ZIP file as called for in most recent SSP templates.

Mr. Jim Harris 2015-04-14 13:21 UTC

Posted draft SDD for 4.01 SSP. Most of the content was simply copied from the core spec and reorganized to follow v1.0 of the SSP SDD template. After any edits/updates, we?ll replace the template version that was already in the ECF SSP as a placeholder. I?ve got a couple of questions about the SIDD we can discuss during today?s call. For ECF 5, we?ll want to use the 1.1 SDD template and a separate business process documentation package. This will work better anyway if we refactor (as one would actually do for implementation) into multiple services and, hence, multiple SSPs.

Mr. Jim Harris 2015-05-12 06:03 UTC

Posted updates to draft SDD and SIDD for 4.01 SSP. Also replaced corresponding draft documents in the 4.01.1 SSP ZIP file.

Mr. Jim Harris 2015-05-26 16:11 UTC

Added new SDD 1.0.1 draft (see referenced items in TC Action Item #5) with changes to reference Core Spec and WS-SIP documents where appropriate and remove redundant narrative. Working on similar updates to SIDD now. Will post SIDD and updated SSP zip file later today.

Mr. Jim Harris 2015-05-27 00:09 UTC

The following updates have been applied:

- Replaced SDD 1.0.1 draft with minor corrections to draft posted earlier today.

- Added new SIDD 1.0.1 draft with changes to reference Core Spec and WS-SIP documents where appropriate and suggestions from the TC.

- Replaced the SSP (ECF\_SSP\_v\_4.01.1) containing latest versions of the SDD and SIDD.

Referenced Items

ECF GRA Assessment and Alignment (89K) 2012-10-23 Download | View Details

ECF 4.01 - Update Web Service SIP 2.01 2013-09-25 View Details

ECF\_SSP\_v\_4.01.0 (4MB) 2013-10-08 Download | View Details

ECF\_SDD\_v\_1.0.0.doc (456K) 2015-05-11 Download | View Details

ECF\_SIDD\_v\_1.0.0.doc (101K) 2015-05-11 Download | View Details

ECF\_SDD\_v\_1.0.1.doc (200K) 2015-05-26 Download | View Details

ECF\_SIDD\_v\_1.0.1.doc (110K) 2015-05-26 Download | View Details

ECF\_SSP\_v\_4.01.1.zip (5MB) 2015-05-26 Download | View Details

3-3-2016 (481826)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201603/msg00000.html>

Subject: Groups - ECF-4.0-WebServicesProfile-Definitions(new).wsdl uploaded

From: Jim Harris<jharris@ncsc.org>

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Thu, 3 Mar 2016 08:22:03 -0800 (PST)

Submitter's message

This is an updated version of the WSDL from version 2.1 of the ECF Web Services SIP. It's been updated to conform with section 2.5 of the ECF WS-SIP specification document. The WSDL is provided here as requested in the Feb 09 TC conference call to solicit assistance from TC members in generating sample SOAP messages to help with confirming expected outcomes. Note, this version of the WSDL includes previous code that was revised as comments. These will be removed in the updated SSP.

-- Mr. Jim Harris

Document Name: ECF-4.0-WebServicesProfile-Definitions(new).wsdl

Description

This is a draft of the WSDL from version 2.1 of the ECF Web Services SIP.

It's been updated to conform with section 2.5 of the ECF WS-SIP

specification document.

Download Latest Revision

Public Download Link

Submitter: Mr. Jim Harris

Group: OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing TC

Folder: Specifications

Date submitted: 2016-03-03 08:21:43

3-8-2016 (482072)

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/legalxml-courtfiling/email/archives/201603/msg00006.html>

Subject: Groups - Document/Literal Wrapped WSDL uploaded

From: Greg Zarkis<gzarkis@imagesoftinc.com>

To: legalxml-courtfiling@lists.oasis-open.org

Date: Tue, 8 Mar 2016 05:59:00 -0800 (PST)

Submitter's message

All-

I have uploaded a modified WSDL definition that follows a document/literal wrapped style. Some key updates from the existing WSDL:

\* Each operation has a "type" for the request and response message. This type has is implemented by an element with the operation name for the request and operation name + "Response" for the response.

\* I extracted the schema definition for the Web Service Profile types into it's own XSD and added an import to the WSDL definition file. This is something I end up doing often when working with other vendors to verify my outbound messages are schema-conformant, which also makes working with XMLSpy a lot easier. I would really like to see the SIP published this way.

\* Each operation now has a SOAP Action defined in the binding.

I ran a few brief tests creating proxies with SoapUI, the Wizdler extension for Chrome, as well as the .NET wsdl.exe tool. They all seemed to like the new definition, but I still would like to go through some more ?fine tooth? testing. If anyone from the "non- .NET side" of development could take a look and verify, it would be greatly appreciated. :)

Finally, I am interested in discussing how this new patter man (or may not) help in the future with needs such as modifying these request/response messages with additional elements, and remaining Springboard compliant. For example, adding a PaymentMessage to the RecordFiling operation by modifying the schema of the Message type rather than modifying the schema of a "sub type" of the Message.

Regards,

-Greg

-- Greg Zarkis

1. Confusingly, the current public review version of Web Services SIP v4.1 released for public review on 2-2-2023 is designated as csd01 and not as csprd01. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)