## Introduction

The feedback put forth within this document is based upon review of ECF 5 Working Draft 18.

Jim Cabral’s responses in green

## GetFilingAssemblyProviders

The ECF 5 IEPD Change Log indicates support for a new operation (GetFilingAssemblyProviders)

* 1. This new operation is not described in the ECF 5 Specification
  2. We do not see it included in the IEPD materials

Remove the reference in the Change Log

## Limited Electronic Service of Process

It seems that ECF 5’s inclusion of Limited eSOP should alter the language below (found on page 13 of the ECF Specification)

In addition to filing of court case documents, this specification supports “secondary service” – the delivery of copies of filed documents to persons who have already been made parties to a case. This specification does NOT support “primary service,” which entails the service of summonses, subpoenas, warrants and other documents that establish court jurisdiction over persons, making them parties to a case. Therefore, this specification does NOT support the following automated information exchanges:

* A query by a filer seeking from the court record system the names and addresses of parties in a new case who must be served to establish court jurisdiction over them in the new case
* Transmission of copies of or links to documents submitted for filing to any party in a new case or any newly added parties in an existing case, except in the electronic delivery of documents to a registered agent.

Amend the second sentence as follows:

This specification does NOT support “primary service,” which entails the service of summonses, subpoenas, warrants and other documents that establish court jurisdiction over persons, making them parties to a case, except through electronic delivery to registered agents through the ServeProcess operation described in Section 6.1.6.

## Document Stamp MDE

At question is whether a Document Stamp MDE is to exist. The Specification is ambiguous to this point at present due to conflicting information. It should be noted that the TC vacillated as to whether the document stamp operations should be contained within the Court Record MDE vs. a new Document Stamp MDE. This likely contributes to the present problem. **Per the January 10th 2017 meeting minutes, the TC decided that we do not need a separate MDE.**

On pages 20-21 the table reflects the existence of a Document Stamp MDE; However, the table includes the DocumentStampInformation() operation within both the Court Record MDE and the Document Stamp MDE. **Action Item: Remove the row for the Document Stamp MDE.**

Replace references to Document Stamp MDE with Court Record MDE

## Pass Through MDE

On page 16 the Specification currently states:

An MDE MAY provide an operation on behalf of another MDE. For instance, a Filing Review MDE may receive a GetCase operation from a Filing Assembly MDE, “pass through” the request to a Court Record MDE, and then “pass through” the response from the Court Record MDE back to the originating Filing Assembly MDE.

We believe this is confusing. For example, the reader may take this to mean that they should add a GetCase operation to their implementation of the Filing Review MDE, whereas we believe it would be more proper for the reader to implement the Court Record MDE. We recommend the following alternative verbiage:

Multiple systems MAY implement the same operation within a given MDE whereby one system “passes through” the request to another system. A likely use case for this is a hub/spoke topology where one system is serving as a hub through which multiple FilingAssemblyMDE providers are accessing multiple CourtRecordMDE providers. In such a scenario, the FilingAssemblyMDE system would invoke the CourtRecordMDE on the hub system, which would then “pass thru” the request by invoking the CourtRecordMDE on the appropriate court system. The hub would then “pass thru” the response from the court system to the system that made the original request.

Make this change

## Typographical Errors

We believe page 16 contains the following typographical error:

An MDE defines an information model and behavior model of a service as described in the **[SOA-RM]**. Not**e** that “service” in the service oriented architecture sense is not the same as the business function of “service of filing” used throughout in this document.

We believe page 17 contains the following typographical error:

At any point during or after the ReviewFiling ~~operationa~~ operation a party MAY access information through the following operations:

We believe page 34 contains the following typographical error in Section 6.1.16:

If this operation is enabled by court policy, a Filing Assembly MDE MAY ~~use~~ invoke the GetCourtSchedule operation on the Court Scheduling MDE to return the court schedule by participant, attorney or case.

Make these changes

## Incomplete Diagram

On page 19 the diagram appears to be slightly incomplete: the NotifyCourtDate operation invoked upon the Filing Assembly MDE by the Court Scheduling MDE lacks lines/directional indicators.

Regenerate the diagram to avoid the clipping

## Emphasis

We recommend a change to the following uppercase emphasis found on page 23. Specifically, it would be beneficial to uppercase “SHOULD NOT” as opposed to just “SHOULD”.

The case type and category associated with a filing SHOULD be indicated with the ecf:CaseTypeCode and ecf:CaseCategoryCode elements. The inclusion or lack of a case type augmentation in a filing message SHOULD NOT be considered an indicator of the case type and category associated with that filing.

Make this change

## Payment in NFRC

On page 34, we recommend simplifying the stated requirement as follows to avoid potential implementer specific scenarios:

If the filing included a payment~~, and the filing was accepted by the clerk and court record system,~~ a receipt for the payment MUST be included in the operation. The Filing Assembly MDE responds synchronously with a [cbrn:MessageStatus](file:///C:\Users\JamesECabral\OneDrive\xml\ecf5\schema\niem\domains\cbrn\3.2\cbrn.xsd) to acknowledge the callback message.

The proposed change does not address how to handle payment receipts if the filing is not accepted. I suggest leaving the current condition on acceptance but changing the MUST to SHOULD.

## Court Identifiers

On pages 35-36, we feel the specification goes too far in stipulating that the Court Identifiers include the Internet domain of the court administrator. In practice, the jurisdictional domain names vary greatly, can change over time (e.g. a court does not have its own domain, but uses the county’s domain, then moves to their own domain at a future date). Including such a requirement provides no added benefit while posing unnecessary overhead and risk to interoperability.

Court identifiers, labeled by nc:OrganizationIdentification/nc:IdentificationID, are locally assigned by the court administrator for a region (typically a state, provincial or federal court administrator) and MUST be universally unique to a court but not necessarily to a particular court house, branch or subunit of a court. Court identifiers MUST conform to following convention:

<Internet domain of the court administrator>:<unique identifier within the court system>.

Examples of conformant court identifiers include:

courts.wa.gov:superior.king

nmcourts.com:albd.civil

uscourts.gov:100

courts.gov.bc.ca:appeal

The only truly necessary requirement is that court identifiers be unique within the e-Filing ecosystem in which the court participates.

Make this change

## Assignment of Identifiers

On page 36-37, we recommend simplifying the stated requirements as follows.

Document identifiers, labeled by nc:DocumentIdentification/nc:IdentificationID within a nc:Document element ~~are assigned by the court record system and~~ MUST be unique within a court. The following is a non-normative example of a document with identifier “1”:

Event identifiers, labeled by nc:ActivityIdentification/nc:IdentificationID~~, are assigned by the court record system and~~ MUST be unique within a case. The following is a non-normative example of an event with identifier “10”:

Filing identifiers, labeled as nc:DocumentIdentification/nc:IdentificationID within a [cancel:CancelFilingMessage](file:///C:\Users\JamesECabral\OneDrive\xml\ecf5\comments\schema\cancel.xsd), [cbrn:MessageStatus](file:///C:\Users\JamesECabral\OneDrive\xml\ecf5\schema\niem\domains\cbrn\3.2\cbrn.xsd), [filing:FilingStatusRequest](file:///C:\Users\JamesECabral\OneDrive\xml\ecf5\schema\filingstatusrequest.xsd) or [filing:FilingStatusResponse](file:///C:\Users\JamesECabral\OneDrive\xml\ecf5\schema\filingstatusresponse.xsd) message, MUST be unique within a court ~~and will be generated by the court in response to a ReviewFiling operation~~. The following is a non-normative example of a filing with identifier “1”:

When operations are “passed thru”, multiple systems are likely to assign such identifiers and the relevant identifiers depend upon the context of the systems involved.

Make these changes

## Service Recipient Identifiers

On page 37, section 6.2.9 states the following:

Identifiers for filers and parties to a case, including person, organizations and property, labeled as ecf:ServiceRecipientID/nc:IdentificationID, MUST correspond to the above filer and party identifiers. The following is a non-normative example of an identifier for filer number 100:

We feel that it is important to clarify the term “correspond”. Does this indicate that the values must be EQUIVALENT as they are within the example?

Replace “correspond” with “be equivalent”

## Maximum Amount

Page 41, Section 6.3.2 says:

The payment MAY include a maximum amount for the payment if some latitude is needed to accomplish the filing.

We have not found an element for the max amount in the schema. Is there one?

This could be provided in cbc:Amount. Otherwise, we may need to add an element. Let’s discuss with the TC.

## Case Participant Rules

The table on page 42 could use a sizing adjustment.

Fix the column widths

## Appendix G: Revision History

We believe the following is in error:

Renamed ecf:FilingAttorneyID in ecf:CaseOfficialAugmentation to ecf:AttorneyID and clarified definition of ecf:FlingAttorneyID. Clarified NotifyFilingReviewComplete is the response to cancel:CancelFilingMessage. Added nc:DocumentStatus to all documents. Fixed table in Section 4.1 to include Document Stamp MDE. Updated non-normative examples.

As currently written, reviewfilingcallback:NotifyFilingReviewComplete is the response to cancel:CancelFilingMessage. If you think we need a different message, we should discuss with the TC.

## RecordDocketing/RecordFiling

ECF 5 has RecordDocketing as a replacement for ECF 4 RecordFiling. However, there are a number of references to RecordFiling that remain in the Specification.

Replace references to RecordFiling with RecordDocketing

## Filing Message

The MessageWrappers.xsd currently restricts the following:

ReviewFiling – one and only one FilingMessage

RecordDocketing – one and only one RecordDocketingMessage

ServeFiling – one and only one FilingMessage

ServeProcess – one and only one FilingMessage

We would prefer this be set to maxOccurs=unbounded to facilitate the ability to submit/process more than one filing in a single e-filing transaction, thereby enabling product/feature differentiation in the marketplace while preserving general interoperability.

Make these changes