## Introduction

The feedback put forth within this document is based upon review of ECF 5 Working Draft 22.

## Case Participants

### CaseInitiatingParty

Per Section 6.4.1 we see that the intent is that this represent the party on whose behalf a document is filed.

### CaseRespondentParty

Per Section 6.4.1 we see that the intent is that this represent the party on whose behalf a response document is filed.

### Reference: From wd22 Section 6.4.1

A [filing:FilingMessage](file:///C:\Users\JamesECabral\OneDrive\xml\ecf5\schema\filing.xsd) MUST express the name or names of the party or parties on whose behalf a document is filed, and the party whose document is the subject of a responsive document being submitted for filing. If a case refers to a single element using the legal term “In Re,” the filer SHOULD use j:CaseRespondentParty, not the j:CaseInitiatingParty element.

### Reference: From wd22 Section 6.5

A case participant is a legal entity (person, organization and item/property) associated with a court case. The types of case participants include judicial officials, case officials (attorney), parties (litigants) and “other” entities. Each case participant MUST be represented with one of the role elements and entity representations and elaborated with the ecf:CaseParticipantRoleCode as shown in the following table.

| Participant Type | Case Participant Role Elements | Entity Representations | | ecf:CaseParticipantRoleCode |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Judicial Official | [j:CaseJudge](file:///C:\Users\JamesECabral\OneDrive\xml\ecf5\schema\FiduciaryTypeCode.gc)\* | nc:EntityPerson | SHOULD be provided | |
| Case Official (Attorney) | j:CaseDefendantAttorney, j:CaseInitiatingAttorney, j:CaseProsecutionAttorney, ecf:CaseOtherEntityAttorney,j:CaseOfficial |
| Party (Litigant) | j:CaseDefendantParty, j:CaseInitiatingParty, j:CaseRespondentParty,  ecf:CaseOtherParty | nc:EntityPerson, nc:EntityOrganization, ecf:EntityItem | MUST be provided | |
| Other | j:CaseOtherEntity |

**Questions:**

1. What element is appropriate for representing other parties on a case? We assume ecf:CaseOtherParty
2. What is the purpose of CaseDefendantParty? Are there special considerations for it?
3. The caseresponse.xml sample uses both CaseInitiatingParty and CaseRespondentParty. This is a case load operation, not a filing, therefore it seems inappropriate to use these elements. Presumably these should be ecf:CaseOtherParty and/or j:CaseOtherEntity

## FilingLeadDocument/FilingConnectedDocument

### We are seeking to confirm the intended use of these elements, whereby we can determine whether a Tyler ECF 5 implementation would differ from our ECF 4 implementation.

### Reference: From wd22 Section 6.4.1 (highlight reflects text added in ECF 5)

If a [filing:FilingMessage](file:///C:\Users\JamesECabral\OneDrive\xml\ecf5\schema\filing.xsd) includes documents, the lead documents MUST be included in filing:FilingLeadDocument elements and the message MUST include only one level of connected and supporting documents in filing:FilingConnectedDocument elements. filing:FilingConnectedDocument elements MUST reference filing:FilingLeadDocument with the nc:DocumentAssociation element that includes a nc:PrimaryDocument element with structures:ref with the ID of the filing:FilingLeadDocument and a ecf:DocumentRelatedCode element with value “parent”.

Tyler currently uses these elements to reflect an e-filing “envelope” concept, whereby the filer can submit one or more filings in a single e-filing transaction if all such filings pertain to one and only one case. As such, we use LeadDocument to represent the first filing in the envelope, and one or more ConnectedDocument elements to represent the 2nd thru Nth filing in the envelope. Filings in an envelope are not necessarily connected other than pertaining to the same case and submitted by the same filer.

**Questions:**

1. Is it accurate to say that ConnectedDocument is intended to merely represent an additional document (electronic file such as a PDF) and not a separate filing (docket entry)?
2. As an alternative in ECF 5, we would potentially use a separate FilingMessage for each filing in the envelope. (ReviewFilingRequestType allows this – refer to MessageWrappers.xsd)

If #2 is the recommended approach, we propose two changes to GetFeesCalculationRequestType:

* We propose making FilingMessage unbounded (in FeesRequest.xsd) to mirror that of ReviewFiling.
* We propose adding support for PaymentMessage to mirror that of ReviewFiling.

## Pro Se Parties

What is the expected representation of pro se parties?

## ServeFilingRequestType

We propose adding support for an optional payment message to mirror ReviewFiling.