**ECF5 Spec Feedback and Considerations – 18**

Jim Cabral’s responses in green

This document contains additional questions and commentary resulting from a review at the Electronic Court Filing Version 5.0 Working Draft 22, unless otherwise noted.

1. **Section 6.2.4 Message and Filing Identifiers**

Typographical corrections needed:

Specification contains (highlight added):

* In [docket:RecordDocketing](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5CDesktop%5Cschema%5Cdocket.xsd), [reviewfiling:NotifyFilingReviewComplete](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5CDesktop%5Cschema%5Creviewfilingcallback.xsd) and [docketcallback:NotifyRecordDocketingComplete](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5CDesktop%5Cschema%5Cdocketcallback.xsd), [cancel:CancelFilingMessage](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5COneDrive%5Cxml%5Cecf5%5Cschema%5Ccancel.xsd), [filing:FilingStatusRequest](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5COneDrive%5Cxml%5Cecf5%5Cschema%5Cfilingstatusrequest.xsd) and [filing:FilingStatusResponse](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5COneDrive%5Cxml%5Cecf5%5Cschema%5Cfilingstatusresponse.xsd) messages, and the asynchronous [cbrn:MessageStatus](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5CDesktop%5Cschema%5Cniem%5Cdomains%5Ccbrn%5C3.2%5Ccbrn.xsd) responses to these messages and [filing:FilingMessage](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5CDesktop%5Cschema%5Cfiling.xsd), the message identifier MUST be assigned by the Filing Review MDE and identify a unique filing in the court.

The correct message is docketcallback:NotifyDocketingCompleteMessage.

The correct message is filingstatusrequest:GetFilingStatusRequestMessage.

The correct message is filingstatusresponse:GetFilingStatusResponseMessage.

These messages and the others listed in this section will be fixed.

1. **Terminology**

Even after the significant overhaul of the Identifier sections with regard to document identifiers, and identifiers for filings and messages, and the separation of these concepts:

* It remains unclear whether or not a ‘message identifier’ is the same thing or is different than a ‘filing identifier’. Are these two terms synonymous?
* It also remains unclear if the term ‘transaction identifier’ is the same or different than either message identifier, or filing identifier or both.

Consider adding definitions for Message Identifier, Filing Identifier and Transaction Identifier to section 1.1 Terminology. The following definitions are suggested:

**Message Identifier**

 A unique value assigned to a message, either as a unique reference to the message, or as a correlation value to reference a prior message.

**Filing Identifier**

A unique value assigned as a tracking identifier for a ‘Filing’ (e.g. an e-filing submission). The filing identifier is carried by messages that are involved in an e-filing episode that begins with the submittal of a filing:ReviewFiling message, and culminates with the final NotifyFilingReviewComplete operation call for the original filing:ReviewFiling message. Upon receipt of the final reviewfilingcallback:NotifyFilingReviewCompleteMessage by the originating FAMDE, all filing lead and connected documents in the original filing:ReviewFiling message will have been reviewed and dispositioned (e.g. accepted and docketed, or rejected, etc.) or the filing will have been cancelled. Even after the conclusion of the e-filing episode, the filing identifier continues to be useful for GetFilingStatus requests.

**Transaction Identifier**

A unique value that identifies a set of messages which collectively belong to or relate to a single purpose, episode, or outcome. Filing Identifier is an example of a specific type of transaction identifier. A transaction identifier may also be used to relate messages collectively involved in the ‘Scheduling Process’, such as resrvedate:ReserveCourtDateMessage, datecallbakc:NotifyCourtDateMessage, and allocatedate:AllocateCourtDateMessage.

These terms will be added to Section 1.1.

1. **Transaction Identifier for ServeFiling**

Joe Mierwa has asked about the purpose and use of nc:DocumentIdentification within serve filing.

Joe says “… nor is there anything to tell what the document identification relates to for the serve filing message.”

Jim Cabral’s response included “ecf:MessageStatusAugmentation/nc:DocumentIdentification in the schema is mapped to MessageStatusMessage/filingID in the UML with the definition “An identifier for a single electronic filing transaction assigned by the Filing Review MDE. The identifier is unique within a court and case. ‘Transaction’ means the sequence of messages from the initial filing review through receipt of the asynchronous review callback.”

Per the description for filing identifer in the response above, ecf:MessageStatusAugmentation/nc:DocumentIdentification appears to be a Filing Identifier as described in section 6.2.6 in WD21.

Furthermore, it seems that the value in ecf:MessageStatusAugmentation/nc:DocumentIdentification/nc:IdentificationID in a serve filing response, should be the value of the document identifier described in WD 21 specification, section 6.2.4, bullet 1 (i.e. nc:CaseFiling/nc:DocumentIdentifcation) which is described as “identifies a unique transaction and is assigned by the Filing Review MDE.” In the WD 22 rewrite, this is presumed to equate to bullet 1 in section 6.2.4.

Since this Filing/Transaction ID is assigned by the FRMDE (presumably “in response to a ReviewFiling operation” as prescribed in ECF 4.01, and as specified in section 6.1.4 in ECF5) then the response to Joe Mierwa implies that a ServeFilingRequest should contain this filing identifier. Therefore, if the filing:ReviewFiling message sent to ServeFiling should contain the filing identifier, then legal service cannot be requested until after the ReviewFilingRequest has been sent to, and the Filing/Transaction ID returned from, the FRMDE.

I have had the understanding that ECF does not dictate to order of ReviewFiling and ServeFiling; that an implementation is free to perform these operations in any sequence. This understanding is supported by 6.1.5 ServeFiling that states: “At approximately the same time as a Filing Assembly MDE submits the filing to the court, the Filing Assembly MDE MAY serve the entire filing …”. It does not say “At approximately time as, and following a Filing Assembly filing submittal to the court, the Filing Assembly …”.

Perhaps ECF does intend to specify that ReviewFiling MUST be performed before ServeFiling, and the filing identifier provided by the FRMDE should be provided on the filing:ReviewFiling message to the Legal Service MDE.

However, if upon further reflection it is determined that assignment of the Filing/Transaction ID “by the Filing Review MDE” (see above proposed Joe Mierwa response, yellow highlight) is incorrect, then which MDE should be responsible for assigning the Filing/Transaction ID in ECF5?

Be careful in thinking that the responsibility for assigning the ID can just be moved from the FRMDE to the FAMDE. Yes, doing so would allow the ID value to be assigned before the RvFR is provided to ReviewFiling and could therefore support ServeFilingRequests prior to ReviewFiling. However, and depending upon the nature and format of the ID, this may not work in a multiple FAMDE environment. If however, the ID was required to be a UUID, then permitting the FAMDE to make the ID assignment should be workable, even in a multi-FRMDE implementation.

Should ECF require UUIDs for Filing/Transaction IDs? (also see #4 below)

The “At approximately the same time” language suggests that it was not the intent of the TC that ReviewFiling MUST be performed before ServeFiling. Therefore, if the filing ID is not yet assigned by the FilingReview MDE, then nc:CaseFiling/nc:DocumentIdentification in ServeFiling and ecf:MessageStatusAugmentation/nc:DocumentIdentification in the corresponding response should probably revert to a transaction ID for the service transaction assigned by the Filing Assembly MDE. Let’s discuss with the TC.

1. **Filing and Message Identifiers**

In the first bullet in section 6.2.4 it specifies that the Message Identifier for several messages (most are specifically identified by name), including filing:ReviewFiling, MUST be assigned by the FRMDE.

The filing:ReviewFiling message is sent by the FAMDE to either the FRMDE (ReviewFiling) or the Legal Services MDE (ServeFiling). When sent to the FRMDE in ReviewFiling, then it is not possible for the Message Identifier (e.g. filing identifier) to exist in the ReviewFiling message, because this value is assigned by the FRMDE and cannot be known by the FAMDE in advance of the ReviewFiling submission (except by employing an extra-ECF method).

As currently stated, one could interpret 6.2.4 as saying that a new and different, court unique ‘filing’ identifier must be assigned by the FRMDE for each of the itemized messages. However, I would have expected that instead of this, the same ‘filing’ identifier as assigned by the FRMDE upon receipt of the filing:ReviewFiling message should also be populated to all other messages (as itemized in 6.2.4 bullet 1) that occur within the ‘filing transaction’ (using the term ‘transaction’ as specified in the Joe Mierwa response (i.e. Transaction’ means the sequence of messages from the initial filing review through receipt of the asynchronous review callback.” ) ).

If my presumption is correct that the same ‘filing identifier’ is to be contained on all the relevant messages participating in the ‘transaction’, then consider the following restatement for 6.2.4:

Message identifiers are labeled by nc:DocumentIdentification/nc:IdentificationID when present as an immediate child in a message element derived from ecf:CaseFilingType (e.g., filing:FilingMessage, serviceinformationrequest:GetServiceInformationRequest, documentrequest:GetDocumentRequest). Intended usage is described as follows:

* Upon receipt of a filing:ReviewFiling message in a ReviewFiling operation, the Filing Review MDE will assign a court unique filing identifier. This filing identifier MUST be provided as the message identifier on its corresponding asynchronous cbrn:MessageStatus (i.e. ecf:MessageStatusAugmentation/nc:DocumentIdentification/IdentifcationID ) response message returned to the initiating FAMDE.

For [docket:RecordDocketing](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cggraham%5CDocuments%5CECF-5%20Working%20Draft%5Cecf-v5.0-wd22%5Cschema%5Cdocket.xsd), [docketcallback:NotifyDocketingComplete](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cggraham%5CDocuments%5CECF-5%20Working%20Draft%5Cecf-v5.0-wd22%5Cschema%5Cdocketcallback.xsd), [reviewfiling:NotifyFilingReviewComplete](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cggraham%5CDocuments%5CECF-5%20Working%20Draft%5Cecf-v5.0-wd22%5Cschema%5Creviewfilingcallback.xsd), [cancel:CancelFilingMessage](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5COneDrive%5Cxml%5Cecf5%5Cschema%5Ccancel.xsd), [filing:GetFilingStatusRequest](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5COneDrive%5Cxml%5Cecf5%5Cschema%5Cfilingstatusrequest.xsd) and [filing:GetFilingStatusResponse](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5COneDrive%5Cxml%5Cecf5%5Cschema%5Cfilingstatusresponse.xsd) messages and the asynchronous cbrn:MessageStatus responses to these messages, the filing identifier, assigned by the FAMDE upon receipt of filing:ReviewFiling, MUST be provided as the message identifier, thus permitting message exchange correlation.

* In other messages, the message identifier is assigned by the MDE sending each message.

Be mindful that the above suggested restatement does not address the issue raised above, that it is impossible to have the ‘filing identifier’ in the filing:ReviewFiling message provided to ServeFiling, when legal service is requested before ReviewFiling (since this identifier is assigned by the FRMDE). Referring back to the suggestion in Item 3 that instead a UUID filing identifier must be assigned, and that assignment responsibility instead lies with the FAMDE and not the FRMDE, then a revised restatement is:

Message identifiers are labeled by nc:DocumentIdentification/nc:IdentificationID when present as an immediate child in a message element derived from ecf:CaseFilingType (e.g., filing:FilingMessage, serviceinformationrequest:GetServiceInformationRequest, documentrequest:GetDocumentRequest). Intended usage is described as follows:

* Immediately prior to submittal of a filing:ReviewFiling message to a ReviewFiling operation, the Filing Assembly MDE MUST assign a universally unique identifier (i.e. UUID) as the filing identifier. This filing identifier MUST be provided as a correlating message identifier on the corresponding asynchronous cbrn:MessageStatus (i.e. ecf:MessageStatusAugmentation/nc:DocumentIdentification/IdentifcationID ) ReviewFiling response message returned to the initiating FAMDE.

For [docket:RecordDocketing](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cggraham%5CDocuments%5CECF-5%20Working%20Draft%5Cecf-v5.0-wd22%5Cschema%5Cdocket.xsd), [docketcallback:NotifyDocketingComplete](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cggraham%5CDocuments%5CECF-5%20Working%20Draft%5Cecf-v5.0-wd22%5Cschema%5Cdocketcallback.xsd), [reviewfiling:NotifyFilingReviewComplete](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cggraham%5CDocuments%5CECF-5%20Working%20Draft%5Cecf-v5.0-wd22%5Cschema%5Creviewfilingcallback.xsd), [cancel:CancelFilingMessage](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5COneDrive%5Cxml%5Cecf5%5Cschema%5Ccancel.xsd), [filing:GetFilingStatusRequest](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5COneDrive%5Cxml%5Cecf5%5Cschema%5Cfilingstatusrequest.xsd) and [filing:GetFilingStatusResponse](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5COneDrive%5Cxml%5Cecf5%5Cschema%5Cfilingstatusresponse.xsd) messages and the asynchronous cbrn:MessageStatus responses to these messages, the filing identifier, assigned by the FAMDE upon receipt of the filing:ReviewFiling message, MUST be provided as the message identifier thereby permitting message exchange correlation.

* In other messages, the message identifier is assigned by the MDE sending each message.

However, this may not be all. Given that there is agreement that a UUID should be used as the filing identifier and it must be assigned by the FAMDE, then we must also consider the ServeFiling operation. When an FAMDE UUID is used as the filing identifier, there is no longer any restriction that requires that the ReviewFiling operation must be performed before ServeFiling (so that the filing identifier can be passed to the Legal Service MDE). Now these two operations can be performed in any sequence.

However, if ServeFiling is to be allowed prior to ReviewFiling, then the suggested rewording from above needs to be further refined as suggested below:

Message identifiers are labeled by nc:DocumentIdentification/nc:IdentificationID when present as an immediate child in a message element derived from ecf:CaseFilingType (e.g., filing:FilingMessage, serviceinformationrequest:GetServiceInformationRequest, documentrequest:GetDocumentRequest). Intended usage is described as follows:

* Immediately prior to submittal of a filing:ReviewFiling message to either a ReviewFiling operation or a ServeFiling operation, the Filing Assembly MDE MUST assign a universally unique identifier (i.e. UUID) as the filing identifier. This filing identifier MUST be provided as a correlating message identifier on the corresponding asynchronous cbrn:MessageStatus (i.e. ecf:MessageStatusAugmentation/nc:DocumentIdentification/IdentifcationID ) ReviewFiling and/or ServeFiling response message(s) returned to the initiating FAMDE.

For [docket:RecordDocketing](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cggraham%5CDocuments%5CECF-5%20Working%20Draft%5Cecf-v5.0-wd22%5Cschema%5Cdocket.xsd), [docketcallback:NotifyDocketingComplete](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cggraham%5CDocuments%5CECF-5%20Working%20Draft%5Cecf-v5.0-wd22%5Cschema%5Cdocketcallback.xsd), [reviewfiling:NotifyFilingReviewComplete](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cggraham%5CDocuments%5CECF-5%20Working%20Draft%5Cecf-v5.0-wd22%5Cschema%5Creviewfilingcallback.xsd), [cancel:CancelFilingMessage](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5COneDrive%5Cxml%5Cecf5%5Cschema%5Ccancel.xsd), [filing:GetFilingStatusRequest](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5COneDrive%5Cxml%5Cecf5%5Cschema%5Cfilingstatusrequest.xsd) and [filing:GetFilingStatusResponse](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5COneDrive%5Cxml%5Cecf5%5Cschema%5Cfilingstatusresponse.xsd) messages and the asynchronous cbrn:MessageStatus responses to these messages, the filing identifier, assigned by the FAMDE upon submission of the filing:ReviewFiling message, MUST be provided as the message identifier thereby permitting message exchange correlation.

* In other messages, the message identifier is assigned by the MDE sending each message.

Now, one final tweak. Up to this point, the specification reader is left on their own to connect the dots between message identifier and filing identifier. The following rewrite relates these two concepts.

Message identifiers are labeled by nc:DocumentIdentification/nc:IdentificationID when present as an immediate child in a message element derived from ecf:CaseFilingType (e.g., filing:FilingMessage, serviceinformationrequest:GetServiceInformationRequest, documentrequest:GetDocumentRequest). Intended usage is described as follows:

* Immediately prior to submittal of a filing:ReviewFiling message to either a ReviewFiling operation or a ServeFiling operation, the Filing Assembly MDE MUST assign a universally unique identifier (i.e. UUID) as the message identifier. This message identifier serves as the filing identifier for the sequence of messages beginning with the initial filing review and service through receipt of the final asynchronous filing review callback. This filing identifier MUST be provided as a correlating message identifier on the corresponding asynchronous cbrn:MessageStatus (i.e. ecf:MessageStatusAugmentation/nc:DocumentIdentification/IdentifcationID ) ReviewFiling and/or ServeFiling response message(s) returned to the initiating FAMDE.

For [docket:RecordDocketing](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cggraham%5CDocuments%5CECF-5%20Working%20Draft%5Cecf-v5.0-wd22%5Cschema%5Cdocket.xsd), [docketcallback:NotifyDocketingComplete](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cggraham%5CDocuments%5CECF-5%20Working%20Draft%5Cecf-v5.0-wd22%5Cschema%5Cdocketcallback.xsd), [reviewfiling:NotifyFilingReviewComplete](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cggraham%5CDocuments%5CECF-5%20Working%20Draft%5Cecf-v5.0-wd22%5Cschema%5Creviewfilingcallback.xsd), [cancel:CancelFilingMessage](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5COneDrive%5Cxml%5Cecf5%5Cschema%5Ccancel.xsd), [filing:GetFilingStatusRequest](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5COneDrive%5Cxml%5Cecf5%5Cschema%5Cfilingstatusrequest.xsd) and [filing:GetFilingStatusResponse](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5COneDrive%5Cxml%5Cecf5%5Cschema%5Cfilingstatusresponse.xsd) messages and the asynchronous cbrn:MessageStatus responses to these messages, the filing identifier, assigned by the FAMDE upon submittal of the filing:ReviewFiling message, MUST be provided as the message identifier thereby permitting message exchange correlation.

* In other messages, the message identifier is assigned by the MDE sending each message.

If we agree that filing identifiers are court-specific then, in my opinion, these MUST be assigned by the FilingReview MDE, not the FilingAssembly MDE. However, message and transaction IDs can be assigned by any MDE, including FilingAssembly MDEs. I support requiring message and transaction IDs MUST be UUIDs. Let’s discuss with the TC.

1. **Synchronous vs. Asynchronous Responses**

For both the ‘Filing and Service Process’ and the ‘Scheduling Process’, the dashed lines in the sequence diagrams “indicate synchronous responses” to the operation invocation.

In WD 22, section 6.2.4 Message and Filing Identifiers, the responses to the following messages are identified as asynchronous cbrn:MessageStatus messages, whereas the cbrn:MessageStatus message is identified as a synchronous message in the corresponding subsections in section 6.1. Operation Business Rules, i.e.:

* docket:RecordDocketing – cbrn:MessageStatus is specified as synchronous in 6.1.8 RecordDocketing.
* docketcallback:NotifyDocketingComplete – cbrn:MessageStatus is specified as synchronous in 6.1.9 NotifyDocketingComplete.
* reviewfiling:NotifyFilingReviewComplete - cbrn:MessageStatus is specified as synchronous in 6.1.10 NotifyFilingReviewComplete.
* filing:GetFilingStatusRequest – the response is specified as synchronous in 6.1.12 GetFilingStatus, but cbrn:MessageStatus is not specified as the response message type. One would expect filing:GetFilingStatusResponse to be the synchronous response message. This presumption is supported by the chart in section 4.1. Messages.

I presume that these inconsistencies are errors requiring correction, but if this is not the case, then please explain.

The reference to cbrn:MessageStatus as “asynchronous” in 6.2.4 was incorrect and will be changed to “synchronous”. filing:GetFilingStatusResponse is the synchronous response in Section 6.1.12 as established in Section 4.1.

1. **Response to a Response**

As specified in section 6.1.12 GetFilingStatus and the chart in section 4.1, the GetFilingStatus operation synchronously returns a filing:GetFilingStatusResponse.

Furthermore, as provided in section 6.2.4, the receipt of a filing:GetFilingStatusResponse may also return an asynchronous cbrn:MessageStatus to the filing status response provider (i.e. FRMDE).

It is not clear whether asynchronous response messages (e.g. cbrn:MessageStatus) are required or optional as a response to a response message (e.g. filing:GetFilingStatusResponse).

Where or how in the specification is this determined?

Note, section 4.5. Error Handling provides “Successful request and response messages MUST return an cbrn:ErrorCodeText of “0”. This statement could be interpreted in more than one way. One interpretation is that for a successful response message (such as filing:GetFilingStatusResponse) the error code “0” (success) must be returned, and therefore cbrn:MessageStatus is mandatory. An alternative interpretation is that for a successful response message, if cbrn:MessageStatus is returned, then it must include cbrn:ErrorCodeText with a value of “0” (success).

As defined in Section 4.1, the response to filingstatusrequest:GetFilingStatusRequest is filingstatusresponse:GetFIlingStatusResponse. References to both of these messages in Section 6.2.4 will be moved to eliminate the inference that cbrn:MessageStatus is a synchronous response to those messages.

1. **Notify Docketing Complete Document Identifiers and other Docketing Information**

I was really surprised by the response to Item 14, in Feedback document 17. I had expected that the ‘document identifiers’ referenced in the narrative for section 6.1.9 NotifyDocketingComplete would have been the nc:DocumentFileControlID variety rather than the nc:DocumentIdentification/IdentificationID variety.

Since the description refers to ‘docketing information’ I have always understood this to be referring to information added as a result of docketing in the court. Since nc:DocumentIdentification/IdentificationID is provided to the court in the RecordDocketingMessage, I have never previously understood this to be ‘docketing information’.

However, the court assigned identifier for the document would seem to be docketing information; and by this I am referring to the “document file control identifier” (i.e. nc:DocumentFileControlID).

It’s not that I don’t think the document identifier (e.g. ecf:ReviewedLeadDocument/nc:DocumentIdentification/nc:IdentificationID) should be returned in the NotifyDocketingCompleteMessage; I think it is necessary and should be mandatory, just as it is or should be in the RecordDocketingMessage. My point is that I do not think the document identifier as in ecf:ReviewedLeadDocument/nc:DocumentIdentification/nc:IdentificationID is docketing information, whereas the document file control identifier as in nc:DocumentFileControlID should be considered docketing information.

The language in section 6.1.9 in the ECF5 specification is exactly the same as the language in ECF 4.01 section 3.2.7 NotifyDocketingComplete, i.e. “If the Court Record MDE accepts the filing, the docketing information (e.g. date and time the document was entered into the court record, judge assigned, document identifiers and next court event scheduled) MUST be provided.”

In Arizona, for ECF 4.01, we have interpreted the reference to “document identifiers” above to mean the Court Record MDE assigned identifier for the document. However, since no specific element was referenced under ECF 4.01, we have interpreted that ecf:DocumentDocketID/nc:IdentificationID is the appropriate element for this purpose. We use nc:DocumentFileContorlD in ECF 4.01 to hold the document reference that the filer provided; typically this is just a file name.

It appears that the ECF 4.01 element ecf:DocumentDocketID has been replaced in ECF 5 with nc:CaseDocketID, however since the element definitions are quite different, this assumption may not be correct.

The ECF 5 definition for nc:CaseDocketID is: “An identifier used to reference a case docket.” I believe this definition should really be: “an Identifier used to reference an event or entry on a case docket.”

The ECF 4.01 definition for ecf:DocumentDocketID is: ”The identifier from the court record system used to identify the document. This attribute is populated by the MDE/process that is authorized to create docket identifiers; the attribute will not be present before that creation takes place. For example, if the clerk review process creates docket identifiers, then this attribute will be present in the RecordDocketingMessage that goes to the court record MDE. However, if the court record process creates docket identifiers, then this attribute will not be present in the RecordDocketingMessage, but will be present in subsequent callbacks. This attribute will be absent in callbacks when the ReviewedDocument was rejected, either by clerk review or the court record system.”

One of the objectives for ECF 5 is to correct misunderstanding regarding dockets/docket events and documents (see ECF Action #0061 ‘ECF 5.0 – DocketIDs vs DocumentIDs”).

Replacing ecf:DocumentDocketID with nc:CaseDocketID goes a long way towards this objective. However, we may have lost a bit when doing this.

If there is any need or value in returning to the FAMDE, its own local document reference (e.g. file name or EDMS identifier, etc.) for use in matching up to document information in the returned message, then we may need an element for this purpose if ECF5 nc:DocumentFileControlID is now used for the CRMDE document control number. However, since the FAMDE assigns the original nc:DocumentIdentification/nc:IdentificationID, and this element and value are (should be) returned to the FAMDE, then this external content reference can be used for matching up.

The element description for ecf:DocumentDocketID contained a lot of processing information. Although it may have been handy to see this description when exploring schema, most of it should have been in the written specification. If we correct a few things from the original ECF 4 definition, such as replacing ‘docket identifiers’ with ‘document identifiers’ and ‘attribute’ with ‘element’, etc. then an updated instruction might be:

The document file control identifier (i.e. nc:DocumentFileControlID) is populated by the MDE/process that is authorized to create and assign court document identifiers; the element value will not be present before creation/assignment takes place. For example, if the clerk review process creates/assigns document identifiers, then this element will be present in the RecordDocketingMessage that goes to the court record MDE. However, if the court record process creates/assigns document identifiers, then this element will not be present in the RecordDocketingMessage, but will be present in subsequent callbacks. This element will be absent in callbacks when the ReviewedDocument was rejected, either by clerk review or the court record system.

As revised above, I think this is just as true for ECF 5 as it is for ECF 4.

As important as this process explanation appears to be, neither this nor anything similar is currently present in ECF5. However, a possible contradictory statement is provided in ECF5 in section 6.2.5 Document Identifiers, bullet 2, which states:

“nc:DocumentFileControlIdentification/nc:IdentificationID is a reference to a unique document in the Court Record system and is assigned by the Court Record MDE.”

This suggests that the unique court system document reference value can only be assigned by the Court Record MDE, whereas the element definition from ECF 4.01 appears to have allowed either the FRMDE or the CRMDE to assign the court document reference value.

While on the subject of ‘docketing information’, I’d like to point out that in section 6.1.9 NotifyDocketingComplete, it states that the CRMDE MUST provide docketing information. However, what exactly docketing information consists of is not prescribed. Therefore, any and all NotifyDocketingComplete messages appear meet this normative requirement, even if they do not add any new information from the CRMDE.

So I suppose by now, some readers may be thinking “this is a lot to unpack”. So let me help by itemizing my suggestions below:

1. Define “docket information” so that the requirement to include it in the NotifyDocketingComplete message is not a hollow requirement. I think this needs to be further discussed with the TC, but here’s a starter:

“Docketing information” as provided by the CR MDE in the NotifyDocketingComplete message MAY include (mandatory elements bolded):

nc:DocumentStatus/nc:StatusDescriptionText for the NotifyDocketingCompleteMessage

ecf:FilingStatus/nc:StatusText

ecf:FilingStatus/nc:StatusDate/nc:DateTime

ecf:FilingStatus/nc:StatusDescriptionText

**ecf:FilingStatus/ecf:FilingStatusCode**

ecf:FilingCompleteDate

**nc:DocumentFileControlID** for each docketed reviewed lead and connected document

nc:DocumentFiledDate/nc:DateTime for each docketed reviewed lead and connected document

**ecf:DocumentHash** for each docketed reviewed lead and connected document

nc:CaseDocketID

j:CaseAugmentation/j:CaseJudge

j:CaseAugmentation/j:CaseCourtEvent/j:CourtEventSchedule

j:CaseAugmentation/ecf:CourtEventAugmentation/ecf:CourtEventEnteredOnDocketDate

j:CaseAugmentation/ecf:CourtEventAugmentation/ecf:CourtEventTypeCode

1. Revise the paragraph in section 6.1.9 to be:

The Court Record MDE MUST invoke the NotifyDocketingComplete operation on the Filing Review MDE that invoked a RecordDocketing operation as a callback message to indicate whether the filing was accepted or rejected by the court record system. If the Court Record MDE rejected the filing, an explanation MUST be provided. If the Court Record MDE accepts the filing, the docketing information (e.g. date and time the document(s) were entered into the court record, judge assigned, document file control identifiers (nc:DocumentFileControlID) and next court event scheduled, etc.) MUST be provided. The Filing Review MDE responds synchronously with an [cbrn:MessageStatus](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CJamesECabral%5COneDrive%5Cxml%5Cecf5%5Cschema%5Cniem%5Cdomains%5Ccbrn%5C3.2%5Ccbrn.xsd) to acknowledge the callback message.

Beneath the above revised paragraph, then add the docketing information list from a. above.

1. Add the process description provided below. Since this process description is potentially applicable to one or the other of two different operations, it is not clear where this process description best fits. Probably not in section 6.1 Operation Business Rules; perhaps in section 6.4 Message Rules, sub-section 6.4.3 docket:RecordDocketingMessage.

In the ‘Filing and Service’ process, the court’s document file control identifier (i.e. nc:DocumentFileControlID) is populated by the MDE/process that is authorized to create and assign court document identifiers; the element value will not be present before creation/assignment takes place. For example, if the clerk review process creates/assigns document identifiers, then the nc:DocumentFileControlID element will be present in the RecordDocketingMessage that goes to the court record MDE. However, if the court record process creates/assigns document identifiers, then this element will not be present in the RecordDocketingMessage, but will be present in subsequent callbacks. This element will be absent in callbacks when the Reviewed Document was rejected, either by clerk review or the court record system.

1. Require nc:DocumentIdentification/IdentificationID in RecordDocketing, NotifyDocketingComplete, NotifyFilingReviewComplete and perhaps other filing transaction messages.

Currently there is little if anything in the ECF5 specification that describes or requires that document identifiers, for filing lead/connected documents or reviewed lead/connected documents, must to be passed along through the filing sequence (e.g. transaction). Consider adding the following suggested text. This probably best fits into section 6.2.5 Document Identifiers, associated with the first bullet; perhaps as an additional paragraph for this bullet.

Document identifiers MUST be assigned by the Filing Assembly MDE (FAMDE) in the filing:ReviewFiling message for all documents referenced within the message (e.g. FilingLeadDocument and FilingConnectedDocument). All references to these documents in subsequent ‘Filing and Service’ process messages MUST repeat these FAMDE assigned document identifiers.

1. Correct 6.2.5, bullet 2 – the element name is incorrect and the description does not also include the FRMDE as a valid source for document file control identifiers. Revise to:

nc:DocumentFileControlID is a reference to a unique document in the Court Record system and is assigned either by the Filing Review MDE or the Court Record MDE. The values for this element MUST be unique within a court.

In the current mapping, nc:CaseDocketID replaces both ecf:ChildDocketReference and ecf:DocumentDocketID. Based on the definitions, we should probably revert to providing both nc:CaseDocketID (still replacing ecf:ChildDocketReference) and ecf:DocumentDocketID (with a modified definition as you suggested). Let’s discuss this with the TC as well as clarifying what other elements constitute required “docket information” in Section 6.19.

1. **Error Handling Paragraph**

Can the paragraph on error handling on page 31 in section 6.2.2 be removed?

This paragraph appears to be the same as that in section 4.5 Error Handling.

This paragraph will be removed.

1. **AllocateCourtDate**

The element ecf:DocumentFiler appears twice in the AllocateCourtDateMessage:

allocatedate:AllocateCourtDate/ecf:DocumentFiler

allocatedate:AllocateCourtDate/ecf:DocumentAugmentation/ecf:DocumentFiler

Are both necessary?

If so, how would one be used versus the other?

We need both if ecf:DocumentFiler is mandatory for each filing message but optional for each document. Currently,

ecf:CaseFiling/ecf:DocumentFiler has cardinality 1,1 and ecf:DocumentAugmentation/ecf:DocumentFiler has cardinality 0,1. Let’s discuss with the TC if we need both.

1. **Definitions for Reviewed Documents**

The definitions for the ecf:ReviewedLeadDocument and ecf:ReviewedConnectedDocument elements still contain references to other elements using the element’s names from ECF 1. We need to update these definitions to reference modern, ECF 5 element names.

The following revisions are suggested:

**ecf:ReviewedLeadDocument**

Current definition:

“The association will be present for every connected document that is reviewed by clerk review. For documents that were rejected by the clerk review process or the court record system, only the documentStatusCode, originalDocumentID, and (optionally) the documentStatusReasonDescription will be present. For documents that were accepted and recorded, all attributes will be present, except for documentStatusReasonDescription, which may or may not be present.”

Proposed revised definition:

This element will be present for every lead document that is reviewed by clerk review. For documents that were rejected by the clerk review process or the court record system, only the ecf:DocumentReviewStatus/nc:StatusText, the original filing:FilingLeadDocument/nc:DocumentIdentification/nc:IdentificationID, and (optionally) the nc:DocumentReviewStatus/nc:StatusDescriptionText will be present. For documents that were accepted and recorded, all sub-elements will be present, except for nc:DocumentReviewStatus/nc:StatusDescriptionText, which may or may not be present.

Note also that ‘connected’ has been replaced by ‘lead’ above.

**ecf:ReviewedConnectedDocument**

Current definition:

“This association will be present for every connected document that is reviewed by clerk review. For documents that were rejected by the clerk review process or the court record system, only the documentStatusCode, originalDocumentID, and (optionally) the documentStatusReasonDescription will be present. For documents that were accepted and recorded, all attributes will be present. Except for documentStatusReasonDescription, which may or may not be present.”

Proposed revised definition:

This element will be present for every connected document that is reviewed by clerk review. For documents that were rejected by the clerk review process or the court record system, only the nc:DocumentReviewStatus/nc:StatusText, the original filing:FilingLeadDocument/nc:DocumentIdentification/nc:IdentificationID, and (optionally) the nc:DocumentReviewStatus/nc:StatusDescriptionText will be present. For documents that were accepted and recorded, all sub-elements will be present, except for nc:DocumentReviewStatus/nc:StatusDescriptionText, which may or may not be present.

Here are a couple more things to consider:

* Why is the term “association” used in these reviewed document elements current definitions? Certainly associating the reviewed document element to the filing document is a necessary and essential component which is provided by the ecf:DocumentAugmentation/nc:DocumentAssociation element. I think the term “association” properly describes nc:DocumentAssociation, but not reviewed document. I have therefore replaced “association” with “element” in the revised proposed descriptions above.
* Both the original descriptions and the proposed revisions appear to overly prescribe the required and optional use of document sub-elements. I don’t think this is correct. I believe the original element descriptions were attempting to prescribe what clerk review information should be provided in the reject and accept conditions. I do not think this was an attempt to prescribe the use or non-use of all reviewed document sub-elements (e.g. nc:DocumentCategoryText, nc:DocumentSoftwareText, nc:DocumentDescriptionText, etc.).

If I am correct in this judgement then here is what I think should be prescribed for document review acceptance and rejection:

 Acceptance:

 ecf:DocumentReviewStatus

 nc:StatusDate/nc:Date or nc:DateTime (one or the other should be required)

 nc:StatusText (should be required with a value ”accepted”)

ecf:DocumentReviewer (optional)

 Rejection:

 ecf:DocumentReviewStatus

 nc:StatusDate/nc:Date or nc:DateTime (one or the other should be required)

 nc:StatusText (should be required with a value ”rejected”)

ecf:DocumentReviewer (optional)

Note that there are other clerk review outcomes for a document other than just “accepted” and rejected”; these include “received” and “issued”. I believe the same clerk review elements should be used (optional or required) regardless the outcome disposition.

Furthermore, I believe this type of processing instruction belongs in the specification document, not as part of an element description, only visible when exploring schema using some sort of schema browsing tool.

 Okay, time to do some “unpacking”. Here are my recommendations:

1. Revise the definition for ecf:ReviewedLeadDocument to be:

This element will be present for every lead document that is reviewed by clerk review. The filing lead document must be referenced using nc:DocumentAssociation. The clerk review results must be recorded using ecf:DocumentReviewStatus, and ecf:DocumentReviewer (optional).

1. Revise the definition for ecf:ReviewedConnectedDocument to be:

This element will be present for every connected document that is reviewed by clerk review. The filing connected document must be referenced using nc:DocumentAssociation. The clerk review results must be recorded using ecf:DocumentReviewStatus, and ecf:DocumentReviewer (optional).

1. Added the following processing description to section 6.1.4 ReviewFiling:

At the conclusion of clerk review, all filing documents which were reviewed and dispositioned during the review session, MUST have the clerk review document information and result recorded in the RecordDocketingMessage and/or the NotifyFilingReviewCompleteMessage. If the clerk review session does not address all filing documents presented in the filing:ReviewFiling message, then those documents which have not been addressed should not provide ecf:ReviewedLeadDocument or ecf:ReviewedConnectedDocument elements. For documents reviewed and dispositioned during the clerk review session, the clerk review information MUST be provided using ecf:DocumentReviewStatus and optionally, ecf:DocumentReviewer. For documents and filings that have been rejected in clerk review, an explanation MUST be provided.

1. In the FilingStatusCode.gc file, add “issued” as a new code value, with the following definition:

“document has been issued”

Documents such as subpoenas and summons are submitted to the court, typically along with other filing documents. If approved in clerk review, subpoenas and summons documents are “issue” stamped and not “file” stamped. In many implementations, the ‘issued’ documents are immediately returned to the filer in a NotifyFilingReviewCompleteMessage and are not included in a RecordDocketingMessage, since many/most courts do not file subpoenas and summons documents.

These definitions originated in the UML developed for ECF 3 and the references to other properties use their UML names. I agree that cardinality should not be expressed in the definitions; instead, cardinality should be defined preferably in the schema and or in the specification if not supported in schema. We should also not reference other properties/elements in the UML definitions using their XML names since the XML names change from version to version. Instead, we should probably just remove all references to other properties/elements in the definitions. Let’s discuss this with the TC before we make these extensive changes to the specification.

1. **FilingCompletionDate**

Shouldn’t ecf:FilingCompletionDate be an nc:DateType?

Yes, the mapping will be fixed.