

## Electronic Court Filing Technical Committee

### Statement of Work RE: E-Filing Process Models

This *Statement of Work (SOW)*<sup>\*</sup> provides information the OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing Technical Committee will use to decide whether resources should be applied to the work product proposed here. The SOW is described in this document and then made available to the members of the ECF TC for a period of review and comment. Following the close of the review and comment period, the author(s) of the SOW will review all input, make whatever modifications to the SOW they choose, and the SOW will be posted on the ECF TC members' Listserv for a vote according to the ECF TC's procedures. If the ECF TC votes to approve the SOW, it declares thereby that it believes it is worthwhile to apply the resources identified in it to the project it describes.

**TITLE** *(A title appropriate to the subject matter of the specification or other expected deliverable.)*  
E-Filing Process Models

---

**DESCRIPTION** *(Describe the specification or deliverable to be drafted if the Statement of Work is approved.)*

The objective of the E-Filing Process Models subcommittee will be to produce a set of process flow diagrams with supporting textual descriptions that document existing and potential conceptual models for the electronic filing of documents with courts and for the courts to respond to those filings. Process models will be collected, evaluated for commonalities and differences and, where possible, reduced into a common set of high level models. After the distilled set of process models has been delineated, they will again be reviewed to identify the intersection points that must be supported to accommodate all of the models. These intersection points will be subjected to a preliminary evaluation to gauge their potential as a candidate for an API to accommodate interoperability among all of the models. It is *not* within the scope of this statement of work to develop a specification for any APIs. That effort, should it prove to be desirable, will be deferred to a later subcommittee and be subject to a subsequent statement of work.

The work of this subcommittee will be conducted through a series of conference calls, via email on the listserv, and during face-to-face meetings in conjunction with, but usually scheduled the day prior to, the face-to-face meetings of the Technical Committee.

**NON-TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION** *(A non-technical description of the subject matter and its significance to the work of the ECF TC.)*

See the above Description, which is non-technical.

**RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ECF TC ACTIVITIES AND DELIVERABLES** (A description of the relationship of the proposed work product to other products or activities of the ECF TC.)

This work is a necessary first step to gain a better understanding of the business processes that must be supported by Court Filing Blue and to identify any APIs that would need to be specified. It also has potential impact on the security model(s) inherent in these efforts. In the development lifecycle, business process modeling is frequently the first step of the requirements gathering process.

**PROPOSED AUTHOR(S) OF THE WORK** (Names and relevant qualifications of the proposed authors and the roles they would play in the work—indicate who would have lead responsibility for the work. *Proposed* authors may not yet have made a commitment to participate in the work.)

There are no proposed authors at the present time.

**AUTHOR[S], IDENTIFIED AND NEEDED** (List identified authors who have committed to the proposed work. Describe any skill sets/expertise needed to complement those of the identified authors.)

IDENTIFIED AUTHORS: The following have committed to participate in this work.

None.

NEEDED AUTHORS/EXPERTISE/RESOURCES:

The author(s) of the work product will need to have the ability to model business processes. Depending on the tools chosen, this can be as simple as diagramming flow charts. It will also be necessary to compose textual descriptions to accompany the diagrams.

**PROPOSED TIMELINE** (Describe factors or deadlines that might drive the schedule related to this work.)

It is hoped that the work product can be completed in a six (6) to nine (9) month timeframe. This assumes quick identification of the primary author and the collection and collation of existing models in time for discussion at the April meeting. This timeline is driven in part by the desire of the Technical Committee to commence work on the requirements for Court Filing Blue by the fall of 2003.

**PROPOSED REVIEW AND COMMENT PERIOD** (Proposed timeline for review of the SOW in order to obtain input and to seek a vote of approval to proceed with the work. The actual timeline will be announced by the ECF TC Co-Chairs, not by the SOW proposer[s].)

The standard two (2) week time period for comment on the statement of work is suggested. All comments questions and suggestions should be made on the E-Filing Process Models listserve during the specified time period.

## **OASIS Legal XML Court Filing Technical Committee**

### **Statement of Work for E-Filing Process Models**

Page 3 of 5

---

**DOCUMENT HISTORY/VERSION (Optional)** (If the SOW has been processed through several iterations before first being presented to the ECF TC, the author[s] may want to provide links to or a list of the various working drafts.)

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Changes</b>
0.1	1/3/03	Dwight R. Daniels	Initial Draft

# **OASIS Legal XML Court Filing Technical Committee**

## **Statement of Work for E-Filing Process Models**

Page 4 of 5

---

### **PROCESS STEPS**

1. Send the completed SOW to the TC Editor, who will assign the appropriate ECF TC version number and file name to the document. (Send a copy of the message and SOW to the webmaster for the TC and a copy to the TC's co-chairs.)
2. Once the SOW has been reviewed for compliance with the TC's rules and procedures, it will be forwarded to the TC's co-chairs by the Editor, with a copy to the webmaster, who will prepare for publishing the document on the TC's Web site.
3. The co-chairs will determine the review and comment period to be observed for the SOW and they will issue an announcement (using a standard form for such announcements) to the listserve.
4. At the conclusion of the review period, the Author[s] of the SOW will incorporate input and suggestions they believe strengthen the SOW and record all other input received that they chose not to incorporate, with a brief explanation of the reasons for each change suggestion not agreed to by the author[s]. This report is to be sent to the TC co-chairs and webmaster for posting on the TC Web site prior to a formal vote to approve or disapprove of the SOW.
5. Following review of the comments and input accepted/not accepted, the author[s] are to request that the webmaster publish the resulting specification or other deliverable on the TC's Web site. After it is published there, the author[s] will ask the TC co-chairs to announce an approval process, indicating a set deadline for completion of the approval vote.
6. If the SOW is approved by the ECF TC, the designated, committed authors, particularly anyone assigned a "Lead" role, will begin the process of developing the *Statement of Requirements* as provided in the TC's adopted procedures.

--Template updated 12/18/02

---

\* The following description about the *Statement of Work* is from the *Electronic Court Filing Procedures*.

A. The Electronic Court Filing Technical Committee (TC) review process begins with a proposer (who may be one or more persons), or a proposer the TC designates, drafting a Statement of Work. This would be a paper, prepared using a standard TC template, to describe the specification or other deliverable<sup>[1]</sup> that will result from the proposed work, explain its general purposes, relate it to other work products of the TC, describe how it will be developed and by whom, and state when the proposer believes the work must be or could be completed.

B. The Draft Statement of Work must be sponsored by at least one TC member. The proposer will submit it to the TC Co-Chairs with a recommended period for comment and review by the TC. The Co-Chairs have the power to modify the proposed comment and review period and they will announce the deadline when declaring the Statement of Work to be out for TC review. The Co-Chairs will refer the draft for publishing to a "topical Web page"<sup>[2]</sup> whose title would be that of the proposed specification or other deliverable (e.g., "Electronic Court Filing Certification," "Request for Proposals for Trusted Document Repository"), with its own URL within the Web site structure for the Electronic Court Filing TC. The TC Editor would not be expected to review this document in detail, except to verify the proposer used the appropriate template.

# **OASIS Legal XML Court Filing Technical Committee**

## **Statement of Work for E-Filing Process Models**

Page 5 of 5

---

C. Contents of the Statement of Work should include:

1. A title appropriate to the subject matter of the specification or expected deliverable (with the title subject to modification by the Co-Chairs of the TC or the TC)
2. A description of the type of specification or deliverable (e.g., DTD, Schema, White Paper, RFP) that would be drafted if the Statement of Work is approved
3. A non-technical description of the subject matter and its significance to the work of the TC
4. A description of the relationship of the proposed work product to other products or activities of the TC (presented as a narrative and described in relation to any of the TC's charts/diagrams of its work products)
5. The names and relevant credentials of the proposed authors of the specification or other deliverable and a description of the roles they would play in doing the work, including designating who would have lead responsibility for the work
6. A list of identified authors and a description of skill sets/expertise needed from potential additional authors to complement those of the identified authors (e.g., "needs technical expert to prepare the Schema," "no drafter is expert with SOAP and this may be needed")
7. Description of the proposed timeline to develop the work product, citing any factors or deadlines that might be driving the work (e.g., "Federal Administrative Office of the Courts would review this for adoption only if a 'Proposed Specification' is in place by August, 2003")
8. Version number assigned to the current draft of the Statement of Work, as required for proper version control and management.

D. The TC Co-chairs would announce and provide a link to the Draft Statement of Work for (Subject) to the TC membership, inviting their review for a specific period ending on a particular date. Input from the TC would be directed to a special List or provided otherwise, as described in the announcement. During this stage of the process, the draft is "owned" by the authors, who are responsible to take note of input provided through the TC's discussion lists, through written submittals, and otherwise. The Web master and Editor for the TC will be available as consultants and will ensure documents are well managed, with version control and so forth.

E. Input (from all sources) would be collected and reported to the TC members, no later than a set period of days after the close of the announced review period. The Co-Chairs would set the deadline for reporting what input was incorporated, what was not, the reasons, etc. The authors would have "ownership" at this stage and would:

1. Make a record of the input received or noted.
2. Make changes in the Statement of Work reflecting input the authors believe should be accepted.
3. Report the input not accepted and incorporated in the Statement of Work, with brief explanations for each item.
4. Complete the final draft of the Statement of Work and submit it to the Co-Chairs.

F. The final draft of the Statement of Work will be reviewed by the Co-Chairs and the TC Editor, based on completion and resolution of all of the above. It will then be published for TC final review and concurrence. This document would not be subject to a required period of public review and comment, nor would it have to be reviewed at a Face-to-Face meeting of the TC. TC approval indicates only that it believes the subject is worth applying resources to draft the actual specification or other deliverable. Though public comment and a Face-to-Face meeting review are not required, they could be done for any given Statement of Work.

G. The TC Co-Chairs will notify the TC about the final review period to be observed and would schedule the TC's vote. A vote to accept the final draft of the Statement of Work would, in effect, constitute the TC's consent that resources should be used, as described in the Statement of Work, to develop the specification or deliverable.

H. A Statement of Work that is accepted by the TC will be prepared by the TC Editor for final publishing on the Web page by the Web master. The published Statement of Work should include only technical editing, but not substantive changes, that might be needed to ensure it conforms to the TC's requirements for its official documents, including version control requirements. The review process would be described in a document history statement.