**12/13/10 Recommendations from Jim Cabral In response to feedback from the public review of ECF 4.01 core specification ending 10/18/11**

**Proposed changes to ECF 4.01 Core Specification based on feedback from the Arizona Supreme Court received 10/21/11:**

1. In response to the “ECF is too imprecise on some very important points“ comment, these changes would require significant changes to the schemas. Therefore, make no changes to ECF 4.01 and consider adding specificity to ECF 4.1.
2. ~~In response to the “Court Specific and Case Type Specific Messages” comment, remove the references to “CaseTypeSpecificMessage” and “CourtSpecificMessage” in Appendix C, Section C.3.1 and allow multiple RecordDocketingMessages in ECF-4.0-WebServicesMessagingProfile-Definitions.wsdl as follows:~~

 ~~<xsd:complexType name="RecordFilingRequestMessageType">~~

 ~~<xsd:annotation>~~

 ~~<xsd:documentation>Multi-part message type (required for conformance with WS-I Basic Profile 1.1</xsd:documentation>~~

 ~~</xsd:annotation>~~

 ~~<xsd:complexContent>~~

 ~~<xsd:extension base="ecf:ElectronicFilingMessageType">~~

 ~~<xsd:sequence>~~

 ~~<xsd:element ref="docket:RecordDocketingMessage" maxoccurs=”unbounded”/>~~

 ~~<xsd:element ref="core:CoreFilingMessage"/>~~

 ~~</xsd:sequence>~~

 ~~</xsd:extension>~~

 ~~</xsd:complexContent>~~

 ~~</xsd:complexType>~~

 ~~<xsd:element name="RecordFilingRequestMessage" type="RecordFilingRequestMessageType">~~

 ~~<xsd:annotation>~~

 ~~<xsd:documentation>Multi-part message (required for conformance with WS-I Basic Profile 1.1</xsd:documentation>~~

 ~~</xsd:annotation>~~

 ~~</xsd:element>~~

1. In response to the “RecordDocketingMessage” comment, make no changes to ECF 4.01 but consider adding a Case element to RecordDocketMessage in ECF 4.1 to support information added or modified during clerk review.
2. ~~Add CourtEventDocumentReference (s:ReferenceType) to CaseCourtEvent to prevent duplication of document metadata.~~
3. In response to the “Case Type and Categorization” comment, make no changes to ECF 4.01 but consider additional tier of case categorization in ECF 4.1.
4. ~~In response to the “Document Title” comment, add nc:DocumentTitleText to nc:DocumentType.~~
5. ~~In response to the “Document Category” comment, add nc:DocumentCategoryID and nc:DocumentCategoryName to nc:DocumentType.~~
6. ~~In response to the “CaseOfficialRoleCode” comment, replace references to “CaseOfficialRoleCode” with “CaseOfficialRoleText”.~~
7. ~~In response to the “Subsequent Filings” comment, clarify in Section 2.4.3 that the case substitution elements are intended for use in case initiation.~~

**Proposed changes to ECF 4.01 Core Specification based on feedback from URL Integration:**

1. ~~Extend CaseCourtEvent with:~~
	1. ~~CourtLocationCode (nc:TextType) - A code referring to the location in a court of the calendar event.~~
	2. ~~CourtLocationText (nc:TextType) - A textual description of the location in a court of the calendar event.~~
2. ~~In section 3.1, “The Filing-Preparation-to-Docketing Process Model”, change the statements~~

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

* ~~GetFilingList~~
* ~~GetFilingStatus~~

~~At any point after the NotifyFilingReviewComplete operation, a party MAY access information through the following operations:~~

* ~~GetCaseList~~
* ~~GetCase~~
* ~~GetDocument”~~

~~to clarify that a response is only available when the case of filing in question is accessible.~~

1. ~~In Section 3.2.12 capitalize “MAY” in~~ ~~“The Filing Assembly MDE MAY also limit the amount of case detail returned from the Court Record MDE by using a set of filters”~~
2. ~~In Section 3.3.3.2, capitalize “MAY”~~ **~~in~~** ~~“The payment MAY include a maximum amount for the payment if some latitude is needed to accomplish the filing”~~
3. ~~In Section 3.4, replace “courts are cautioned against, but not prohibited from” with “SHOULD NOT”  in “While an ROA transaction is awaiting acceptance or rejection in the destination court, and when the target case consists of multiple records, courts SHOIULD NOT send additional amendment transactions intended for the same record for the same target case”~~
4. ~~In Section 2.4.2, “Machine Readable Court Policy”. Clarify that the machine readable court policy MUST be provided to the Filing Assembly MDE either by the Filing Review MDE through the GetCourtPolicy query or some other means.~~