**ECF 4.0 to 4.01 “Juice worth the Squeeze” Points**

The cardinality of many elements was revised in ECF 4.01 OS from the initial committee draft of ECF 4.0.

See ‘ECF 4-0 to ECF 4-01 Differences-1.docx’ document for a complete listing for three of the most important schema files (i.e. jxdm.xsd, niem-core.xsd & ECF-4.0-CommonTypes.xsd).

This document identifies elements which have had maxOccurs changes in ECF 4.01 OS that adversely affect Arizona e-filing messages defined using ECF 4.01 CD01. This list is only a subset of all cardinality v4.01 revised elements for which cardinality revision should be reconsidered and is only intended to identify the most critical elements that Arizona is requesting maxOccur reversals to ‘unbounded’. There are additional elements not included on this list that may also benefit from cardinality reversal that the TC should consider, either for immediate action, or for future correction via an additional ECF 4 maintenance release or a future version (e.g. ECF 5).

**1. CoreFilingMessage/nc:DocumentIdentification**

 With ECF 4.0, the maxOccurs for DocumentIdentification within DocumentType was ‘unbounded’; with ECF 4.01, it is now restricted to ‘1’.

In the CoreFilingMessage as used with Arizona, multiple instances of DocumentIdentification are used. The first DocumentIdentification is used for the ‘Submission ID’ and the second is used for the FAMDE ‘Form Set ID’.

Example:

 <CoreFilingMessage xmlns="urn:oasis:names:tc:legalxml-courtfiling:schema:xsd:CoreFilingMessage-4.0" xmlns:nc="http://niem.gov/niem/niem-core/2.0" xmlns:ecf="urn:oasis:names:tc:legalxml-courtfiling:schema:xsd:CommonTypes-4.0" xmlns:s="http://niem.gov/niem/structures/2.0" xmlns:j="http://niem.gov/niem/domains/jxdm/4.0" xsi:schemaLocation="urn:oasis:names:tc:legalxml-courtfiling:schema:xsd:CoreFilingMessage-4.0 ../xsd/message/ECF-4.0-CoreFilingMessage.xsd">

 <nc:DocumentIdentification>

 <nc:IdentificationID>s-d5dfc237-932c-48cd-9bcd-77e980d6f6c6</nc:IdentificationID>

 <nc:IdentificationCategoryText>SubmissionID</nc:IdentificationCategoryText>

 </nc:DocumentIdentification>

 <nc:DocumentIdentification>

 <nc:IdentificationID>971441</nc:IdentificationID>

 <nc:IdentificationCategoryText>FormSetID</nc:IdentificationCategoryText>

 </nc:DocumentIdentification>

Multiple instances of this element are also used in the NotifyDocketingComplete message (NDC); one instance is used for ‘NotificationID’ and the second instance is used for the ‘SubmissionID’.

Example:

 <docketcb:RecordDocketingCallbackMessage>

 <nc:DocumentIdentification>

 <nc:IdentificationID>EAC3B5C3-9A73-4A86-9092-FC909E59EE26</nc:IdentificationID>

 <nc:IdentificationCategoryText>NotificationID</nc:IdentificationCategoryText>

 </nc:DocumentIdentification>

 <nc:DocumentIdentification>

 <nc:IdentificationID>s-c41b24b5-e5e5-4741-9ff6-d228c16adbf7</nc:IdentificationID>

 <nc:IdentificationCategoryText>SubmissionID</nc:IdentificationCategoryText>

 </nc:DocumentIdentification>

**2. CivilCase/nc:ActivityIdentification**

With Civil cases in Pima County Superior Court, multiple instances of ActivityIdentification may be sent. As of ECF v4.01, only a single ActivityIdentification is now allowed. The maxOccurs for nc:ActivityIdentification will need to be reset to ‘unbounded’ to support multiple instances.

Example:

 <tce:CivilCase>

 <nc:ActivityIdentification>

 <nc:IdentificationID>GeneralCivil</nc:IdentificationID>

 <nc:IdentificationCategoryText>CaseType</nc:IdentificationCategoryText>

 </nc:ActivityIdentification>

 <nc:ActivityIdentification>

 <nc:IdentificationID>Subsequent</nc:IdentificationID>

 <nc:IdentificationCategoryText>FilingType</nc:IdentificationCategoryText>

 </nc:ActivityIdentification>

**3. nc:DocumentStatus/nc:StatusDescriptionText**

Arizona uses multiple instances of nc:StatusDescriptionText in the NDC for reviewed documents. The first instance identifies the Clerk Review result. Subsequent instances may provide additional information regarding the disposition/status of the document that was processed.

Example:

 <aoc:ReviewedLeadDocument s:id="Lead1">

 <nc:DocumentFiledDate>

 <nc:DateTime>2011-04-11T00:00:00-07:00</nc:DateTime>

 </nc:DocumentFiledDate>

 <nc:DocumentIdentification>

 <nc:IdentificationID>cc95a456-3c12-4541-9ca0-2f5621a621c6</nc:IdentificationID>

 <nc:IdentificationCategoryText>DocumentID</nc:IdentificationCategoryText>

 </nc:DocumentIdentification>

 <nc:DocumentStatus>

 <nc:StatusText>0</nc:StatusText>

 <nc:StatusDescriptionText>accepted</nc:StatusDescriptionText>

 <nc:StatusDescriptionText>Routed to Judge for Review</nc:StatusDescriptionText>

 </nc:DocumentStatus>

**4. j:AppellateCaseOriginalCase**

This element is defined as “*The original case that is being retried in an appellate court*.” Overlooking the fact that cases are reviewed and not tried in an appellate court, there may also be a misunderstanding that an appellate case has a single lineage predecessor case. Whereas most do have a single ancestor case, many have multiple immediate predecessor cases. As such, this maxOccurs revision from ‘unbounded’ to ‘1’ should be reversed.

**5. j:CaseAugmentation/j:CaseJudge**

In ECF 4.0, any number of judges could be associated with a case. With ECF 4.01, this is now restricted to at most a single judge. This will be an issue when needing to communicate information about cases that have multiple judges (e.g. GetCaseResponse), such as appellate cases (which typically have three to five judges/justices), or even GJ cases where multiple judges have participated, each in different role (e.g. arraignment, trial, sentencing, etc.).

**6. CaseOfficialRoleText**

ECF 4.01 now limits CaseOfficialRoleText to at most one within CaseOfficialType (e.g. CaseDefenseAttorney, CaseInitiatingAttorney, CaseJudge, CaseOfficial, CaseProsecutionAttorney, and CaseRespondentAttorney). This is unduly restrictive in that a single ‘case official’ at times may have multiple case roles. However, a work around is available with ECF 4.01 (see Example 2 below).

Example 1 – multiple attorney roles under ECF 4.0:

<j:CaseInitiatingAttorney>

 <nc:RoleOfPersonReference s:ref="iced5c7bd-05b7-4ccd-8347-d7c1fe7acbf7"/>

 <j:JudicialOfficialBarMembership>

 <j:JudicialOfficialBarIdentification>

 <nc:IdentificationID>019025</nc:IdentificationID>

 <j:IdentificationJurisdictionNCICLISCode>AZ</j:IdentificationJurisdictionNCICLISCode>

 <nc:IdentificationSourceText>State Bar of AZ</nc:IdentificationSourceText>

 </j:JudicialOfficialBarIdentification>

 </j:JudicialOfficialBarMembership>

 <j:CaseOfficialRoleText>AttorneyForAppellants</j:CaseOfficialRoleText>

 <j:CaseOfficialRoleText>Pro Hac Vice</j:CaseOfficialRoleText>

</j:CaseInitiatingAttorney>

Example 2 –multiple attorney roles under ECF 4.01 (work around):

<j:CaseInitiatingAttorney>

 <nc:RoleOfPersonReference s:ref="iced5c7bd-05b7-4ccd-8347-d7c1fe7acbf7"/>

 <j:JudicialOfficialBarMembership>

 <j:JudicialOfficialBarIdentification>

 <nc:IdentificationID>019025</nc:IdentificationID>

 <j:IdentificationJurisdictionNCICLISCode>AZ</j:IdentificationJurisdictionNCICLISCode>

 <nc:IdentificationSourceText>State Bar of AZ</nc:IdentificationSourceText>

 </j:JudicialOfficialBarIdentification>

 </j:JudicialOfficialBarMembership>

 <j:CaseOfficialRoleText>AttorneyForAppellants</j:CaseOfficialRoleText>

</j:CaseInitiatingAttorney>

<j:CaseInitiatingAttorney>

 <nc:RoleOfPersonReference s:ref="iced5c7bd-05b7-4ccd-8347-d7c1fe7acbf7"/>

 <j:CaseOfficialRoleText>Pro Hac Vice</j:CaseOfficialRoleText>

</j:CaseInitiatingAttorney>

In the ECF 4.01 work around above, there are two instances of j:CaseInitiatingAttorney. However, since the s:ref value within the nc:RoleOfPersonReference is the same for each j:CaseInitiatingAttorney, these two instances both describe the same person. In this way, two or more CaseOfficialRoleText values can be applied.

This work around is more difficult to understand, explain, implement and maintain. This translates into higher support costs.

**7. j:CitationViolation**

With ECF 4.10, the number of CitationViolations permitted in a Citation was changed from ‘unbounded’ to ‘1’. This is incorrect in many or most jurisdictions. If a driver were cited for both ‘speeding’ and ‘unsafe lane change’, both of these violations would be on the same citation.

**8. nc:ActivityDisposition within ActivityType**

 CaseDisposition can be substituted for ActivityDisposition and is used to describe the outcome of a case. Not all cases have a single outcome, so multiple CaseDispositions need to be supported. This requires that the maxOccurs for ActivityDisposition within ActivityType be reversed to ‘unbounded’.