**ECF5 Spec Feedback and Considerations - 8**

This document contains additional questions and commentary resulting from a review at the Electronic Court Filing Version 5.0 Working Draft 14. A subcommittee conference call has held on May 23, 2017 to address pending issues from prior review feedback. The goal of this feedback installment is to focus on the issues raised and revised during the working session conference call. This goal includes collecting together any loose ends with regard to these issues.

1. **Corrected Filing**

There has been a lot of back and forth conversations on this topic of clerk review corrections and modifications, beginning with item #19 in my first review feedback document. Hopefully this is now concluded as a result of the discussions during the May 23, 2017 conference call. These results are expected to be included in working draft 14 which has just been released.

The response to the first feedback document was that the following had been added to section 6.3.3:

Added “If the clerk made any modifications to the original filing, the modified filing SHOULD be included in the docket:CorrectedFiling element.”

As of working draft 13, this revision had been further revised as:

If the clerk made any modifications to the original filing, the original filing SHOULD be included in the filing:FilingMessage element.

During the conference call of May 23, 2017, it had been agreed to rename the ‘outermost’ nc:Case element to docket:CorrectedCase (see feedback document #6, item 2).

As such, in working draft 14, I would expect the 6.3.3 revision to be:

“If the clerk made any modifications to the original filing, then the modified filing SHOULD be included in the docket:CorrectedCase element”

However, it may be better stated as:

“If the clerk made any modifications to the original filing case information, then the modified case information SHOULD be included in the docket:CorrectedCase element”

With the release of wd14, this statement has not been revised.

The filing:FilingMessage element is still optional in wd14 and needs to be mandatory.

Also, in feedback #6, some integrity rules and/or guidelines were suggested. These were not discussed on 5-23-17, and therefore this is a loose end still requiring closure.

Finally, the example xml may also need to be revised per changes made. Multiple examples may be useful.

1. **Document Associations**

This topic also has had a lot of back and forth discussion.

Document association was also discussed on the May 23, 2017 conference call.

At this conference call, the following was agreed:

The nc:DocumentAssociation element would be used to associate documents, including associating FilingConnectedDocument to FilingLeadDocument.

As such, when associating FilingConnectedDocument to FilingLeadDocument, it should be done as shown in the non-normative example in section 6.3.1 of working draft 13, and not as shown in section 6.3.1 of working draft 8.

<filing:FilingMessage>

<filing:FilingConnectedDocument structures:id=”Document2”>

…

<ecf:DocumentAugmentation>

…

<nc:DocumentAssociation>

<nc:PrimaryDocument structures:ref="Document1" xsi:nil="true"/>

<ecf:DocumentAssociationAugmentation>

<ecf:DocumentRelatedCode>parent</ecf:DocumentRelatedCode>

</ecf:DocumentAssociationAugmentation>

</nc:DocumentAssociation>

…

</ecf:DocumentAugmentation>

</filing:FilingConnectedDocument>

<filing:FilingLeadDocument structures:id=”Document1”>

…

</filing:FilingLeadDocument>

…

</filing:FilingMessage>

Example above from wd 13.

<filing:FilingMessage>

<filing:FilingConnectedDocument structures:id=”Document2”>

…

</filing:FilingConnectedDocument>

<filing:FilingLeadDocument structures:id=”Document1”>

…

<ecf:ConnectedDocument structures:ref=”Document2”/>

…

</filing:FilingLeadDocument>

…

</filing:FilingMessage>

Example above from wd 8.

Also illustrated during the 5-23-1027 conference call was XML mark-up for referencing a document that has been previously filed (shown below).

<nc:DocumentAssociation>

<nc:PrimaryDocument>

<nc:DocumentIdentification>

<nc:IdentificationID>123456</nc:IdentificationID>

</nc:DocumentIdentification>

</nc:PrimaryDocument>

<ecf:DocumentAssociationAugmentation>

<ecf:DocumentRelatedCode>prior-related</ecf:DocumentRelatedCode>

</ecf:DocumentAssociationAugmentation>

</nc:DocumentAssociation>

It was also discussed whether or not the value of the ecf:DocumentRelatedCode must be ‘parent’ when associating a connected document to a lead document. I believe we agreed that this made sense. Check for this in wd14; confirmed that a ‘parent’ rule is stated.

Just as a reminder, associating a connected document to a lead document in ECF 4.01 is done using ecf:ParentDocumentReference within ecf:DocumentMetadata, as shown below:

<FilingConnectedDocument s:id="\_123456ABC.inf.doc">

<nc:DocumentApplicationName>Microsoft Word</nc:DocumentApplicationName>

<nc:DocumentDescriptionText>Information</nc:DocumentDescriptionText>

<nc:DocumentSequenceID>1</nc:DocumentSequenceID>

<nc:DocumentLanguageCode>eng</nc:DocumentLanguageCode>

<ecf:DocumentMetadata>

<j:RegisterActionDescriptionText/>

<ecf:ParentDocumentReference s:ref="\_123456ABC.app.doc"/>

<ecf:FilingAttorneyID/>

<ecf:FilingPartyID/>

</ecf:DocumentMetadata>

So now, when using nc:DocumentAssociation in ECF5, there are multiple ways this can be done when the primary document ‘exists’ within the XML document. This can be done using nc:PrimaryDocument/nc:DocumentIdentification or by using the structures:ref attribute (or both). Currently the specification is silent on this point (check again in wd14 – still silent).

In wd14, the civil.xml example includes an example of the first approach (abbreviated):

<filing:FilingConnectedDocument structures:id="Document2" structures:metadata="Document1Metadata">

<nc:DocumentDescriptionText>Petition</nc:DocumentDescriptionText>

<nc:DocumentIdentification>

<nc:IdentificationID>1</nc:IdentificationID>

</nc:DocumentIdentification>

<ecf:DocumentAugmentation>

<nc:DocumentAssociation>

<nc:PrimaryDocument structures:ref="Document1" xsi:nil="true"/>

<ecf:DocumentAssociationAugmentation>

<ecf:DocumentRelatedCode>parent</ecf:DocumentRelatedCode>

</ecf:DocumentAssociationAugmentation>

</nc:DocumentAssociation>

</ecf:DocumentAugmentation>

</filing:FilingConnectedDocument>

The second approach would look like:

<filing:FilingConnectedDocument structures:id="Document2" structures:metadata="Document1Metadata">

<nc:DocumentDescriptionText>Petition</nc:DocumentDescriptionText>

<nc:DocumentIdentification>

<nc:IdentificationID>1</nc:IdentificationID>

</nc:DocumentIdentification>

<ecf:DocumentAugmentation>

<nc:DocumentAssociation>

<nc:DocumentIdentification>

<nc:IdentificationID>2</nc:IdentificationID>

</nc:DocumentIdentification>

<ecf:DocumentAssociationAugmentation>

<ecf:DocumentRelatedCode>parent</ecf:DocumentRelatedCode>

</ecf:DocumentAssociationAugmentation>

</nc:DocumentAssociation>

</ecf:DocumentAugmentation>

</filing:FilingConnectedDocument>

And the ‘both’ approach would be:

<filing:FilingConnectedDocument structures:id="Document2" structures:metadata="Document1Metadata">

<nc:DocumentDescriptionText>Petition</nc:DocumentDescriptionText>

<nc:DocumentIdentification>

<nc:IdentificationID>1</nc:IdentificationID>

</nc:DocumentIdentification>

<ecf:DocumentAugmentation>

<nc:DocumentAssociation>

<nc:PrimaryDocument structures:ref="Document1”>

<nc:DocumentIdentification>

<nc:IdentificationID>2</nc:IdentificationID>

</nc:DocumentIdentification>

</nc:PrimaryDocument>

<ecf:DocumentAssociationAugmentation>

<ecf:DocumentRelatedCode>parent</ecf:DocumentRelatedCode>

</ecf:DocumentAssociationAugmentation>

</nc:DocumentAssociation>

</ecf:DocumentAugmentation>

</filing:FilingConnectedDocument>

The ‘both’ approach would not be recommended without exercising care that the structures:ref attribute value and nc:DocumentIdentification element value for nc:PrimaryDocument are consistent.

I still think that a specific approach should be defined so as to promote interoperability.

Based on the decision to use nc:DocumentAssociation, then the specification text in section 6.3.1 ‘filing:FilingMessage’ seems a bit askew. It says:

A [filing:FilingMessage](file:///C:\Users\JamesECabral\OneDrive\xml\ecf5\schema\filing.xsd) MAY NOT include documents for transactions such as the payment of a criminal fine. 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 and referenced in filing:FilingLeadDocument with the ecf:ConnectedDocument element that includes an ecf:DocumentRelatedCode with value “parent”. The following non-normative example includes a single lead document and single connected document:

I am not finding any ecf:ConnectedDocument element.

Perhaps this should be revised as:

A [filing:FilingMessage](file:///C:\Users\JamesECabral\OneDrive\xml\ecf5\schema\filing.xsd) MAY NOT include documents for transactions such as the payment of a criminal fine. 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 and referenced in filing:FilingLeadDocument with the nc:DocumentAssociation element that includes an ecf:DocumentRelatedCode with value “parent”. The following non-normative example includes a single lead document and single connected document:

Other loose ends on document association include the use or non-use of nc:SecondaryDocument.

It appears that nc:SecondaryDocument MUST not be used when defining an association between a connected document and a lead document. Should this be cast as a rule?

Under what circumstances would the use of nc:SecondaryDocument be appropriate?

Do we even need this nc:SecondaryDocument element?

1. **CaseAugmentation**

CaseAugmentation was also discussed during the May 23, 2017 conference call (see feedback document 5, item #8).

We agreed that determining the case type from the case-type augmentation was not a pragmatic approach and therefore ecf:CaseTypeCode would be added. In wd14, this element has been added in ecf:CaseAugmentation. However, I do not think that the element description is correct, at least in this context. Although ecf:CaseTypeCode has been added to ecf:CaseAugmentation in wd14, it does not yet appear in the examples (i.e. appellate.xml, civil.xml, citation.xml, criminal.xml, domestic.xml, juvenile.xml).

It was agreed that the sequence in which element substitution is done in nc:CaseAugmentationPoint is important for some TC members (especially for human readers of XML messages), and should be defined in the specification. The order should be:

j:CaseAugmentation

ecf:CaseAugmentation

Case type augmentations (e.g. civil:CivilCaseAugmentation)

Implementation specific case augmentations (e.g. aoc:CaseAugmentation)

It was also agreed that these elements may only be substituted once.

I do not see these specification rules in the specification document in wd14 yet. Perhaps I am not looking in the right place.

It was also agreed that there is no restriction on implementers defining their own implementation specific augmentations. The concern regarding the specification statement: “case type augmentations MAY ONLY substitute for nc:CaseAugmentationPoint” is a misinterpretation. This statement is intended to say that the only allowable place that case type augmentations can be used is in substitution for nc:CaseAugmentationPoint.

1. **ID/IDREF**

This issue was also discussed on May 23, 2017.

It was agreed that Gary Graham will try his hand at drafting rules to extend and supplement existing NIEM rules (refer to feedback document 4, ietm #2).