**ECF5 Spec Feedback and Considerations – 28**

This document provides additional ECF-5 feedback, questions, and commentary. This feedback is based on review of the Electronic Court Filing Version 5.0 Working Draft 36 (WD36), unless otherwise noted. This document does not represent a comprehensive review of WD36 but instead only raises issues uncovered during a limited review time interval. Additional review of WD36, or other future work draft(s), is anticipated as additional time permits.

1. **Typos**

Section 4.3. Code Lists on page 26 – DocumentDocketingStatusCode.gc is mistyped (i.e. missing ‘o’ in ‘Docketing’).

1. **CASA**

CaseParticipantRoleCode.gc file contains the code “CASA” twice (line 266 and line 494).

CaseParticipantRoleCode-roles.gc also has two “CASA” codes (line 266 and line 494).

1. **PaymentMessage Payer**

The payment:Payer element in payment:PaymentMessage only allows for person payers. This element needs to also allow for organization payers. Is there a need to also provide support for Item payers?

1. **Appellate Case – j:AppellateCaseNotice**

The j:AppellateCaseNotice element within appellate:CaseAugmentation needs to be nillable.

1. **Appellate Case – j:AppellateCaseOriginalCase**

The cardinality for j:AppellateCaseOriginalcase is 0,1.

Some appellate cases have multiple original cases.

With the availability of j:CaseLineageCase (maxOccurs=unbounded), is there really any need for j:AppellateCaseOriginalCase?

1. **Nillable ecf:DocumentAugmentation**

Make ecf:DocumentAugmentation nillable.

1. **ecf:ParticipantID**

Element ecf:ParticipantID is mandatory for EntityPerson and EntityItem but not for EntityOrganization. These should be consistent.

1. **Self-Represented Attorneys**

It seems that the last paragraph in section 6.2.9 Participant Identifiers (shown below) should be moved to section 6.3.1 Attorney to Party References.

Self-represented litigants that are also an attorney MAY be represented using both attorney and party elements for the same individual, with a reference from the attorney element to the party element. Otherwise, the attorney elements for a self-represented litigant SHOULD NOT include a bar number.

1. **Appellate Use Case examples**

Two new use case example sets are provided. Each Use Case example set contains 8 messages, from ReviewFilingRequest through NotifyFilingReviewCompleteResponse.

1. Appellate-NOA

This xml example is from a series of examples that illustrate a full life cycle sequence use case for an illustration of

Barabara Holmes' Test Case # 1300 (Case Initiation, Court of Appeal, Appeal of an Agency determination). In this use case,

an attorney for the appellant is appealing a decision from an executive branch agency (i.e. the Corporation Commission) to

an intermediary appellate court.

1. Appellate-ROA

This xml example is an illustration of a case initiation e-filing submission modeled on Barabara Holmes' Test Case # 1100

(Case Initiation, Court of Appeal, Petition for Appeal). In this use case, an attorney is appealing a case from a lower

trial court to an intermediary appellate court.

1. **Civil-Complaint Use Case**

Some adjustments have been made to the existing civil-complaint use case. The following files were revised:

Civil-complaint-006-RecordDocketingResponse-04.xml, civil-complain-008-NotifyDocketingCompleteResponse-04.xml, and civil-complaint-010-NotifyFilingReviewCompleteResponse-04.xml.

Added additional nc:DocumentIdentification element to return [ECF] filing identifier per 6.2.4.

1. **Corrections/Revisions to existing docket.xml example**

This example illustrates the use of docket:CorrectedCase to capture the following changes made in clerk review:

* Case title corrected
* Case number and case tracking ID added.
* Correction of Driver’s License number for the case initiating party (e.g. Plaintiff) John W. Doe.
1. docket:CorrectedCase\j:CaseAugmentation

The example as of WD36 provides the following for j:CaseAugmentation within CorrectedCase:

 <j:CaseAugmentation>

 <j:CaseCourt>

 <nc:OrganizationIdentification>

 <nc:IdentificationID>10</nc:IdentificationID>

 </nc:OrganizationIdentification>

 <j:CourtName>King County Circuit Court</j:CourtName>

 </j:CaseCourt>

 <j:CaseOfficial>

 <nc:RoleOfPerson structures:ref="Person3" xsi:nil="true"/>

 </j:CaseOfficial>

 </j:CaseAugmentation>

However, j:CaseAugmentation in nc:Case provides:

 <j:CaseAugmentation>

 <j:CaseCourt>

 <nc:OrganizationIdentification>

 <nc:IdentificationID>10</nc:IdentificationID>

 </nc:OrganizationIdentification>

 <j:CourtName>King County Circuit Court</j:CourtName>

 </j:CaseCourt>

 <j:CaseOfficial>

 <nc:RoleOfPerson structures:id="Person3">

 <nc:PersonName>

 <nc:PersonFullName>Jane Doe, JD</nc:PersonFullName>

 </nc:PersonName>

 <ecf:PersonAugmentation>

 <ecf:ParticipantID>

 <nc:IdentificationID>13</nc:IdentificationID>

 </ecf:ParticipantID>

 </ecf:PersonAugmentation>

 </nc:RoleOfPerson>

 <j:JudicialOfficialBarMembership>

 <j:JudicialOfficialBarIdentification>

 <nc:IdentificationID>100</nc:IdentificationID>

 </j:JudicialOfficialBarIdentification>

 </j:JudicialOfficialBarMembership>

 <ecf:CaseOfficialAugmentation>

 <ecf:CaseRepresentedParty>

 <nc:EntityPerson structures:ref="Person1" xsi:nil="true"/>

 <!-- John W. Doe -->

 </ecf:CaseRepresentedParty>

 </ecf:CaseOfficialAugmentation>

 </j:CaseOfficial>

 </j:CaseAugmentation>

Since j:CaseAugmentation in CorrectedCase does not include j:JudicialBarMembership and ecf:CaseOfficialAugmentation, then the understanding must be that these were eliminated in Clerk Review. Since removing this case information is not intended in the example, this must be corrected. The easiest and most straight forward correction is to apply concise representation using structures:ref in CorrectedCase\j:CaseAugmentation to reference the original j:caseAugmentation in nc:Case, as shown below:

 <j:CaseAugmentation structures:ref="OriginaljCaseAugmentation"/>

1. docket:CorrectedCase\civil:CaseAugmentation

Although the docket:CorrectedCase\civil:CaseAugmentation is not technically incorrect as it appears in the docket.xml example, the recent addition of the xsi:nil attribute to civil:CaseAugmentation permits an even more concise representation. The docket.xml example was revised to provide a reference from the CorrectedCase civil:CaseAugmentation to civil:CaseAugmentation in nc:Case.

1. ecf:ConnectedDocumentReview\ecf:ReviewedDocument\ecf:DocumentAugmentation

Added elements: ecf:DocumentFiler, ecf:RedactionRequiredIndicator, ecf:RegisterActionDescriptionCode, ecf:SpecialHandlingInstructions and nc:DocumentAssociation. With these elements absent, the understanding must be that the information is no longer applicable following clerk review.

1. ecf:LeadDocumentReview\ecf:ReviewedDocument\ecf:DocumentAugmentation

Added elements: ecf:DocumentFiler, ecf:RedactionRequiredIndicator, and ecf:RegisterActionDescriptionCode. With these elements absent, the understanding must be that the information is no longer applicable following clerk review.

1. **Make ecf:PersonAugmentation nillable**

When attempting to make the docket.xml example more concise, I was unable to do so by using structures:ref for ecf:PersonAugmentation due to ecf;ParticipantID being a mandatory element.

ecf:PersonAugmentation should be nillable.

As a broader consideration, should not all augmentations be nillable?

1. **Allow nc:DocumentAssociation to be nillable**

See the newly revised docket.xml example.

When adding a new file stamped rendition of a connected document in clerk review, a new ecf:DocumentAugmentation element should be included. Any information not provided in the augmentation must be considered as not applicable. This includes nc:DocumentAssociation.

If nc:DocumentAssociation were nillable, then a concise reference using structures:ref could be used to reference the original nc:DocumentAssociation instead of repeating the information.

1. **xxx**