**ECF5 Spec Feedback and Considerations – 30**

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 39 (WD39), unless otherwise noted. This document does not represent a comprehensive review of WD39 but instead only raises issues uncovered during a limited review time interval. Additional review of WD39, or other future work draft(s), is anticipated as additional time permits.

1. **CaseParticipantRoleCode**

Section 6.5 Case Participant Rules provides:

The [CaseParticipantRoleCode.gc](schema%5CCaseParticipantRoleCode.gc) code list defines the allowed values for ecf:CaseParticipantRoleCode and includes columns indicating which code values are valid in combination with each role element. If ecf:CaseParticipantRoleCode is provided, the code value MUST be in the [CaseParticipantRoleCode.gc](schema%5CCaseParticipantRoleCode.gc) code list and the code list column matching the role element MUST have the value “true”.

There appears to be a change from WD38 to WD39 which makes the above statement no longer true.

In WD38, CaseParticipantRoleCode.gc provides SimpleCodeList that appears as in the example extracted below:

 <Value ColumnRef="code">

 <SimpleValue>Affiant</SimpleValue>

 </Value>

 <Value ColumnRef="definition">

 <SimpleValue>Author of an affidavit</SimpleValue>

 </Value>

 <Value ColumnRef="CaseOtherEntity">

 <SimpleValue>true</SimpleValue>

 </Value>

 <Value ColumnRef="CaseDefendantAttorney">

 <SimpleValue>true</SimpleValue>

 </Value>

 <Value ColumnRef="CaseInitiatingAttorney">

 <SimpleValue>true</SimpleValue>

 </Value>

 <Value ColumnRef="CaseProsecutionAttorney">

 <SimpleValue>true</SimpleValue>

 </Value>

 <Value ColumnRef="CaseOtherEntityAttorney">

 <SimpleValue>true</SimpleValue>

 </Value>

 <Value ColumnRef="CaseOfficial">

 <SimpleValue>true</SimpleValue>

 </Value>

 </Row>

 <Row>

 <Value ColumnRef="code">

 <SimpleValue>Appellant</SimpleValue>

 </Value>

 <Value ColumnRef="definition">

 <SimpleValue>Party who appeals a to a higher court</SimpleValue>

 </Value>

 <Value ColumnRef="CaseOtherParty">

 <SimpleValue>true</SimpleValue>

 </Value>

 </Row>

However, in WD39, this now appears as:

 <Row>

 <Value ColumnRef="code">

 <SimpleValue>Administrator</SimpleValue>

 </Value>

 <Value ColumnRef="definition">

 <SimpleValue>Court appointed manager of an estate</SimpleValue>

 </Value>

 </Row>

 <Row>

 <Value ColumnRef="code">

 <SimpleValue>AdoptedChild</SimpleValue>

 </Value>

 <Value ColumnRef="definition">

 <SimpleValue>Child adopted by a parent</SimpleValue>

 </Value>

 </Row>

Also note that WD39 provides CaseParticipantRoleCode-roles.gc that appears the same or similar to the WD38 CaseParticipantRoleCode.gc.

It appears that the structure CaseParticipantRoleCode-roles.gc is the correct structure and should be applied to CaseParticipantRoleCode.gc. As such, is there any need to keep CaseParticipantRoleCode-roles.gc?

Observe that there are some role code differences between CaseParticipantRoleCode.gc and CaseParticipantRoleCode-roles.gc. For instance, CaseParticipantRoleCode.gc contains “Administrator” and CaseParticipantRoleCode-roles.gc does not.

Also note that some of the role element names used as ColumnRef values in the gc files may no longer be used; e.g. ‘CaseDefendantParty’, ‘CaseInitiatingParty’, ‘CaseRespondentParty’, ‘CaseOtherParty’, ‘CaseDefendantAttroney’, ‘CaseInitiatingAttorney’, ‘CaseProsecutionAttorney’, and ‘CaseOtherEntityAttorney’.
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