Court Policy File Overview

Table of Contents

1.0 What is a Court Policy?

In the context of this document, a **Court Policy** (also called **Policy XML**) is a technical *configuration file*.[1] A Court Policy includes information about individual courts and their divisions in a way that computer programs can understand without human intervention. Electronic filing service providers (*EFSPs*) and *justice partners* (collectively called *integration partners*) programmatically[2] consume information in the Court Policy and use the information to configure their systems. Some Court Policy data specifies court business rules. Integration partners must use or conform to the business rules to be able to send transactions to the court.   Other Court Policy data is included in the integration partner's electronic submission to the court.   This data is used by the court.

An example of information contained in a Court Policy is *hours of operation*. Hours of operation vary among courts and court divisions. A Court Policy enables each court to publish its regular hours of operation as well as the hours of operation of the court's subdivisions (e.g., a court may have regular business hours from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm, but it may have a subdivision that holds night court on Tuesdays and Thursdays).

2.0 Benefits of Court Policy to Statewide Business Services?

Court Policy provides a number of benefits, including the following:

- Quality Assurance

- Standardized Publication of Court Information

- Reduces Court Software Customization

- Scalability

- Satisfaction of California's CRC 2.254(b) Publication of Electronic Filing Requirements

---

[1] Despite its name, and just to be clear, the Court Policy does not contain the court's local rules or statements on (public) policy. Certain data elements in the Court Policy reflect things that may be expressed in a court's local rules (e.g., hours of operation of a particular division), but that's the extent of the connection.

[2] The *programmatic* consumption of Court Policy information is what distinguishes a Court Policy from, for example, a website. The court's website may include certain information that is also contained in a court policy. However, the website format does not allow an integration partner to easily consume the data and import it into their system.   It is possible to publish Court Policy information in spreadsheets (and some jurisdictions do this) but spreadsheet format has technical limitations and nuances that also limit the ability to easily consume the data. This topic is beyond the scope of this document, but additional information is available from this author upon request.

The following sections explain these benefits.

2.1 Quality Assurance

Court Policy data is included in the integration partner's electronic submission to the court. This ensures that electronic transactions submitted from integration partners to the court have accurate information. For example, electronic filing applications use document types in a Court Policy as a pick list for filers. Only those documents types in the Court Policy are available from the pick list. Furthermore, different lists of document types can be associated with different case categories and case types. Because the document type list originates from the court and is not changed by the integration partner, (but for a defect in the filing application) there is no opportunity for the document type value to be incorrect.

Increasing the accuracy of the electronic submission reduces the work of the court clerk to process the filing.

2.2 Standardized Publication of Court Information

A Court Policy technical specification provides a standardized way for a court to publish information and for integration partners to consume information.[3]

2.3 Reduces or Eliminates Court Customization

In technical implementations, court-specific customizations are a spoiler for Courts as well as integration partners. System integration work is complex and expensive; it delays projects; and economies of scale are elusive. Standard Court Policy formats and publication procedures allow integration partners to write software one time and then configure it for use in multiple courts.

2.4 Statewide Scalability

Electronic filing and other types of data submission are possible without Court Policy and, indeed, occur regularly in projects around the country.[4] However, such

---

[3] For example, the Second Generation Electronic Filing Specifications ("2GEFS") Court Policy format is a specification implemented by around ten electronic filing service providers, four courts, and the California Case Management System, Version 3 ("CCMS V3"). CCMS V4 has stated an intention to create a new specification for Court Policy (which has not been published as of this writing). OASIS/Legal XML Electronic Court Filing (ECF) 4.0 includes a Court Policy specification. Other jurisdictions, in both civil e-filing and criminal data exchanges, publish similar information, typically in spreadsheets or various XML formats.

[4] Projects that do not have a standard Policy XML format often use spreadsheets to convey similar information. Spreadsheets are better than nothing, simply because the data is most often structured. However, spreadsheets do not provide precise content validation and have technical limitations. Data in

implementations are less scalable because they are more difficult to repeat. A high-quality, well-defined, and robust Court Policy specification, because it increases quality, provides a standard, and reduces court customization, allows implementations to multiply and scale more easily and more quickly.

Imagine, for example, writing code for, and consuming, different formats of the same type of information for each implementation of each court or court subdivision. This makes each project unique and increases the time and cost to implement multiple projects that are otherwise the same or similar.

2.5 Satisfaction of California's CRC 2.254(b) Publication of Electronic Filing Requirements

Court Policy also provides a means for a court to partially satisfy the publishing requirement of California Rules of Court (CRC) 2.254(b). CRC 2.254(b) states:

> "Each court that permits electronic filing must publish, in both electronic and print formats, the court's electronic filing requirements."

3.0 What goes into a Court Policy?

This section provides a summary of the information that typically goes into a court policy. While there may be practical limitations, theoretically, there is no limitation to the types of information that could be put into a Court Policy. [5] This section, therefore, should be viewed as an illustration of what is currently working in production, but not necessarily what might be done in the future.

3.1 Policy Name and Identifiers

3.1.1 Policy Name

The *Policy Name* is a human readable name for a court's **Policy XML**. For example a Policy Name might be **Sacramento County California, USA Court Policy**. There is no

---

spreadsheets must usually be "massaged" prior to import, which is time consuming and error prone and lacks the opportunity for full automation.

[5] 2GEFS includes two Policy XML versions: Policy XML 01 (published in 2004) and Policy XML 02 (published in 2009). 2GEFS Policy XML Version 02 has more information in it than Version 01. The Version 01 specification was intentionally limited to information that was deemed (at the time) to be (a) the most important for electronic filing and (b) practical to implement. Over time, one would expect to include more and more information in a Court Policy.

special or strict format for Policy Name. It can be any string of text.   Typically, one Policy XML file represents the case categories and case types for a single court.[6]

3.1.2 Policy Identifiers

Policy XML is identified with a *Unique Identifier*. This identifier is unique across publications of the policy. For example, the Superior Court of Orange might publish five versions of its Policy XML. Each of these versions would have a unique identifier that distinguishes it from the next.

3.2 Publication Dates and Version Control

Each version of a Policy file is assigned a *Version Number* in accordance with rules specified in the Court Policy specification. A *Publication Date* indicates the date on which a policy is published and available for testing.   An *Effective Date* indicates the date on which the policy becomes effective. A Court Policy expires when the next version of the Court Policy becomes effective. The gap between the publication date and the effective date allows a court to post a new or revised policy file prior to its becoming effective so that integration partners or others have an opportunity to examine and test the new policy.

This publication and version control system provides applications that use the court policy a mechanism for controlling the frequency with which they must refresh the file if they are caching it locally. The period between the publication date and effective date, as well as the period between policy effective dates, is a matter of court discretion.

Expired policy files should be archived. Archived policies are useful for testing, in case a roll back is required, or in the event of an issue resulting from incorrect data sent to a court (most often when a submission has been rejected).

3.3 Clerk of Court

Clerk of Court is public information about the clerk of the court (in California, the court's executive officer). Public information includes name, address, public phone number, and public email address. Only information that would be published on the court's website should be included in the Court Policy. Courts typically do not include information intended to be private.

---

[6] 2GEFS Policy XML, Version 02 supports "federated" policies. This allows a court to create a master policy and associate sub-policies outside of the master policy. This is useful in situations where a single policy is too large or where different divisions of the court operate separately and may wish to publish policies at different times without affecting other divisions of the same court.

3.4 Court Details

Court Details (for the *court*) is information about the court's name and primary location, including the court's primary address, public phone number, and public email address. This information may or may not be the same as the information about the *Clerk of Court*.

Court Details (for each *court division*) includes the same type of information about the court (e.g., name, contacts, phone numbers, addresses, email addresses), except each division's information is specific to a case category, case type, and/or location combination (e.g., Civil Unlimited, Complex, Simi Valley). Additionally, each division has its own unique *Court Key* and may also have its own hours of operation.

3.5 Hours of Operation and Holidays

The Court Policy includes a court and the court's divisions' *Hours of Operation*. Hours of Operation include operating hours, non-standard operating hours or closures, and holidays. Hours of Operation should include the regular business hours of the court (e.g., **Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.**). Hours of Operation includes specific dates and hours of *Holidays* or other days where regular business hours are not followed. Each Holiday can include a note that describes the special circumstances for that day, such as **Closed** or **Open Only between 9:00 a.m. and Noon**. The following graphic illustrates a court's regular House of Operation and a few Holidays. (This is a human readable representation of Policy XML.)

Hours of Operation

Regular Hours of Operation

Day	Open	Close
Monday	09:00:00	17:00:00
Tuesday	09:00:00	17:00:00
Wednesday	09:00:00	17:00:00
Thursday	09:00:00	17:00:00
Friday	09:00:00	17:00:00

Holidays

Holiday	Date	Note
New Year's Day	2006-01-02	Closed
Martin Luther King, Jr.	2006-01-16	Closed
Abraham Lincoln	2006-02-13	Closed

The Hours of Operation are the hours on which the court is open for business, which in California, by rule, also corresponds to the hours the court is open for electronic filing.

It is possible to specify general (or default) Hours of Operation for the court and then to specify different Hours of Operation for a division or location of the court. For example,

the court's regular Hours of Operation might be **9:00 to 5:00**, but one of the court's locations might be open only from **9:00 to 4:00** on Fridays. It is likewise possible that a single court location may be closed on a particular day (e.g., because of a parade) while other locations are open on the same day. It is possible to specify any of these distinctions in Court Policy.

3.6 Court Contact Information

Court Contact Information is the names of people or organizations within the court that can be contacted for a given reason. Contact information can be associated with the entire court or with a division of the court. Contact information can be given for a single person, such as **Mary Clerk**, or for a group, such as **E-Filing Help Desk**.

It is possible to specify any type of contact information, such as an address, phone, fax, or email.

It is possible to specify the reason to contact the person or organization as well as specific reasons not to contact the person or organization. For example, the reason to contact a person might be **Contact for electronic filing support**, while the reason not to contact a person might be **Do not contact for over-the-counter filing support**.

Finally, it is possible to specify the Hours of Operation for a *contact*, in situations where the Hours of Operation for the contact are different than the court's (or a court's division's) Hours of Operation. For example, the court might be open from **9:00 to 5:00 on Monday through Friday**, but the listed contact might be available only **9:00 to 4:00 Monday through Thursday and never on Friday**.

3.7 Organization Key and Court Keys

Court Policy includes unique names and identifiers for the Court and its divisions.[7] These identifiers are called *Organization Keys* and *Court Keys*. Court Keys, in particular, are important, because they uniquely identify divisions of a court and are associated not only with the court (division) and the policy, but also information about the court's data. Court Keys are designed to be unique across California and the country.

---

[7] Divisions can be created in various ways using Divisions, Subdivisions, Departments, Groups, and Locations. In CCMS V3, the CCMS case category maps to a division, the case type maps to a subdivision and the location maps to location.

An *Organization Key* is a unique identifier for a court. *Court Keys* are unique identifiers for the court or divisions of the court, such as **Civil**, **Probate**, or **Juvenile**. Court Keys must be unique within the court (and ideally, should be globally unique).[8]

The convention for creating Organization Keys is to use a meaningful string value that is globally unique based on the court's jurisdiction. For example:

- USCASacramentoSuperior

- USCAContraCostaSuperior

- USCASanMateoSuperior

Court Keys are extensions of a court's Organization Key that map to a division or location of the court. For example:

- USCASacramentoSuperiorCivilUnlmitedUnlawfulDetainer

- USCASacramentoSuperiorSmallClaims

3.8 Code Tables

In Court Policy, it is possible to map any *Court Key* to any *code value* used internally in a court system. For example, if **CCMS** were to identify **Ventura Superior Court's Small Claims** as **20001**, then it is possible within the Court Policy to map the Court Key to the Ventura internal code value. It is useful for various applications to map the external identifier to an internal identifier. If internal identifiers exist, then these identifiers should be supplied along with the division or location of the court to which the identifier corresponds.

Code Tables are code tables from any *Court's Case Management System (CMS)* that the court wishes to publish to outside applications, such as filing applications. The benefit of publishing to filing and other applications is that the applications can use the values to generate filings, thereby increasing the accuracy and reducing the work of the clerk.

Common Code Tables include the following:

- Case Types (and categories of Case Types)

- (Filing) Document Types

- Roles (for People and Organizations)

---

[8] The globally unique, human readable Court Key value benefits service providers that operate in multiple jurisdictions. It avoids conflicts that arise when, for example, Sacramento were to identify a division using the number 48 and a court in Georgia were also identified a division using the number 48.

- Organization Types

- Aliases for People and Organization (e.g., DBA, FKA, AKA)

Code Tables often include a readable text value and a short alphanumeric code value that correspond to the same logical meaning. For example, **Defendant** would be a readable value with **DEF** as a short code value. Court Policy can maintain such relationships, so Code Tables extracted from a CMS should show this relationship.

It is also possible for Code Tables to be related to other Code Tables or to Fees. For example, in CCMS there is a relationship between the Filing Name and the Filing Document Type code tables. If relationships among Code Tables exist, then Code Tables extracted from a CMS should also show the relationship to other code tables that are to be included in the Court Policy.

There is a difference and a distinction between code values (enumerated lists) in a Court Policy and the code values (enumerated lists) in an XML Schema. As a general rule, the code values in an XML Schema should be standard and very stable, whereas, in contrast, the code values in a Court Policy may be subject to change or variation. By distinguishing between stable and somewhat variable code lists and then putting them in XML Schema or Court Policy, respectively, it is possible to maintain stability in XML Schemas (and related code) used to implement a data exchange. This is a major benefit of Court Policy. If lists of somewhat variable codes are put into XML Schemas, then XML Schemas (and related code) must be changed frequently, which results in much more time and effort to develop, test, and maintain data exchanges.

3.9 Fee Schedules

Court Policy includes information about a court's filing fees, and how payments can be made to court accounts by integration partners.

Fees are the breakdown of fees charged by the court for filing documents. Fees information includes the name of the fee and the amount of the fee. It is especially beneficial to show the relationship of a given fee to one or more document types. This allows applications to create fee calculators based the filing documents selected and filed into the system.

3.10 Payment Information

The Court Policy includes enough information to pay the court in an automated way. Court Policy supports publishing the bank name and ACH information (bank routing number and account number) for a court. This information is only needed if the court intends to accept ACH payments from filers or vendors on behalf of filers. If the court

intends to take credit card payments, then this information is not necessary in the Court Policy.

Some courts prefer not to publish Payment Information in Court Policy. In this situation, the court should make other arrangements to publish the court's ACH payment details to electronic filing service providers, such as in private contracts with service providers.

The Court Policy also includes the accepted credit cards taken by the court, in the event the court accepts credits cards for electronic filing payment. The Court Policy can also support a fake credit card number that can be used for testing the court's credit card systems.

4.0 Court Policy Operational Issues

This section explains court policy operational issues, beginning with an explanation of court policy basics and then moving on to operational issues related to publication and consumption of a court policy. The end of this section lists the organizations and human resources that would typically be involved in court policy operational activities.

4.1 Court Policy Basics

The Court Policy specification is an XML Schema that, when populated with the data for a given court, becomes an XML file that resides at a known location and is accessible, preferably at a web address.[9] Court Policies can also be emailed in the event they are not posted on the Internet; however, this method has some disadvantages.

Despite its name, and just to be clear, the Court Policy file does not contain the court's local rules. Certain data elements in the Court Policy are related to information that may be expressed in a court's local rules (e.g., hours of operation of a particular division), but that's the extent of the connection.

The following are basic considerations affecting how court policy files work:

- **Accessibility**: Court Policies are intended to be freely available over the Internet, for use by any application that might have a need for some or all of the information contained in the policy.

- **Public Information**: Court Policy files contain no information that might be considered confidential, so access to them or their dissemination does not need to be restricted or controlled.

---

[9] Sacramento Superior Court, for example, publishes its current and archived court policies at http://www.saccourt.ca.gov/ud/e-filing.aspx.

- **Multiple Uses**: Filing Applications, Justice Partner Applications, and the Court's own Electronic Filing Manager[10] application can rely on information contained in Court Policy files.

- **Format**:   Court Policies are published in a standard, well-specified XML format so that applications can more easily consume and use their content.

These features provide scalability because the process of updating applications that use Court Policy information can be automated.

4.2 Development and Testing

Court Policies typically go through a lifecycle that begins with development and testing and ends in production. The court, or a delegate of the court (e.g., the California Administrative Office of the Courts), is usually deemed responsible for the *content*, *development*, and *publication* of a Court Policy. All parties that use the Court Policy *test* the policy. It is prudent for the court to do basic testing on the policy prior to publication. Electronic Filing Service Providers (EFSPs), Justice Partners, and others that consume the policy must also test the policy to ensure the information can be imported into their systems.

The beginning of the lifecycle usually includes frequent updates, while the end of the lifecycle usually results in a Court Policy that is updated only one time per year.[11] The sooner a policy becomes stable, the quicker electronic filing can go into production. Likewise, the sooner a policy becomes stable, the less human resources that are required to update and test the policy.

The following table shows the Court Policy lifecycle for Sacramento Superior Court's Unlawful Detainer Court Policy. A number of factors affect the court policy lifecycle. As a result, these statistics are far from scientific. Notwithstanding, one can observe a trend showing that the length of time between publication dates is longer over time. It can be said, based on these statistics and also based on participation in the project, that the Court Policy XML became more stable over time and required fewer updates. No policy survives forever. Accordingly, courts that wish to use Court Policy will need to develop a plan for updating and maintaining the court's policy.

---

[10] For example, the CCMS V3 Electronic Filing Manager (EFM) uses Court Policy to validate information that comes into the EFM as an electronic filing.   Because the electronic filing uses Court Policy and the EFM use Court Policy, the common information is synchronized and should always be valid (this assumes that the filing application and the EFM are using the same Court Policy).

[11] An exception to this rule, as can be seen in the Sacramento illustration below, is when an unplanned changed is made, followed by a mistake. This can be seen in Sacramento's publication dates, in August 2009, when a new policy was published on 8/17/2009 and then again on 8/27/2009. It is not known for certain whether a mistake was made, but the publication of version 1.1.1 ten days after the publication of version 1.1.0, after many cycles of long stability, would indicate a mistake was made.

Date	Version	Life
3/9/2004	0.0.1	7 days
3/16/2004	0.0.2	3 weeks
4/6/2004	0.0.3	3 weeks
4/27/2004	0.0.4	3 weeks
5/18/2004	0.0.5	5 weeks
6/25/2004	0.0.6	4 weeks
7/27/2004	0.0.7	2 days
7/29/2004	0.0.8	4 months
11/19/2004	0.0.9	6 weeks
1/12/2005	1.0.0	8 days
1/20/2005	1.0.1	Unsure
Unsure	1.0.2	Unsure
Unsure	1.0.3	5 months
6/10/2005	1.0.4	2 months
8/10/2005	1.0.5	4 months
1/1/2006	1.0.6	1 year
1/1/2007	1.0.7	1 year
1/1/2008	1.0.8	1 year
1/1/2009	1.0.9	8 months
8/17/2009	1.1.0	10 days
8/27/2009	1.1.1	10 months

4.3 Publication and Consumption

After development and testing, the court must publish its Court Policy (on the Internet or via email) so that consumers of the information can obtain and consume the policy. This section covers considerations related to court policy publication and consumption.

4.3.1 Harmonization with Case Management System

The information in a Court Policy must be harmonized with the Case Management System (CMS). Indeed, the primary purpose of a Court Policy is to publish information that is in a CMS. If the Court Policy and the CMS are not harmonized, then this can lead to confusion, inability to submit certain transactions, and, in a worst case, technical error.

Historically, court clerks have been accustomed to changing their CMS configuration at will and without notice to people or organizations outside of the court. With the advent of electronic filing and electronic data exchange, the ability to change the CMS configuration at will and without notice is (or should be) restricted. If not restricted, then a change without notice comes with some risk to the health of the data exchange system. The following examples illustrate two common issues, one of which is not ideal, but will not cause error, and the other that will cause technical errors.

In the first example, the court determines that is needs a new document type, **Motion for Summary Judgment**. The court adds the document type to the CMS, but does not re-publish its Court Policy. Because the document type is not in the Court Policy published prior to the CMS change, integration partners have no knowledge of it. As a result, an electronic filer would never see the document type **Motion for Summary Judgment** and could not electronically file a transaction with this document type. This is not a catastrophic situation. But, it could cause confusion if the court expects to receive the value **Motion for Summary Judgment** and the electronic filer cannot send it.

In the second example, the court determines that it needs to delete a document type. For example, assume that legislation changes, or a Judicial Council Form changes, resulting in a name change to document. In this situation, the court deletes the unwanted document type from the CMS, but does not re-publish its Court Policy. Here, the unwanted document type would remain available to electronic filers, because it exists in the published policy. If the electronic filer submits a filing with this unwanted document type, it will go into the court's system and could cause an error.[12]

The need to harmonize the Court Policy with the CMS and to ensure it is published at the same time (or before) the change to the production CMS configuration is a "cultural" shift in court operations. It means that there is a need for a somewhat sophisticated and coordinated operational effort when the CMS configuration is changed. This is not necessarily a disadvantage, given the desire (and need) to standardize CMS configurations statewide (i.e., there are other reasons to put in place a formal process around CMS configuration changes).[13]

4.3.2 Implications of Major and Minor Changes

Generally, changes to the CMS configuration that result in changes (and republication) of Court Policy can be categorized into major and minor changes. Minor changes are those that are easily consumed by an integration partner and that, as a result, can be done relatively quickly with minimum testing. For example, the addition or deletion of a document type is an example of a minor change that integration partners should be able to consume quickly (indeed automatically).

Major changes are those that result in a business or operational change and that require more time, effort, and testing to implement. For example, the addition of a case type (such as small claims) to a court policy represents a new electronic filing project. This typically requires more time and effort.

---

[12] In CCMS V3, there are a couple scenarios where this can happen. In early versions of CCMS, this caused a stack trace. In more recent versions, the stack trace does not occur, but there is no value for the document type when the document comes into the system.

[13] Some have argued that Court Policy information should be published dynamically via web services. There are a number of disadvantages to this approach as well as practical considerations that make dynamic publication difficult or undesirable. This topic is complicated and beyond the scope of this document.

The point is that courts must consider the impact of court policy changes on integration partners prior to publication of a new policy. The impact of the court's changes determines how much advance time the integration partner needs to test the policy and, as a result, how quickly the court can implement desired changes in the policy.

4.3.3 Version Control

The **2GEFS Court Policy Specification** includes a strict version control system as well as a requirement to archive past court polices. Version control and archiving is important in situations where the Court Policy and the CMS are not harmonized and either rejections or errors (or both) occur as a result.   The Court Policy becomes a historical document that allows system participants to determine how the rejection or error occurred and how to remedy the situation. Without version control and archiving, it is difficult, possibly impossible, to troubleshoot problems between information exchange systems.

4.3.4 Access

Court Policy XML should be publicly available to many organizations, preferably over the Internet, for local or remote use. A standard means of publication is included in the **2GEFS Court Policy Specification**. Implementing, in whole or in part, a standard means of publication is not necessary for the use of Court Policy, but it is certainly helpful and makes an electronic filing (or data exchange) system more scalable.

4.4 Court Policy Human Resources

This section illustrates the human resources typically needed to publish and maintain a court policy. This section also lists the activities that tend to require more human resources than others. This section is based on historic and present experience in California's CCMS V3 system. CCMS V4 or other systems may have different considerations and requirements. Additionally, the CCMS V3 human resource requirements have changed over time. In particular, the CCMS V3, Release 10 included features that automatically generated most of a Court Policy.   This has significantly reduced the time and effort for Deloitte and CA AOC human resources.

4.4.1 Human Resources

Human resources typically need for Court Policy development and maintenance are:

- **Court Operational Staff**: Court operational staff knowledgeable about the CCMS case type being implemented as well as the Policy XML subject matter described in Section 3, above.

- **Deloitte Staff**: Historically, (prior to CCMS V3, Release 10), the Deloitte staff person responsible for gathering and maintaining the CCMS configuration table information for the court. This has shifted since CCMS V3 Release 10. The focus since Release 10 has been to ensure that the CCMS Court Policy export processes is working properly.

- **AOC E-Filing Team**: The AOC E-Filing Team guides the court through the process of understanding the court policy, gathering information, and configuring the CMS. In the event the court cannot or does not edit the policy independently, the AOC E-Filing Team edits the Policy XML based on information and instructions from the court.

- **Court Managers**: Court managers may wish to take part in early meetings to understand the overall goal and process. Later meetings may become mundane and less relevant to court managers.

4.4.2 Human Resource Activities

With respect to Court Policy information gathering and development, the most significant issues and time expenditures throughout the course of an electronic filing project tend to occur in the following areas.

- **Manual Editing**: The present CCMS V3 Release 10 court policy export program includes several defects that result in a policy that while mostly correct, requires manual editing. Further, there are certain features in the 2GEFS Policy specification that are not supported in the CCMS V3 Release 10 user interface. To take advantage of the 2GEFS features, it is necessary to manually edit the Court Policy.

- **Code Tables and Lists**: Project participant devoted the most time to ensuring that code tables and lists are appropriate and accurate. The most challenging list to maintain tends to be the document types list. The second most challenging is the list of roles.

- **Court Keys**: Court Keys are unique identifiers that identify a court and divisions of a court. Court staff must create and configure meaningful court keys that are then input into CCMS and exported into the Court Policy.

- **Fees and Hours of Operation**: Fees and Hours of Operation should be reviewed and should be included in the Court Policy. Not all fees that are in the CMS are relevant to electronic filing and should not, as a result, be published in the Court Policy (or, if published, a filter should be applied to distinguish the fee(s) as not related to electronic filing).

These configuration activities are not unlike the original CMS configuration activities. It is important to point out, however, that court policy activities are strongly related, but not the same. The Court Policy includes a subset of CCMS configuration information, not all configuration information. For example, certain document types would not be electronically filed into the system. As a result, these documents types should not be included in the Court Policy.

Appendix A. Example Court Policies

Example Court Policies in XML and in easier-to-read PDF are located at the following links.

Appendix A.1. Contra Costa

XML

http://policies.xmllegal.org/CourtPolicies/US/CA/ContraCosta/USCAContraCostaSuperiorVer_1_0_13_2005_11_11.xml

PDF

http://policies.xmllegal.org/CourtPolicies/US/CA/ContraCosta/USCAContraCostaSuperiorVer_1_0_13_2005_11_11.pdf

Appendix A.2. Sacramento

XML

http://policies.xmllegal.org/CourtPolicies/US/CA/Sacramento/USCASacramentoSuperior_2006_01_01_00_00_01.xml

PDF

http://policies.xmllegal.org/CourtPolicies/US/CA/Sacramento/USCASacramentoSuperior_2006_01_01_00_00_01.pdf

Appendix A.3. San Mateo

XML

http://policies.xmllegal.org/CourtPolicies/US/CA/SanMateo/USCASanMateoSuperior_2006_03_02_Ver_1_0_11.xml

PDF

http://policies.xmllegal.org/CourtPolicies/US/CA/SanMateo/USCASanMateoSuperior_2006_03_02_Ver_1_0_11.pdf

Appendix B. Change History

Version	Date	Editor	Changes	Sections
0.1	5/29/2010	Todd Vincent, <xmlLegal>	Initial Draft. Did not publish.	All Sections.
0.2	6/18/2010	Todd Vincent, <xmlLegal>	First published draft. Published to Christopher Smith, Joye Beachum, Robin Harris, Peggy Petras-Ames	All Sections.
1.0	7/13/2010	Todd Vincent, <xmlLegal>	Revisions based on comments from Christopher Smith, Joye Beachum, Robin Harris, Peggy Petras-Ames	All Sections.