

Arizona Supreme Court Data Standardization Advisory Committee

AGENDA

November 19, 2024, 10:00 am – 12 noon, Zoom Webinar

9:50 a.m.	Zoom Webinar Open for Members, Attendees and Presenters	Laura Ritenour, AOC Staff
Meeting Opening		
10:00 a.m.	Welcome to Members and Roll Call of Attendees Review and Vote October 29, 2024, Meeting Minutes	Cathy Clarich, Chair, substitute for Michael Malone
Items from Previous Meeting/s		
10:10 a.m.	Review/Discuss (Michele Gillich and Laura Ritenour) - Integration, Required Data Elements, Legislation, Code Standardization and Data Translation Implementation - Updated Draft Administrative Directive - Requests for Extension of Time – Updated Draft Template	
10:20 a.m.	Update – Two Items Tabled to January 2025 Meeting - Counting Continuances Concept - Case Category Standards and Public Access Functions	
10:22 a.m.	Review/Discuss/Vote (Janita Zendejas and Laura Ritenour) Updated Request for Inmate Release Court (IRC) Event Codes and Appearance Reason	
10:40 a.m.	Review/Discuss/Vote (Laura Ritenour) Proposed 2025 Meeting Schedule	
10:45 a.m.	Review/Discuss/Vote (Laura Ritenour and Michele Gillich) Contact Status – New Code Request and Definitions	
New Items		
11:15 a.m.	Review/Discuss/Vote (Laura Ritenour and Michele Gillich) Designate Department of Public Safety (DPS) as authority for Ethnicity Codes and Descriptions	
Ongoing Business		
11:30 a.m.	Updates, Comments, and Questions from Members	
11:35 a.m.	Call to the Public	Cathy Clarich, Chair

	Reminder	There is no December 2024 meeting. After November meeting, committee will meet again in January 2025 per the schedule approved in this meeting.	Cathy Clarich, Chair
12 noon	Adjournment (motion needed)		Cathy Clarich, Chair

Link to OneDrive folder with all DS Advisory Committee meeting videos (July 2023 – present): [DS Advisory Committee Recordings](#)

DATA STANDARDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

October 29, 2024

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., via Zoom Webinar

DRAFT MINUTES

Present: Laurie Allen, Leslie Zak as proxy for Gil Bensinger, Laura Bergan, Daniel Bowman, Summer Dalton, Niltza Flores, Ralph Garcia, Todd Herrera-Ridenhour, Susann Holland, Randy Kennedy, Adele May, Michael Nimitz, Ester Reeves, Ginger Rodas, Marcos Romero, Danica Sanchez, Katrina Solis, Adam Walterson, and Jeanette Wiesenhofer

Not Present: Odette Apodaca, Roopa Kalidindi, and Michael Malone

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and Guests: Lorri Behunin (Chandler Municipal Court), Julian Bell, Mary Bellefeuille (Mesa), Stewart Bruner (AOC), Angelica Burris (AOC), Tom Carroll (Phoenix Municipal), Melanie Cluff (AOC), Andrew Fornek (Chandler Municipal Court), Leon Li (AOC), Anirban Mitra (AOC), Laura Ritenour (AOC), Michele Gillich (AOC), Tina Knezovich-Hladik (AOC), Jennifer Jones (AOC), Laura Navarro Cobos (Paradise Valley), Joe Hamilton (Phoenix Municipal), Alexis Allen (Tempe), Chris Phelps (Scottsdale), Fahmida Wahab (AOC), and Janita Zendejas (AOC)

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The October 29, 2024, meeting of the Data Standards Advisory Committee was called to order by Summer Dalton, meeting chair, at 10:00 a.m. Mike Malone and Cathy Clarich were unable to attend and serve as chair.

B. September 27, 2024, Meeting Minutes

Laura Ritenour, staff for the committee, displayed the September 27, 2024, draft meeting minutes and the members had no comments or concerns. Ginger Rodas moved to approve the minutes and Niltza Flores seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

II. ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS AND NEW ITEMS

A. Warrant Code Standardization

Warrant Authority - Laura Ritenour presented the Warrant Authority code standardization request from AOC's Technical Integration Team as outlined in the meeting packet. The members discussed the code set. There was a question about the preferred Juvenile Warrant code and the group decided "8-386.01" would be the most appropriate code. There was also a discussion about adding a space before "26.12C"

for the Rule 26.12C code. Niltza Flores moved to approve the code set with the two verbal corrections discussed and Randy Kennedy seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

Bond Type - Laura Ritenour presented the Bond Type code standardization request from AOC's Technical Integration Team as outlined in the meeting packet. The members had questions and discussed the request. It was requested that in future meetings that code standardization requests be prioritized for required data elements and not elements marked as "desired" in the CCR specifications. Ester Reeves moved to approve the code set and Randy Kennedy seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

DPS as Authority for Extradition Codes – Laura Ritenour presented the Extradition code standardization request from AOC's Technical Integration Team as outlined in the meeting packet. This request is to designate Department of Public Safety (DPS) as the authority for this code set. The members discussed the request. Todd Herrera-Ridenhour moved to approve the designation of DSP as the authority for extradition codes and Randy Kennedy seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

Warrant Authority – A member mentioned that the Civil Arrest Warrant Authority Rule 64.1B code needs to have the "B" added to make it consistent with the other codes. Randy Kennedy moved to approve the updating of that code in the Warrant Authority code set and Niltza Flores seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

B. Proposed Implementation for Integration, Required Data Elements, and Code Standardization and Draft Administrative Directive

Laura Ritenour displayed the updated draft administrative directive (AD) for feedback. This draft has new dates based on the input from the September meeting. Laura Bergan reported that Pima County would need more time to analyze the level of effort for meeting the draft administrative directive dates based on a meeting the day before with AOC staff. Summer Dalton agreed to table discussion on the dates until the November meeting but told members that the November meeting would be the last meeting for dates to be discussed. Laura Ritenour then displayed the draft template for requests for extension of time. Several members provided feedback on the template. Stewart Bruner joined the meeting and changes to the template were discussed. Laura Ritenour will update the template and bring a new draft to the November meeting. Randy Kennedy requested that a blog of Q&A be added to the Technical Integration SharePoint and Michele Gillich reported that AOC SharePoint team is working on the request.

Laura Ritenour stated that the Case Category Standards and Public Access Functions discussion that had been tabled from July to this meeting would be postponed one more month to the November meeting.

C. Continuance Data

Laura Ritenour reported that the Counting Continuances Workgroup met twice and there is no report-out ready for this meeting. There will be a summary for the committee at the November meeting.

D. Inmate Release Court (IRC) Event Codes and Appearance Reason

Janita Zendejas provided an overview of the IRC Program and the request for code standardization. Laura Ritenour presented the code request. Members asked questions about whether the transactions for this request would be person- or case- based. The answer was case-based. Members asked for the request to contain more specifics regarding transactions. Laura Ritenour will update the request and bring this item back to the November meeting.

E. Contact Status – New Code Request and Definitions

Laura Ritenour and Michele Gillich provided an overview of the request. The code set for Contact Status was approved last year. This request is to approve definitions for the statuses and to add a new status of FBAD. Members had questions and discussed the request. Laura Ritenour will meet with the FARE team and update the request based on the feedback of the members and the FARE meeting and will bring this item back to the November meeting.

F. Proposed 2025 Meeting Schedule

Laura Ritenour thanked members for completing the online meeting schedule poll earlier in the month. She then presented the proposed 2025 meeting schedule. Two members had issues with one or more meeting dates.

G. Updates, Comments and Questions from Members

Laura Ritenour announced that Several courts are presenting operational dashboards at the December 11th Data Standards Steering Committee meeting. The meeting agenda and materials will be posted online about one week prior to the meeting. The meeting starts at 1:30 p.m. and dashboard presentations will begin after 2 p.m. This is a public meeting and anyone can attend.

H. Call to the Public

Summer Dalton made a call to the public for comments. There was no answer.

I. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Niltza Flores at 11:48 a.m.

J. Next Committee Meeting Date

Tuesday, October 29, 2024, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Zoom Webinar

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

In the Matter of:)
)
SUBMISSION OF STANDARDIZED) Administrative Directive
CASE-RELATED DATA TO) No. 2024 – XX)
CENTRAL CASE REPOSITORY)
- PHASE ONE)

On June 26, 2024, the Supreme Court issued Administrative Order 2024-123 which ordered that all general and limited jurisdiction courts, including those that do not utilize the state sponsored case management system, submit data to the Administrative Office of the Court’s (AOC) Central Case Repository (CCR) as specified in the CCR Integration Design Specification documentation (“the CCR Specifications”. It was further ordered that the Director would provide a phased implementation schedule developed in coordination with the Data Standardization Advisory Committee.

IT IS DIRECTED that all courts transmit data using the “core_XXX” transactions identified within the FARE, NICS, and Public Access Repository sections of the CCR Specifications by June 30, 2025. Maricopa County Superior Court will not be required to transmit FARE data until such time they are participating in the FARE program. **All data transmitted to CCR must include the proper Security Indicators outlined in the Record Security Guidelines section and Domain Values must align with code standards when designated in the CCR Specifications.**

IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts transmit either the “pm_XXX” or “core_XXX” transactions as required by Administrative Order 2019-143 and identified within the Protection Orders section of the CCR Specifications by June 30, 2025. **All data transmitted to CCR must include the proper Security Indicators outlined in the Record Security Guidelines section and Domain Values must align with code standards when designated in the CCR Specifications.**

IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts transmit case data starting at the time a case is initiated using the “core_XXX” transactions identified in the Stage Data Feeds section of the CCR Specifications by **June 30, 2026**. **All data transmitted to CCR must include the proper Security Indicators outlined in the Record Security Guidelines section and Domain Values must align with code standards when designated in the CCR Specifications.**

IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts will provide a bulk load of existing case data from cases filed on or after July 1, 2010 using the “core_XXX” transactions identified in the Stage Data Feeds section of the CCR Specifications by **June 30, 2026**. **All data transmitted to CCR must include the proper Security Indicators outlined in the Record Security Guidelines section and Domain Values must align with code standards when designated in the CCR Specifications.**

IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that court leadership may request an extension of time to one or more of the deadlines listed above based on a compelling business reason, along with a plan for timely implementation:

1. With approval of the local presiding judge of the court, written requests for extensions of time to implement a deadline listed above may be submitted to AOC staff.
2. The court shall submit the request using the AOC's Extension Request for Administrative Directive 2024-XX template (to be inserted as Attachment A).
3. The staff of the Arizona Supreme Court Commission on Technology will add the extension request to the next meeting agenda for discussion and decision. The Commission's decision will be written and sent back to the local presiding judge after the meeting.

Dated this ____ day of _____, 2024.

DAVID K. BYERS
Administrative Director of the Courts

All data transmitted to CCR must include the proper Security Indicators outlined in the Record Security Guidelines section and **Domain Values** must align with code standards when designated in the CCR Specifications.

Example of Domain Values

5.Stage Case					
Field Name	Field Type and Max Length	Primary Key	Required Desired	Domain Values	Description
CaseNumber1	[char](1)	Yes	REQ	A = Appellate Appeals C = Court of Appeals S = Superior Court M = Municipal Courts J = Justice of the Peace	Identifies the Court type to which the case belongs. Court type defines the court jurisdiction based on how Arizona courts are organized.
CaseNumber2	[smallint]	Yes	REQ	Court Code	This is the Unique Number assigned to each court by AOC/DPS. E.g., Phoenix Municipal Court is 745, Yavapai Superior is 1300 etc.
CaseNumber3	[char](2)	Yes	REQ	State defined case type: See Case Category Codes	Identifies the Category to which the case belongs e.g CR- Criminal, CV- Civil, JV- Juvenile, etc. This is the starting point in the hierarchy of a Court System (Level 1) that classifies the Case Type (i.e., Civil, Criminal, Family Court, Probate).

Extension Request Form for Administrative Directive 2024-XXXX

Complete this form in its entirety and ensure the signatures are obtained prior to submittal. Email the completed form to the Court Services Division (CSD) of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) at DataStandards@courts.az.gov. If additional space is needed, please attach any additional sheets(s) as an addendum. All requests will be forwarded to the Commission on Technology (COT) staff for review, follow-up, and addition to a future COT agenda. The requestor and technical project manager **may be invited** to the COT meeting to present their request and answer questions.

Court: _____

Requestor's Name and Title: _____

Requestor Email: _____

Requestor Phone Number: _____

Code Standards Technical Project Manager Name and Title (If different than Requestor):

Technical Project Manager Email: _____

Technical Project Manager Phone Number: _____

- 1) This request is pertaining to the following section/s in Administrative Directive 2024-XXX:

IT IS DIRECTED that all courts transmit data using the "core_XXX" transactions identified within the FARE, NICS, and Public Access Repository sections

IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts transmit either the "pm_XXX" or "core_XXX" transactions as required by Administrative Order 2019-143

IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts transmit case data starting at the time a case is initiated using the "core_XXX" transactions identified in the Stage D.....

IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts will provide a bulk load of existing case data from cases filed on or after July 1, 2010 using the "cor....."

2) The court requests a later deadline of (enter month and year): _____

3) State the reason(s) the court cannot meet the current deadline in the Administrative Directive. Include current and applicable processes, conditions, background information, and statistics.

4) Is the reason for this extension related to the court needing additional time for implementing FME for data translation? _____ Yes _____ No

If answer is Yes, then court can skip questions 5 and 6 below.

5) Estimated cost of complying with Administrative Directive 2024-XX:
\$ _____

6) Provide a brief explanation of how you arrived at the estimated cost in question 5.

Requestor Signature and Date: _____

Project Manager Signature and Date: _____

Local Presiding Judge Signature and Date: _____

For Court Services Division and Commission on Technology Use Only

This Extension Request was received by Court Services Division on [date] and forwarded to the COT staff person on [date].

The Extension Request was presented and discussed at COT's [date] agenda. COT's decision on the Extension Request was:

Granted Denied Granted with the following conditions: _____

Commission on Technology Chair

Date

Data Standardization Advisory Committee

Business Need and Code Standardization Request

Date: 11/08/2024 (updated since October 29, 2024 meeting)

Requestor: AOC Court Services Inmate Release Court (IRC) Program

Background and Request

The Inmate Release Court (IRC) Program is a collaborative partnership between the AOC and the Arizona Department of Corrections' Rehabilitation & Reentry's Second Chance Program (a program designed to prepare inmates for release). The IRC program was established to resolve open cases in limited jurisdiction courts for inmates participating in ADCRR's Second Chance Program. It is guided by [Administrative Order 2023-223](#). The IRC Program is requesting event codes and an appearance reason for statewide data tracking.

Public Access and eAccess Display

- Should this data be displayed on Public Access? Yes
- Should this data be displayed in eAccess? Yes

Possible Interfaces Affected: eFiling, CCR

Reporting

The IRC Program Coordinator wants the ability to track and create reports with the following data from the CCR:

- Number of cases with IRC Participant Agreement Form docketed/filed
- Number of cases with IRC Participation Granted docketed/filed
- Number of cases with IRC Participation Denied docketed/filed
- Number of cases with IRC Program Certificate of Completion docketed/filed
- Number of cases with IRC Not Completed docketed/filed
- Number of cases with Order of IRC Program Completion docketed/filed
- Case numbers of cases with IRC Financial Worksheet docketed/filed (to determine dollar amounts of mitigated obligations until an automated method is implemented)
- Number of cases with IRC Status Review Hearings set (need for AJACS courts, do non-AJACS courts needs this as well?)

Proposed Standard Code	Proposed Standard Event Code Description	Comments
4000058	IRC Participant Agreement Form	This is a standard form completed by all defendants wishing to enter the program. It is filed with the court that sentenced them. They complete two sections of the form and then send it to the court that sentenced them. The court would scan and attach this form to this event in the ROA and then send the case to the judge for review and decision. NOTE: The name of this form and the form itself are defined in Administrative Directive 2024-03 .
4000059	IRC Participation Granted OR IRC Participation Request Granted	Used when judge grants participation in program. After the judge reviews the participation agreement form in (1), if they grant participation they select a box on the form, and this form with their decision and signature would be scanned and attached to this event in the ROA.
4000060	IRC Participation Denied OR IRC Participation Request Denied	Used when judge denies participation in program. After the judge reviews the participation agreement form, if they deny participation they select the denial box on the form, and this form with their decision and signature would be scanned and attached to this event in the ROA.
4000061	IRC Program Certificate of Completion OR IRC Participation Completion Form filed with Court	Used when Second Chance Center verifies that defendant successfully completed the program. Document from Second Chance Center when the defendant successfully completes the program. The certificate of completion is provided to the court and is scanned and attached to this event in the ROA.
4000062	IRC Financial Worksheet	Along with the form above, a financial worksheet can be completed, scanned, and attached to this event in the ROA. (Or attach with Order of IRC Program Completion below)?

4000063	IRC Not Completed OR IRC Failure to Complete Form filed with Court	Used when Second Chance Center verifies that defendant did not complete the program. If the defendant is allowed into the program and does not complete the program, this event is entered into the ROA.
4000064	Order of IRC Program Completion	Order created by the court and signed by the judge that orders the financial adjustments, lifting of other sanctions, and credit for outstanding mandates.

Tentative Implementation Timeline: If the committee approves the IRC code set, the data would be sent as part of a case file’s StageRecordOfAction transaction and therefore would be part of the third paragraph of Administrative Directive (still in draft) that states “IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts transmit case data starting at the time a case is initiated using the “core_xxx” transactions identified in the Stage Data Feeds section of the CCR Specifications by [date to be determined]...” There would be no separate due date for this code set.

Example core_roa transaction: core_roa|U|0|13617874|0403|2024-11-11 00:04:28.407|J|0403|TR|2022000005|D|1|4000058|2024-11-11 00:03:54.057|4000058|IRC Participant Agreement Form|IRC||403|0|0|0|2024-11-11 00:03:54.230|2024-11-11 00:03:54.230|0|

Proposed Motion: Move to approve the standard event codes and event descriptions related to the IRC Program, as listed above, to be standards for limited jurisdiction courts.

Proposed Standard Code	Proposed Standard Appearance Reason Description	Comments
IRC	IRC Status Review	For hearings that a court schedules with a defendant after they complete the IRC Participation Agreement Form to check on the defendant’s status on the program. This event should not be scheduled after a defendant was denied entry into the program or did not complete the program.

Tentative Implementation Timeline: If the committee approves the IRC appearance reason, the data would be sent as part of a case file’s StageHearing transaction and therefore would be part of the third paragraph of Administrative Directive (still in draft) that states “IT IS FURTHER

DIRECTED that all courts transmit case data starting at the time a case is initiated using the “core_xxx” transactions identified in the Stage Data Feeds section of the CCR Specifications by [date to be determined]...” There would be no separate due date for this appearance reason.

Example core_hrng transaction: core_hrng|U|0|62115|0766|2021-02-14 9:37:30.043|9863254|M|0766|CR|2020000120|D|1|||2025-02-13 10:20:00.000|2025-02-13 13:20:00.000|1|IRC||DJG|DJG|CRTRM4|Court Room West|||0|0766|0|0|0|2025-02-13 10:20:10.000|2025-02-14 08:40:15.000|0

Proposed Motion: Move to approve the standard appearance reason code and description related to the IRC Program, as listed above, to be standard for limited jurisdiction courts.

Data Standardization Advisory Committee

Proposed 2025 Meeting Dates and Times

All meetings would be held via Zoom Webinar, from 10 a.m. – 12 noon

- January 28th
- February 25th
- March 25th
- April 29th
- May 27th Please note, during the November meeting, it was noted that the July 27th date should be July 29th. So when the verbal motion was made, it was for the July 29th and December 2nd.
- June 24th
- July 27th
- August 26th
- September 30th
- October 28th

- November 18th as November 25th is during Thanksgiving week
OR move it to the first Tuesday in December, December 2nd???

- No December meeting or no November meeting if Dec 2nd chosen above

Proposed Motion

Motion to approve the proposed meeting dates listed above for the year 2025.

Data Standardization Advisory Committee

Code Standardization Request

Code Request and Requestor

1. **Standardize Contact Status Definitions**, Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team
2. **Add a new Code Status for Standardization**, Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team and Consolidated Collections Unit

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

- The Contact Status codes and descriptions listed below (except FBAD) were approved by this committee on September 26, 2023.
- The Consolidated Collections Unit and AOC Information Technology Integration team are requesting the addition of a new contact status code, FBAD.
 - This updated process is part of the new person-based feeds included in the CCR 4.1 Specifications. These feeds are optional for non-AJACS courts.
 - The FBAD code **could** be sent by courts to the CCR upon receiving a Bad Address status from the FARE vendor. This code **could be sent** once the court has updated their address status and is notifying the CCR of the status change. The CCR will update their address status but will not send a transaction to the vendor since the status originated with them, as opposed to the court marking an address as bad.
- The AOC Information Technology Integration team is also requesting the approval of definitions for each Contact Status to ensure that courts use each status for its intended purpose.
- NOTE: The statuses below do not replace the Record Security Indicators on each transaction submitted to the CCR. See CCR Integration Design Specification documentation for more information. For example, data feeds to CCR for Stage Address transactions still require flags set to 0=No and 1=Yes for IsMailingAddress, IsPrimaryAddress, etc.
- NOTE: Reporting of a data contact status of Primary or Protected is not required as a data contact status for CCR/CORE reporting since courts are required to also report as a separate indicator.

Public Access and eAccess Display – not applicable

Requested Implementation Timeline

When approved, the codes would be added to the AOC's FME Data Translation Server and courts would need to transmit these codes per the CCR Integration Design Specification documentation by the date stated in the Administrative Directive 2024-XX (still in draft as of 10/02/2024). NOTE: With the current Draft AD, this would be the June 30, 2025 date, in the "IT IS DIRECTED"/first paragraph. – Laura Ritenour

Proposed Motions

1. Motion to approve the Contact Status definitions below.

2. Motion to approve the FBAD code, description, and definition below.

Approved Contact Status Code	Approved Contact Status Description	Proposed Definition	Examples
ACT	Active	Refers to an address, phone number, and email address that a party identifies as being in a working or valid status. A party may have multiple addresses, phone numbers, and email addresses that are active.	Residential and employment mailing address; numbers for a cell phone and land line; multiple email addresses
FUT	Future	Refers to an address, phone number, and email address that will become valid or operational at a future date. A way of indicating where a party will be reachable once the transition occurs. A party may designate a date on which the contact will change from a future status to an active status.	The party plans to move to a new residence or a obtain a new phone number in the future.
PRI	Prior	Refers to an address, phone number, and email address that was valid or in use by a party before a change occurred	A previous residence where someone lived, a phone number used prior to switching to a new one.
PRM	Primary	Refers to the contact information that a party identifies as being the main address, phone number, or email address. A party may have multiple Active address, phone number, and email address; however, only one may be marked primary for the contact type. A primary mailing address is where someone wants to receive their mail.	The party has both an active residential and employment address, but their primary mailing address would be the address they want to receive their mail at.
PRO	Protected	Refers to an address, phone number, and email address that a party has had officially designated as needing to be shielded or safeguarded from public disclosure or access which typically granted to those with safety concerns.	Victims of domestic violence, law enforcement officers
BAD	Bad/Undeliverable	Refers to an address, phone number, and email address to which mail, phone calls and email information cannot be successfully delivered and is no longer valid.	Incomplete or inaccurate address details, the party having moved without updating their address, the address provided

			being nonexistent or invalid
FBAD	Bad/Undeliverable - FARE Vendor	This code is sent by the court to the CCR when receiving a Bad Address status from the FARE vendor.	The FARE Vendor receives an undeliverable notice in the mail and sends a Bad Address status to the court.

Excerpt from Stage Address section of current CCR Specifications as an example:

IsBadAddress	[bit]		D		If Address is NOT VALID then this flag should be set to TRUE. 0 = Not bad 1 = Bad
IsCollectionAddressBad	[bit]		D		Note: Applicable only for FARE cases. ACS has determined that the address is bad
IsCollectionAddressNew	[bit]		D		Note: Applicable only for FARE cases. ACS has provided a new address determined by skip tracing
IsPOContactAddress	[bit]		D		Note: Used only when the case is a PO case Indicates if this address can be used to contact about Protection Order
IsMailingAddress	[bit]		REQ	0 = No (Not Mailing) 1 = Yes (Mailing)	Indicates if the address is a Mailing address
IsPrimaryAddress	[bit]		REQ	0 = Not Primary 1 = Primary	Indicates if the address is a Primary address
IsRestricted	[bit]		REQ	0 = Not Restricted 1 = Restricted	Indicates if the address record is restricted

IsRemovedFromPublicAccess	[bit]		REQ	0 = No 1 = Yes	Indicates if the record must be removed from public access
IsSealed	[bit]		REQ	0 = No 1 = Yes	Indicates if the address record is sealed

Data Standardization Advisory Committee

Code Standardization Request

Code Request and Requestor

Approve Department of Public Safety (DPS) as the authority for Ethnicity Descriptions and Codes

Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background and Issue

The AOC Information Technology Team is requesting the Department of Public Safety be designated as the authority for standardization of the Ethnicity codes and descriptions. Ethnicity codes sent to DPS for protection order and criminal disposition reporting follow the NCIC standards. Currently, Race and Ethnicity are separate code sets for NCIC. The statewide standards code set for Race has already been approved.

Public Access and eAccess Display

Should this data be displayed on Public Access? No

Should this document be displayed in eAccess? No

Possible Interfaces Affected: eWarrant

Requested Implementation Timeline

When approved, the codes would be added to the AOC’s FME Data Translation Server and courts would need to transmit these codes per the CCR Integration Design Specification documentation by the date stated in the Administrative Directive 2024-XX (still in draft as of 10/02/2024). NOTE: With the current Draft AD, this would be the June 30, 2025 date, in the “IT IS DIRECTED”/first paragraph. – Laura Ritenour

Motion

Move to approve DPS as the authority for the Ethnicity codes and standard descriptions.

For Court Information - Ethnicity Codes and Descriptions

DPS Code	DPS Standard Description
U	Unknown
H	Hispanic or Latino
N	Not Hispanic or Latino

NOTE: Some courts are currently sending X for None. This will still be accepted by CCR but will not be a statewide standard.

