

Arizona Supreme Court Data Standardization Advisory Committee

AGENDA

May 27, 2025, 10:00 am – 12 noon

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://zoom.us/j/93946039512?pwd=NLHgPMiQbAo2foak0f0V60ibTtCAME.1>

Passcode: 880227

Webinar ID: 939 4603 9512

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 - Welcome to Tania Nieblas, Superior Court for Maricopa County, Family Department Deputy Administrator Review/Vote on April 29, 2025, Meeting Minutes	Michael Malone, Chair, CSD Division Director
10:05 a.m.	Call to the Public	Michael Malone, Chair
Items from Previous Meeting/s		
10:10 a.m.	Review/Discuss/Vote – Code Standardization Requests (Laura Ritenour) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Person Suffix Code Set • Person Prefix Code Set • Stage Petition Protection Order Code Set 	
10:30 a.m.	Reminder – Requests for Extension of Time to meet Administrative Directive 2024-10 are due by June 1 st . The requests will be added to the Commission on Technology June meeting agenda for review and discussion.	
New Items		
10:35 a.m.	Review/Discuss/Vote – New Code Standardization Requests (Laura Ritenour) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update to Hair Color in Demographics Table • Payment Type Code Set • Case Category, Case Type, Case Subtype requests 	
Ongoing Business		
11:30 a.m.	Updates, Comments, and Questions from Members	
	Reminder - The next committee meeting will be Tuesday, June 24, 2025, 10 a.m. - 12 noon via Zoom webinar	Jennifer Jones to substitute for Michael Malone as Chair

11:45 a.m.	Closing Comments and Adjournment (motion needed)	Michael Malone (Chair)
------------	--	------------------------

Links

- [Administrative Directive 2024-10](#)
- [Administrative Order 2025-67](#)
- Link to OneDrive folder with all DS Advisory Committee meeting videos (July 2023 – present): [DS Advisory Committee Recordings](#)
- All code standards are posted here: <https://www.azcourts.gov/courtservices/Court-Operations-Unit/Required-Data-Elements-and-Code-Standardization/Code-Standardization>

Questions concerning code standards: Please raise to the questions to the Data Standardization Advisory Committee via lritenou@courts.az.gov and miwise@courts.az.gov

If your court is having issues, mapping your local codes to standard codes, understanding the code set CCR is seeking, then please reach out to Data Standardization Advisory Committee and to itdintegrationteam@courts.az.gov. In your email, please provide the code standard in question or if seeking for code to be approved, and detailed information along with your questions and justification for the need for the code. All codes must be presented to the Data Standardization Advisory Committee for approval. If the code is denied, next steps will be determined .

All times are approximate. The Chair reserves the right to set the order of the agenda. For any item on the agenda, the Committee may vote to go into executive session as permitted by Arizona Code of Judicial Administration §1-202. Please contact Laura Ritenour at (602) 452-3675 with any questions concerning this agenda. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation by contacting Laura Ritenour at (602) 452-3675. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange for the accommodation.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: For any item listed on the agenda, the Committee may vote to go into Executive Session for the purpose of discussion or consultation with an attorney employed by or representing any judicial entity regarding legal advice, pursuant to the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration, Code Section 1-202(C)(5)(c)

DATA STANDARDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

April 29, 2025

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

DRAFT MINUTES

Present: Laurie Allen, Odette Apodaca, Gil Bensinger, Laura Bergan, Daniel Bowman, Summer Dalton, Niltza Flores, Ralph Garcia, Dean Hammel, Todd Herrera-Ridenhour, Susann Holland, Randy Kennedy, Adele May, Mike Nimtz, Ester Reeves, Ginger Rodas, Marcos Romero, Danica Sanchez, Adam Walterson, and Michael Malone

Not Present: Katrina Solis, Jeanette Wiesenhofer

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and Guests: Andrew Fornek (Chandler), Anirban Mitra (AOC), Christine Sanchez (AOC), Daniel Paulson (Mesa), Jennifer Jones (AOC), Joe Hamilton (Phoenix), Kristie Wooley (AOC), Laura Navarro Cobos (Paradise Valley), Laura Ritenour (AOC), Lorri Behunin (Chandler), Mary Bellefeuille (Mesa), Melanie Cluff (AOC), Michael Wise (AOC), Michele Gillich (AOC), Scott Fitzpatrick (Scottsdale), and Tania Nieblas (Maricopa County)

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The April 29, 2025, meeting of the Data Standards Advisory Committee was called to order by Mike Malone, meeting chair, at 10:00 a.m. Mike Malone let the committee know that Roopa Kalidindi was no longer on the committee and a search for a replacement was underway. Mike Malone took roll call, established a quorum, and mentioned the meeting was being recorded.

B. March 25, 2025 Meeting Minutes

Mike Malone displayed the March 25, 2025, draft meeting minutes. Mike Malone asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Marcos Romero made a motion to approve the minutes and Niltza Flores seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

C. Call to the Public

Mike Malone announced that the Data Standards Advisory Committee will be moving the "Call to the Public" section to the beginning of its meetings to ensure everyone has an opportunity to speak. Mike Malone made a call to the public for comments. There was no answer.

II. ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS AND NEW ITEMS

A. Review/Discuss/Vote - Code Standardization Requests

Laura Ritenour presented on the code sets below:

i. Email Type

There were questions in the last meeting about the use case for email types. Laura Ritenour stated that if there are future requirements to differentiate email types that we will be prepared. This would have a target date of June 2026. Randy Kennedy posed the question: what should be considered the default email type for a business? Scottsdale currently uses "home" for businesses, interpreting it as the home email for the business; specifically, if the defendant is a business. Marcos Romero responded that in Tempe, that would fall under "personal." Adam Walterson from Gilbert said they would use "work" for a business, or "other" if necessary. Mike Malone said that since courts are already distinguishing between email types in business-related use cases, the three existing email types should be retained.

Randy Kennedy motioned to approve the Email Type code set and Odette Apodaca seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

ii. Identity Types

Ester Reeves requested to add "USID – Military Identification Number" and "VISA – U.S. Visa Sticker" to the list. This would have a target date of June 2026.

Niltza Flores motioned to approve the Identity Type code set and Ester Reeves seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

iii. Person Suffix

Committee members discussed this code specifically about the need to differentiate generational and academic suffixes with the key point being sure that there was not a mismatch with the MVD records. The committee would like to increase the suffix count from I-VI (one to six) to I-X (one to ten) as well as do more research on how and what MVD and DPS currently collect. Ester Reeves motioned to approve with Summer Dalton seconding however both revoked their motion as further research takes place on the Person Suffix code set. This will be further discussed in the May meeting.

iv. Post-Conviction Relief Notification Request

Marcos Romero asked if the sample form was mandatory, and Laura Ritenour confirmed it was not.

Summer Dalton motioned to approve the Post-Conviction Relief Notification Request and Odette Apodaca seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

B. Update/Discuss – Administrative Directive 2024-10 and Code Standardization (Laura Ritenour and Michele Gillich)

Last Tuesday, April 22nd was this quarter's CCR workshop. Laura Ritenour reminded everyone that the code standards are published on our website and encouraged anyone needing assistance to reach out to our teams.

C. Review/Discuss/Vote - Code Standardization Requests (Laura Ritenour)

i. Adding Status Offense (ST) to the standardized Offense Class Code Set

Randy Kennedy wanted to confirm if Status Offense was considered the same as what their presiding judge calls Delinquent Act. It was confirmed that Status Offenses are charges like truancy, underage consumption of alcohol, etc.

Summer Dalton motioned to approve the updated Offense Class Code of Status Offense and Randy Kennedy seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

ii. Adding Service of Process Information Form (POSOP) to standardized PO Events Code Set

Before the motion and voting, Randy Kennedy asked who should be contacted at the AOC in regard to the firearm transfer form. Michele Gillich responded that a meeting is scheduled soon to discuss this and that anyone interested in joining the group should reach out to Theresa Barrett. Marcos Romero asked whether, in cases where a paper petition is used, there is a corresponding field in the portal. Michele confirmed that there is but clarified that the discussion was focused on how to get the completed forms returned to them.

Summer Dalton motioned to approve the PO Events Code of Service of Process Information Form (POSOP) and Marcos Romero seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

iii. Person Prefix Code Set

Following points raised by Ester Reeves regarding the source and usage of these codes, and Marcos Romero's concern about a possible mismatch with MVD—like the Suffix codes—this item will be moved to the May

meeting to allow time for further research.

iv. Stage Petition Protection Order Code Set

Ester requested that this be postponed until May so she can verify details with her court. The item will be added to the May agenda.

D. Update/Review - Administrative Order 2025-67 – Revisions to DUI, Felony, and Juvenile Time Standards (Mike Malone and Laura Ritenour)

Jennifer Jones presented on this topic. Gil Bensinger asked if there was an update on the delinquency definition of an advisory hearing. Laura Ritenour responded by asking to meet with Gil after the meeting to discuss it further.

E. Updates, Comments and Questions from Members

There were no updates, comments, or questions.

F. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Odette Apodaca at 11:11 a.m.

G. Next Committee Meeting Date

Tuesday, May 27, 2025, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Zoom Webinar

Data Standardization Advisory Committee

Code Standardization Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize the Person Suffix code set, Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

- In CCR Specifications Version 4.1, in the Stage Party, Stage Person Organization, and Stage Alias feeds is the SuffixCode field. The definition of the field is: “The person’s name suffix.”
- This is a desired field for transmission; however, AOC Information Technology Integration Team is requesting this field be standardized so that if a case management system sends this field, the data received will be standardized.
- This code set would be used by both general and limited jurisdiction courts.
- Update – The *ADOT MVD Electronic Violation and Abstract Record Layout and Data Elements* displays “N/A” in the valid codes section for First, Middle and Last Names. Data Element 3 is Last Name or Last Name and Suffix . The examples for this element are “Jones or Garcia JR or Maximillian III or Smith SR.” Therefore, whatever the Data Standardization Advisory Committee chooses will be accepted by MVD for Suffix since there is no list of valid codes and the field is an appendage of the Last Name field.

Public Access and eAccess Display –

- Should this data be displayed on Public Access/eAccess? Yes for Public Access and eAccess.
- Should any document associated with this Docket (that is not sealed or restricted) be displayed in eAccess? n/a

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 June 30, 2026 date stated in [Administrative Directive 2024-10](#).

Proposed Motion

Motion to approve the Person Suffix codes, descriptions, and reference listed below.

Proposed Code	Proposed Description	Proposed Reference
DDS	DDS	Doctor Dental Surgery
DO	DO	Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine
DVM	DVM	Doctor of Veterinary Medicine
I	I	First
II	II	Second
III	III	Third

IV	IV	Fourth
JR	JR	Junior
MD	MD	Medical Doctor
RN	RN	Registered Nurse
SR	SR	Senior
V	V	Fifth
VI	VI	Sixth
VII	VII	Seventh
VIII	VIII	Eighth
IX	IX	Ninth
X	X	Tenth

Data Standardization Advisory Committee

Code Standardization Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize the Person Prefix code set, Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

- In CCR Specifications Version 4.1, in the Stage Party, Stage Person Organization, and Stage Alias feeds is the PrefixCode field. The definition of the field is: “The person’s name prefix.”
- This is a desired field for transmission; however, AOC Information Technology Integration Team is requesting this field be standardized so that if a case management system sends this field, the data received will be standardized.
- This code set would be used by both general and limited jurisdiction courts.
- Update – The *ADOT MVD Electronic Violation and Abstract Record Layout and Data Elements* does not contain a field for a person’s prefix. Therefore, whatever the Data Standardization Advisory Committee chooses will not impact MVD as that data element is not transmitted to MVD.

Public Access and eAccess Display –

- Should this data be displayed on Public Access/eAccess? Not applicable for Public Access and for eAccess
- Should any document associated with this Docket (that is not sealed or restricted) be displayed in eAccess? 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 June 30, 2026 date stated in [Administrative Directive 2024-10](#).

Proposed Motion

Motion to approve the Person Prefix code and description listed below.

Proposed Code	Proposed Description
DR	Doctor
HON	Honorable
MISS	Miss
MR	Mister
MRS	Missus
MS	Ms
REV	Reverend
OFC	Officer

FR	Father
PROF	Professor

Data Standardization Advisory Committee

Code Standardization Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize the Protection Order Petition Type code set, Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

- In CCR Specifications Version 4.1, in the Stage Petition Protective Order is the PetitionTypeCode.
- This field indicates the code value for the type of protection order as selected by the plaintiff.
- This is a required data feed for Protection Order case to provide Order information. NOTE: If mapping from pm transactions, this was Protection Order Information Transactions aka pm_info.
- This code set would be used by both general and limited jurisdiction courts

Public Access and eAccess Display –

- Should this data be displayed on Public Access/eAccess? Not applicable for Public Access and for eAccess
- Should any document associated with this Docket (that is not sealed or restricted) be displayed in eAccess? 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 **June 30, 2025 date** stated in [Administrative Directive 2024-10](#).

Proposed Motion

Motion to approve the Stage Petition Protection Order Petition Type codes and descriptions listed below.

Proposed Code	Proposed Description
IAH	Injunction Against Harassment
IAW	Injunction-Workplace Harassment
OOP	Order of Protection

Data Standardization Advisory Committee

Code Standardization Update

Code Update and Requestor

Updating the Hair Color Demographics code set, Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

- On June 7, 2023, the Data Standards Steering Committee approved Hair Color, Eye Color, Race, and Sex code sets. These code sets were based on standards set by DPS.
- At that time, BLD was the code for Bald, and XXX was the code for Unknown.
- AZPOINT had been sending courts BLD for Bald due to the standards set at that time.
- On March 31, 2025, DPS confirmed that NCIC changed the code for Bald from BLD to XXX.
- **CCR will now accept the codes of BLD or XXX for Bald.**
- If a protective order petitioner files a paper petition and the court uses BLD for Bald, then AZPOINT will update the BLD to XXX when submitting to DPS. Courts do not have to update their tables for this change unless they want to.

Implementation Timeline

AOC Information Technology Integration Team is currently revising their tables to meet this updated standard.

Standard Code	Standard Description	Type
BLD or XXX	Bald	Hair Color
BLK	Black	Hair Color
BLN	Blond or Strawberry	Hair Color
BLU	Blue	Hair Color
BRO	Brown	Hair Color
GRY	Gray or Partially Gray	Hair Color
GRN	Green	Hair Color
ONG	Orange	Hair Color
PNK	Pink	Hair Color
PLE	Purple	Hair Color
RED	Red or Auburn	Hair Color
SDY	Sandy	Hair Color
XXX	Unknown	Hair Color
WHI	White	Hair Color

Data Standardization Advisory Committee

Code Standardization Request

Code Request and Requestor

Standardize the Payment Type code set, Requested by: AOC Information Technology Integration Team

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

- In CCR Specifications Version 4.1, in the Stage Obligation Feed is the PaymentTypeCode.
- This field indicates the type of payment or action used in a payment transaction.
- For some courts, these codes are not a table in their case management system. Rather, these codes are derived when payments or actions on payments are sent or received, and these codes are added into the core_oblign transaction to the CCR.
- The FARE Team reports that all courts currently in FARE use the Payment Type codes correctly and there are no known issues with these codes at this time.
- This is a Desired field in the obligation transaction. This code set is used for payments on FARE and non-FARE cases. The values below are mandatory when payments are made on FARE and OLCP cases.
- This code set would be used by both general and limited jurisdiction courts.

Public Access and eAccess Display –

- Should this data be displayed on Public Access/eAccess? Not applicable for Public Access and for eAccess
- Should any document associated with this Docket (that is not sealed or restricted) be displayed in eAccess? 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 **June 30, 2025 date** stated in [Administrative Directive 2024-10](#).

Proposed Motion

Motion to approve the Payment Type codes and descriptions listed below.

Proposed Code	Proposed Description	Notes
C	Court Payment	Transmitted by courts to CCR
D	Debt Setoff Payment	Transmitted by courts to CCR
W	Web Payment	Transmitted by FARE Vendor through CCR to the courts when FARE web payment portal used
I	IVR Payment	Transmitted by FARE Vendor through CCR to the courts when FARE IVR system used
O	OLCP Payment	Transmitted by FARE Vendor through CCR to the courts when www.azcourtpay.com website used to make a payment on an OLCP case*

P	FARE CAP Payment	Transmitted by courts to CCR and FARE Vendor to denote an initial FARE CAP payment – only used by courts in the FARE CAP Program
R	Correction from Court	Transmitted when an update is made on a FARE or OLCP case to sync the CMS with the CCR and FARE

*OLCP stands for Online Case Payment and is an AJACS-only program currently. It may be available to non-AJACS courts once they are sending their pre-FARE case information to the CCR.