

# Arizona Supreme Court Data Standardization Advisory Committee

## AGENDA

May 26, 2026, 10:00 am – 12:00 pm

[Zoom Webinar Link](#), Passcode: 891514, Webinar ID: 961 4369 1963

Conference Call Line: 888-788-0099 (US Toll Free)

9:45 am	Zoom Webinar Open for Members, Attendees and Presenters	Laura Ritenour, AOC
<b>Meeting Opening</b>		
10:00 am	<p>Welcome to Members and Proxies, and Roll Call of Attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jennifer Jones serving as chair for Michael Malone</li> <li>• Joe Hamilton as proxy for Ester Reeves</li> <li>• Anirban Mitra as proxy for Susann Holland</li> </ul> <p>Review/Vote on April 28, 2026, Meeting Minutes</p>	Jennifer Jones, Chair
10:05 am	Call to the Public	Jennifer Jones, Chair
10:08 a.m.	AOC Statistics Team – Updates from Team and Questions from Members	Richard “Rico” Rivera, AOC
10:10 a.m.	Administrative Directive 2026-05 Modifying AD 2024-10 – Review and Discuss	Laura Ritenour
<b>Items from Previous Meeting/s</b>		
10:15 am	<p>Code Standardization Requests (Review/Discuss/Vote)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Mental Health Repository Code Set (Laura Ritenour and Summer Dalton)</li> <li>2) Additional AZPOINT Codes (Laura Ritenour and Michele Gillich)</li> <li>3) Sentence Type Code Set (Laura Ritenour)</li> <li>4) Appearance Reason Code Set (Laura Ritenour)</li> <li>5) Event Category Code Set (Laura Ritenour and Michael Wise)</li> <li>6) Event Entry Type Code Set (Laura Ritenour and Michael Wise)</li> </ol>	
<b>New Items</b>		
	None	

<b>Ongoing Business</b>		
11:45 am	Updates, Comments, and Questions from Members	
	Reminder - The next committee meeting will be Tuesday, June 30, 2026, 1:30 pm – 3:30 pm via Zoom webinar.	Jennifer Jones, Chair
12:00 pm	Closing Comments and Adjournment (motion needed)	Jennifer Jones, Chair

*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 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, 2026

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

**DRAFT MINUTES**

---

**Present:** Laurie Allen, Charlie Barrett, Gil Bensinger, Laura Bergan, Daniel Bowman, Summer Dalton, Christopher Fong, Ralph Garcia, Dean Hammel, Susann Holland, Randy Kennedy, Adele May, Tania Nieblas, Ester Reeves, Ginger Rodas, Marcos Romero, Danica Sanchez, Katrina Solis, Adam Walteson, Joana White, and Jeanette Wiesenhofer

**Not Present:** Odette Apodaca, Niltza Flores, and Michael Malone

**Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and Guests:** Jennifer Ferguson (Maricopa), Anirban Mitra (AOC), Allen Wheeler (Pima), Jessica Cooley (Pima), Michele Gillich (AOC), Patrick McGrath (Chandler), Joe Hamilton (Phoenix), Tom Carroll (Phoenix), Todd Herrera (Maricopa), Scott Fitzpatrick (Scottsdale), Kristie Wooley (AOC), Melanie Cluff (AOC), Fahmidha Wahab (AOC), Jennifer Jones (AOC), Laura Ritenour (AOC), and Michael Wise (AOC)

---

## I. CALL TO ORDER

### A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The April 29, 2026, meeting of the Data Standards Advisory Committee was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Jennifer Jones, meeting chair. Jennifer welcomed members, took rollcall, established a quorum, and noted the meeting was being recorded.

### B. February 24, 2026, Meeting Minutes

Jennifer Jones displayed the February 24, 2026, draft meeting minutes. Jennifer asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

Marcos Romero made a motion to approve the minutes, and Ester Reeves seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

### C. Call to the Public

Jennifer Jones made a call to the public for comments. There was no response.

## II. ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS AND NEW ITEMS

### D. Remaining Required Data Elements Review for 2027-2030 Checklists

The committee reviewed the draft Required Data Elements (RDEs) for the 2027–2030 checklists. Laura Ritenour provided background and facilitated discussion. The committee raised questions on juvenile RDEs as well as needing clearer definitions and alignment overall. Implementation challenges, noting potential costs, resource limitations, and risks associated with standardizing too many elements, which could increase complexity and errors were also discussed. A question was asked that if courts do not handle specific case types are they required to add those RDEs into their CMS. The committee suggested forming general and limited jurisdiction workgroups to further define requirements and evaluate jurisdiction-specific needs.

### E. Code Standardization Requests

Laura Ritenour presented the following code sets for review:

#### i. Designate MVD as authority for DL Restriction and Endorsement Codes

The committee reviewed the proposal to designate the Motor Vehicle Division as the authoritative source for driver license restriction and endorsement codes. After discussion regarding implementation timing, members recommended the request have an updated effective date of January 1, 2027.

Summer Dalton made a Motion to approve the designation of MVD as the authority for Driver License Restrictions and Endorsement Codes with the updated effective date and Randy Kennedy seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

#### ii. Amend a Court Role Type Definition

The committee reviewed a proposed update to expand the Officer Court Role Type definition to expand the number of officers and non-officers at various agencies that would meet the definition.

Ester Reeves made a Motion to amend the definition of the Officer/OF court role type and Randy Kennedy seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

#### iii. Mental Health Repository Code Set

The committee reviewed the proposed Mental Health Repository Code Set and discussed its use. Additional time to review was requested, and the item was tabled until the May meeting.

#### iv. Additional AZPOINT Codes

The committee reviewed additional AZPOINT codes code set and focused on the importance of petition-related codes. Additional time to review was

requested, and the item was tabled until the May meeting.

**v. Sentence Type Code Set**

The committee reviewed the Sentence Type Code Set and discussed its relationship to statistical reporting requirements and jurisdictional usage. The committee agreed that the list requires refinement and clearer definitions. The item was tabled until the May meeting.

**vi. Appearance Reason Code Set**

The committee reviewed the Appearance Reason Code Set and discussed the number of codes, previous mapping impact, and consistency of definitions. Additional codes were requested to be added and will be sent to Laura. The item was tabled until the May meeting.

**vii. Event Entry Type Code Set**

The committee reviewed the Event Entry Code Set and discussed standardization of the code format and the need for jurisdiction on this code set. Additional time to review was requested, and the item was tabled until the May meeting.

**viii. Event Category Code Set**

The committee reviewed the Event Category Code Set and discussed simplifying the structure by aligning it with the Event Entry Code Set where the event entry code determines the event category. Additional refinement and time for review is needed, and the item was tabled until the May meeting.

**ix. Hearing Results**

The committee reviewed updates to the Hearing Results Code Set and discussed current usage limitations and future standardization efforts. The committee agreed to form a workgroup to refine codes, definitions, and descriptions. Once completed, the workgroup's recommendations will support development of an administrative directive to transition the field from desirable to required status. The committee agreed to establish a workgroup to further define and standardize the Hearing Results Code Set, including development of complete definitions and implementation guidance.

Randy Kennedy made a Motion to approve the Hearing Results Code Set with any duplicate codes removed, and the creation of a workgroup to further define and standardize this code set. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

**F. Updates, Comments and Questions from Members**

There were no updates, comments, or questions from members.

**G. Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Marcos Romero at 3:15 p.m.

**H. Next Committee Meeting Date**

Tuesday, May 26, 2026, 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 CENTRAL	)	No. 2026 - <u>05</u>
CASE REPOSITORY: PHASE ONE	)	(Amending Administrative
	)	Directive No. 2024-10)
	)	

---

Pursuant to Administrative Order No. 2024-123 and by the issuance of Administrative Directive No. 2024-10, the Administrative Director promulgated phase one of the implementation schedule establishing requirements for courts to submit case-related data to the Administrative Office of the Court’s (AOC) Central Case Repository (CCR). These requirements include a provision that Domain Values must align with code standards when designated in the CCR Specifications. To ensure that courts can comply with this requirement, it is necessary to extend the deadlines for submission of certain code sets.

Therefore, Administrative Directive No. 2024-10 is amended as follows:

IT IS DIRECTED that all courts must transmit case data starting when a case is initiated using the “core\_xxx” transactions identified in the Stage Data Feeds section of the CCR Specifications by June 30, 2026, except that the deadline for Domain Values of Appearance Reason, Event Entry, and Event Category code sets not identified in the FARE, NICS, Public Access Repository, and Protection Orders sections of the CCR Specifications is January 22, 2027.

IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts must 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, except that the deadline for Domain Values of Appearance Reason, Event Entry, and Event Category code sets not identified in the FARE, NICS, Public Access Repository, and Protection Orders sections of the CCR Specifications is January 22, 2027.

IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that an extension of time for the deadlines above may be requested according to the procedures set forth in Administrative Directive No. 2024-10, by using the AOC’s Extension Request Form for Administrative Directive No. 2026-05 template attached hereto as Attachment A.

Dated this 7th day of May, 2026.

---

DAVID K. BYERS  
Administrative Director of the Courts

# **Attachment A**

**Extension Request Form for Administrative Directive 2026-05**

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](mailto: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 2026-05:

[ ] IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts must transmit case data starting when a case is initiated using the “core\_ xxx” transactions identified in the Stage Data Feeds section of the CCR Specifications by June 30, 2026, except that the deadline for Domain Values of Appearance Reason, Event Entry, and Event Category code sets not identified in the FARE, NICS, Public Access Repository, and Protection Orders sections of the CCR Specifications is January 22, 2027.

[ ] IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts must 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, except that the deadline for Domain Values of Appearance Reason, Event Entry, and Event Category code sets not identified in the FARE, NICS, Public Access Repository, and Protection Orders sections of the CCR Specifications is January 22, 2027.

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 development cost of complying with Administrative Directive 2026-05 (Answer N/A if reason for extension is related to time and not cost):  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_

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 \_\_\_\_\_ and forwarded to the COT staff person on \_\_\_\_\_.

The Extension Request was presented and discussed at COT's \_\_\_\_\_ agenda.  
COT's decision on the Extension Request was:

\_\_\_ Granted      \_\_\_ Denied      \_\_\_ Granted with the following conditions: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Commission on Technology

\_\_\_\_\_

# Data Standardization Advisory Committee

## Code Standardization Request

### Code Request and Requestor

Request to Standardize Event Codes Required by Mental Health Repository through eAccess to support ARS 36-540(S). Requested by Summer Dalton, AOC eCourt Services Unit

### Background, Summary, and Intended Use

- In preparation for the statewide Mental Health Repository (MHR) to transition over to CCR (currently uses CCI), the MHR Project has identified a set of event/document codes that will be used for logic in the MHR.
- MHR Business Rule: Any non-sealed document associated with one of the following event/document codes in a Mental Health (MH) case is made available to MHR subscribers.
- These new codes would be used by general jurisdiction courts.
- These codes are included in the Event Entry Type code set that the Advisory Committee will be reviewing in April and May 2026. This code request was submitted so that Pima/AGAVE and Maricopa/iCIS staff can review these event/document codes separately from the 3,000+ Event Entry Type codes and allow those teams an opportunity to raise any concerns they have with mapping to these codes.

### Public Access and eAccess Display –

- Should this data be displayed on Public Access/eAccess? NO. This data is not displayed to the general public. This data will only be made available to MHR approved subscribers
- Should any document associated with this Event/Document code (that is not sealed or restricted) be displayed in eAccess? NO. These documents will not be made available to the general public. They will only be made available to MHR approved subscribers
- Note: FYI - There is an application process for MHR access. Only the following role types have access to this information: Superior Court Judges, County Attorneys, Patients' Attorneys (Public Defenders or Other Legal Defense Organizations), the Regional Behavioral Health Authority (RBHA), Behavioral Health Service Providers who are identified by a RBHA, and Health care institutions as defined in A.R.S. § 36-401 that provide services subject to the federal emergency medical treatment and active labor act (HB2041)

### 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 proposed codes and descriptions listed below as statewide standards.

<b>Proposed Code</b>	<b>Proposed Description</b>
11418	MISCELLANEOUS: Release from Evaluation
2000546	NOTICE: DISCHARGE FROM TREATMENT
13023	ORDER: AMENDED ORDER FOR TREATMENT
13117	ORDER: Approval of Revised Outpatient Treatment Plan
13263	ORDER: Continued Treatment
13279	ORDER: Continuing Court Ordered Treatment
13314	ORDER: Court Ordered Evaluation

NOTE: Below are two additional codes/descriptions that are used for MHR business logic, however these were already approved statewide as part of [NICS Code Set](#) (June 27, 2023 Advisory Committee meeting)

13322 - ORDER: Court Ordered Treatment

14046 - ORDER: TREATMENT

[Additional Information provided since April 26, 2026 Data Standardization Advisory Committee Meeting to Pima and Maricopa counties](#)

<b>Proposed Code</b>	<b>Proposed Description</b>	<b>Current Definition in AJACS</b>
11418	MISCELLANEOUS: Release from Evaluation	Use when the court receives notice that the person has been evaluated and has been released from further evaluation.
2000546	NOTICE: DISCHARGE FROM TREATMENT	For use when the document is filed by service providers in Mental Health cases pursuant to ARS 36-542
13023	ORDER: AMENDED ORDER FOR TREATMENT	Use when the court generates/issues an amended order of the original order for treatment.
13117	ORDER: Approval of Revised Outpatient Treatment Plan	Use when the court generates/issues an Order of Approval of Revised Outpatient Treatment Plan.
13263	ORDER: Continued Treatment	Use when the court generates/issues an Order for Continued Treatment.
13279	ORDER: Continuing Court Ordered Treatment	Use when the court generates/issues an Order Continuing Court Ordered Treatment.
13314	ORDER: Court Ordered Evaluation	Use when the court generates/issues an Order for Court Ordered Evaluation.
13322	ORDER: Court Ordered Treatment	Use when the court generates/issues an Order for Court Ordered Treatment.
14046	ORDER: Treatment	Use when the court generates/issues an Order for Treatment.

# Available Document Images

Maricopa County	Pima County	All Other Counties
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•DEN - Detention Order-Evaluation and Notice</li> <li>•DOT - Detention Order/Treatment/Notice</li> <li>•LET- Letter</li> <li>•OOE - Order for Outpatient Evaluation</li> <li>•OTR - Order for Treatment</li> <li>•RFE - Release from Evaluation</li> <li>•454 - ME: Pet Cot Dismissed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Order Discharging Patient</li> <li>• Release From Evaluation</li> <li>• Order on Judicial Review</li> <li>• Order on Involuntary Hospital Judicial Review</li> <li>• Order Terminating</li> <li>• Order To Amend Outpatient Treatment Plan</li> <li>• Order to Revise End Date Of Treatment Order</li> <li>• Order To Suspend OutPatient Treatment Plan</li> <li>• Notice Of Patient's Unauthorized Absence</li> <li>• Notice Of Patient's Return From Unauthorized Absence</li> <li>• Order for Evaluation</li> <li>• Court Ordered Treatment Plan</li> <li>• Order for Treatment</li> <li>• Order To Amend Outpatient Treatment Plan</li> <li>• Court Ordered Outpatient Treatment Plan</li> <li>• Outpatient Treatment Plan</li> <li>• Order of Conditional OutPatient Treatment Plan</li> <li>• Order Tolling Treatment Plan</li> <li>• Order To Toll Running of Period of Court-Ordered Treatment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Order: Court Ordered Evaluation</li> <li>• <u>Misc</u>: Release from Evaluation</li> <li>• Order: Amended Order for Treatment</li> <li>• Order: Continued Treatment</li> <li>• Order: Continuing Court Ordered Treatment</li> <li>• Notice: Discharge From Treatment</li> <li>• Order: Court Ordered Treatment </li> <li>• Order: Treatment </li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"> Standardized with NICS</p>

# Data Standardization Advisory Committee

## Code Standardization Request

### Code Request and Requestor

Request to Standardize Sentence Types. Requested by AOC Technical Integration Team

### Background, Summary, and Intended Use

- In CCR Specifications Version 4.1, in the StageCase Charge feed is the SentenceCode field. The definition of the field is: “This indicates the type or category of sentences assigned to the charge by the Source system.”
- 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.
- NOTE: In AJACS, a user does not select one of these codes. Instead, it is derived based on the sentencing and receivables entered by the user.

### Public Access and eAccess Display –

- Should this data be displayed on Public Access/eAccess? N/A
- Should any document associated with this Event/Document code (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 proposed codes and descriptions listed as statewide standards.

# Data Standardization Advisory Committee

## Code Standardization Request

### Code Request and Requestor

Request to Standardize Event Codes for transmission to CCR/AZPOINT. Requested by Michele Gillich, AOC Technical Integration Team

### Background, Summary, and Intended Use

- Standardizing event codes for the AZPOINT project is a high priority so the data between courts, CCR, AZPOINT, and law enforcement is accurate.
- These codes would be used by general and limited jurisdiction courts.
- These codes are included in the Event Entry Type code set that the Advisory Committee will be reviewing in April and May 2026. This code request was submitted so that courts can review these event/document codes separately from the 3,000+ Event Entry Type codes and allow those teams an opportunity to raise any concerns they have with mapping to these codes.

### Public Access and eAccess Display –

- Should this data be displayed on Public Access/eAccess? N/A Protective Order cases do not display on Public Access/eAccess
- Should any document associated with this Event/Document code (that is not sealed or restricted) be displayed in eAccess? N/A Protective Order cases do not display on Public Access/eAccess

### 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 proposed codes and descriptions listed below as statewide standards.

Proposed Code	Proposed Description	Definitions/Usage Notes
MODPETN	Protective Order Petition Modified	This is an optional code for courts. It can be used if the court sends in a modified petition. Currently, if a petition is modified, courts send in a second POINIT (Protective Order Petition). If courts use

		this code, it allows AZPOINT to display it as a modified petition. This is a document and sending this in indicates to AZPOINT that it needs to be served.
POACCSER	Protective Order Acceptance of Service	This is just an FYI for this code. Currently, acceptance of service is done electronically with PM Service. Court do not have to send in a document for this.
PODGS	Protective Order Defendants Guide Sheet	This is just an FYI for this code. Court do not have to send in a document for this. This document is already in AZPOINT.
PONOTSER	Protective Order Declaration/Affidavit of Service	This is just an FYI for this code. Court do not have to send in a document for this. This document is already in AZPOINT.
POPIS	Protective Order Information Sheet	This is just an FYI for this code. Court do not have to send in a document for this. This document is already in AZPOINT.
POREQMOD	Protective Order Request to Modify	This is a document and is the code used when the defendant requests a post-issuance hearing.
POSTRESC	Protective Order Hearing - Post Issuance - Reschedule	This is an event and is the code used when a post-issuance hearing has been rescheduled.

**Approved by Steering Committee on June 7, 2023 and updated on April 30, 2024 and April 29, 2025 by approval of the Data Standardization Advisory Committee**

Approved Code	Standard Description	Definitions/Usage Notes from Michele Gillich
POINIT	PROTECTIVE ORDER PETITION	This code represents that a protective order petition has been filed. If a protective order is granted by the court following Rule 31 (Service of Protective Orders), the petition is served under Rule 4(d).

PCTGD	PROTECTIVE ORDER GRANTED	<p>This code represents the granted protective order document</p> <p>This ORDER document is created following:</p> <p>a. Rule 23. Order of Protection: Individual Hearing. A judicial officer must conduct an individual hearing with each plaintiff who requests an Order of Protection.</p> <p>b. Rule 25. Injunction Against Harassment: Individual Hearing. The judicial officer must conduct an individual hearing with each plaintiff who requests an Injunction Against Harassment</p> <p>c. Rule 26. Injunction Against Workplace Harassment: Individual Hearing. A judicial officer must hold an individual hearing with each plaintiff--an employer or an authorized agent of the employer--who requests an Injunction Against Workplace Harassment.</p>
PCTOD	PROTECTIVE ORDER DENIED	This event is submitted when a protective order petition has been denied.
BRDYSET	PROTECTIVE ORDER BRADY FLAG SET	This code represents the document to notify that the Brady flag has been set.
MODOP	PROTECTIVE ORDER AMENDED	<p>This code represents the protective order document when the court amended an order following Rule 40:</p> <p>Rule 40. Motion to Modify:(a) Request for Modification. A plaintiff may ask for modification of a protective order at any time during the term of the order. (b) Verification of Identity. When a plaintiff files a motion to modify, court personnel must verify the plaintiff's identity. c) Modification Prior to Contested Hearing Request. If a contested hearing has not yet been requested or held, the judicial officer must personally interview the plaintiff and make sufficient inquiry of the plaintiff to determine that the plaintiff is not making the request under duress or coercion.(d) Modification After Contested Hearing or Request for Contested Hearing. If a contested hearing has been requested or has occurred, the motion to modify must be set for hearing with notice to the defendant. (e) Service and Registration of a Modified Order. The service and registration requirements applicable to the original protective order also apply to a modified protective order. See Part VI. Service and Registration.</p>

POCSETX	PROTECTIVE ORDER TRANSFERRED	This event would be submitted when the court transfers a protective order case to another court.
PETVACA	PROTECTIVE ORDER PETITION VACATED	This event would be submitted when a court vacates a petition and did not hold a pre-issuance hearing.
PODS	PROTECTIVE ORDER DISMISSED	<p>This code represents the dismissal document when the court dismisses an order after it's been issued. It could be because the plaintiff requested the dismissal, or it's dismissed after a post-issuance hearing following Rule 41:</p> <p>Rule 41: (a) Request for Dismissal. A plaintiff may request the dismissal of a protective order at any time during the term of the order. (b) Verification of Identity. When a plaintiff files a motion to dismiss, court personnel must verify the plaintiff's identity. (c) Personal Interview. The judicial officer must personally interview the plaintiff and make sufficient inquiry of the plaintiff to determine that the plaintiff is not making the request under duress or coercion. (d) Request with Defendant Present. If the plaintiff and the defendant appear jointly on a motion to dismiss, the judicial officer may interview the plaintiff separately only if the defendant has been served but has not requested a hearing. (e) Request with Defendant Absent. If the plaintiff requests dismissal of an order and the defendant is not present, the judicial officer may act without notice to the defendant.</p>
POINEFF	PROTECTIVE ORDER REMAINS IN EFFECT	This event would be submitted when the court orders an order remains in effect. It could be used after a plaintiff requested the dismissal, or it's the judge's ruling after a post-issuance hearing.
POU	PROTECTIVE ORDER UPDATED	This code represents a document; this code is used when the court makes a clerical correction on an order that did not change the terms ordered by the court. A new version of the order with the check box "Amended Order" must be selected and updated on the order. This can only occur on the same day the original order was issued by the court, corrected within 2 hours. Also, this must reflect the copy of the order the plaintiff left the court with.
PORBA	PROTECTIVE ORDER REINSTATED ON APPEAL	This code represents a document submitted by the court after a previously dismissed order has been reinstated after an appeal.

PORBE	PROTECTIVE ORDER REINSTATED ON DISMISSAL ERROR	This event would be submitted by the court after it's discovered that a court staff person made a data entry error and dismissed an order by mistake.
POSOP	PROTECTIVE ORDER SERVICE OF PROCESS INFORMATION FORM	When a petition is not created from the AZPOINT petition portal, the court must have the plaintiff complete a paper Service of Process Information form. This code represents this document; the court must scan the Service of Process Information form into the court's EDMS system then submit to the AZPOINT program following the transaction set for documents set by the CCR specification. The servicing agency needs the information collected from this form to serve the defendant.

## Data Standardization Advisory Committee

### Code Standardization Request

#### **Code Request and Requestor**

Request to Standardize Appearance Reasons. Requested by AOC Technical Integration Team

#### **Background, Summary, and Intended Use**

- In CCR Specifications Version 4.1.4, in the Stage Hearing feed is the HearingTypeCode (aka Appearance Reason) field. The definition of the field is: “Refers to the specific reason a party or parties were scheduled to appear before the court. Submitted to CCR when the hearing is scheduled and may be updated after the hearing date with the result of the hearing.”
- Appearance Reason refers to the specific purpose a party or parties were scheduled to appear before the court. It refers to the purpose of the appearance not the fact that someone was present (“appeared”).
- This is a required field for transmission.
- 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? N/A
- Should any document associated with this Event/Document code (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 January 22, 2027 date stated in [Administrative Directive 2026-05](#).

#### **Proposed Motion**

Motion to approve the proposed codes and descriptions as statewide standards.

# Data Standardization Advisory Committee

## Code Standardization Request

### Code Request and Requestor

Request to Standardize Event Categories. Requested by AOC Court Services Division and Technical Integration Team

### Background, Summary, and Intended Use

- In CCR Specifications Version 4.1.4, in the Stage Record of Action feed is the EventCategoryCode field. The definition of the field is: "This indicates the code value of the event category associated to the Event Entry."
- An event category is a high-level grouping that organizes related events into a meaningful segment, making it easier to filter data.
- 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.

### Public Access and eAccess Display –

- Should this data be displayed on Public Access/eAccess? N/A
- Should any document associated with this Event/Document code (that is not sealed or restricted) be displayed in eAccess? N/A

### For Committee Discussion

The event categories presented were created by AJACS to allow for event filtering during data entry.

eFiling and eBench both use event category for processing and displaying information to parties and judges.

Some event categories are named after document groups, like Orders, Applications, Motions, etc. Some event categories were created so that groups of events associated with a particular court process could easily be found by staff (Garnishment, Rule 11, Administrative, Change of Venue, etc.).

For example, the Garnishment event category contains the following documents and events:

- Application for Garnishment Judgment Filed
- Application for Order of Continuing Lien Filed
- Creditor's Garnishment Report Filed
- Garnishee Answer Filed
- Garnishee's Nonexempt Earnings Statement Filed
- Garnishment - Judgment Against Garnishee
- Garnishment - Notice to Discharge and Release Garnishee
- Garnishment - Notice to Judgment Debtor on Garnishment Filed
- Garnishment - Order Discharging Garnishee
- Garnishment - Order of Continuing Lien Issued

- Garnishment - Petition for Order Discharging Garnishee
- Garnishment - Petition for Order to Show Cause Regarding Garnishee's Default Requested
- Garnishment - Second Notice to Judgment Debtor of Garnishment Filed
- Garnishment - Writ of Garnishment and Summons Issued
- Garnishment Application - Writ Requested
- Garnishment Hearing Requested
- Initial Notice to Debtor of Garnishment Filed

### Initial Discussion Questions

- 1) Is the definition of event category as “a high-level grouping that organizes related events into a meaningful segment” correct? If not, what should we change this definition to?
- 2) Is having event categories named after documents a practice that we want to continue?
- 3) Is having event categories named after processes a practice that we want to continue?
- 4) What is missing on this list?

### 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 January 22, 2027 date stated in [Administrative Directive 2026-05](#).

### Proposed Motion

Motion to approve the attached proposed codes, descriptions, and definitions as statewide standards.

# Data Standardization Advisory Committee

## Code Standardization Request

### Code Request and Requestor

Request to Standardize Event Entry codes. Requested by AOC Court Services Division and Technical Integration Team

### Background, Summary, and Intended Use

- In CCR Specifications Version 4.1.4, in the Stage Record of Action feed is the EventEntryCode field. The definition of the field is: “This indicates the code value assigned to the event or register of action by state standards.”
- These codes are also referenced in the Stage Document feed as the DocumentTypeCode. The definition of the field is: “This indicates the Event entry/ROA standard code assigned for Court Document .”
- The Document Type Code in the core\_docs transaction and the Event Entry Code in the core\_roa transaction use the same set of Even Entry codes for CCR.
- If the event is associated with a document, the court is not required to submit the event with transaction core\_roa.
- This is a required field for transmission.
- 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? N/A
- Should any document associated with this Event/Document code (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 January 22, 2027 date stated in [Administrative Directive 2026-05](#).

### Proposed Motion

Motion to approve the proposed codes and descriptions as statewide standards.