

# Arizona Supreme Court Data Standardization Advisory Committee

## AGENDA

January 28, 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
<b>Meeting Opening</b>		
10:00 a.m.	<p>Welcome to Members and Roll Call of Attendees</p> <p>Welcome to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jennifer Jones, Manager for AOC Court Operations Unit</li> <li>• Michael Wise, Court Case Management Analyst for Time Standards and Data Standards</li> <li>• Lorri Behunin, Deputy Court Administrator and proxy for Chandler Municipal Court</li> </ul> <p>Review and Vote on November 19, 2024, Meeting Minutes</p>	Michael Malone, Chair, CSD Division Director
<b>Items from Previous Meeting/s</b>		
10:10 a.m.	<p>Review/Discuss (Michele Gillich and Laura Ritenour) - Integration, Required Data Elements, Legislation, Code Standardization and Data Translation Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="#">Administrative Directive 2024-10</a></li> <li>- <a href="#">Required Data Elements January 2025 Checklist</a></li> <li>- CCR Specifications Workshop Follow-up to January 21, 2025 meeting</li> </ul>	
10:30 a.m.	Review/Discuss (Laura Ritenour) Counting Continuances Workgroup Recommendations	
10:45 a.m.	Review (Brittany Pelly and Steve Hausser) FARE Skip Tracing: Business Process between Court and Collection Vendor (Trellint)	
11:00 a.m.	Review/Discuss/Vote (Laura Ritenour and Michele Gillich) Contact Status – New Code Request for FBAD	
11:05 a.m.	Update (Laura Ritenour) Ongoing AOC-Internal Discussions on Case Number, Case Categories, Case Types, and Case Subtypes	
<b>New Items</b>		
11:10 a.m.	Review/Discuss/Vote (Laura Ritenour) New Court Role Type – “Statutory Agent”	

11:15 a.m.	Review/Discuss/Vote (Laura Ritenour and Michele Gillich) Update PCO Code Set – Remove 52, 53, and 54 Codes	
<b>Ongoing Business</b>		
11:40 a.m.	Updates, Comments, and Questions from Members	
11:50 a.m.	Call to the Public	Michael Malone, Chair
	Reminder	The next committee meeting will be Tuesday, February 25, 2025, 10 a.m. - 12 noon via Zoom webinar
11:55 a.m.	Adjournment (motion needed)	Michael Malone (Chair)

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

# DATA STANDARDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

November 19, 2024

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, Ralph Garcia, Dean Hammel, Todd Herrera-Ridenhour, Susann Holland, Roopa Kalidindi, Chris Phelps for Randy Kennedy, Adele May, Michael Nimtz, Ester Reeves, Ginger Rodas, Marcos Romero, Danica Sanchez, Katrina Solis, Adam Walterson, and Jeanette Wiesenhofer

**Not Present:** Daniel Bowman, Niltza Flores and Michael Malone

**Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and Guests:** Teri Munn (AOC), Steve Hausser (AOC), Angelica Burris (AOC), Cathy Clarich (AOC), Melanie Cluff (AOC), Kristi Hageman (AOC), Brittany Pelly (AOC), Laura Ritenour (AOC), Michele Gillich (AOC), and Janita Zendejas (AOC)

---

## I. CALL TO ORDER

### A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The November 19, 2024, meeting of the Data Standards Advisory Committee was called to order by Cath Clarich, meeting chair, at 10:02 a.m. Mike Malone was unable to attend and serve as chair. Cathy welcomed the committee's newest member, Dean Hammel. Dean is the Assistant IT Director (Applications) for Pima County Superior Court, Justice Courts, and Clerk of Clerk. Cathy took roll call, established a quorum, mentioned the meeting was being recorded, and that there will be time at the end of the meeting for public comment.

### B. October 29, 2024, Meeting Minutes

Laura Ritenour, staff for the committee, displayed the October 29, 2024, draft meeting minutes and it was noted that in the October draft minutes, the Next Committee Meeting Date section displayed the wrong date. That date will be updated in the approved minutes. Cathy asked for a motion to approve the minutes with this correction. Katrina Solis made that motion and Marcos Romero seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

## II. ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS AND NEW ITEMS

### A. 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. Members gave reasoning for extending two of the dates and those dates and reasons were noted. Members discussed the importance communication between the courts and AOC so that both were aware of where each court case management system is in meeting each section of the AD. Members and the AOC will work together to avoid delays and resource issues. Laura Ritenour then displayed the draft template for requests for extension of time. Several members provided feedback on the template. Cathy thanked the committee for their input. She said the draft would go to AOC Legal as the next step.

**B. Two Items Tabled to January 2025 Meeting**

Cathy announced that the Counting Continuances Concept and Case Category Standards and Public Access Functions are tabled until the next meeting.

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

Laura Ritenour presented the updated code and appearance reason request. Members and staff discussed the request. It was agreed that these event codes and appearance reason are case-based and not defendant-based. Summer Dalton made a motion to approve the event codes with the updated descriptions listed in red font on the request form. Adele May seconded the motion. Members voted and the motion passed with Ester Reeves and Marcos Romero voting “nay” and Dean Hammel and Chris Phelps abstaining.

**D. Proposed 2025 Meeting Schedule**

Laura Ritenour presented the proposed 2025 meeting schedule. Members decided to not have a November meeting and instead meet the first Tuesday in December. Ginger Rodas made a motion to accept the meeting schedule as discussed. Katrina Solis seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. It was noted later in the meeting that the July 2025 date should be July 29<sup>th</sup>.

**E. Contact Status – New Code Request and Definitions**

Laura Ritenour 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. Members were not ready to vote on the FBAD request. Ester Reeves made a motion to accept the definitions as written. Chris Phelps seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Laura Ritenour will invite the FARE team to present at the January meeting.

**F. Designate Department of Public Safety (DPS) as authority for Ethnicity Codes and Descriptions**

Laura Ritenour presented the request for the committee to designate DPS as the authority for Ethnicity codes and descriptions. Members discussed the request and

Summer Dalton made a motion for the designation. Marcos Romero seconded it and the motion passed unanimously.

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

Members did not have any updates, comments, or questions. Laura Ritenour reported that the Required Data Elements checklists would be published online by December 16<sup>th</sup> and that this checklist would be one list covering all elements, regardless of case type.

**H. Call to the Public**

Cathy Clarich made a call to the public for comments. There was no answer.

**I. Adjournment**

Cathy Clarich thanked members for their participation and said good-bye to committee members, as she is retiring at the end of December. A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Chris Phelps at 11:59 a.m.

**J. Next Committee Meeting Date**

Tuesday, January 28, 2025, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Zoom Webinar

## Counting Continuances Workgroup Outcomes

AOC staff would like to thank the members of the Counting Continuances workgroup for their participation. Workgroup members were Ryan Anderson, Gil Bensinger, Daniel Bowman, Jordan Falber, Samuel Guy, Katie Lavery, Alish Major, Yolanda Potter, Nikki Smith, Lauryn Thompson, Dolly Legleu, and Jennifer Ferguson, and Laura Ritenour (AOC staff).

### Issue Background

When courts have issues with meeting time standards, questions regarding continuances arise. National research has consistently shown that limiting continuances and the time between proceedings leads to courts getting closer to meeting standards. Courts knowing their continuance data can help them make decisions regarding caseload management processes. In Arizona, no statewide continuance reports exist.

### Workgroup Purpose

The workgroup's purpose was to learn about how courts currently count continuances to begin constructing a possible solution to this data gap.

### Workgroup's Discussion and Assignments

- 1) Held meetings on August 20 and September 9, 2024
- 2) Constructed a definition of "continuance"
- 3) Discussed examples of what continuances are and aren't
- 4) Learned how various case management systems currently hold data on continuances (Motions to Continue filed, Calendar Hearing Results of "Continued", or no data)
- 5) Submitted examples of continuance scenarios and Hearing Result tables

### Workgroup Outcomes

- A. The workgroup agreed that a continuance was "when a proceeding is deferred to a future date and is repeated on the court calendar."
- B. Members were not able to reach consensus on a consistent list of what was and wasn't a continuance. For example, when a proceeding is held but then needs to be continued because lab results are not ready, some members believe that is a continuance to be counted while others did not ("one party just needs more time"). Another example is when a Motion to Continue (MTC) is filed prior to a hearing and the hearing is vacated and rescheduled – some believed that is a continuance while others did not.
- C. Some case management systems contain calendaring systems with hearing results while others did not. In some systems, whether a proceeding was continued had to be "figured out" by staff by reviewing the Register of Actions.
- D. In some courts, if a defendant and their attorney are not going to appear because they want to go to trial, a MTC is filed as a way to "move the case along" from a Pretrial Conference to the next proceeding and the proceeding is not repeated. This means that courts could not just count MTCs as a way to count continuances.

- E. A review of the Arizona Judicial Branch’s 2024-2029 Strategic Agenda, Goal 4.1 mentions “increase the utilization of data dashboards, data analytic tools, and time standard reports that already exist by....”. While the creation a statewide continuance report is a worthy endeavor, Goal 4.1 mentions “existing” reports and a new statewide continuance report would not meet this criteria.

#### AOC Staff Recommendation

AOC staff recommends that each case management system work towards developing their own continuance reports or adding continuance data to their existing reports. For example, courts could add continuance data to their existing time standards reports, data dashboards, or other applications so that judicial officers reviewing a case are aware of that case’s continuances.

## FARE Program and Skip- Tracing Process for Courts

1. Upon referral to the FARE Program, a Notice 1 is sent if the address is good. If the address is marked as “Bad” then the address is immediately skip-traced.
2. If Notice 1 is return to Contractor (nixied) then the address is skip-traced for an update.
3. The address that prompted a nixied is marked as “bad” and this “bad address transaction” is provided back to the CMS
4. As nixies are received, bad address transactions are shared with the CMS as updates to the case.
5. If Contractor returns a bad address indicator to the CMS, it is up to the court’s discretion to absorb this information. Regardless of if the court accepts this information, bad address information will prompt continued skip-tracing.
6. If a new address is found ia skip-tracing, the new address is sent to the court and it's up to the court to decide how it will handle or notate the new address in the CMS. Regardless of what the court does, the new address will be used by the vendor for noticing.
7. If a court notates that an address is bad, this information is shared with Contractor.
8. Contractor’s CMS, eTIMS®, notates this information, both good and bad, in the case history
9. On an annual basis, the FARE team and Contractor review bad address populations to issue specialized notices, restart skip-tracing waterfalls, or push cases to outbound calling to reach customers.

### Address Events

- “Notice” ntc\_type “with notice number” ntc\_num “was produced on” ntc\_dt “for” ntc\_bal?
  - Indicates which notices were generated along with Notice number, date, and balance amount.
- Corrected Party Address Returned – please review
  - Nix Skip-Tracing has recovered new FARE Address

The screenshot shows the FARE software interface. At the top, there is a 'General Search' section with various filters. Below this is a table of events. The table has columns for Filing Date, Party, Event Type, and Description. One row is highlighted in red, indicating a 'CORRECTED PARTY ADDRESS RETURNED' event.

Filing Date	Party	Event Type	Description
01/06/2025	CONWAY, TERESA JEAN	"NOTICE" NTC_TYPE "WITH NOTICE NUMBER" NTC_NUM "WAS PRODUCED ON" NTC_DT "FOR" NTC_BAL?	Notice 31 with notice number 312500701697 was produced on 01/07/2025 for \$393.16
01/03/2025	CONWAY, TERESA JEAN	"NOTICE" NTC_TYPE "WITH NOTICE NUMBER" NTC_NUM "WAS PRODUCED ON" NTC_DT "FOR" NTC_BAL?	Notice 31 with notice number 312500600994 was produced on 01/06/2025 for \$393.16
11/28/2024	CONWAY, TERESA JEAN	"NOTICE" NTC_TYPE "WITH NOTICE NUMBER" NTC_NUM "WAS PRODUCED ON" NTC_DT "FOR" NTC_BAL?	Notice 30 with notice number 302433801084 was produced on 12/03/2024 for \$393.16
11/06/2024	CONWAY, TERESA JEAN	CORRECTED PARTY ADDRESS RETURNED	Corrected address returned - Please review
10/25/2024	CONWAY, TERESA JEAN	"NOTICE" NTC_TYPE "WITH NOTICE NUMBER" NTC_NUM "WAS PRODUCED ON" NTC_DT "FOR" NTC_BAL?	Notice 03 with notice number 032430201325 was produced on 10/28/2024 for \$393.16

- Current Party Address Has Been Marked “Bad” FARE
  - Notice returned undeliverable as Bad Address

## FARE Program and Skip- Tracing Process for Courts

**General Search**

Search Case Details Batch Printing Print Export Restore Archived Reset Close

Case Citation Person **Event** Receipt Payment Contract Journal Voucher Tickler Other Person Resource Search Calendar Summary Track Attendance

Last Name/ Organization: [ ] LIKE [ ] First: [ ] Middle: [ ] Suffix: [ ]

Case Number: [ ] Role Type: [ ] Filing Date (From): [ ] (To): [ ] Draft: [ ]

Event Category: FARE Event Date (From): [ ] (To): [ ]

Event Type: CURRENT PARTY ADDRESS HAS BEEN MARKED BAD Court Type: [ ]

Data Entry Date: [ ]

Event Judge: [ ] User ID: [ ]

Disbursement Journal Documents Exhibit Tracking **FARE Events** Folder Tracking

Drag a column header here to group by that column.

Filing Date	Party	Event Type	Description
10/11/2024	JAY, LESLIE ANN	FARE COLLECTIONS FEE ADDED	FARE COLLECTIONS FEE ADDED
10/10/2024	JAY, LESLIE ANN	CURRENT PARTY ADDRESS HAS BEEN MARKED BAD	CURRENT PARTY ADDRESS HAS BEEN MARKED BAD

### Mark Existing Address as Bad

- Allows court to alert FARE of bad address to commence skip-tracing.
- Documented in FARE Events Tab

#### Instructions

1. Click Modify
2. Select "Bad"
3. Check box and Save

**Person**

Demographics Date Of Birth Identity Info Citizenship Info Person Alerts **Address** Point Of Contact E-Mail Telephone Person Case History Physical Marks Attached Documents

Address Source: MANUAL

Address Type: PO BOX

Address Line 1: PO BOX 998

Country: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Zip Code: 85001

City: PHOENIX

State: ARIZONA

Data Status: ACTIVE

Effective Date: 12/1/2014

End Date: 12/1/2064

Mailing:  **BAD**

Restricted:

Comment: [ ]

### View FARE Skip Traced Event

- Allows court to view most recent (current) address utilized by FARE
- This is documented in FARE Events tab; does not supersede courts current address

#### Instructions

1. Identify FARE labeled address
2. Click "Modify" to view details

## FARE Program and Skip- Tracing Process for Courts

**Person**

- Demographics
- Date Of Birth
- Identity Info
- Citizenship Info
- Person Alerts
- Address**
- Point Of Contact
- E-Mail
- Telephone
- Person Case History
- Physical Marks
- Attached Documents

Address Source: FARE / SKIP TRACE

Address Type: OTHER

Address Line 1: 6906 W RAY ROAD

Country: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Zip Code: 85226

City: CHANDLER

State: ARIZONA

Data Status: ACTIVE

Effective Date: 12/5/2014

End Date: 12/5/2064

Mailing:  BAD

Restricted:

Comment: System added Address record

Filing Date	Party	Event Type	Description
12/03/2010	ATTRIDGE, LUCAS	Corrected party address returned - please review	Corrected address returned - Please review

### View Address Marked as “Bad”

- Allows court to view address identified by FARE as no longer current
- Documented in FARE Events Tab (A)
- Court may search by event for a report of “Address Updated” (B)

### Instructions

1. Click “Modify” to view details

**Person**

- Demographics
- Date Of Birth
- Identity Info
- Citizenship Info
- Person Alerts
- Address**
- Point Of Contact
- E-Mail
- Telephone
- Person Case History
- Physical Marks
- Attached Documents

Address Source: MANUAL

Address Type: PO BOX

Address Line 1: PO BOX 998

Country: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Zip Code: 85001

City: PHOENIX

State: ARIZONA

Data Status: ACTIVE

Effective Date: 12/1/2014

End Date: 12/1/2064

Mailing:  BAD

Restricted:

Comment:

## FARE Program and Skip- Tracing Process for Courts

### **Contract Language for Skip-Tracing**

- If Contractor finds a new address based on skip-tracing, the Contractor shall send an address refresh transaction, via the AOC, to the court in which the case was filed, transmitting the new address obtained through skip-tracing.
- The Contractor shall perform address skip-tracing on all returned and undeliverable notices and immediately upon receipt of a bad address indicator from the AOC. The skip-tracing process shall encompass the following characteristics:
  - (a) Electronically retain previous address history for skip-tracing processes.
  - (b) Electronically match FARE case party demographic records using the following data fields to skip-trace new addresses: Name (first, middle, last, suffix), social security number (SSN) (required if available), address, and date of birth (DOB), at minimum or as required by the agreed upon business processing rules.
  - (c) Send a bad address indicator to the AOC upon receipt of all returned or undeliverable notices.

# Data Standardization Advisory Committee

## Code Standardization Request

### Code Request and Requestor

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 2024-10 with a the June 30, 2025 deadline date.

### Proposed Motion

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

Proposed Contact Status Code	Proposed Contact Status Description	Proposed Definition	Examples
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.

Approved Contact Status Code	Approved Contact Status Description	Approved 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

**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		<b>Note: Applicable only for FARE cases.</b> ACS has determined that the address is bad
IsCollectionAddressNew	[bit]		D		<b>Note: Applicable only for FARE cases.</b> ACS has provided a new address determined by skip tracing
IsPOContactAddress	[bit]		D		<b>Note: Used only when the case is a PO case</b> 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

**Date:** 12/18/2024

**Requestor:** Williams Municipal Court

### Background and Request

Williams Municipal Court has several Civil Local Ordinance cases (and expect more in the future) with a charge code of Unlawful to Operate without a License. The filing is against a business and when the person representing the business is added to the case, they currently use “Other.”

The person is not an attorney, not a fiduciary, or another type of person listed in the Court Role Type table. They are requesting Statutory Agent be added as a Court Role Type.

The definition of Statutory Agent from USLegal.com, “A statutory agent is an agent designated by law to receive litigation documents and other legal notices for a nonresident corporation. It is also known as a registered agent. Most businesses that are registered with a state government must have such an agent.”

### Public Access and eAccess Display

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

**Possible Interfaces Affected:** eFiling, CCR

**Reporting:** N/A

Proposed Standard Code	Proposed Standard Event Code Description	Proposed Type of Role	Definition
SG	Statutory Agent	Participant	A statutory agent is an agent designated by law to receive litigation documents and other

			<p>legal notices for a nonresident corporation. It is also known as a registered agent. Most businesses that are registered with a state government must have such an agent.</p>
--	--	--	--

**Tentative Implementation Timeline:** If the committee approves the Statutory Agent Court Role Type, the data would be sent as part of a case file’s StageParty transaction and therefore would be part of the third paragraph of Administrative Directive 2024-10 that states, “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.”

**Example of StageParty transaction:** core\_party|U|0|14548979|0747|2023-02-14 15:26:22|M|0747|CV|2023000050|443092|10706160|  
**SG**|1|0||1|0||0|0|0|| TOMMY|P|MARATHON|||0||AZ|US|01-01-2050|02-14-1980|0||||  
||0||N||N|N|||||12380|D|D|0||0|1|1|0|0|2023-02-14 15:25:09.293|2023-02-14 15:25:09.420|0|||

**Proposed Motion:** Move to approve that the Statutory Agent code and description be added to the Court Role Type code set as a statewide standard.

# Data Standardization Advisory Committee

## Code Standardization Request

**Date:** 1/21/2025

### Standardization Request and Requestor

Update standardized PCO Codes and Descriptions, Requested by: AOC Information Technology Division

### Background and Issue

AOC Information Technology Division is requesting updates to the standardized codes and descriptions for Arizona-specific reference PCO (Protective Order Conditions) codes that will be displayed in CCR, AZPOINT, and by running inquiry query Wanted Person (ACQW) thru the Arizona Criminal Justice Information System (ACJIS) network. Codes 52, 53, and 54 are duplicates of codes 42, 43, and 44, respectively. Analysis has shown that no court outside of one AJACS court has ever sent in these codes.

### Public Access and eAccess Display

- Should this data be displayed on Public Access/eAccess? Not applicable. Case data for protective order cases does not appear on Public Access or eAccess
- Should any document associated with this Docket (that is not sealed or restricted) be displayed in eAccess? n/a see above

**Interfaces Affected:** AZPOINT, CCR and all court CMS systems

### Tentative Implementation Timeline

If approved, the codes and descriptions would be removed from the PCO code set list and courts would not transmit codes 52, 53, and 54 by June 30, 2025 as part of Administrative Directive 2024-10 (IT IS FURTHER DIRECTED that all courts must transmit either the "pm\_xxx" or "core\_xxx" transactions as required by Administrative Order No. 2019-143 and identified in the Protection Orders section of the CCR Specifications by June 30, 2025.).

### Proposed Motion

Move to remove the Arizona Protection Type Codes and Descriptions 52, 53, and 54 from the PCO Code list.

### PCO Codes

AZ Protection Type Code	Protection Type Description
1	PCO 1 NOT THREATEN, ASSAULT PLAINTIFF OR TRESPASS
2	PCO 1 NOT THREATEN, ASSAULT OTHER PROTECTED PARTY OR TRSPASS
12	PCO 3 EXCLUSIVE USE OF RESIDENCE
13	PCO 4 NOT TO GO ON OR NEAR PLAINTIFF/PROTECTIVE PARTY RESIDE
14	PCO 4 NOT TO GO ON OR NEAR PLAINTIFF/PROTECTIVE PARTY EMPLOY
15	PCO 4 NOT TO GO ON OR NEAR PLAINTIFF/PROTECTIVE PARTY SCHOOL

<b>AZ Protection Type Code</b>	<b>Protection Type Description</b>
16	PCO 4 NOT TO GO ON OR NEAR PLAINTIFF/PROTECTIVE PARTY OTHER
41	PCO 5 TO HAVE NO CONTACT WITH PLAINTIFF
42	PCO 5 TO HAVE NO CONTACT EXCEPT BY PHONE
43	PCO 5 TO HAVE NO CONTACT EXCEPT BY EMAIL/FAX
44	PCO 5 TO HAVE NO CONTACT EXCEPT BY MAIL
45	PCO 5 TO HAVE NO CONTACT OTHER EXCEPT
46	PCO 5 NO CONTACT W/PARTIES LISTED IN ORDER
47	PCO 5 TO HAVE NO CONTACT W/PARTIES EXCEPT BY PHONE
48	PCO 5 TO HAVE NO CONTACT W/PARTIES EXCEPT BY EMAIL/FAX
49	PCO 5 TO HAVE NO CONTACT W/PARTIES EXCEPT BY MAIL
50	PCO 5 TO HAVE NO CONTACT W/PARTIES OTHER EXCEPT
<b>52</b>	<b>PCO 5 TO HAVE NO CONTACT EXCEPT BY PHONE</b>
<b>53</b>	<b>PCO 5 TO HAVE NO CONTACT EXCEPT BY EMAIL/FAX</b>
<b>54</b>	<b>PCO 5 TO HAVE NO CONTACT EXCEPT BY MAIL</b>
17	PCO 7 NOT TO POSSESS AND/OR PURCHASE FIREARMS (AZ Statute)
18	PCO 7 NOT TO POSSESS AND/OR PURCHASE AMMUNITION (AZ Statute)
20	PCO 8 COMPLETE APPROVED DV OFFENDER TREATMENT PROGRAM
19	PCO 8 TRANSFER FIREARMS TO LAW ENFORCEMENT
21	PCO 8 COMPLETE SCREENING/RECOMMENDED PROGRAM
22	PCO 8 PROVIDE COURT WRITTEN PROOF OF COMPLETION BEFORE
23	PCO 8 OTHER ORDER
24	PCO 8 SHALL APPEAR FOR A HEARING
51	PCO 8 LAW ENFORCEMENT
57	PCO 8 – NOT TO GO NEAR ANIMALS IN PLAINTIFF HOUSEHOLD MINOR CHILD HOUSEHOLD OR DEFENDANT HOUSEHOLD