

Arizona Supreme Court Data Standardization Advisory Committee

AGENDA

June 24, 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.	<p>Welcome to Members and Proxies, and Roll Call of Attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christine Sanchez as proxy for Summer Dalton • Samuel Guy as proxy for Ralph Garcia • Karen Roush as proxy for Ginger Rodas <p>Review/Vote on May 27, 2025, Meeting Minutes</p>	Jennifer Jones, interim Chair
10:05 a.m.	Call to the Public	Jennifer Jones, interim Chair
Items from Previous Meeting/s		
10:10 a.m.	<p>Review/Discuss/Vote – Code Standardization Requests (Laura Ritenour)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Category, Case Type, Case Subtype code sets 	
New Items		
11:00 a.m.	<p>Review/Discuss/Vote – New Code Standardization Requests (Laura Ritenour)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protective Order Relationship code set • PCO code set (modification) 	
11:25 a.m.	Review/Discuss - Required Data Elements list with CCR Specs information (Laura Ritenour)	
Ongoing Business		
11:30 a.m.	Updates, Comments, and Questions from Members	
	Reminder - The next committee meeting will be Tuesday, July 29, 2025, 10 a.m. - 12 noon via Zoom webinar	Jennifer Jones, interim Chair
11:45 a.m.	Closing Comments and Adjournment (motion needed)	Jennifer Jones, interim 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

May 27, 2025

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

DRAFT MINUTES

Present: Laurie Allen, Gil Bensinger, Daniel Bowman, Summer Dalton, Niltza Flores, Ralph Garcia, Dean Hammel, Todd Herrera-Ridenhour, Anirban Mitra as proxy for Susann Holland, Randy Kennedy, Adele May, Tania Nieblas, Mike Nimitz, Ester Reeves, Ginger Rodas, Marcos Romero, Mary Bellefeuille as proxy for Danica Sanchez, Adam Walterson, Jeanette Wiesenhofer, and Michael Malone

Not Present: Odette Apodaca, Laura Bergan, Katrina Solis

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and Guests: Andrew Fornek (Chandler), Angelica Burris (AOC), Daniel Paulson (Mesa), Jennifer Jones (AOC), Joe Hamilton (Phoenix), Kristi Hageman (AOC), Laura Navarro Cobos (Paradise Valley), Laura Ritenour (AOC), Melanie Cluff (AOC), Michael Wise (AOC), Michele Gillich (AOC), Sabrina MacDonald (AOC), Scott Fitzpatrick (Scottsdale), and Steve Hausser (AOC)

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The May 27, 2025, meeting of the Data Standards Advisory Committee was called to order by Mike Malone, meeting chair, at 10:00 a.m. Mike Malone welcomed the new member Tania Nieblas from the Superior Court for Maricopa County. Mike Malone took roll call, established a quorum, and mentioned the meeting was being recorded.

B. April 29, 2025, Meeting Minutes

Mike Malone displayed the April 29, 2025, draft meeting minutes. Mike Malone asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Gil Bensinger made a motion to approve the minutes, and Ginger Rodas 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

D. Review/Discuss/Vote - Code Standardization Requests

Laura Ritenour presented on the code sets below:

i. Person Suffix Code Set

There is no ADOT MVD standardization in place, so we have the flexibility to proceed as we see fit. Ginger Rodas raised a concern about using "MD" professional titles rather than true suffixes. Ester Reeves asked whether including such titles might cause mismatches with MVD records. Randy Kennedy clarified that as long as the driver's license number matches, discrepancies in other fields are generally not an issue for MVD. However, if the name does not match, it could result in a mismatch. After discussion, it was decided to remove professional titles from the code set.

Ginger Rodas motioned to approve the revised Person Suffix code set and Marcos Romero seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

ii. Person Prefix Code Set

Laura Ritenour stated that, based on her research, this field does not appear to be sent to ADOT MVD. Ginger Rodas and Marcos Romero asked whether the field is optional and if it exists in AJACS. Mike Malone and Laura confirmed that it is an optional field and currently in AJACS.

Randy Kennedy motioned to approve the Person Prefix code set and Ralph Garcia seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

iii. Stage Petition Protection Order Code Set

Laura reviewed the code set, as some committee members needed time after the April meeting to consult with their courts before voting.

Marcos Romero motioned to approve the Stage Petition Protection Order code set and Niltza Flores seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

E. Reminder – Requests for Extension of Time to meet Administrative Directive 2024-10 are due by June 1st

Laura reminded the committee of the deadline, form location, and steps required to complete and submit the Request for Extension of Time form.

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

i. Update to Hair Color in Demographics Table

DPS and NCIC have updated the code for 'bald' from BLD to XXX. The AOC will accept both codes, and the CCR will automatically translate them to XXX. Courts are not required to update their tables unless they choose to do so.

ii. Payment Type Code Set

Laura presented on the topic. Ester inquired about how PayNearMe (PNM) transactions are tracked. Steven Hausser explained that they are tracked by confirmation number with a leading 6 rather than payment type and typically appear as payment codes "W" or occasionally "O." At Ester's request, a note explaining this was added to the bottom of the code set table. The committee discussed why PNM does not have its own payment code and the potential programming changes required to implement one. Both the advantages and disadvantages of the change were considered. Mike Malone concluded that if a formal proposal is submitted in the future, it will be reviewed and discussed at that time.

Summer Dalton motioned to approve the Payment Type code set and Marcos Romero seconded the motion. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

iii. Case Category, Case Type, Case Subtype requests

Laura presented on this topic and asked courts to review the spreadsheet over the coming months in preparation for future discussions. It will be added to next month's agenda for a progress check-in. While courts are reviewing the spreadsheet, if they have questions or edits, they should email Laura so she can include them in the June meeting.

G. Updates, Comments and Questions from Members

Joe Hamilton asked for further clarification on the requirements for Requests for Extension, and Laura reviewed Administrative Order 2024-10 with the committee.

H. Adjournment¹⁰

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Niltza Flores at 10:58 a.m.

I. Next Committee Meeting Date

Tuesday, June 24, 2025, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Zoom Webinar

Data Standardization Advisory Committee

Code Standardization Request

Code Request and Requestor

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

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

- In CCR Specifications Version 4.1.2, in the Stage Party (18/18A/18PM) feed is the PlaintiffRelationshipToOtherProtectedPartyTypeCode field. The definition of the field is: “Protection Order Cases Only: Identifies the Relationship Code between the Plaintiff and other protected parties as per the Source system”
- This is a desired field for transmission; however, AOC IT 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? Not applicable for Public Access and applicable for eAccess and should be displayed??
- 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 Protective Order Relationship code and description below.

Proposed Code	Proposed Description
24	MARRIED NOW OR IN THE PAST
25	PARENT OF A CHILD IN COMMON
26	INTIMATE - LIVE TOGETHER NOW OR IN THE PAST
28	ONE OF US IS PREGNANT BY THE OTHER
29	RELATIVE
30	ROMANTIC OR SEXUAL RELATIONSHIP (CURRENT OR PREVIOUS)
31	NON INTIMATE - LIVE TOGETHER NOW OR IN THE PAST
99	OTHER

* 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. – From [Administrative Directive 2024-10](#).

Data Standardization Advisory Committee

Code Standardization Request

Code Request and Requestor

Modify the PCO code set by removing reference to “ammunition”, Requested by: Randy Kennedy, Scottsdale City Court, and Elsa Robbins, AOC Court Services Division

Background, Summary, and Intended Use

- In CCR Specifications Version 4.1.2, in the Stage Protection Order Association (27) feed is the ProtectionTypeCode field. The definition of the field is: “This field indicates the statewide standard code associated with each Protection Type.”
- This is a required field for transmission.
- This code set is used by both general and limited jurisdiction courts.
- As of 04/30/2024, these were two approved PCO 7 codes and descriptions with different descriptions:

AZ Protection Type Code	Protection Type Description
17	PCO 7 NOT TO POSSESS AND/OR PURCHASE FIREARMS (AZ Statute)
18	PCO 7 NOT TO POSSESS AND/OR PURCHASE AMMUNITION (AZ Statute)

However, Arizona statute 13-3602(G)(4) does not mention ammunition; it only mentions firearms.

Elsa Robbins consulted on this issue with Judge Million, Tucson City Court, and Chair of the Committee on the Impact of Domestic Violence and the Courts. She recommended that AZ Protection Type Code 18, associated with PCO 7 and ammunition, be removed from the statewide list.

Public Access and eAccess Display

- Should this data be displayed on Public Access/eAccess? Not applicable for Public Access and applicable for eAccess and should be displayed??
- 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 modify the PCO Code Set and remove AZ Protection Type Code 18, associated with PCO 7 and ammunition.

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
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
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

* 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. – From [Administrative Directive 2024-10](#).