Abstract:
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1 Introduction

This document defines a Service Interaction Profile, as called for in section 5 of [ECF 4.0]. The purpose of the Web Services Service Interaction Profile is to provide a web service-based system in conformance with the WS-I Basic Profile 1.1 ([WS-I BP 1.1]) and Basic Security Profile 1.0 ([WS-I BP 1.0]) for use with the [ECF 4.0] specification. This version adds support for bulk filings, improves security support for tokens, attachments, and rights management through inclusion of WS-Security 1.1 and adds supports for message splitting and assembly through inclusion of WS-Reliable Messaging 1.0. This specification requires an active network connection between the sending and receiving MDEs.

1.1 Relationship to ECF 4.0 Specifications

The ECF 4.0 specification describes the technical architecture and the functional features of an electronic court filing system, that is, features needed to accomplish electronic filing in a court, pointing out both normative (required) and non-normative (optional) business processes it supports. The non-functional requirements associated with electronic filing transactions, and actions and services needed to accomplish the transactions, such as network structures and security infrastructures, are defined in related specifications, namely:

- Service interaction profile specifications defining communications infrastructures within which electronic filing transactions can take place.
- Document signature profile specifications that define mechanisms for stating or proving that a person signed a particular document.

This specification represents an ECF 4.0 service interaction profile based on web-services. It is intended for implementation in conjunction with the ECF 4.0 specification and at least one ECF 4.0 document signature profile specification. Specifically, in this service interaction profile, the implementation details for each of the Major Design Elements (MDEs), operations, and messages defined in the ECF 4.0 specification, are defined in Web Services Description Language (WSDL).

1.2 Relationship to other XML Specifications

Consistent with the ECF 4.0 principle of leveraging other existing, non-proprietary XML specifications wherever possible, this service interaction profile specification leverages previous specifications for web services messaging and security including the following:

- W3C XML Schema 1.0.
- W3C Namespaces in XML.
- W3C Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) 1.1.
- W3C Web WSDL 1.1.
- W3C XML-Signature Syntax and Processing.
- W3C SOAP 1.1 Binding for MTOM 1.0
- WS-I Basic Profile Version 1.1.
- WS-I Basic Security Profile Version 1.0.
- OASIS WS-Reliable Messaging 1.0.

The use of each of these specifications is described below.

1.2.1 W3C XML Schema 1.0

The W3C XML Schema 1.0 specification defines an application protocol for imposing constraints on the storage layout and logical structure of data objects using text tags or “markup.” Compliance with the
requirements of the XML Schema 1.0 specification is REQUIRED for compliance with this service
interaction profile.

1.2.2 W3C Namespaces in XML

The W3C Namespaces in XML specification defines conventions for defining and referring to separate
XML tags. Compliance with the requirements of the Namespaces in XML specification is REQUIRED for
compliance with this service interaction profile.

1.2.3 W3C Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) 1.1

The W3C SOAP 1.1 specification defines message exchange patterns and message structures for use
with XML. Compliance with the requirements of the SOAP 1.1 specification is REQUIRED for compliance
with this service interaction profile.

1.2.4 W3C Web Services Description Language (WSDL) 1.1

The W3C WSDL specification enables the description of services as sets of endpoints operating on
messages. Compliance with the requirements of the WSDL 1.1 specification is REQUIRED for
compliance with this service interaction profile.

An MDE implementation MUST consist of a SOAP 1.1 web service that implements the SOAP HTTP
binding for that MDE’s portType from the ECF-4.0-WebServicesProfile-Definitions.wsdl document
(provided with this specification). Further, the implementation MUST be accompanied by an
implementation-specific WSDL document that imports the namespace defined in
ECF-4.0-WebServicesMProfile-Definitions.wsdl, and defines a <wsdl:service> element containing a
<soap:address> element with a location attribute whose value provides an HTTP URL at which the
MDE implementation can be invoked.

(Note that in the previous paragraph, a namespace prefix of “wsdl” is assumed to map to the
http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/ namespace, while the namespace prefix of "soap" is
assumed to map to the http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/soap/ namespace.)

An example implementation-specific WSDL document (ECF-4.0-WebServicesProfile-
ImplementationExample.wsdl) is provided with this specification.

1.2.5 W3C XML-Signature Syntax and Processing

The W3C XML Signature Syntax and Processing specification defines representations of signatures of
Web resources, portions of protocol messages (anything that may be referenced by a URI), and
procedures for computing and verifying such signatures. Compliance with the requirements of the XML
Signature Syntax and Processing specification is REQUIRED for compliance with this service interaction
profile.

1.2.6 WS-I Basic Profile 1.1

The WS-Interoperability Basic Profile 1.1 ([WS-I BP 1.1]) specification defines a set of best practices for
implementing interoperable web services. Compliance with the requirements of the [WS-I BP 1.1] is
REQUIRED for compliance with this service interaction profile.

1.2.7 W3C SOAP 1.1 Binding for MTOM 1.0

The SOAP 1.1 Binding for MTOM 1.0 ([SOAP MTOM 1.0]) defines a set of best practices for
implementing interoperable serialization of the SOAP envelope and its representation in the message.
This binding MUST be used as a replacement for the WS-I Attachments Profile 1.0 and the W3C Simple
SOAP Binding Profile in the WS-I Basic Profile [WS-I BP 1.1]. Compliance with the requirements of the [SOAP MTOM 1.0] and the specifications that this binding references, the SOAP Message Transmission Optimization Mechanism (MTOM) ([MTOM]) and the W3C XML-binary Optimized Packaging (XOP) specifications ([XOP]), is REQUIRED for compliance with the web services service interaction profile.
1.2.8 WS-I Basic Security Profile 1.0

The WS-Interoperability Basic Security Profile Version 1.0 ([WS-I BSP 1.0]) complements [WS-I BP 1.0] and defines a set of best practices for implementing interoperable and secure web services. With the exception of the requirements for use of the WS-I Attachments Profile 1.0 and the W3C Simple SOAP Binding Profile 1.0, compliance with the requirements of [WS-I BSP 1.0] is REQUIRED for compliance with this service interaction profile. However, in many cases, [WS-I BSP 1.0] is underspecified. The following options in [WS-I BSP 1.0] are REQUIRED for compliance with this web services service interaction profile:

- E0002 - Security Tokens - Security tokens MUST be specified in additional security token profiles.
  (NOTE: This will be determined in Court Policy)
- R3103 - A SIGNATURE MUST be a Detached Signature as defined by the XML Signature specification.

1.2.9 WS-ReliableMessaging Version 1.0

The WS-Reliability 1.1 ([WS-RM 1.0]) specification complements [WS-I BP 1.1] and defines a set of extensions for exchanging SOAP messages with guaranteed delivery, no duplicates, and guaranteed message ordering.

1.3 Terms and Definitions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC2119].

The key terms used in this specification include:

- **Attachment**
  Information transmitted between MDEs that is of an arbitrary format, and is related to the message(s) in the transmission in a manner defined in the ECF 4.0 specification. An attachment may be in XML format, non-XML text format, encoded binary format, or un-encoded binary format.

- **Callback message**
  A message transmission returned by some operations some time after the operation was invoked (asynchronously).

- **Document**
  Represents an electronic version of the paper that would have been sent as paper.

- **Docketing**
  The process invoked when a court receives a pleading, order, or notice, when no errors in transmission or in presence of required content have occurred, and when the pleading, order, or notice is recorded as a part of the official record.

- **Filer**
  Attorneys or pro se litigants are individuals who assemble and submit Filings (data and documents).

- **Filing**
  Electronic document collection that has been assembled for filing on a designated court case.

- **Major Design Element (MDE)**
  A logical grouping of operations representing a significant business process supported by ECF 4.0. Each MDE operation receives one or more messages, returns a synchronous response message, and optionally sends an asynchronous response message back to the original sender.
Message

Information transmitted between MDEs that consists of a well-formed XML document that is valid against one of the defined message structure schemas in the ECF 4.0 specification. A message may be related to one or more attachments in a manner defined in the ECF 4.0 specification.

Message Transmission

The sending of one or more messages and associated attachments to an MDE. Each transmission must invoke or respond to an operation on the receiving MDE, as defined in the ECF 4.0 specification.

Operation (or MDE Operation)

A function provided by an MDE upon receipt of one or more messages. The function provided by the operation represents a significant step in the court filing business process. A sender invokes an operation on an MDE by transmitting a set of messages to that MDE, addressed to that operation.

Operation signature

A definition of the input message(s) and synchronous response message associated with an operation. Each message is given a name and a type by the operation. The type is defined by a single one of the message structures defined in the ECF 4.0 specification.

Receiving MDE

In an Electronic Court Filing operation, the MDE that receives the request with the operation invocation performs the operation and sends the response.

Sending MDE

In an Electronic Court Filing operation, the MDE that sends the request including the operation invocation and receives the response with the results of the operation.

Synchronous response

A message transmission returned immediately (synchronously) as the result of an operation. Every operation has a synchronous response.

1.4 Symbols and Abbreviations

The key symbols and abbreviations used in this specification include:

ECF 4.0

OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing 4.0

MDE

Major Design Element

OASIS

Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Systems

SOAP

Simple Object Access Protocol

XML

eXtensible Markup Language

W3C

World Wide Web Consortium

WSDL

Web Services Description Language
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2 Profile Design

This section describes the design of the Web Services Service Interaction Profile and identifies how it satisfies the requirements of a document signature profile listed in Section 5 of the [ECF 4.0] specification. In addition, this profile is intended for compatibility with the Global Justice Reference Architecture Web Services Service Interaction Profile [JRA WS-SIP].

2.1 Service Interaction Profile Identifier

Each ECF 4.0 service interaction profile MUST be identified with a unique URI which is used in the ECF 4.0 court policy to identify the service interaction profile(s) that a given MDE supports. The ECF 4.0 Web Services Service Interaction Profile 2.0 will be identified by the following URI:

```
```

All ECF 4.0 messages sent via this service interaction profile MUST include this URI in the `<SendingMDEProfileCode>` element. In addition, any court supporting this service interaction profile MUST include this URI in the `<SupportedMessageProfile>` element in the `CourtFilingResponseMessage`.

2.2 Transport Protocol

Each ECF 4.0 message transmission sent using this service interaction profile MUST be encapsulated in a SOAP message over the HTTP 1.1 protocol as defined in the [WSI-I BP 1.1] and [SOAP MTOM] specifications. Figure 1 illustrates the containment of ECF 4.0 messages and attachments within a SOAP Message Package. For compliance with this specification, a SOAP envelope MUST contain one or more messages and MAY contain one or more attachments.

Figure 1. SOAP Envelope with ECF 4.0 Messages and Attachments
2.3 MDE Addressing

Each ECF message transmission sent using this service interaction profile MUST identify the sending and receiving MDEs with universally unique address identifiers. The identifier for each MDE will be assigned by the organization that manages the MDE and MUST be the HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP) or HTTP over Secure Socket Layer (SSL) permanent URL for the MDE web service.

This URL MUST be the value of the location attribute of the <soap:address> element contained within the <wsdl:service> element that binds the MDE’s portType to a service, and that is defined in the implementation-specific WSDL document discussed in section 1.2.4 above.

For instance, a conformant MDE ID of a web service at courts.wa.gov using HTTP over SSL on port 8000 would be as follows:

```
https://courts.wa.gov:8000
```

2.4 Operation Addressing

Each message transmission MUST either identify the operation or operations being invoked or be a synchronous response to a previous request. Each operation MUST be either a required operation as defined in the ECF 4.0 specification or an optional operation identified as supported by the court through the current machine-readable court policy. The response to a request for an operation not supported by the court MUST be reported using the ECF 4.0 <ErrorCode> element in the core message and MAY also include a SOAPFault in the SOAP envelope.

2.5 Request and Operation Invocation

Each message transmission MUST identify the operation being invoked within the SOAP Body only; the (qualified) operation name MUST be the qualified name of the first child element of the SOAP body element, as called for in section 7.1 of the [SOAP 1.1] specification.

An MDE implementation MAY allow message transmissions that include a SOAPAction HTTP header. In compliance with the [WSI-I BP 1.1] specification, a receiving MDE MAY NOT rely on the value of the SOAPAction HTTP header in processing the message.

2.6 Synchronous Mode Response

Synchronous responses to requests MUST be encoded using the MIME binding defined in Section 4.1.1 of the [SOAP MTOM 1.0] specification.

2.7 Asynchronous Mode Response

The receiving MDE MUST deliver the asynchronous response to a request sent using the web services service interaction profile by sending the asynchronous response to the sending MDE via the web services service interaction profile. The response message transmission MUST conform to the rules for message transmissions established in section 2.5 of this specification above.

2.8 Message/Attachment Delimiters

The ECF 4.0 messages MUST be encapsulated in the SOAP Body. All other attachments MUST be included in separate MIME parts as shown in Figure 1. The delimiters between the message and the first attachment, and between attachments, must comply with the rules for delimiting MIME parts as defined in [RFC2045].

2.9 Message Identifiers

Each MIME part that includes an attachment MUST have a unique “Content-ID” as defined in [RFC2045] that uniquely identifies the content within that part.
2.10 Message Non-repudiation

The SOAP message MAY include a digital signature applied to the SOA Body and all MIME parts that contain messages or attachments. The digital signature MUST be conformant with Section 8 of the [WS-I BSP 1.0] specification which references the [XMLSIG] specification. The algorithms defined by [XMLSIG] support non-repudiation of the signer and signing date through a digital signature created using the signer’s private key. Because the sender is the only one with access to the private key and the date is included in the signature, receivers can be reasonably assured of the signer and signing date.

2.11 Message Integrity

The algorithms defined by [XMLSIG] support message integrity through inclusion of a public-key-based digital signature. Because the signing date and message hash are included in the signature and the entire signature is computed using the sender’s private key, the receiver can compare the hashes to verify that the message has not been altered since it left the control of the sender on the specified date.

2.12 Message Confidentiality

If the Filing Review MDE supports the filing of confidential filings and publishes the court’s public key in court policy, messages and attachments MAY be encrypted for filing into the court according to Section 9 of the [WS-I BSP 1.0] specification which references the [XMLENC] specification. Because the Filing Review MDE is the only one with access to the court’s private key, filers can be reasonably assured that only the Filing Review MDE will be able to read the message or attachment.

This mechanism MAY be used to protect sensitive or confidential information in a filing such as the FilingPaymentMessage. However, this specification does NOT support the transmission of messages and attachments encrypted with the court’s public key to other parties in the case. Any messages and attachments transmitted to other parties MUST be either encrypted with the party’s public key or not encrypted. This specification and the ECF 4.0 specification do NOT define the exchange or publication of public keys by persons or organizations other than the court.

2.13 Message Authentication

Each MDE MAY define HTTP credentials for authentication to access the operations supported by that MDE. If authentication is required, the sending MDE MUST include the credentials in the request as defined in [RFC2617].

For instance, the Filing Review MDE MAY assign user ID and password pairs to each supported Filing Assembly MDE, and require authentication for ReviewFiling operations but not query operations. In that case, each Filing Assembly MDE would include the user ID and password assigned to them in each filing.

2.14 Message Reliability

If a court expresses support for message reliability in human-readable court policy, a sending MDE MAY include reliability extensions to the SOAP envelope as defined in the [WS-RM 1.0] specification. An MDE that receives a request with a SOAP envelope that includes reliability extensions MUST include reliability extensions as defined by [WS-RM 1.0] in the response.

2.15 Message Splitting and Assembly

WS-Reliable Messaging defines mechanisms by which messages MAY be split into multiple pieces that are assigned sequence numbers and transmitted separately by the RM Source (sending MDE) and reassembled into the complete message by the RM Destination (receiving MDE).
2.16 Transmission Auditing

An implementation of the web services message profile MUST ensure that the complete SOAP message, including the SOAP envelope, any attachments, and signatures, is available to the receiving MDE for persisting and auditing purposes.
3  Service Definitions

Implementation of this service interaction profile MUST be described in a WSDL file that imports the service definitions from the ECF-4.0-WebServicesProfile-Definitions.wsdl file included with this specification.
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Appendix C. (Informative) Example Implementation

This non-normative section provides an example WSDL implementation of this service interaction profile.

This is also included in ECF-4.0-WebServicesProfile-ImplementationExample.wsdl file included with this specification. Note that the following is for illustrative purposes only.

```xml
<definitions

targetNamespace="urn:oasis:names:tc:legalxml-courtfiling:wsdl:WebServiceProfile-

ImplementationExample-4.0"

xmlns:wmp="urn:oasis:names:tc:legalxml-courtfiling:wsdl:WebServiceProfile-

Definitions-4.0"

xmlns:xsd="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"

xmlns:soap="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/soap/"

xmlns:wsdl="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/"

xmlns="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/">

<import namespace="urn:oasis:names:tc:legalxml-courtfiling:wsdl:WebServiceProfile-

Definitions-4.0" location="ECF-4.0-WebServicesProfile-Definitions.wsdl"/>

<service name="ServiceMDEService">

<port name="ServiceMDEPort" binding="wmp:ServiceMDEPortSOAPBinding">

<soap:address location="https://localhost/..."/>

</port>

</service>

<service name="FilingAssemblyMDEService">

<port name="FilingAssemblyMDEPort" binding="wmp:FilingAssemblyMDEPortSOAPBinding">

<soap:address location="https://localhost/..."/>

</port>

</service>

<service name="CourtRecordMDEService">

<port name="CourtRecordMDEPort" binding="wmp:CourtRecordMDEPortSOAPBinding">

<soap:address location="https://localhost/..."/>

</port>

</service>

<service name="FilingReviewMDEService">

<port name="FilingReviewMDEPort" binding="wmp:FilingReviewMDEPortSOAPBinding">

<soap:address location="https://localhost/..."/>

</port>

</service>

</definitions>
```
Appendix D. (Informative) Example Transmissions

This non-normative section provides an example transmission that demonstrates an operation invocation, a synchronous response, and an asynchronous response using this service interaction profile. Note that these examples are for illustrative purposes only.

D.1 Operation Invocation

This is an example of a request including a ReviewFiling operation invocation.

```
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: Multipart/Related; boundary=boundary;
    type="application/xop+xml";
    start="Envelope"
    start-info="text/xml"
--boundary
Content-Type: application/xop+xml;
    text/xml; charset="UTF-8"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
Content-ID: Envelope
<?xml version='1.0' ?>
<env:Envelope xmlns:env="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/soap/envelope/">
    <env:Body xmlns:types="http://example.com/some-namespace">
<types:ReviewFiling>
    <CoreFilingMessage>...
</CoreFilingMessage>
    <PaymentMessage>...
</PaymentMessage>
</types:ReviewFiling>
</env:Body>
</env:Envelope>
--boundary
Content-Type: application/pdf
Content-Transfer-Encoding: binary
Content-ID: Attachment1
...Lead Document...
--boundary--
Content-Type: application/pdf
Content-Transfer-Encoding: binary
Content-ID: Attachment2
...Connected Document...
--boundary--
```
D.2 Synchronous Response

This is an example of a MessageReceiptMessage synchronous response.

```xml
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: Multipart/Related; boundary=boundary;
    type="application/xop+xml";
    start="Envelope"
    start-info="text/xml"
--boundary
Content-Type:application/xop+xml;
    text/xml; charset="UTF-8"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
Content-ID: Envelope

<?xml version='1.0' ?>
<env:Envelope xmlns:env="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/soap/envelope/">
    <env:Body xmlns:types="http://example.com/some-namespace">
        <types:ReviewFiling-Response>
            <MessageReceiptMessage>
            ...
            </MessageReceiptMessage>
        </types:ReviewFiling-Response>
    </env:Body>
</env:Envelope>
```
D.3 Asynchronous Response

This is an example of a NotifyFilingReviewComplete asynchronous response.

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: Multipart/Related; boundary=boundary;
    type="application/xop+xml";
    start="Envelope"
    start-info="text/xml"
--boundary
Content-Type:application/xop+xml;
text/xml; charset="UTF-8"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
Content-ID: Envelope
<?xml version='1.0' ?>
<env:Envelope xmlns:env="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/soap/envelope/">
  <env:Body xmlns:types="http://example.com/some-namespace">
    <types:NotifyFilingReviewComplete>
      <ReviewFilingCallbackMessage>
      ...
      </ReviewFilingCallbackMessage>
    <PaymentReceiptMessage>
      ...
    </PaymentReceiptMessage>
  <types:NotifyFilingReviewComplete>
</env:Body>
<env:Envelope>
--boundary
Content-Type: application/pdf
Content-Transfer-Encoding: binary
Content-ID: Attachment1
...Lead Document...
--boundary--
Content-Type: application/pdf
Content-Transfer-Encoding: binary
Content-ID: Attachment2
...Connected Document...
--boundary--