

Topic: XML Standards

Question By: Sherri De Marco

Jurisdiction: Michigan

Date: 2 February 2012

Jurisdiction	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7
	Has your jurisdiction adopted any XML standard for UCC filings?	If so, did you adopt the IACA standard wholesale, or did you develop your own?	Please answer Question 3 only if you developed your own standard: In developing your own standard, did you first give consideration to using the IACA standard?	If you did consider using the IACA standard, for what reasons did you choose not to adopt it wholesale?	Is your standard BASED on the IACA standard, or is it a complete departure from the IACA standard?	If your standard is BASED on the IACA standard, would you classify the changes as minimal, considerable, or substantial?	Would you be willing to share your XML standard with other jurisdictions? If you replied yes, what is the URL to your standard?
Alabama							
Alaska							
Arizona							
Arkansas							
California		California accepts financing statements using the IACA standard.					Attached is the link to our XML Implementation Guide. (Note: See Additional Comments following this table for Fri 02/24/2012 12:57 PM.)
Colorado	We have not, but we are developing an XML process to be launched at the end of May 2012.	Not wholesale, but we are using as much of the IACA standard as	Yes, we are using the IACA standard as a starting point and making some changes to				

		possible.	meet system needs and incorporate some customer suggestions.				
Connecticut							
Delaware	Yes.	We developed our own.	Yes.	System limitations	It is based on the IACA standard.	Considerable.	Not at this time, we are currently in the process of developing/implementing a new computer system.
District of Columbia							
Florida							
Georgia	Georgia has not currently adopted a XML standard for UCC filings. We started the process years ago and it never became a priority. Submitters have been knocking on our door though, so we will be revisiting this in the near future. The other questions therefore don't apply directly, BUT, we did review the IACA standard and the draft work we did was to	Develop our own	YES	Did not consider multiple filing jurisdictions, as exists in Georgia. Also, there were a few technical peculiarities that we didn't necessarily agree with. We always try to target national standards where they exists, so our approach is to stay as close to the IACA standard as possible.	Based on IACA	Minimal	One day, when it exists sure... TDB ;)

	'adopt it' with a few changes. As is, when we resume this process we will develop our own based on the IACA. So our INTENTIONS ARE:						
Hawaii							
Idaho	Idaho's answers are below. (Note: See Additional Comments following this table for Fri 02/24/2012 1:03 PM.)						
Illinois	Yes	We adopted the model that was created by Tom Ose and expanded the tags to fit Illinois filing needs.		We did not want to travel where no man has ever gone...	Based on IACA STANDARD	Minimal	Absolutely. No URL available, but will share by email if asked...
Indiana							
Iowa							
Kansas							
Kentucky							
Louisiana	NO Louisiana has not.						
Maine							
Maryland							

Massachusetts	Yes.	We developed our own. A portion of the IACA standard was not appropriate for our needs.	Yes.	It didn't fit our process. For example, our transaction type list was not the same as the IACA list, our character field lengths were different, etc.	It is based on the IACA standard.	I am not quite sure where I would classify our changes. Even if there are only a few changes, they are very substantial to the XML filing process. Perhaps, for this reason, they are substantial.	Yes. We also require XML submitters to provide us with a UCC XML transmission agreement, also attached, so each submitter is aware of the terms.
Michigan	Michigan has not adopted an XML standard.						
Minnesota	OSS closely followed the IACA standard DTD (Document Type Declaration) as the base XML format for this service. However, OSS has some deviations from the IACA DTD standard version 06232003.	Same as #1	Yes	Not all Elements were applicable or captured in Minnesota's Central Filing System.	Based	Minimal	Yes. See attachment.
Mississippi							
Missouri	Missouri has not.						

Montana	Montana has not at this time.						
Nebraska							
Nevada							
New Hampshire							
New Jersey							
New Mexico							
New York							
North Carolina	Yes	Wholesale	n/a	n/a	IACA Standard	Considerable	http://www.secretary.state.nc.us/ucc/kbuccinfo.aspx
North Dakota	North Dakota has not.						
Ohio							
Oklahoma							
Oregon	Oregon has not adopted an XML standard for UCC filings, but if we do start using XML, we will look first to the IACA standard.						
Pennsylvania							
Rhode Island							
South Carolina							
South Dakota							
Tennessee							
Texas	Yes	Developed own.	Yes	It was not a good fit with our database table contents nor did it match the data our EDI partners were used to receiving.	As the IACA standard was not compatible with our needs, our standard is a complete departure.	I would say substantial.	We would have no objection to that. https://direct.sos.state.tx.us/help/help-ucc.asp?pg=ucc_ws

Utah	No	It didn't exist when we wrote our system.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	I suppose we could expose a web service if there was a business need for it....
Vermont							
Virginia							
Washington	Ditto from Washington State UCC Office. Our answers are the same as Illinois.						
West Virginia							
Wisconsin							
Wyoming							

Additional Comments:

Fri 02/17/2012 12:31 PM

Hi Sherri. Please see Minnesota's responses below.

Thanks!

Ann Datko
 UCC & Notary Services Supervisor
 MN Office of the Secretary of State
 (651) 556-0633
 ann.m.datko@state.mn.us

3 Deviations from IACA DTD Standard

The follow tables contain OSS deviations from the IACA DTD standard, version 06232003.

ATTRIBUTE	Description
XMLVersion	Use MN OSS specific version number, since DTD is not 100% compliant to IACA DTD.
AltFilingType	Omitted: FoodSecurityAct
AltNameDesignation	Omitted: Licensee-Licensor Beneficiary Trustee Creditor.
AmendmentAction	Omitted: CollateralChange.
AmendmentType	Omitted: Correction TerminationDebtor TerminationSecuredParty Added: Termination.
FileStatus	Omitted: AcceptedWithErrors.
OrganizationalType	Omitted: ForeignAssociation RegisteredLimitedLiabilityLimitedPartnership UnincorporatedAssociation UnincorporatedNonProfitAssociation. Added: Corporation CreditUnion GeneralPartnership GovernmentalAgency Estate LimitedLiabilityCompany Municipality Non-ProfitCorporation.
MIMEType	Only allow PDF and TIFF.

ELEMENT	Description
Collateral	Allow more than one attachment.
Filer	Only require ClientAccountNum element.
IndividualName	Only require the LastName element.
Names	Make the MailAddress , City , State , PostalCode elements optional.
InitialFileDate	Changed to OriginalFileDate .
InitialFileNumber	Changed to OriginalFileNumber .
OriginalFilingCounty	Added element. Required for filings made before 07-01-2001.
FileSignature	Not Allowed
FSAProduct	Not Allowed
Location	Not Allowed
NameCode	Not Allowed
SearchToReflect	Not Allowed
TrustDate	Not Allowed
TaxId	Not Allowed
Unit	Not Allowed
Year	Not Allowed
Years	Not Allowed
Mark	Not Allowed
Record	Replaced InitialFileNumber , InitialFileDate with OriginalFileNumber , OriginalFilingCounty , OriginalFileDate .

Fri 02/24/2012 12:57 PM

California accepts financing statements using the IACA standard. Attached is the link to our XML Implementation Guide, which is posted on the web.
https://uccconnect.sos.ca.gov/help/ucc%20downloads/UCC_XML_Implementation_Guide.pdf

Vasquez, Kathleen [Kathleen.Vasquez@sos.ca.gov]

Fri 02/24/2012 1:03 PM

1. Has your jurisdiction adopted any XML standard for UCC filings?

As far as our online filings go, yes we have adopted the IACA XML standard. We have two online filing applications; the XML Bulk Filing Service and the UCC Online Form Application. Both use IACA <XMLVersion Version="06232003"/> for the xml images created.

The XML Bulk Filing Service actually accepts XML documents conforming to version "06232003" as the only input we receive from a client. These documents are verified using x-schema and other verification methods (e.g. with amendments, checking our database to make sure that the original filing being amended actually exists). If accepted, the data is parsed out of the document and added to our UCC database to create the filing record.

While we simply use html forms for collecting data in the UCC Online Form Application, we do use the XML standard for creating XML documents to be used as image sources for those filings. We can transform the XML document to HTML using XSLT for displaying and printing those filing images for both our in-house use as well as in online searches.

2. If so, did you adopt the IACA standard wholesale, or did you develop your own?

Thomas Ose helped us with the development process. We adopted the standard wholesale, though we found that a number of elements didn't apply according to Idaho law. We simply ignore those elements.

Jeff Harvey
UCC Supervisor
Secretary of State of Idaho
Phone: 208-332-2849
Fax: 208-334-2847
<http://www.sos.idaho.gov>

Full Text of Original Email:

Fri 02/10/2012 11:38 AM

Happy Friday to All:

In planning for the ITS-STIS joint session in Williamsburg, we would like your answers to the following questions.

1. Has your jurisdiction adopted any XML standard for UCC filings?
2. If so, did you adopt the IACA standard wholesale, or did you develop your own?

Please answer Question 3 only if you developed your own standard:

3. In developing your own standard, did you first give consideration to using the IACA standard?
4. If you did consider using the IACA standard, for what reasons did you choose not to adopt it wholesale?
5. Is your standard BASED on the IACA standard, or is it a complete departure from the IACA standard?
6. If your standard is BASED on the IACA standard, would you classify the changes as minimal, considerable, or substantial?
7. Would you be willing to share your XML standard with other jurisdictions?
8. If you replied yes to Question 7, what is the URL to your standard?

Thank you,
Sherri L. De Marco
UCC & IRP Analyst
517-322-5264
demarcos@michigan.gov