

1. Host Schema Evaluation

This evaluates: *Business Narrative Markup Language (BNML)* It is based upon a single example of BNML, to wit the "Requirements for Technical Specification" for this TC. I did not have access to a specification for BNML.

1.1. Object Representation

Q: Does the host schema use a generic structural markup model?

A: Yes.

Q: Does the host schema define a "clause" object?

A: Yes, `item`.

Q: Does the host schema define a paragraph level object that represents a structural or grammatical paragraph?

A: Yes, `block`. I see it uses `block` and `text`.

Q: Using the host schema, can the clause equivalent object be inserted at arbitrary levels in the document hierarchy without transformation?

A: I did not see any examples where `item` were inserted into `block`. However, `item` could be inserted into `item` arbitrarily.

Q: In the host schema, are element names and the structure sufficiently flexible that the clause and paragraph level objects can be used for other legal and business documents?

A: Yes.

1.2. Metadata

Q: Does the host schema provide a mechanism to add semantic information about:

- whole documents
- distinct objects, such as clauses, within documents?

A: The sample document did have Dublin Core and BNML meta data elements. I note that the items such as Version Number and contributors on the Requirements document were prepared as a table.

I did not see any metadata in any other elements.

Q: If so, is the metadata model for the host schema sufficient for contracts or will it be necessary to extend it?

A: I do not have access to the documentation needed to answer the question.

Q: Does the host schema allow embedded values to be represented and semantic information to be added to these values?

A: I did not see any in the sample document.

1.3. Processing Technologies

Q: Does the host schema require use of a particular processing technology?

A: As per the May 31 2005 minutes, software will be provided. I did not see any thing about the XML requiring processing technology that would not be otherwise available.

Q: Does the design of the host schema preclude use of particular currently available processing technologies?

A: I did not see any reason that this XML would not be amenable to processing by style sheets, Java programs or the like.

1.4. Number of Content Objects

Q: Does the host schema permit the numbering of clauses, paragraphs, lists and other objects to be represented in the markup?

A: Yes.

Q: Does the host schema provide a mechanism to define the numbering schema applied to the document so that two applications could apply the same numbering, if desired?

A: The sample document had markup of the form: `<item><num>1.1</num>` However, I did not see any example where the users could specify that `item` would be numbered numerically, alphabetically, or other schemes. It appears the user must enter the numbers desired.

1.5. Complete Document Representation

Q: Using the host schema, will it be possible for the contract author to explicitly represent all parts of the narrative contract terms or will it be necessary to imply some parts?

A: I do not see a reference to anything specific to contracts. However, all narrative parts should be available.

1. Host Schema Evaluation

Q: Does the host schema represent the relationship between all significant components in a way that allow high quality print and web rendition of of contact documents?

A: I see no reason why high quality print and web products could not be generated from this XML.

1.6. Variables Definition

Q: Does the host schema include a mechanism for defining variables for embedded data values?

A: I did not see any such mechanism.

Q: If the host schema does not include such a mechanism, is there any obstacle to adding it?

A: I have no reasonable to believe such could not be added.

1.7. Ease of use for authors

Q: Based on the following factors is the host schema easy for contract authors to use:

- Does it require authors to know only a small number of elements (positive factor)?
- Does it require authors make unnecessary or subtle distinctions that will be applied inconsistently (negative factor?)
- Does it have a clear logical structure that can be quickly explained to new users (positive factor)?
- Does it allow authors to re-locate content objects within a document hierarchy with minimal or no need for transformation of markup (positive factor)?

A: Generally, I see this standard meeting all of the above criteria. However, I was unable to determine if one could move `item` tags inside of `block` . Thus, it is unclear, if one could move what might be numbered clauses or a list inside of what was originally a paragraph.

1.8. Schema Syntax

Q: Is the host schema a DTD only or can it also be expressed as an XML Schema or other schema type?

A: I did not see any DTD, Schema, or other definitions for BNML? However, I see no obstacle to defining same for any of these.

1.9. Adaptability to contracts

- Q: Does the host schema provide for the complete representation for the distinct structures commonly found in contracts?
- A: I was unable to find any representation for components such as "parties, recitals, schedules, attachments," or "written signatures."
- Q: If not, does the host schema explicitly allow additional distinct structures to be added?
- A: Possibly, BNML may have an extension mechanism. I do not know what it is.
- Q: Does the host schema allow elements not considered necessary for contracts markup to be removed without contract documents being incompatible in a disadvantageous way with other documents using the host schema?
- A: I do not find any elements that would not be useful for a contract. I do not know if removing this would create incompatibility problems with any existing software.
- Q: If distinct contract structures are added to the host schema, will this result in contracts documents being incompatible in a disadvantageous way with other documents using the host schema?
- A: Not having seen the software in question, I do not know if removing these elements would create incompatibility.

1.10. Vendor and Developer Support

- Q: Is the host schema already in widespread or general use for markup of narrative documents?
- A: Apparently, this is the case at Elker, Ltd. I do not know the extent of this use.
- Q: Are the already developed applications that will make it easy for organizations to implement the TC's specification based around the host schema?
- A: As per the May 31st 2005 teleconference, software will be put into the public domain shortly.
- Q: Is there any reason to expect that the host schema will prove any particular advantages in gaining market support.
- A: If public domain software is made available as planned, this will provide an advantage. Apparently, Elker, Ltd. clients are this standard, but Elker would be better prepared to answer this question.

1.11. Other Factors

- Q: Does the host schema provide any other advantages for use in the TC's specification?

1. Host Schema Evaluation

A: I am not aware of any.

Q: Does the host schema have any other disadvantages that make it undesirable for use in the TC's specification?

A: I am not aware of any.