

1. Host Schema Evaluation

This evaluates: *Court Document 1.1*

This was approved by the Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards (OASIS) Legal XML Member Section Electronic Court Filing Technical Committee. It was also approved by the Joint Technology Committee of the Conference of State Court Administrators and the National Association of Court Managers (COSCA/NACM) for comment and experimental use.

1.1. Object Representation

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

A: The "structural" hierarchy includes `legal`, `docuemntBody`, `paragraphGroup`, `paragraph`, `subparagraph` and `phrase`. The `paragraphGroup` and `subparagraph` have elements such as `subparagraph1`, etc. to allow for further nesting. `paragraph` can also contain `list`'s.

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

A: The `paragraphGroup` could be used for this purpose.

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

A: Yes, `paragraph`

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

A: No. The DTD defines a specific hierarchy. For example, a `paragraph` could contain a `list` but not vice versa. A `paragraphGroup` could contain a `paragraph`, but not vice versa.

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: The concepts of `paragraphGroup`, `paragraph`, `subParagraph` and `phrase` are obviously applicable to a wide variety of documents.

Note, this standard was designed for court documents, so by definition, it can be used in at least one other legal domain.

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:

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

A: The documentMetadata includes the following useful elements: creator, submitter, documentTitle, documentType, dateTimeCreated, contributor, description, reference, documentStatus. I did not find metadata for parts of legal documents.

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

A: No specific markup is provided for embedded values. The addIn and machineData tags could be used for this purpose.

1.3. Processing Technologies

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

A: No processing technology was developed for it. Mr. Chambers prepared several CSS style sheets to demonstrate the capability and the group at Western Illinois University prepared XSLT style sheets for court documents.

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

A: No.

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: I did not see a specific number entry. However, the label attribute or title element could be used.

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: See the above answer. I did not see markup to provide for numbering types such as alphabetic or numeric, or to start at various values.

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: The court document has markup for party and partyGroup and places to list them. They also provide markup for signature blocks and attachments.

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: No specific markup for printing purposes is provided. However, as noted above, both Mr. Chambers and WIU have developed style sheets for generating HTML from XML prepared using the court documents.

1.6. Variables Definition

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

A:

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

A:

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: The document was designed to be easy to author. The specification mentions using a flatter structure with parameter entries to help achieve this goal.

The elements have a clear meaning and were designed for a legal context.

However, as noted above, there is a specific hierarchy so one moving something that was a list outside into the paragraph or paragraphGroup structure would have to change tag names. appear

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: Mr. Chambers has converted this to an XML Schema structure.

1.9. Adaptability to contracts

Q: Does the host schema provide for the complete representation for the distinct structures commonly found in contracts?

A: As mentioned above, many of the markup needed for legal documents is included.

Q: If not, does the host schema explicitly allow additional distinct structures to be added?

A: The addIn element is designed for extensions and has an encoding of any in the DTD.

Later on, Mr. Chambers and the WIU Group have extended the court document standard using the extends mechanism in XML Schema. A schema was provided for each area of law such as criminal or civil which imported and extended the original court document schema.

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: There is no specific subsetting mechanism provided. However, I see no harm in this.

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: No.

1.10. Vendor and Developer Support

Q: Is the host schema already in widespread or general use for markup of narrative documents?

A: Although approved as a standard, I am not aware of any production use of Court Document.

Q: Are the already developed applications that Will make it easy of for organizations to implement the TC's specification based around the host schema?

1. Host Schema Evaluation

A: No.

Q: Is there any reason to expect that the host schema will prove any particular advantages in gaining market support.

A: The OASIS Electronic Court Filing Technical Committee decided at its June 2005 Face-to-Face to look at XML documents as the "payload" in court filing. Thus, hopefully, this will renew interest in Court Docuemnt.

1.11. Other Factors

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

A: It is appropriate that the Technical Committees in the Legal XML member section develop and use standard markup.

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

A: