

## MEEK Project Team chat 14.11.2008

11:59:28 <Erkki> Welcome!

14/11/2008 11:59:59 <Karl> Hello everybody! At first, my apologies for missing the chat from 3008-10-31. I was unexpectedly prevented from being at my office, thus I even could not inform anybody.

14/11/2008 12:00:14 <Karl> Regarding the ongoing revision of ISO/IEC 9995-3, I am aware of the fact that the Romanian comma (U+0326) is missing. I plan to suggest a comment to add it on position C11 level 2 (instead of U+018E, which was intended as a variant of the uppercase schwa [U+018F on C12] for some users).

14/11/2008 12:00:51 \* Mina Laridan joins meek

14/11/2008 12:02:16 <Mina Laridan> Hello everybody.

14/11/2008 12:03:32 <Erkki> Have you seen Mike's very recent contribution?

14/11/2008 12:03:45 \* mike joins meek

14/11/2008 12:04:10 <mike> hello

14/11/2008 12:04:12 <Tero> In the process of doing so.

14/11/2008 12:04:28 <Erkki> I suspect that we aren't able to really comment on it in this chat.

14/11/2008 12:06:23 <Erkki> We need to come up with a new plan for the WS schedule.

14/11/2008 12:06:41 <Karl> I agree to that. I have received it and read it but not to the detailed level. A minor typo on p.8: The letter K is Greenlandic and not Faroese.

14/11/2008 12:08:01 <Erkki> Karl: As far as I recall, it is also Faroese.

14/11/2008 12:08:43 <Karl> If a physical meeting is planned in January, I could only attend if it is not before 2009-01-23, due to some project schedules in my main job.

14/11/2008 12:10:39 \* Troy joins meek

14/11/2008 12:11:25 <Troy> Greetings, everybody. sorry for my lateness.

14/11/2008 12:12:27 <Tero> It would be beneficial if we could decide the date for the meeting as soon as possible, so that other plans could be more freely made.

14/11/2008 12:13:11 <Mina Laridan> If you want to have a final physical meeting of the Workshop at CEN, I just want to inform you that it will be held in our new

premises, avenue Marnix 17, a 50 m distance from rue de Stassart

14/11/2008 12:13:47 <Erkki> The question is, do we need a physical meeting prior to agreeing within the WS on the CWA for public review?

14/11/2008 12:13:51 <Troy> Agreed. Is Mike's contribution online? I don't have access to my email now.'

14/11/2008 12:14:04 <Tero> What about Paris? I thought we were also considering to have the meeting there?

14/11/2008 12:14:57 <Karl> Paris would be OK for me, especially as I can reach it by train easily.

14/11/2008 12:16:08 \* Marc joins meek

14/11/2008 12:16:27 <Erkki> Mina, what are the conditions for an open meeting that we must have?

14/11/2008 12:16:37 <Marc> Hello! Sorry for being late.

14/11/2008 12:16:56 <mike> Either venue works for me

14/11/2008 12:17:48 <Erkki> I've understood that the WS has to have agreed on the CWA content prior to the public review, which should also precede the open meeting.

14/11/2008 12:18:05 <Marc> both places would be easy to reach for me, provided I'm able to participate at all

14/11/2008 12:18:19 <Marc> Erkki: yes, though not necessarily in plenary session  
14/11/2008 12:18:29 <Mina Laridan> if you want to held the meeting in PARIS, you must find a room then... but a physical meeting is recommended, but not mandatory  
14/11/2008 12:18:32 \* gaid joins meek  
14/11/2008 12:18:51 <Erkki> Thus, do we need a physical meeting prior to agreeing on the content?  
14/11/2008 12:19:36 <Karl> Erkki, in my opinion, no.  
14/11/2008 12:19:41 <Mina Laridan> you can approve the CWA electronically, if you wish so  
14/11/2008 12:20:36 <Marc> it is mainly a political question  
14/11/2008 12:20:43 <Erkki> Paris has been brought up so that Yves Neuville, the chair of SC35, would attend.  
14/11/2008 12:21:06 <Marc> do we expect consensus? if not, a physical WS meeting would IMHO be preferable  
14/11/2008 12:21:21 <Marc> to hash out disagreements  
14/11/2008 12:21:35 <Marc> otherwise, I don't see the necessity  
14/11/2008 12:22:06 <Erkki> Yves has not participated in the chat nor has he made any comments except in the physical meetings.  
14/11/2008 12:22:57 <Erkki> Other than that, I don't see a necessity for another physical meeting prior to the open meeting.  
14/11/2008 12:23:16 <Tero> It would be important to have him involved as well, wouldn't it?  
14/11/2008 12:23:39 <gaid> Sorry to be late ! what do you mean by open meeting ?  
14/11/2008 12:24:25 <Troy> Is Mike's latest contribution accessible online? I am on the road, but I would like to have a peak.  
14/11/2008 12:24:42 <Erkki> Since the WS is in public interest, we have the public review and an open meeting in the plan.  
14/11/2008 12:24:44 <Tero> Should I upload it or...?  
14/11/2008 12:24:59 <Troy> Mike? Is that OK?  
14/11/2008 12:25:10 <Troy> I would like it.  
14/11/2008 12:25:46 <mike> Sure - as I said in my e-mail I think it may be in need of more work and especially comment from you  
14/11/2008 12:25:57 <Erkki> Unfortunately Mike's contribution is embedded in a copy that has lots of prior change marks in it.  
14/11/2008 12:26:30 <Troy> Ouch. I don't know if this machine has Word/Open Office on it.  
14/11/2008 12:26:42 <gaid> Erkki, this workshop cannot be considered as in public interest since it is not supported financially by the EU. So there is not obligation to have a public enquiry.  
14/11/2008 12:26:53 <Troy> OK. It's got the Word viewer app.  
14/11/2008 12:27:20 <Tero> I can make a pdf as well, if that's better? It'll just take some time.  
14/11/2008 12:27:21 <Erkki> I'd propose that we'd get into Mike's contribution with comments by others, Troy in particular, in the next chat.  
14/11/2008 12:27:37 <Tero> That's probably for the best.  
14/11/2008 12:27:44 <Troy> The word doc should be fine, Tero.  
14/11/2008 12:28:13 <Erkki> Gaid: Your comment has never come up before!  
14/11/2008 12:28:18 <Troy> Sounds good, Erkki.

14/11/2008 12:28:18 <mike> Troy - if you do get to see it now, my additions are in in the "Usage scenarios" section and one at the end of the "Sample design and implementation" section

14/11/2008 12:29:41 <mike> The point I made in my e-mail that may be more relevant than discussing the new text, is that I found the structure and content of the existing document a little difficult to work with. I cannot see what the end result will look like

14/11/2008 12:29:47 <Troy> Great, Mike. I will try and have a look.

14/11/2008 12:30:30 <Marc> @Erkki, Gaid: this would inndeed change the situation

14/11/2008 12:30:49 <gaid> We usually advise to have a public consultation but it is not mandatory when it is not cfunded by EU. I think I mentioned the fact during the kick-off meeting

14/11/2008 12:31:18 <Tero> Check your private messages, Troy, if you already haven't done so.

14/11/2008 12:31:37 <Erkki> Mike: Thus far, we don't yet have a CWA draft. We should turn the material into one and distribute it to the full WS. Do you think that we have enough material by now for that?

14/11/2008 12:31:59 <Troy> **Tero**, I got the file. Can you keep it for a while, in case the viewer chokes on me and I have tio reload.

14/11/2008 12:32:25 <Tero> Okay.

14/11/2008 12:33:54 <Erkki> I'd say that the public consultation is necessary for the status of the WS. The reason why no EU funding was sought was the urgency of the considerations/guidance. Had we sought EU funding, we couldn't have even started yet, as we discussed with JK.

14/11/2008 12:35:23 <gaid> I agree with you. However, in this particular case you have the choice : up to the participants to decide.

14/11/2008 12:37:11 <Erkki> I repat that the public copnsultation is necessary for the status of the CWA (not the WS, as I erroneously stated before).

14/11/2008 12:38:00 <Marc> agreed

14/11/2008 12:38:47 <Erkki> Gaid, how long does the WS internal approval period have to be? And how long is the public consultation period?

14/11/2008 12:38:49 <Karl> Erkki, as I am not accustomed to such formal issues: what exactly is the impact of having such a public consultation for the relevance/importance of the CWA?

14/11/2008 12:38:52 <Troy> Mike's edits seem fine to me. I will have to read the document in full when I back home.

14/11/2008 12:39:00 <mike> I think that we will all agree that a public consultation is necessary if we want the CWA to have status. Now I am unclear - do we need 2 meetings (one before finalisation and an open meeting - or just the latter)?

14/11/2008 12:39:15 <Troy> **Tero**, you can hit delete on the file now.

14/11/2008 12:40:20 <gaid> Mike, I was going to ask the same question. May be you can have a final meeting when you have received the comments of the public consulation ?

14/11/2008 12:41:08 <Marc> I guess it really boils down to if we see the need for another round of discussion

14/11/2008 12:41:46 <Erkki> Karl, public consultation means that the CWA is not just the result of a relatively small group but that it has been scrutinized and eventually accepted by the public at large, by the relevant stakeholders at least.is for

14/11/2008 12:41:49 <Marc> as the public meeting will largely be an opportunity for us to catch attention, not to resolve potential dissension

14/11/2008 12:42:29 <Karl> When a public consultation is held, does this mean that everybody who happens to be told of the event can participate and request changes, and (if yes) how are these requests decided?

14/11/2008 12:42:51 <mike> I think that it is likely that we can reach a good consensus without a meeting that precedes public consultation - it seems that the reason for a possible meeting is Yves

14/11/2008 12:43:05 <Troy> In my mind, if we have two meetings, the earlier one is more important. Some issues only arise in person. We can pat each other on the back virtually when all is agreed.

14/11/2008 12:43:22 <mike> It would be awkward if Yves makes lots of negative comments in the public consultation and final meeting period

14/11/2008 12:43:41 <Marc> indeed

14/11/2008 12:43:48 <Erkki> Karl, the public consultation may produce comments (by anybody), and they need to be "disposed of" in the public meeting.

14/11/2008 12:44:08 <Marc> @Karl, Erkki: formally, that's indeed the case

14/11/2008 12:44:31 <Marc> but I agree with Mike that it'd be awkward to have that

14/11/2008 12:44:54 <Marc> if we can identify potential sources of dissent in advance

14/11/2008 12:45:18 <Troy> Erkki, that was my point too. We need to have time to address any issues, and we need to make sure we hear about them asap.'

14/11/2008 12:47:34 <Marc> so, to put it bluntly: do we expect / fear Yves or anybody else to produce negative comments?

14/11/2008 12:48:52 <Troy> On the other hand, can we expect positive comments? Is there anything we can do to advance that?

14/11/2008 12:49:21 <Erkki> I've tried to keep these considerations/guidance separate from the ISO/IEC JTC1/SC35 process, and the justification is the the urgency (multilingual keyboard layouts were needed yesterday!), whereas the ISO process takes always a lot of time.

14/11/2008 12:50:35 <Erkki> I also understand that once the CWA is published, we may get implementations forthcoming.

14/11/2008 12:50:55 <Erkki> ... relatively soon, that is.

14/11/2008 12:51:26 <mike> My fear is that if the Workshop produces a practical and short-term solution in the keyboard field particularly if we can get industry to acknowledge its benefits - it will make SC35's activity seem less relevant - I can't see Yves welcoming this outcome

14/11/2008 12:51:56 <Karl> Erkki, ISO/IEC 9995-3 however can be a finalized standard in relative short time (fall 2009 or spring 2010), and (in my opinion) it in fact fulfils the MEEK goals at least for the Latin writing community.

14/11/2008 12:52:12 <Erkki> ...and?

14/11/2008 12:53:28 <Troy> I guess I should state my opinion that we in fact several needs. One solution is unlikely to match them all.

14/11/2008 12:53:47 <Troy> have several needs

14/11/2008 12:54:02 <Erkki> Karl: Even Yves has publicly stated that 9995-3 is not good for the purpose (even with the amendments).

14/11/2008 12:54:47 <Erkki> ... the purpose being a multilingual keyboard layout for non-expert users.

14/11/2008 12:55:35 <Karl> Erkki, does this apply to the revision which is now out for CD ballot? If yes, I would learn about that statement.

14/11/2008 12:56:42 <Erkki> Karl, the statement referred to the structure of 9995-3, which has not been revamped by the amendment.

14/11/2008 12:57:15 <Karl> Erkki: ... and thus we have a (I do not say: the one, and I do not say: the best) solution only a few months later as we have our CWA (and in fact, when we get consensus at the Berlin meeting in February 2009 to release a FDIS, this solution is applicable about the same time).

14/11/2008 12:57:47 <Erkki> Y went as far as to put the blame on the Swedish editor of that part.

14/11/2008 12:58:37 <Tero> I have to leave in a few minutes. Can someone else record the log from this point on?

14/11/2008 13:00:02 \* mike quit (timeout)

14/11/2008 13:01:15 <Erkki> Karl, we can state in the CWA that there is a short term ISO process to amend the 9995-3 and a longer term process to effectively replace it by a new part, which could in the future provide the basis for a standards based solution. We are working on an interim solution.

14/11/2008 13:01:24 <Tero> Bye!

14/11/2008 13:01:34 <Erkki> Bye, Tero!

14/11/2008 13:01:42 <Troy> Bye Tero

14/11/2008 13:01:45 \* Tero quit (timeout)

14/11/2008 13:02:01 <mike> bye

14/11/2008 13:02:14 <mike> That was to Ter!

14/11/2008 13:02:23 <mike> Tero!

14/11/2008 13:02:55 <Karl> Erkki, that seems OK.

14/11/2008 13:04:11 <Erkki> That SHOULD also satisfy Yves, particularly in light of his disliking of the current 9995-3.

14/11/2008 13:05:45 <Erkki> Getting back to my original question, do you think that we need a physical WS internal meeting?

14/11/2008 13:06:11 <Troy> We have to recognize that users have various needs, and we need to address them separately. Whether it's 9995-3 or another solution, we have to look at its applicability to specific usage cases.

14/11/2008 13:07:08 <Troy> If we can't address all usage scenarios, then we have to leave them without a specific recommendation.

14/11/2008 13:08:18 <Marc> if we are confident that these comments satisfy Yves and others, then no

14/11/2008 13:08:20 <Erkki> We have stated that the CWA will include considerations and - where possible - guidance.

14/11/2008 13:08:30 <Marc> (regarding Erkki's question)

14/11/2008 13:09:17 <Troy> Should we ask Yves, to find out if he can attend, and when?

14/11/2008 13:12:09 <Erkki> Karl, incidentally, although 9995-3 is referred to in the Swedish standard, it only follows it to the extent that there is no conflict with current usage and if it does not cause any other conflict. The same is true for the Finnish standard, although ours differs considerably from the Swedish one.

14/11/2008 13:13:07 <Karl> Erkki, as far as I know, in fact the only widely used national standard which refers to

14/11/2008 13:13:37 <Erkki> ... which effectively means that no compliance to part 3 could be claimed, quite the contrary..

14/11/2008 13:14:18 <Karl> ... ISO 9995-3 is the Canadian standard. Therefore, the current revision of ISO 9995-3 is a little bit biased to the Canadian needs, to be compatible with that national standard as it is now.

14/11/2008 13:16:17 <Erkki> Karl, the Canadian standard is not widely used at all, but you don't have to take my word for it. The reason for its implementation was Alain's employment with the Quebec government.

14/11/2008 13:16:35 <Karl> It is, anyway, designed to accommodate the world's (not only Europe's) needs as far as it is possible within its given framework. Thus, I regard it to be applicable as a (not: as the one) interim solution for the European needs.

14/11/2008 13:17:29 <Troy> Why interim?

14/11/2008 13:17:36 <mike> Sorry must leave - NOW! Bye  
14/11/2008 13:17:52 <Troy> Bye Mike. and Thanks.  
14/11/2008 13:17:58 <mike> Please update me only any decisions - Bye again  
14/11/2008 13:18:09 \* mike quit  
14/11/2008 13:19:53 <Karl> Troy, "interim" only if you want to employ a more comprehensive in the future (like ISO 9995-9, if that will be a success). However, an ISO 9995-9 has to be designed in a way that it can be used in addition to an ISO 9995-3 based solution, at least for compatibility reasons.  
14/11/2008 13:20:20 <Erkki> Karl, if 9995-3 would have been seen as a useful base for multilingual support within EU, there would have been no need for MEEK. Sweden the country of origin, could not use it (although I don't praise their different choice, either).  
14/11/2008 13:21:14 <Troy> OK, Karl. I will have to look into 9995-9, I guess. Is the info on it public?  
14/11/2008 13:22:32 <Erkki> Karl, if 9995-9 must be compatible with 9995-3, it will not succeed either. You should use the opportunity given by the different part number.  
14/11/2008 13:23:42 <Erkki> ... and make a fresh start.  
14/11/2008 13:23:44 <Karl> Troy, until now, the newest info is still the N11R on the MEEK site, together with some handwritten notes on my desk.  
14/11/2008 13:23:47 <Troy> Found it. <http://portailgroupe.afnor.fr/...330.pdf>  
14/11/2008 13:25:31 <Karl> Erkki, not technically compatible - only to the extent that group and level numbers used in 9995-3 have not to be reused in a 9995-9. Thus, 9995-9 in fact can be designed from scratch.  
14/11/2008 13:26:27 <Karl> Sorry, read "group and level numbers" as "group numbers" only. (Thus, in my recent draft, group numbers start at 100.)  
14/11/2008 13:26:31 <Erkki> Karl, which I'd strongly encourage!  
14/11/2008 13:27:13 <Troy> Great. I will study it when I get home.  
14/11/2008 13:27:22 <Troy> I have to go now.  
14/11/2008 13:27:38 <Troy> Good chat. You all have a good weekend!  
14/11/2008 13:27:44 <Erkki> I'd like to see a standards based solution being useful.  
14/11/2008 13:29:09 <Troy> I agree. Usability is judged by users anyway, and only their approval will mean approval.  
14/11/2008 13:29:27 <Erkki> ... also for the ordinary users, not just for those, who have to be able to enter the characters, no matter how intuitively it can or cannot be done.  
14/11/2008 13:29:27 <Troy> Bye now.  
14/11/2008 13:29:49 <Marc> bye Troy  
14/11/2008 13:29:51 <Erkki> Bye, Troy!  
14/11/2008 13:30:04 \* Troy quit  
14/11/2008 13:30:18 <Marc> where does that leave us with the question of another WS meeting?  
14/11/2008 13:30:28 <Erkki> I guess we have concluded that we don't necessarily need another physical meeting prior to the open meeting.  
14/11/2008 13:31:05 <Marc> ok  
14/11/2008 13:31:06 <Erkki> Let's agree in the next chat on the work schedule towards publication.  
14/11/2008 13:32:38 <Erkki> I propose that we have the next PT chat next Friday, 2008-11-21, at either 10 or 13 o'clock Brussels time.  
14/11/2008 13:33:22 <Marc> both times would work for me  
14/11/2008 13:33:39 <Karl> OK (I prefer 13:00 but can also manage 10:00)  
14/11/2008 13:34:27 <Erkki> OK, I'll send out a note asking for preferences. I suspect that 13 o'clock will again be the preferred choice.  
14/11/2008 13:35:19 <Erkki> Can we conclude the chat?  
14/11/2008 13:35:35 <Karl> Yes  
14/11/2008 13:35:42 <Erkki> On my part, I wish you all a nice weekend.

14/11/2008 13:36:08 <Marc> thanks. Same to you!  
14/11/2008 13:36:10 <Erkki> I, myself, will need to work, though.  
14/11/2008 13:36:41 <Karl> Erkki, best wishes to you regarding your operation.  
Nice weekend, also, for everybody. Bye!  
14/11/2008 13:37:02 <Erkki> Thanks, I hope that everything goes well.  
14/11/2008 13:37:07 \* Karl quit (timeout)  
14/11/2008 13:37:12 <Erkki> Bye!  
14/11/2008 13:37:43 \* Erkki quit (timeout)  
14/11/2008 13:38:04 <Marc> bye  
14/11/2008 13:38:26 \* Marc quit (timeout)  
14/11/2008 13:45:41 \* mike joins meek  
14/11/2008 13:47:46 \* mike quit