

MEEK Project Team chat 17.4.2009

07:53:55 * Marc joins meek
17/04/2009 07:55:37 * Tero joins meek
17/04/2009 07:58:01 * Erkki joins meek
17/04/2009 08:00:11 * Havard joins meek
17/04/2009 08:01:03 <Erkki> Good morning, everybody!
17/04/2009 08:01:16 * Mike Pluke joins meek
17/04/2009 08:01:20 <Tero> Morning!
17/04/2009 08:01:36 <Mike Pluke> Morning
17/04/2009 08:01:48 <Erkki> At least Mike, TTroy and Gaid have informed me that they'll join.
17/04/2009 08:02:25 <Erkki> Troy is the only one to have sent written comments.
17/04/2009 08:03:17 <Erkki> Karl cannot join this chat. He's on holidays in the Swiss alps (w/out a reliable internet connection).
17/04/2009 08:03:27 <Marc> Good Morning!
17/04/2009 08:03:39 <Havard> Good morning!
17/04/2009 08:05:09 <Erkki> Thus, I'd propose at the onset that we'll have another chat on the week starting April 27th, since Karl will be in Dublin next week (and so will Tero).
17/04/2009 08:06:22 * Troy joins meek
17/04/2009 08:06:40 <Troy> Good morning.
17/04/2009 08:06:50 <Erkki> This doesn't however, prevent us from editing Karl's contribution, I just don't want to send the next draft to the full WS without him having been in a position to comment on it..
17/04/2009 08:06:55 <Mike Pluke> I had a tentative date for a CDFG meeting of April 27th in Brussels - is that still in any way likely to happen?
17/04/2009 08:07:14 <Marc> No, sorry for not being more proactive on this
17/04/2009 08:07:35 <Marc> I'll put up a Doodle poll for a date probably still this side of the summer break, though
17/04/2009 08:07:50 <Marc> if that's OK with you
17/04/2009 08:08:10 <Erkki> OK with me.
17/04/2009 08:08:24 <Mike Pluke> OK - shame as that week was one of the few free ones with me
17/04/2009 08:10:00 <Marc> Sorry again for not announcing the date change earlier
17/04/2009 08:10:33 <Marc> on the positive side, standardization is seen very important in the Publications Office
17/04/2009 08:11:40 <Erkki> Getting back to the document at hand: Have you all seen Troy's comments?
17/04/2009 08:12:04 <Havard> yes
17/04/2009 08:12:19 <Mike Pluke> Yes - and agree with them
17/04/2009 08:12:37 <Havard> There is reference to "page 31". My document ends on page 30.
17/04/2009 08:13:57 <Erkki> Havard, So does mine.
17/04/2009 08:14:26 <Erkki> Let us look at 6.2. first.
17/04/2009 08:14:49 <Mike Pluke> The only slight issue was that if section F is removed in Appendix 3 we lose the concept "This means they can create their own layouts" a powerful and useful concept.

17/04/2009 08:15:12 <Mike Pluke> Also - there was no section E in this Appendix

17/04/2009 08:15:14 <Troy> I use OpenOffice on linux, so it must be a difference in font metrics causing the difference.

17/04/2009 08:16:04 <Mike Pluke> Sorry - I started responding to Troy's comments before "Lets look at 6.2. first" - lets do that

17/04/2009 08:16:25 <Troy> You're right, Mike. The text should be revised instead.

17/04/2009 08:18:14 <Erkki> I'd accept Troy's comments on 6.2.1.

17/04/2009 08:19:01 <Mike Pluke> Agreed

17/04/2009 08:19:29 <Havard> yes (except "7.1" → "6.1" 😊)

17/04/2009 08:19:49 <Havard> The last smiley was unintended ...

17/04/2009 08:21:57 <Erkki> I have some other comments on the text in 6.2.1:

17/04/2009 08:23:28 <Erkki> The third para does not accurately reflect the situation.

17/04/2009 08:24:11 <Erkki> The publication of the standard means that a DIS has been approved in the binary ballot.

17/04/2009 08:24:39 <Erkki> The current version on the ballot is a FCD.

17/04/2009 08:25:07 <Erkki> Thus, I'd say something along the lines:

17/04/2009 08:28:48 <Erkki> This is likely to be changed by the present revision that is now at the FCD (Final Committee Draft) stage; the DIS (Draft International Standard) could thus be submitted to the combined ISO and IEC ballot towards the end of 2009.

17/04/2009 08:32:16 <Havard> I have a small "thing" in the next paragraph: Instead of "Latin written European languages (including non-EU languages like Turkic) " I would suggest: "Latin-script European languages" (as the question which languages are "EU languages" is of less relevance).

17/04/2009 08:32:26 <Erkki> I'd also change the following chapter: This revision is intended to contain... Also: It is intended to employ a third level..., and overstriking diacritics...

17/04/2009 08:36:43 <Erkki> Havard: Sorry but if we say all European languages using the Latin script, we'd be lying, since there are several regional and minority languages, for which this is not necessarily true (even if one only considers the letters in modern use).

17/04/2009 08:38:44 * Erkki quit (timeout)

17/04/2009 08:39:10 <Havard> Erkki: Point being? The old wording is just as open.

17/04/2009 08:39:22 <Marc> then, why not speak about "official European languages"?

17/04/2009 08:39:53 <Erkki> Havard, I had not edited this submitted section at all.

17/04/2009 08:41:27 <Erkki> We need to add in modern use to the official European languages.

17/04/2009 08:43:00 * Troy quit (timeout)

17/04/2009 08:43:29 <Havard> It is by no means obvious what "official" means in this case. Two ways to go around it: Either have a round formulation, or somewhere in document state explicitly "at least" which languages are covered.

17/04/2009 08:44:09 * Troy quit (timeout)

17/04/2009 08:44:22 <Erkki> We cannot define an all-inclusive list of the languages.

17/04/2009 08:45:12 <Marc> Agreed. "Official" languages isn't precise either, I agree, but it's somewhat more concrete

17/04/2009 08:45:14 <Erkki> Certainly more than the official languages are covered; "official" is defined by each country.

17/04/2009 08:45:59 * Troy quit (timeout)

17/04/2009 08:46:20 <Erkki> We need to also remove at the end of 6.2.1 "Information a bout...I

17/04/2009 08:47:03 <Havard> Different countries have different approaches to the issues of "official". I have two main points: "Latin written language" is not good; "Latin-script language" is better. And "EU language" is irrelevant.

17/04/2009 08:47:28 <Erkki> We should change the last short chapter to: The keyboard layout shown in Appendix 2 is an illustration of the current status of the ongoing work.

17/04/2009 08:48:31 <Erkki> I think that I have now enough input to edit 6.2.1 for review at the next chat.

17/04/2009 08:48:45 * Troy quit (timeout)

17/04/2009 08:48:46 <Erkki> ...provided that you agree.

17/04/2009 08:48:53 <Havard> ok

17/04/2009 08:49:35 <Marc> ok

17/04/2009 08:49:53 <Erkki> What should we do with 6.2.2?

17/04/2009 08:51:08 * Troy quit (timeout)

17/04/2009 08:51:10 <Erkki> We cannot refer to a MEEK document.

17/04/2009 08:51:54 <Marc> why not?

17/04/2009 08:52:31 <Erkki> The MEEK website addresses are not necessarily intended to be stable.

17/04/2009 08:52:37 <Mike Pluke> Also in this section I am very worried about the application of this proposed solution to mobile device keyboards.

17/04/2009 08:52:46 * Troy quit (timeout)

17/04/2009 08:53:11 * Troy quit (timeout)

17/04/2009 08:53:25 <Mike Pluke> Has anyone approached any member of the mobile phone manufacturers or mobile service providers to gauge their reaction - I doubt it?

17/04/2009 08:53:55 <Havard> In the final CWA there shouldn't be references to "internal" MEEK documents. I think that 6.2.2 could be shortened and made slightly less specific, since it just mentions work carried out by others that MAY have results of interest once it is further developed.

17/04/2009 08:54:24 <Erkki> Mike, this is the first time I've seen this mentioned.

17/04/2009 08:54:38 <Erkki> Havard, I totally agree with you.

17/04/2009 08:55:16 * Troy quit (timeout)

17/04/2009 08:55:30 <Mike Pluke> I would like to see this wording removed as it raises false expectations - I think there is zero chance of this approach being adopted - it would seriously compromise usability and is against the whole product release strategy of the mobile sector

17/04/2009 08:56:44 <Erkki> Mike, I'll remove it, and prepare new draft text based on this discussion, provided that the chat will agree on this.

17/04/2009 08:58:46 <Erkki> Getting to Troy's comment on 8 Summary: I had not edited that section based on the new submissions.

17/04/2009 08:59:55 <Erkki> I'd like to get input for this.

17/04/2009 09:00:26 <Havard> I agree in principle with the comment, but don't have any input as to how and what should be done.

17/04/2009 09:00:51 * Troy quit (timeout)

17/04/2009 09:01:14 <Mike Pluke> I think that ideally I would like to see a summary that shows more clearly how the various proposed solutions map to the scenarios introduced at the beginning of the document.

17/04/2009 09:02:06 <Erkki> Mike, could you propose an update for the next chat?

17/04/2009 09:02:31 <Mike Pluke> However, I fear that it is easy to say that the Global IM fits well to scenario 3 and not 1 and 2 and that the SFS method fits well to 1 and 2 but not 3, what is a problem is that the ISO method could be identified as addressing all 3 scenarios

17/04/2009 09:03:37 <Mike Pluke> This would make it sound like the ideal solution - whereas I believe that it is a solution that is not very "user-friendly" and that requires global changes to the world of keyboards that is never likely to happen in practice

17/04/2009 09:04:29 <Mike Pluke> So how do we show this? At present, 7 and 8 are less clear than they could be because of trying to avoid saying what I have just said I feel.

17/04/2009 09:04:48 <Erkki> What we could say of the ISO method, is that it, however, is not firm enough for a short term solution, but could be a valid option for long term development.

17/04/2009 09:05:46 <Mike Pluke> I fear that Karl would say that it is or soon would be firm within the timescale of this work

17/04/2009 09:06:28 <Erkki> ...is not particularly user-friendly nor firm enough...

17/04/2009 09:06:31 <Havard> Is there a need to qualify the "hopes" for the ISO option? There may come up any number of alternative good solutions from various sources in the future.

17/04/2009 09:06:40 <Troy> Could it be moved below text on the SFS solution?

17/04/2009 09:08:29 <Erkki> We cannot compete with ISO. We are searching for a user-friendly method for providing multilingual extensions to existing European keyboard layouts.

17/04/2009 09:09:03 <Erkki> Ant the implementation time table is "very soon".

17/04/2009 09:09:38 <Troy> I don't see a conflict in having multiple ways to input text. Some people will need and prefer the ISO method.

17/04/2009 09:09:40 <Erkki> I'd say even, immediately following the publication of the CWA.

17/04/2009 09:10:24 <Troy> It is not particularly user friendly, and not really suitable for inputting large quantities of text, so it doesn't work for everybody.

17/04/2009 09:11:41 <Troy> In the ideal world, users could choose between two or more different methods. Of course, engravings on a keyboard are an issue which calls for a single agreement. That is, if they are needed.

17/04/2009 09:11:46 <Erkki> OK. How about Appendix 2?

17/04/2009 09:12:50 <Troy> Back to my last comment, In terms of the "F.", the following text could be used "From a user's perspective, only three steps are required: (1) click the save button, (2) login to the server using a web browser, and (3) name the UCL."

17/04/2009 09:13:43 <Troy> The text is copied from my original proposal.

17/04/2009 09:14:28 <Erkki> Troy,

17/04/2009 09:15:09 <Erkki> Could you still re-edit your submission for the next chat based on the comments of this one?

17/04/2009 09:15:27 <Troy> OK

17/04/2009 09:15:34 <Troy> Will do.

17/04/2009 09:15:55 <Erkki> I do need your advice on how to deal with Appendix 2!

17/04/2009 09:17:42 <Havard> Does Appendix 2 have anything to do with the current CWA? Isn't it just a presentation of "something else" ? If so, it should be very brief indeed.

17/04/2009 09:17:42 <Marc> It might fit better with the general thrust if it were somewhat more abstract

17/04/2009 09:17:48 <Troy> The layout seems cluttered. I am not sure if that would work when printed on keytops.

17/04/2009 09:18:44 <Troy> Therefore, it seems problematic to include it in this document which purports to be a recommendation.

17/04/2009 09:19:23 <Tero> The description is, indeed, rather extensive.

17/04/2009 09:19:57 * Erkki quit (timeout)

17/04/2009 09:19:58 <Tero> So I'd also suggest toning it down somewhat.

17/04/2009 09:20:24 <Tero> After all, it's only referred to as an example in the main text.

17/04/2009 09:20:59 <Havard> As small editorial thing: I believe that CWAs have "Annexes", not "Appendixes"

17/04/2009 09:21:33 <Marc> it'd gain if it concentrated more on the underlying principles of that design

17/04/2009 09:24:13 <Mike Pluke> On Annex 2 - I agree with Troy about printing all this on keytops - I suspect that it would be a nightmare both for the keyboard manufacturer to do accurately and certainly for the user to use

17/04/2009 09:24:42 <Havard> I think the CWA should in principle recommend one thing, and if necessary briefly mention "alternative things". The current form of Appendix 2 almost shifts focus from the CWA recommendation.

17/04/2009 09:25:33 <Mike Pluke> But if we have no example of the proposal - then what do we have. The example makes concrete what is being proposed - and many of us don't like it. Without an example it is very hard for the average reader to get an understanding of what is being proposed in the main text

17/04/2009 09:26:11 <Troy> The appendix 2 is obviously a necessary part of this document, since we need to give readers a good picture of the current status quo, also in terms of work at ISO level. As I understand it, the graphic, even though it seems cluttered, is a good way to give a good overview of how the system is designed, for the lay person.

17/04/2009 09:26:58 <Troy> The technical details should probably be excluded for the most part, except for the parts which pertain to the underlying principle, and cannot be changed at ISO.

17/04/2009 09:27:46 <Erkki> I'd take that the illustration should be included in Annex 2.

17/04/2009 09:27:52 <Troy> Including too many details is problematic because they are not finalized at ISO, and could be changed. Including them would be similar to including dead links.

17/04/2009 09:28:06 <Troy> Or false information.

17/04/2009 09:28:51 <Troy> The core principles are of course a separate matter. They are well explained in the main document's description of the proposal.

17/04/2009 09:29:10 <Erkki> I'll take your advice and work on a highly reduced Annex 2 based on your comments, provided that you agree.

17/04/2009 09:29:20 <Havard> ok

17/04/2009 09:29:26 <Troy> Sounds fine to me.

17/04/2009 09:29:55 <Marc> good

17/04/2009 09:30:35 <Erkki> Do you have any other comments on the current draft, or are they such that they could be deferred to the next chat?e the

17/04/2009 09:30:56 <Marc> from me, no

17/04/2009 09:31:05 <Troy> I am all out too.

17/04/2009 09:31:12 <Havard> nothing further

09:31:41 <Erkki> When should we schedule the next chat?

17/04/2009 09:32:33 <Havard> 27 and 29 ok with me. And 30 in the morning.

17/04/2009 09:33:16 <Tero> Both are fine, except for 29th afternoon.

17/04/2009 09:34:09 <Marc> those dates should work for me, too

17/04/2009 09:34:34 <Troy> they work for me too

17/04/2009 09:34:42 <Erkki> How about 29th in the morning, i.e. 10 o'clock Brussels time.

17/04/2009 09:34:50 <Havard> ok

17/04/2009 09:34:58 <Troy> ok

17/04/2009 09:35:10 <Tero> Sounds good.

17/04/2009 09:35:19 <Erkki> I'll send out a note to that effect.

17/04/2009 09:36:18 <Havard> I am hungry; do you serve lunch, Erkki?

17/04/2009 09:36:25 <Erkki> I'll also send out a new draft, but possibly only by the end of next week, since I'll leave for a trip tomorrow morning.

17/04/2009 09:37:21 <Erkki> 09:35:19 <Erkki> I'll send out a note to that effect.

17/04/2009 09:36:18 <Havard> I am hungry; do you serve lunch, Erkki?

17/04/2009 09:36:25 <Erkki> I'll also send out a new draft, but possibly only by the end of next week, since I'll leave for a trip tomorrow morning.

17/04/2009 09:37:21 <Erkki> Tero, you'll have a chance to discuss our sentiments with Karl next week in Dublin.

17/04/2009 09:38:12 <Erkki> Are we all set for now?

17/04/2009 09:38:18 <Tero> Any specific kind of a message I should convey?

17/04/2009 09:39:49 <Erkki> Tero, the two of us can discuss that also offline, but others may want to say something.

17/04/2009 09:40:19 <Mike Pluke> Sorry - had to take a few minutes out - I am OK with the document too

17/04/2009 09:40:23 <Tero> Yeah, let's do that later in the afternoon today.

17/04/2009 09:40:46 <Mike Pluke> 29th seems OK with me too

17/04/2009 09:42:13 <Erkki> OK. We'll meet again on the 29th at 10.00

Brussels time.

17/04/2009 09:42:25 <Troy> see you then

17/04/2009 09:42:37 <Erkki> Thanks everybody! Bye for now!

17/04/2009 09:42:39 <Havard> bye for now

17/04/2009 09:42:47 <Troy> bye

17/04/2009 09:42:50 <Marc> bye

17/04/2009 09:42:53 <Tero> Bye!

17/04/2009 09:42:53 <Mike Pluke> Bye

, you'll have a chance to discuss our sentiments with Karl next week in

Dublin.

17/04/2009 09:38:12 <Erkki> Are we all set for now?

17/04/2009 09:38:18 <Tero> Any specific kind of a message I should convey?

17/04/2009 09:39:49 <Erkki> Tero, the two of us can discuss that also

offline, but others may want to say something.

17/04/2009 09:40:19 <Mike Pluke> Sorry - had to take a few minutes out - I

am OK with the document too

17/04/2009 09:40:23 <Tero> Yeah, let's do that later in the afternoon today.

17/04/2009 09:40:46 <Mike Pluke> 29th seems OK with me too

17/04/2009 09:42:13 <Erkki> OK. We'll meet again on the 29th at 10.00

Brussels time.

17/04/2009 09:42:25 <Troy> see you then

17/04/2009 09:42:37 <Erkki> Thanks everybody! Bye for now!

17/04/2009 09:42:39 <Havard> bye for now

17/04/2009 09:42:47 <Troy> bye

17/04/2009 09:42:50 <Marc> bye

17/04/2009 09:42:53 <Tero> Bye!

17/04/2009 09:42:53 <Mike Pluke> Bye