

MEEK Project Team chat 11.5.2009

08:01:22 <Karl> Good morning, everybody. For technical reasons, I have logged in on two computers, therefore you see a "Karl2".

11/05/2009 08:01:41 * Troy joins meek

11/05/2009 08:01:56 <Troy> Good morning.

11/05/2009 08:02:05 <Mike> Good morning

11/05/2009 08:03:38 <Håvard> Good morning

11/05/2009 08:03:53 <Tero> Good morning.

11/05/2009 08:04:05 <Tero> Erkki will join us in a minute.

11/05/2009 08:04:49 * Erkki joins meek

11/05/2009 08:05:18 <Erkki> Good morning!

11/05/2009 08:06:18 <Erkki> FYI, I've implemented most of Tero's comments up to and including the end of 7 SUMMARY OF ALL THREE SOLUTIONS.

11/05/2009 08:07:56 <Erkki> I have still kept don't and we'll, on which I'd ask your opinion.

11/05/2009 08:08:56 <Erkki> I've also also omitted the the in front of users.

11/05/2009 08:09:18 <Troy> My opinion is leave the dos and donts, but I guess someone who knows how standards are usually written could say better.

11/05/2009 08:10:17 <Tero> According to what I've learnt, contracted forms don't belong to formal writing.

11/05/2009 08:11:00 <Tero> I agree, however, that at times it may sound a bit clumsy, but I guess that's just how it is.

11/05/2009 08:11:17 <Erkki> Mike?

11/05/2009 08:11:25 <Tero> What does our native member say?

11/05/2009 08:11:36 <Troy> I guess the thing to do is to compare to other CEN documents similar in context to this one.

11/05/2009 08:12:05 <Troy> Anyone have access to such docs?

11/05/2009 08:12:30 <Mike> I think in general avoiding the contracted forms in formal documents is recommended - however I do not think that we should be absolute in this if it really reads clumsily

11/05/2009 08:12:50 <Mike> I was looking for instances - and only found a single don't

11/05/2009 08:13:29 <Tero> I think that more than anything, absolute is what we should be, because mixing styles is worse than having a slightly inappropriate single one.

11/05/2009 08:13:31 <Håvard> I think that "don't" is ok; avoid "aren't" etc.

11/05/2009 08:13:42 <Mike> I have no idea what CEN says - while we continue our checking I will consult the ETSI Style Guide to use of English

11/05/2009 08:14:12 <Mike> I certainly agree with what Havard said - aren't is much too colloquial!

11/05/2009 08:14:22 <Håvard> The rules are also more strict for standards than for CWAs.

11/05/2009 08:14:42 <Troy> It's in Annex 1. Which should be OK anyway, because of where it is.

11/05/2009 08:14:45 <Tero> On the "the" matter I agree with the counter-arguments. After all, that's something our people always have problems with, since we lack the distinction in our language, which I have clearly overcompensated.

11/05/2009 08:14:47 <Mike> True

11/05/2009 08:15:36 <Tero> I excluded Annex 1 from my proofreading because it's a document that has already been published as such.

11/05/2009 08:15:48 <Troy> I couldn't find any aren't.

11/05/2009 08:16:34 <Erkki> Annex 1 has never been published in English.

11/05/2009 08:17:23 <Troy> Or "we'll".

11/05/2009 08:17:40 <Tero> Oh! In that case, it's a different matter.

11/05/2009 08:18:01 <Erkki> There was at least one they'll.

11/05/2009 08:18:54 <Troy> I can't find that either. Anyone else?

11/05/2009 08:19:38 <Mike> No - I searched and failed too - where are these mysterious words coming from?

11/05/2009 08:19:54 <Tero> There's a "doesn't" at least.

11/05/2009 08:19:57 <Troy> Oh, I found one. It's been changed to "they will"

11/05/2009 08:20:00 <Erkki> We'll came from they'll.

11/05/2009 08:21:08 <Erkki> OK. Let's move into 6: Several of the letters with multiple diacritics...

11/05/2009 08:21:16 <Troy> Same for "do not"

11/05/2009 08:21:30 <Mike> Yes I found the "doesn't" in Annex 3

11/05/2009 08:21:40 <Mike> Good idea!

11/05/2009 08:21:51 <Troy> At least the "they will" looks fine in the edited form.

11/05/2009 08:23:29 <Erkki> How about: They could also be entered using such an the above extended dead key method, but only as characters that could not be explicitly listed as being supported.

11/05/2009 08:24:17 <Erkki> Sorry, of course without the "such an", since pasting seems to take even deleted text.

11/05/2009 08:24:20 <Tero> It's still unclear in the middle...?

11/05/2009 08:24:53 <Tero> With that correction, it's starting to look readable, yes.

11/05/2009 08:25:05 <Karl> I agree.

11/05/2009 08:26:53 <Erkki> Tero had a question on KRA.

11/05/2009 08:27:22 * Mina joins meek

11/05/2009 08:27:38 <Troy> Did you receive my comments on Friday? I had edited this paragraph there.

11/05/2009 08:28:02 <Tero> Ah yes. And sorry for the comments being in Finnish! Somehow I failed to realize not everyone can read them 🙄

11/05/2009 08:29:33 <Mike> Yes - my Finnish is very poor! I was getting lost (swapping between the document and the chat) - your previous discussion related to the text that you had commented on?

11/05/2009 08:30:05 <Troy> The issue I see with this paragraph is that we jump from talking about entering text to the issue of binary encoding. The issue of composed characters is a problem which must be addressed, but the context must be made clear first.

11/05/2009 08:30:50 <Tero> Mostly they were about sentences being unclear or questionable.

11/05/2009 08:32:34 <Troy> The "They could also be entered" sentence is from the Finnish standard, where we had to address the issue of two input methods, one where diacritics are entered first, and one where they are entered after the base letter.

11/05/2009 08:33:41 <Troy> The only reason we need the second, new, method of input, is that Microsoft cannot handle multiple diacritics in their current drivers. According to them, it would be easier to write a new driver which generates decomposed characters only.

11/05/2009 08:34:23 <Troy> The sentence seems out of place without knowing the full original context.

11/05/2009 08:34:52 <Tero> You have a point there.

11/05/2009 08:36:05 <Mike> I agree - as someone that didn't know the original context I found most of this confusing. I quite like Troy's proposed re-write of this material as it seems more complete and not relying on hidden contextual background information.

11/05/2009 08:36:40 <Erkki> One should realize that there are very few letters with multiple diacritics that can be precomposed and can thus be listed as being specifically supported.

11/05/2009 08:37:37 <Erkki> All precomposed characters must be validated, the others cannot be.

11/05/2009 08:37:55 <Troy> True. There are actually two issues here. One is the precomposed/composed form issue which relates to Unicode. The second issue is the method of input, base letter first or last.

11/05/2009 08:38:42 <Troy> Both should be explained so that a user without prior knowledge of the issues gets the points.

11/05/2009 08:40:02 <Erkki> I suggest that we leave this for now and get back to it later.

11/05/2009 08:40:26 <Erkki> ...due to the complexity of the required changes.

11/05/2009 08:41:20 <Erkki> One should also note that the CWA is not for the end users.

11/05/2009 08:42:01 <Troy> I agree. We just have to make sure no other document is required for understanding what we write.

11/05/2009 08:42:51 <Erkki> We clearly have to think about this somewhat more. Thus...

11/05/2009 08:44:30 <Troy> OK

11/05/2009 08:45:07 <Troy> Should we go through my comments separately, after Tero's comments? Easier?

11/05/2009 08:45:36 <Erkki> How to deal with the KRA question? I've already forgotten where I got that piece of text.

11/05/2009 08:46:06 <Erkki> I'd like to go though the text in sequence.

11/05/2009 08:47:32 <Erkki> I'd drop "particularly" from "A sample specification (for Finnish...out

11/05/2009 08:48:31 <Tero> Sounds good.

11/05/2009 08:48:34 <Mike> Makes sense

11/05/2009 08:48:57 * Karl quit (timeout)

11/05/2009 08:50:23 <Troy> I agree too.

11/05/2009 08:50:53 <Mike> My next comment is on 6.3 - where I fully endorse Troy's suggested change

11/05/2009 08:51:50 <Erkki> Getting back to KRA?

11/05/2009 08:53:14 <Karl> Instead of "With a ... letter Q" simply: "with a complete different pronunciation" seem sufficient for me.

11/05/2009 08:54:07 <Mike> Use "completely"

11/05/2009 08:54:13 <Erkki> ...with a different pronunciation?

11/05/2009 08:54:18 <Troy> I can't find comments on KRA.

11/05/2009 08:54:19 <Karl> yes
11/05/2009 08:54:29 <Troy> Which email were they in?
11/05/2009 08:54:41 <Tero> In my version of the document.
11/05/2009 08:54:46 <Tero> In a box.
11/05/2009 08:54:47 <Erkki> In Tero's doc.
08:54:55 <Mike> In Finnish!
11/05/2009 08:55:46 <Tero> Yes, unfortunately.
11/05/2009 08:56:11 <Troy> OK, got it.
11/05/2009 08:56:52 <Erkki> Tero, could you translate it please?
11/05/2009 08:57:07 <Tero> Of course.
11/05/2009 08:57:08 <Erkki> ...or should I?
11/05/2009 08:57:10 <Troy> I understood the pronunciation to be the pronunciation in Kalallisut.
11/05/2009 08:57:38 <Troy> Not understandable to non-Greenlanders.
11/05/2009 08:58:19 <Troy> In other words, Greenlanders pronounce Q and KRA similar to each other. No idea if this is true, though.
11/05/2009 08:58:20 <Tero> The question was if there can be considered to exist a universal pronunciation for "the letter Q".
11/05/2009 08:58:20 <Erkki> OK. I'll now settle for ...with a different pronunciation.
11/05/2009 08:58:37 <Tero> It works.
11/05/2009 08:59:22 <Troy> Sounds good.
11/05/2009 08:59:54 <Mike> Simple solution
11/05/2009 09:00:19 <Erkki> I'd stick to "this layout also provides for specific punctuation.." as opposed to Tero's suggestion "provides the specific", since we don't claim to be all-inclusive.
11/05/2009 09:00:29 <Håvard> My skills in Greenlandic is limited; but I THOUGHT that "q" is a new orthography thing, replacing the previous "kra". Should be checked!
11/05/2009 09:01:09 <Erkki> I know that q is at least the fall-back.
11/05/2009 09:01:27 <Erkki> However, let's move on.
11/05/2009 09:02:19 <Tero> My main concern with that sentence was that "provide for" in this meaning is very literal nowadays. At least I didn't even know it had one.
11/05/2009 09:02:39 <Erkki> I've implemented essentially all of Tero's comments on 6.2.
11/05/2009 09:04:02 <Tero> In modern use, I'd only use it in the sense of providing for a family etc. but again, I'd like to hear the native view on this.
11/05/2009 09:04:58 * Erkki quit (timeout)
11/05/2009 09:05:18 * Håvard quit (timeout)
11/05/2009 09:06:00 <Erkki> OK, let's drop both "for" and "the"
11/05/2009 09:06:20 <Mike> There is a meaning of "provides for" as you say - but the inclusion of the word "the" again has made this appear to be the single definitive solution
11/05/2009 09:06:50 <Tero> Yes, I agree with excluding "the" here.
11/05/2009 09:07:08 <Mike> That was going to be my suggestion
11/05/2009 09:07:19 <Mike> i.e. removing both words
11/05/2009 09:09:02 * Erkki quit (timeout)
11/05/2009 09:10:11 <Troy> How about just "this layout also provides punctuation used in a number of European languages."
11/05/2009 09:10:16 <Erkki> 6.3.

11/05/2009 09:11:07 <Mike> Troy: Even better

11/05/2009 09:12:17 <Mike> 6.3: As I said I fully agree with Troy's proposed changes to the plural form in the sentence beginning "Each of these IM files ..."

11/05/2009 09:12:33 <Troy> In 6.2 there is "of existing applications". Is this retained or changed?

11/05/2009 09:13:40 <Troy> We don't know of any specific applications, so the change to " the applications" seems unnecessary.

11/05/2009 09:13:41 <Karl> I prefer this over "the existing applications", as no specific set of applications is addressed.

11/05/2009 09:16:08 <Mike> I read this as meaning that the Canadian keyboard was an application (presumably also the only application) - in which case "the" makes a little sense, although the plural form doesn't if it is the only one

11/05/2009 09:17:58 <Troy> I see your point.

11/05/2009 09:18:29 <Troy> The "the" can still be dropped without harming grammar or readability.

11/05/2009 09:18:50 <Erkki> Since we don't know of any other, but don't know that there aren't either, I'd use "the" with the plural form.

11/05/2009 09:19:49 <Erkki> The Swedish standard claims to adhere to it, partially (in unspecified parts), though.

11/05/2009 09:20:26 <Troy> OK. Next issue then.

11/05/2009 09:20:29 <Mike> On balance then I agree with Erkki - keep "the" and the plural form

11/05/2009 09:20:55 <Troy> Either one is OK for me, so this is good.

11/05/2009 09:21:45 <Karl> No problem for me.

11/05/2009 09:23:38 <Troy> By the way, I only now noticed that my edits before 6.1. aren't there. Specifically I noticed the y, x paragraph which is incomprehensible in its current form.

11/05/2009 09:23:52 <Erkki> In 7, The SFS solution: ...The solution also covers most symbols...

11/05/2009 09:24:52 <Tero> That sounds like what I was expecting.

11/05/2009 09:25:37 <Erkki> Troy, which sentence do you refer to?

11/05/2009 09:26:05 <Troy> "As a related matter, it should be noted that it is impossible to create a mechanism ..."

11/05/2009 09:26:23 <Karl> "most" is relative to the user's needs, "a considerable part" would be more neutral.

11/05/2009 09:28:13 <Erkki> Karl, OK.

11/05/2009 09:28:21 <Troy> Duh, I must still be exhausted from the weekend. The document is the one sent by Tero. Of course it can't have Erkki's edits. Please ignore my ramblings.

11/05/2009 09:32:13 <Erkki> Anything on 7 as modified by Tero?

11/05/2009 09:33:51 <Troy> Maybe change "and other scripts and symbols" to "and other scripts, including symbols"

11/05/2009 09:33:56 <Mike> Did you take note of my previous comment (x2) that I endorsed Troy's pluralisation of a sentence in 6.3?

11/05/2009 09:34:29 <Erkki> Yes, Mike.

11/05/2009 09:34:47 <Mike> I was still trying to figure out what Karl's last comment referred to? the one talking about "most"

11/05/2009 09:35:08 <Erkki> I'll also reread the log against whatever changes I've made.

11/05/2009 09:35:45 <Erkki> To the SFS solution in 7.

11/05/2009 09:36:41 <Troy> Also, "The implementation work" implies that there is a known project or projects. I suggest dropping the "The" from the beginning.

11/05/2009 09:37:04 <Troy> Bu either way is still fine.

11/05/2009 09:37:47 <Mike> Going back to Karl's change - I don't like "considerable part" - may I suggest "many of the most" instead of "most"

11/05/2009 09:39:36 <Troy> or "intends to cover most symbols ..." since that is the intention, and efforts were made in that direction.

11/05/2009 09:39:38 <Erkki> Mike, why not just many?

11/05/2009 09:40:11 <Mike> I also think that we should lose the "The" in front of "implementation work" if a specific ongoing implementation project is not being referred to as this is what the sentence currently says.

11/05/2009 09:40:52 <Erkki> Mike and Troy, that was an addition I had not implemented.

11/05/2009 09:42:26 <Troy> We can't conclude that "most" symbols are covered, before someone has done the needed legwork. The entention was to cover the symbols we knew about, though.

11/05/2009 09:43:28 <Erkki> I'll settle for "many" if you don't strongly object to it.

11/05/2009 09:43:37 <Mike> OK

11/05/2009 09:43:41 <Troy> What about "disadvantage is that users"?

11/05/2009 09:43:54 <Troy> Sounds good.

11/05/2009 09:44:31 <Troy> The next sentence explains the intent quite well.

11/05/2009 09:45:23 <Troy> I agree with all other Tero's comments. They make the text much more readable and consistent.

11/05/2009 09:47:49 <Erkki> The disadvantage is that users must always select a specific keyboard layout before starting to type (for sometimes a very small amount of text).

11/05/2009 09:49:05 <Mike> This is the best form

11/05/2009 09:49:30 <Tero> It is.

11/05/2009 09:51:04 <Troy> agreed

11/05/2009 09:52:52 <Mike> Do we move onto 8? Time is flying!

11/05/2009 09:53:31 <Erkki> I've accepted all of Tero's comments on the first three paragraphs.

09:55:00 <Mike> Troy commented on a sentence at the end of paragraph 4. This was a cut and paste error and can be removed. The meaning of this sentence appears at the end of paragraph 5.

11/05/2009 09:56:16 <Erkki> Mike, will do.

11/05/2009 09:57:28 <Erkki> Para 6 in chapter 8?

11/05/2009 09:57:31 <Troy> good

11/05/2009 09:58:00 <Troy> "It should be noted, though, that the proposed solution ..."

11/05/2009 09:58:54 <Troy> "the users" to just "users"

11/05/2009 10:00:46 <Erkki> Agreed, Troy, anything else?

11/05/2009 10:01:09 <Troy> "well learnt" to "well learned"

11/05/2009 10:01:19 <Mike> Troy: Are you proposing that "It should be noted, though, that the proposed solution ..." should replace "Global IM Solution:" at the beginning of para 6?

11/05/2009 10:01:44 <Troy> no. remove that sentence. as uou suggested.

11/05/2009 10:03:32 <Troy> I.e. remove the sentec which I said I didn't understand.

11/05/2009 10:04:05 <Erkki> Now I'm lost.

11/05/2009 10:04:27 <Mike> And where do you propose that your "It should be noted .." appears - at the beginning of the sentence at the end of para 5?

11/05/2009 10:04:57 <Troy> Mike said that the sentence "it should be noted ..." is a Cut and paste typo. It's meaning is covered in para 6. I agree.

11/05/2009 10:06:10 <Troy> It can be removed. Unless someone else sees some value in it.

11/05/2009 10:06:26 <Mike> But you wrote "It should be noted, though, that the proposed solution ..." - I do not understand what this text represents - this is my confusion.

11/05/2009 10:07:22 <Mike> I think we all agree to remove the sentence at the end of paragraph 4.

11/05/2009 10:08:10 <Troy> It's in the end of paragraph 4. I think it is indeed a typo. At least a similar idea seems to be conveyed by the sentence in the end of paragraph 5.

11/05/2009 10:08:26 <Tero> Do you think we should adjourn the meeting onto yet another session? It seems that we still have points to discuss.

11/05/2009 10:08:44 <Troy> It seems that way.

11/05/2009 10:08:58 <Erkki> To me, too!

11/05/2009 10:08:58 <Karl> I would prefer this.

11/05/2009 10:09:33 <Erkki> When could we have another chat?

11/05/2009 10:09:35 <Mike> Sorry Troy - I now see it is the same text - I was just unsure why you rewrote it as a standalone line 😊

11/05/2009 10:10:39 <Troy> Mike, OK. Sorry for the confusion.

11/05/2009 10:11:08 <Troy> Friday?

11/05/2009 10:11:20 <Erkki> OK.

11/05/2009 10:11:26 <Karl> OK

11/05/2009 10:11:29 <Tero> Same time?

11/05/2009 10:11:35 <Erkki> ...or Wednesday?

11/05/2009 10:11:41 <Troy> Sounds good. 11 AM.

11/05/2009 10:11:57 <Troy> Wednesday is OK too.

11/05/2009 10:12:01 <Karl> Any time this week is OK for me, except Wednesday.

11/05/2009 10:12:05 <Erkki> Friday at 10.00 Brussels time.

11/05/2009 10:12:26 <Troy> Sorry, 10AM. 11AM Finnish time. 9AM Mike time.

11/05/2009 10:12:40 * Karl2 quit (timeout)

11/05/2009 10:12:46 <Mike> OK for me

10:13:16 <Erkki> I'll send again two drafts. I'll see if I'll have the solution for the problem that we postponed.

11/05/2009 10:13:17 <Karl> Is it possible to get a version of our paper with all the changes incorporated which we already have agreed until the next chat?

11/05/2009 10:13:31 <Tero> See you on Friday, then!