

From: Alain Vachoux <alain.vachoux@epfl.ch>
To: Ernst Christen
Date: Wed, 12 Feb 2014 10:21:59 +0100
Subject: Re: Baseline LRM - Clauses 1 to 11

Hi Ernst,

I agree that the definition of conditional tags requires further work and must be properly done. Your understanding is the same as mine, except for the following points:

- I followed the convention Peter used in his conditional FM document, except that I decided to use olive strike-through instead of red strike-through for deleted P1076.1-2007 text for, I think, better readability (strike-through red is too much taking attention).
- I did not see any black strike-through text in Peter's document. I do not also clearly understand for what it would be needed. Deletions in P1076-2008 could be indicated as blue strike-through. I do not see what interspersed P1076.1 text would be.

About the new cases you mention:

additions in P1076-2008 that apply to P1076 only. This would apply, for example, to the first paragraphs of 1.1 and 1.2.

I think that we are going to consider the P1076-2008 text as stable during our work, so this issue may happen when considering building a common FM source for P1076 and P1076.1 for future revisions.

deletions in P1076.1-2007 text. Is this also black strike-through as suggested by the Abstract on p.2?

Deleted P1076.1-2007 text is in olive strike-through. Maybe it actually appears as black, so I should use another color.

corrections to P1076-2008 text, e.g. p.46 (footnotes 20, 21)

So far I only mention issues I found in P1076-2008 text in comments. I checked with the official P1076-2008 LRM that these are real issues. I guess these kinds of corrections could be indicated as underline blue for new P1076-2008 text and strike-through blue for deleted P1076-2008 text. I think this could also apply to the first new case you mention.

I agree that it will be better to use underline red for new P1076.1-2007 text. This is consistent with using underline blue for new P1076-2008 text.

The multiple condition tag issue is only existing in Clause 1, because the P1076.1-2007 LRM starts numbering clauses from 0, while the P1076-2008 and the future P1076.1-201X start from 1. In the attempt to be able to generate any LRM, I needed to associate two tags to 1.1 and 1.2. Actually, I would also need to do the same to the heading "1. Overview". Recently I started to use conditional tag expressions for using conditional tags, so I think it is possible to tag these headings in blue only and then using the condition expression "P1076.1-only or P0176-2008 or P1076.1-201X" for generating the new document. I'm still experimenting.

It is possible to convert an unstructured FM document to a structured one. If we do not have a DTD/EDD from the IEEE, a conversion table can be created by FM from the paragraph definitions in the unstructured document and then structure can be added. I still have to experiment further with this.

Best regards
Alain

On 11.02.2014 23:39, Ernst Christen wrote:

Hi Alain,

Maybe I misunderstand the condition tags and the related color scheme indicating the various versions and the related additions and deletions. Here is my understanding:

- black: text common to 1076 and 1076.1, present before 2008
- black strike-through: deletions in P1076-2008, including interspersed P1076.1 text
- blue: additions in P1076-2008
- green: P1076-only text
- brown: P1076.1-only text
- red: P1076.1-201x additions.

I don't know how you are planning to handle the following:

- additions in P1076-2008 that apply to P1076 only. This would apply, for example, to the first paragraphs of 1.1 and 1.2.
- deletions in P1076.1-2007 text. Is this also black strike-through as suggested by the Abstract on p.2?
- corrections to P1076-2008 text, e.g. p.46 (footnotes 20, 21)

Regarding the inserted space that is not visible as such, I was thinking of p.14 (footnote 18), but also the P1076 corrections. In these cases the spaces have been inserted, but this isn't obvious. This is why I propose that red should be underlined. You seem to say the same thing, but the document doesn't bear this.

The headings in 1.1 and 1.2 are interesting for two reasons. From a tool perspective, FrameMaker used to render text with multiple tags in magenta. Either you chose a different color for such situations, or the behavior changed in that it now merges the attributes somehow. From a text perspective I am wondering how the 1.1 and 1.2 headings are different from the 1 heading (and many others, e.g. the x.1 General headings in each clause), which is just in blue. Shouldn't for consistency the blue be sufficient here?

I do not know much about the structured FM stuff, I have never used it. The FM templates from IEEE are regular files, not structured. So why was Peter using structured text? I can think of only three reasons: he submitted the structured text to IEEE, he converted the text to standard FM before submitting, or he converted the text to MS Word, which is what the IEEE says they have. We should discuss this at tomorrow's meeting. BTW, do you know if it's possible to convert a regular FM file to a structured one?

Regards.
Ernst