

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 WG2-EM0112-021

Date: 2002-02-07

REPLACES: -

Guide to using the SCC Forum Email Notifications

Author: Ray Gates Date: February 7, 2002-02-07

This is an attempt to explain the use of the SiteScape forum email notification,
and how to find the context for a particular entry.



Step 1 – Check your Display Options

How the forum appears to you is controlled by your personal display option settings. Document WG2-EM0112-011, which was posted back in December, describes the Editing meeting forum, and section 5.1 of that document describes how to set your display options.

The next page in this document shows the display options that were in effect when the screen shots in this document were taken.

Set Your Personal Display Options

Display Options

Set number of entries listed per page:	100 ▼
Show replies:	All ▼
Show contents of each entry:	No ▼
Select a display style:	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"><div style="text-align: center;"> <input checked="" type="radio"/> No Frames</div><div style="text-align: center;"> <input type="radio"/> Frames</div></div>

OK

Cancel

Help

Step 2 – Following the URL from an email notification











When you get an email notification, the first URL in it will take you to a list of all new entries on the forum. The screen shot on the next page shows one such list. (Other URLs in the email notification will take you straight to individual entries.)

Items found in [FCD 11179-3 Continuation Editing Meeting](#)

Limited to items created since 2002-02-06 15:00.

[FCD 11179-3 Continuation Editing Meeting](#)

[Documents for FCD 11179-3 Editing Meeting](#)

-  [WG2-EM0112-019R5 Clause 4 as of 2002-01-31](#) (8) Ray Gates 2002-02-06 23:02
 -  [3.1.1.2. Email from Frank Farance on internationalized strings](#) Ray Gates 2002-02-06 20:02
 -  [3.1.1.3. Other possibilities - bit array or byte array](#) Ray Gates 2002-02-06 23:02
 -  [WG2-EM0112-018R2 Clause 3 Definitions as of 2002-01-31](#) (6) Ray Gates 2002-02-06 21:13
 -  [1.1.1.1.1. Comments on restricting the relationship to administered items of the same type](#) Ray Gates 2002-02-06 20:56
 -  [1.1.1.1.2. Relationships versus relationship types](#) Ray Gates 2002-02-06 21:13
 -  [WG2-EM0112-019R4 Revised Clause 4 as of 2002-01-22](#) (29) Ray Gates 2002-02-06 22:20
 -  [1.1.2.1.1.1.1. Definition of encapsulation from Grady Booch](#) Ray Gates 2002-02-06 21:55
 -  [1.1.2.1.1.1.2. Definition of encapsulation from James Rumbaugh et al](#) Ray Gates 2002-02-06 22:12
 -  [1.1.2.1.1.1.3. Perhaps the term "encapsulated class" was a bad idea.](#) Ray Gates 2002-02-06 22:20
-

Close

Help

Step 3 – Displaying a new entry with outline context

Clicking on the first new entry (entry number 3.1.1.2) will display the next screen. The new entry (3.1.1.2) is shown in full, and above it are the titles of the entries that provide the context hierarchy outline.

In this example these are:

- At the top level, the Forum itself - FCD 11179-3 Continuation Editing Meeting
- Next the Folder within the Forum – Documents for the FCD 11179-3 Editing Meeting
(There may be more than one folder.)
- The root Document (in this case), or Discussion Topic – WG2-EM0112-019R5 Clause 4 as of 2002-01-31
- The response hierarchy between the root document and the new entry
 - 3. Possible problem with "value_item"
 - 3.1 Possible problem with "value item"
 - 3.1.1 A possible solution



Commission Electrotechnique Internationale
International Electrotechnical Commission
Международная Электротехническая Комиссия



ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 Metadata

[Ray Gates](#)

[Tracker](#) | [Web files](#) | [Site map](#) | [Search all](#) | [Help](#) | [Logout](#)

[Workspace](#) | [My summary](#) | [Discussions](#) | [Calendars](#) | [Chat rooms](#) | [Messaging](#)

[Add](#) | [Modify/delete](#) | [Tools](#) | [Next Unseen](#) | [List Unseen](#) | [Search forum](#) | [Previous Reply](#) | [Next Reply](#)

[FCD 11179-3 Continuation Editing Meeting](#)

[Documents for FCD 11179-3 Editing Meeting](#)

[WG2-EM0112-019R5 Clause 4 as of 2002-01-31](#)

[3. Possible problem with "value item"](#)

[3.1. Possible problem with "value item"](#)

[3.1.1. A possible solution](#)

[3.1.1.2. Email from Frank Farance on internationalized strings](#)

[Reply](#)

[Ray Gates](#) Posted on 2002-02-06 20:02

[Ray Gates](#)

Frank sent the following comment by email:

"This is the wrong understanding of internationalized strings. Don't use the term "Unicode"."

I have asked him to specify how this should be phrased. However, I take his point that interpreting a 10646/Unicode character value in some other way is not what they are intended for (but that doesn't mean it wouldn't work ;) .)

[\[View top of page\]](#)

Step 4 – Displaying more context for the new entry

To see the text of the preceding entries, click on one of the higher level entries.

Clicking on the first response link after the document shows the full response hierarchy but still does not show the original document. See next two pages.

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 Metadata

[Ray Gates](#)

[Tracker](#) | [Web files](#) | [Site map](#) | [Search all](#) | [Help](#) | [Logout](#)

[Workspace](#) | [My summary](#) | [Discussions](#) | [Calendars](#) | [Chat rooms](#) | [Messaging](#)

[Add](#) | [Modify/delete](#) | [Tools](#) | [Next Unseen](#) | [List Unseen](#) | [Search forum](#) | [Previous Reply](#) | [Next Reply](#)

[FCD 11179-3 Continuation Editing Meeting](#)

[Documents for FCD 11179-3 Editing Meeting](#)

[WG2-EM0112-019R5 Clause 4 as of 2002-01-31](#)

[3. Possible problem with "value_item"](#)

[Reply](#)

[Ray Gates](#) Posted on 2002-02-02 22:55
Ray Gates

The datatype associated with "value_item" in "Value" is "String". Should not the datatype match the datatype of the Value Domain.

If this is agreed in principle, how should it be specified?
Perhaps use "Variant"?

[Replies:](#)

[_3.1. Possible problem with "value_item"](#)

[Dan Gillman](#)

2002-02-04 11:21

[Reply](#)

Intersting point. I agree in principle, but I have no idea how to sepcify such a thing. Do OO or Object-Relational DBMSs allow this?

Traditionally, the data type of a field is fixed in a database.

[_3.1.1. A possible solution](#)

[Ray Gates](#)

2002-02-05 21:55

[Reply](#)

If the value is specified using a Unicode string rather than a simple character string, then it can effectively hold any value. This value then just needs to be interpreted in a manner consistent with the datatype specified on the value domain.

[_3.1.1.1. Another possible solution](#)

[Dan Gillman](#)

2002-02-06 12:56

[Reply](#)

We need to flag this as a special case in the model. I propose that instead of telling people they need to use unicode, they should provide a precise description that follows some agreed upon form. So, unicode is a possibility, and there may be others. This is similar to the agreement we obtained for the data type description.

Others will have to weigh in on this, though. We will be asking a lot of the provider to specify values at this level.

[_3.1.1.2. Email from Frank Farance on internationalized strings](#) [Ray Gates](#)

2002-02-06 20:02

[Reply](#)

Frank sent the following comment by email:

"This is the wrong understanding of internationalized strings. Don't use the term "Unicode"."

I have asked him to specify how this should be phrased. However, I take his point that interpreting a 10646/Unicode character value in some other way is not what they are intended for (but that doesn't mean it wouldn't work ;).)

[_3.1.1.3. Other possibilities - bit array or byte array](#)

[Ray Gates](#)

2002-02-06 23:02

[Reply](#)

Given Frank's point about the misuse of Internationalized strings, alternative datatypes might be "bit array"

or "byte array".

I have found the following definition for "byte array".

"A ByteArray represents an array of bytes. It also provides static methods for converting arrays of bytes to and from primitive data, including shorts, ints, longs, Strings, and Objects."

This should provide the capability we need to represent any datatype in a generic way.

The only problem I see with a byte array is that it cannot support a bit string that is not a multiple of 8 bits. A "bit array" would solve this problem, but might not be generally supported.

Unfortunately, 11404 does not define either term, (though it does use "bit array" once). It does however support the concepts, since it supports arrays of any element type. So we could define "bit array" as "an array of bits, each of which has a boolean value".

Comments?

[\[View top of page\]](#)

Step 5 – Displaying full context for the new entry

Clicking on the link to the root document shows the document with ALL its responses.
See next two pages.

Note that the response entries are numbered, but in this example the root entries are not because of the settings of the folder.



Commission Electrotechnique Internationale
International Electrotechnical Commission
Международная Электротехническая Комиссия



ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 Metadata

[Ray Gates](#)

[Tracker](#) | [Web files](#) | [Site map](#) | [Search all](#) | [Help](#) | [Logout](#)

[Workspace](#) | [My summary](#) | [Discussions](#) | [Calendars](#) | [Chat rooms](#) | [Messaging](#)

[Add](#) | [Modify/delete](#) | [Tools](#) | [Next Unseen](#) | [List Unseen](#) | [Search forum](#) | [Previous Topic](#) | [Next Topic](#)

[FCD 11179-3 Continuation Editing Meeting](#)

[Documents for FCD 11179-3 Editing Meeting](#)

WG2-EM0112-019R5 Clause 4 as of 2002-01-31

[Reply](#)

[WG2-EM0112-019R5-Revision-to-Clause-4-2002-01-31.doc](#)

File length: 638464 bytes

[Ray Gates](#) Posted on 2002-02-01 00:20
Ray Gates

Total Accesses: 23 [View names of users who have accessed this entry...](#)

The latest draft of clause 4 is attached.

Replies:

[1. Problems with Figure 8 and 10](#)

[Ray Gates](#)

2002-02-01 11:04

[Reply](#)

I am aware that Figure 8 still does not print cleanly. I will fix it up in the next draft. (Word has really been messing up these figures.)

Figure 10 is missing the Non-enumerated conceptual domain, and the datatype of "data element precision" is incorrect because I had added this manually to the diagram instead of taking it from the model. These problems will be fixed.

[2. Problem with Figure 4](#)

[Ray Gates](#)

2002-02-02 20:10

[Reply](#)

The datatype of "item_registration_authority_identifier" has been truncated. It is missing "_Identifier". I will fix this in the next draft.

[3. Possible problem with "value_item"](#)

[Ray Gates](#)

2002-02-02 22:55

[Reply](#)

The datatype associated with "value_item" in "Value" is "String". Should not the datatype match the datatype of the Value Domain.

If this is agreed in principle, how should it be specified?
Perhaps use "Variant"?

[3.1. Possible problem with "value_item"](#)

[Dan Gillman](#)

2002-02-04 11:21

[Reply](#)

Interesting point. I agree in principle, but I have no idea how to specify such a thing. Do OO or Object-Relational DBMSs allow this?

Traditionally, the data type of a field is fixed in a database.

[3.1.1. A possible solution](#)

[Ray Gates](#)

2002-02-05 21:55

[Reply](#)

If the value is specified using a Unicode string rather than a simple character string, then it can effectively hold any value. This value then just needs to be interpreted in a manner consistent with the datatype specified on the value domain.

[3.1.1.1. Another possible solution](#)

[Dan Gillman](#)

2002-02-06 12:56

[Reply](#)

We need to flag this as a special case in the model. I propose that instead of telling people they need to use

unicode, they should provide a precise description that follows some agreed upon form. So, unicode is a possibility, and there may be others. This is similar to the agreement we obtained for the data type description.

Others will have to weigh in on this, though. We will be asking a lot of the provider to specify values at this level.

[3.1.1.2. Email from Frank Farance on internationalized strings](#) [Ray Gates](#)

2002-02-06 20:02

[Reply](#)

Frank sent the following comment by email:

"This is the wrong understanding of internationalized strings. Don't use the term "Unicode"."

I have asked him to specify how this should be phrased. However, I take his point that interpreting a 10646/Unicode character value in some other way is not what they are intended for (but that doesn't mean it wouldn't work ;) .)

[3.1.1.3. Other possibilities - bit array or byte array](#)

[Ray Gates](#)

2002-02-06 23:02

[Reply](#)

Given Frank's point about the misuse of Internationalized strings, alternative datatypes might be "bit array" or "byte array".

I have found the following definition for "byte array".

"A ByteArray represents an array of bytes. It also provides static methods for converting arrays of bytes to and from primitive data, including shorts, ints, longs, Strings, and Objects."

This should provide the capability we need to represent any datatype in a generic way.

The only problem I see with a byte array is that it cannot support a bit string that is not a multiple of 8 bits. A "bit array" would solve this problem, but might not be generally supported.

Unfortunately, 11404 does not define either term, (though it does use "bit array" once). It does however support the concepts, since it supports arrays of any element type. So we could define "bit array" as "an array of bits, each of which has a boolean value".

Comments?

[\[View top of page\]](#)