The philosophy that the P2.2 server should be "central" is
admirable. No facility should regard itself as central, or it
will have big problems fitting in with other facilities which do the same.
That which is "central" is very subjective.

* There should be provision for a non-interactive fast query. This
probably just means turning off any paging of the output, for
example, and formatting the result with ( SOME, prefably ) tags for
parsing.

MINGLEY:

2.7.7 "...able to answer 80% of questions correctly about a word
processing package with which they are familiar ...".
This doesn't mean anything - what questions? Can the user make up
his/ her own questions? There are questions ans questions. If there is no
way to be precise, don't pretend. I would just remove the
sentence.

3.2.1.20 "User manuals"

For CONCISE itself, do you mean, or for anything?

* 3.2 para 1: ". . .includes pointers..."
If these pointers are to remote electronic data, would it not be wise
to put them either in the database, or in a form in the text in which
they can be extracted, using a consistent representation?

3.2 para 4: "cross links will be added to the structure"
This is good ( quite hypertexty). Is there an acyclic constraint on
the web? I hope not. Can one distinguish "cross-links" from "links"?

3.2.4.1 redundancy limited to 30%.
Why this limit? The quality of the information includes its
completeness. My copy of the Geneva phone book is 99.99% redundant,
but I would hate unused entries to be deleted. Explain to me why the
limit is needed.

* 3.2.7.9 "the expiry date of the information"
Another useful concept is the "shelf life" of any copy one might
take. That is, how often I ought to go back and see whether the
information has changed. For an MPC it's 4 years, for a phone book it's
24hrs.

* 3.2.7.12 "The type of data"
I notice that different formats files of the same document (xxx.txt,
xxx.ps) must be treaded as different nodes. I suppose some convention
for making links to the source, and then having all derived files
below that, for example, will be needed. I point out that having a
set of ( data type, filename ) for different representations of the
same thing is an alternative.

3.2.7.2 "a name"
One can distinguish between an identifier, a menu item, and a title.

An identifier ( like a filename ) would form part of a path to the
document. If you quote the name of a document, then you give its
path. Do not underestimate the amount of access which will be made by
people quoting a full path name which they have on the back of an
envelope. Unless you rule out this method and only allow access by
quoting the unique numeric ID, then it is wise for the Identifier to be
short and have no spaces (like a nice filename).

On a menu, by contrast, a little phrase is better. Ideally it makes
sense in the CONTEXT of the MENU. The menu item can be long and
contain spaces.

It is also useful to have a title. This is a human-readable string
which describes the document IN A VERY WIDE CONTEXT. You would
use this as a running head if you were printing the document. You
would put it on the title bar of a window if you were displaying the
document.

For example, the minutes of our last meeting could have

unique id 1734572
identifier men310415
RARE/WG3/menu item Minutes of the meeting of April 15th
Title Minutes of the 15-Apr-91 meeting of RARE WG3

The menu item can default to the title, and the title can default to
the identifier, and that can even default to the unique id i-e but
it's not so user friendly.

( You have probably discussed this at length already! ) Which do you
mean here?

3.3.10
I agree with the many who have said that the times quoted are too
long. In my experience, most people are content with 3 sec mean, 10
sec max retrieval time ( and that includes any transmission delays ).
They are not happy with longer. I would guess one should aim for a
search to be mean 0.3, max 3s without transmission. An indexed search
ought to be able to achieve this. Without any mention of the size of
the database, of course, none of the figures mean a lot. An
irritatingly slow system won't do anything for the reputation of
anybody, or the networks. ( Yes, I know the larger figures are
contractual requirements. Perhaps the document should also contain
some more realistic figures so that one doesn't forget to aim higher )

3.4 Interactive access
I assume that full-screen mode will not be implemented, no cursor
control facilities on a terminal will be used. Is this correct?

4.3, last para: for "parts" read "parents".

4.3.15: Rights to make links
As I understand it, a link is non-directional, from one node to
another. It does not appear in or affect the destination node. In
this case I propose that anyone who has the rights to alter a node
should have the right to make a link FROM it. ( By analogy, anyone who
writes a paper is allowed to make a reference to anyone else's
published paper without asking their permission. )

4.4.3.2 "Not all 1p functions will be available through RPC's or
gateways" Excuse my ignorance, but why not? Apart from multiple body parts
It is also very useful to have a list of failed keyword searches.

People are often loth to send a complaint message to the help desk,
and may just leave concluding that the information is not there.

Given a list of failed searches, one can improve the wording of
nodes, and keep track of the things which users would like but
haven't got.

Now is the time for someone to make an estimate. If 300MB should
cover it, say so. It affects one's perception of the sort of data to
be stored.

In a trial, one tries something.

For easy portability, a X or Berkeley C option is useful.

This tends to mean mainly putting in alternative function headings,

As we are obviously (5.8parl etc) talking about a

Sun, but I have just ported www to a Sun which did not have an ANSI

C compiler. To port ANSI-C tends to imply a port of GNU gcc...

The time required to port...Of the operating system...

By which you mean sun-os, Unix V, or unix? Say.

I feel it is a pity not to specify portability to BSD when the
product is largely aimed at the academic community.

See comment on 2.7.3.

Reference to level-7 contract. The others seem to have been
removed.

A handy list of those numbered deliverables referred to would be nice
in the references.