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Executive Summary

The Department of J3WAO is considering moving from print to electronic documentation for its software products. The product will be a universally compatible PDF file. The company plans to use Adobe Acrobat to produce the PDF files. For the basic document creation software, this report investigates the feasibility of purchasing an industry-standard word processing package versus a desktop publishing package. The two products being considered are:

* Word, a word processing package already used companywide for other types of documentation
* FrameMaker, a desktop publishing package that the Technical Writing Department uses to create the company’s print manuals

Neither product requires that users be trained, and both are compatible with Adobe Acrobat. This report analyzes the two packages using Under the Bridge Software Systems’ established criteria:

* Ease of navigation: Writers can automatically create a clickable table of contents with PDF files produced from FrameMaker documents. Although Word produces an electronic document, it does not produce a clickable table of contents; the customer must page through the document.
* Compatibility with existing manuals: FrameMaker allows easy updating of print manuals to electronic manuals.
* Cost: The cost of either package is negligible since the company has licences for both. However, the only drawback of switching to Word is the additional cost in labour to customize the software.

This report recommends that the Department of J3WAO continue to use FrameMaker to produce its documents.

# Introduction

J3WAO’s customers are requesting electronic manuals instead of paper manuals for software products. Customers complain that paper manuals take too long to ship, that they cannot be easily reproduced, and that one copy is not sufficient. The Technical Writing Department uses FrameMaker, a desktop publishing system, to produce 250- to 500-page manuals for sixteen software products. The department has decided to use Adobe Acrobat to produce universally readable electronic manuals. The company, however, is investigating the feasibility of using Word, the company’s standard word processing package, as an alternative production system for its manuals. This report uses three criteria to compare FrameMaker documents with Word documents: ease of navigation for customers, compatibility with existing manuals, and cost. To evaluate these criteria, Patrice Kierstead, a Senior Writer, converted three FrameMaker manuals to Word and checked the conversion costs. Both the FrameMaker and the Word versions were then converted to PDF files, and five customers were invited to assess the results.

This report discusses the existing production system and gives a brief overview of FrameMaker and Word. It then analyzes customers’ assessment methods, discusses compatibility with existing manuals, and examines the conversion costs.

# Analysis

This report analyzes the Software Architecture Document (SAD) created for the ERA system.

## Section

Some text.

### Sub-Section

More text.

## Section

Some text.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Col1 | Col2 |
| Row 1 | 1, 1 | 1, 2 |
| Row 2 | 2, 1 | 2, 2 |

Table 1 – A Table

## Section

Some text.

Figure 1 – A Graph

### Sub-Section

Full of text and more analysis.

# Conclusions

The increase in the time necessary to move the data to and from the storage area is unacceptable for the application in question.

All three data-compression techniques tested save storage space.

The binary/alphabetic compression and bit compression techniques provide the best data security.

The binary compression technique provides the best compression and expansion times.

# Recommendations

Because of the increased data-processing time, this report recommends that the compression functions tested not be used for the CAM applications described. The company should explore all available data-compression techniques and their applications.

Development and testing of compression techniques for the CAM system and other GBG I/O systems should continue, with an emphasis on compression of all types of data.
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Appendix A – PD 2 Report Checklist

Your report must:

* [Y] include a 4-6 page body (i.e., analysis), not including any figures or tables that you include in the body. Reports with more than six pages of analysis will not be evaluated and will be given a failing grade. **Note that your report must include at least one table and at least one figure.** Place a table or figure in the body of your report if you discuss it in detail; place the table or figure in an appendix if your analysis refers to it only briefly. **Also, note that your analysis must be based on the feedback of others and on your performance in PD 2.**
* [Y] use a 12-point font
* [Y] be double-spaced and printed on only one side of the page
* [Y] be written in formal, standard English, with no contractions
* [Y] be spellchecked and proofread
* [Y] include pages numbered according to the conventions described in the Co-op Student Manual

Your report must conform to the [format](https://uwangel.uwaterloo.ca/uwangel/Permalink/Permalink.aspx?permalinkId=471f0281-04da-440e-aa85-8a68c19632c8&permalinkType=0) and conventions described in the [Co-op Student Manual](http://www.cecs.uwaterloo.ca/manual/work_reports/9_9.php), except that you do not have to bind your report or include a front cover. Your report will include the following pages and sections:

* [Y] Title page
* [Y] Letter of submittal (addressed to the PD 2 course instructor/s)
* [Y] Table of contents
* [Y] List of figures and tables, if appropriate (you must include at least one table and one figure in your report, either in the body or in appendices; figures or tables in an appendix do not require a list of figures and tables; figures or tables elsewhere in your report do require a list of tables and figures)
* [Y] Summary
* [Y] Introduction
* [Y] Body
* [Y] Conclusions (the section is "conclusions" as in "findings", not "conclusion")
* [Y] Recommendations ([specific, measurable, and attainable](https://uwangel.uwaterloo.ca/uwangel/Permalink/Permalink.aspx?permalinkId=7955f9bd-6725-4d3a-a5cf-3eeae6ae9b9f&permalinkType=0))
* [Y] References
* [Y] Appendices (you need at least two appendices, which include this checklist and a page for marker comments)

Appendix B – Marker’s Comments

Marker Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Critical reflection based on feedback:

Critical reflection based on PD 2:

Conclusions:

Recommendations:

Quality of writing:

-spelling

-grammar

-punctuation

-tone

Three Cs (clarity, conciseness, coherence)