



Dynamic Documents

Anastássios Perdicóúlis

Professor Auxiliar, ECT, UTAD (<http://www.tasso.utad.pt>)

Senior Researcher, CITTA, FEUP (<http://www.fe.up.pt/~tasso>)

Visiting Researcher, Oxford Institute for Sustainable Development, OBU, UK

Abstract

The documentation of *situations, processes, and plans* (Perdicóúlis, 2014c) can be screened for capability or ‘fitness for purpose’ (Perdicóúlis, 2016) in complementary viewpoints (Perdicóúlis, 2014b). Responses should be provided with scientific rigour (Perdicóúlis, 2012) in appropriate means (e.g. text, lists, tables, diagrams). Shortfalls should be addressed through review and revision or prototyping (Perdicóúlis, 2014d).

1 Argument — Completeness, coherence, and clarity

DIAGRAMS Set out to create an ‘element–relationship’ diagram for a system (e.g. city, state, enterprise); an ‘action–state’ diagram for a process (e.g. operation, project); a ‘concern–intent–action–outcome’ diagram for a plan (or strategy, or policy).

SOURCE In the original documentation (e.g. text, knowledge base), identify all referred elements and their relationships; check for sense in every relationship across the whole document.

DEFECTS Register all defects (e.g. ambiguity, errors) during the information processing; think of additional sources (e.g. authors, consulting team) capable of contributing to their resolution.

2 Method — Choice and compliance

IDENTIFICATION Are the chosen methods stated (e.g. SWOT, strategy maps)? Is their application presented explicitly or referred to in another publication?

AD HOC If the method has been created on purpose, are complete descriptions of the method and its application provided or referred to?

COMPLIANCE Is the referred method followed rigorously? Is it possible to tell? What are the indications?



3 Language — Adherence to the rules

IDENTIFICATION Is the chosen language (e.g. text-based, diagram-based) identified?

AD HOC If the language has been created on purpose, are complete descriptions of the rules and their application provided or referred to?

ADHERENCE Are the rules of the chosen language (e.g. about semantics and syntax) observed?

4 References — Meticulous correspondence

SOURCES Are references to external sources of information appropriately identified in a list?

IDENTIFICATION Are the sources of information identifiable (e.g. can you find each document)?

CITATIONS Are in-text citations used? Is there correspondence with the reference list?

BONA FIDE Can the sources be encountered? Are they trustworthy? How can you tell?

COMPARISONS Are internal references (e.g. standards, criteria, targets) used for comparisons or judgements? Are the references presented? Are the comparisons carried out with due rigour?

References

- Perdicoulis, A. (2016) Screening ‘dynamic’ documents for ambiguity. *Systems Planner*, **39**.
- Perdicoulis, A. (2014f) *Methodology*. Perdicoulis Publishing: Folio Division, Technical Collection.
- Perdicoulis, A. (2014e) *Language*. Perdicoulis Publishing: Folio Division, Technical Collection.
- Perdicoulis, A. (2014d) *Operations*. Perdicoulis Publishing: Folio Division, Technical Collection.
- Perdicoulis, A. (2014c) *Objects*. Perdicoulis Publishing: Folio Division, Technical Collection.
- Perdicoulis, A. (2014b) *Practicum*. Perdicoulis Publishing: Folio Division, Technical Collection.
- Perdicoulis, A. (2014a) *Assessment*. Perdicoulis Publishing: Folio Division, Technical Collection.
- Perdicoulis, A. (2012) Scientific writing. *oestros*, **5**

