

---

Subject: Re: Documentation time

Posted by [Michael Galloy](#) on Wed, 07 Jan 2009 14:32:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Jan 6, 7:20 pm, Robbie <ret...@iinet.net.au> wrote:

- > I'm in the process of documenting a fairly large IDL code base (47K
- > lines of code in 272 files).
- > The code base might seem excessive, but I assure you it is nowhere
- > near as large as iTools (152K in 508 files).
- >
- > I've started migrating to IDLdoc 3.0 and the rst style of
- > documentation. I'm using the IDL workbench and the code is managed
- > using CVS. I have only documented a small portion of the existing code
- > using IDLdoc 2.0
- >
- > Is there a way to automatically migrate from the old IDLdoc 2.0 format
- > to the new rst format?

No, but you can do the migration piecemeal. Don't change your IDLDOC command and put

```
docformat = 'rst'
```

as the first line of the rst format files. Then old files will use the IDLdoc style and new files will use the rst format. Migrate over files as necessary by adding the docformat line.

- > Does it make sense to CVS commit the documentation, or should I add it
- > to .cvsignore or just keep it out of the IDL\_PATH to be sure?

I don't like to add generated file to my source control. I would put it in .cvsignore and keep it out of the IDL\_PATH.

- > What value should I put on API documentation? I think that I shouldn't
- > spend more than 50% of my time on API documentation as opposed to
- > other more helpful methods of documentation.
- >
- > Around 30-50% of my code is redundant code (i.e. deprecated). Should I
- > remove them completely from the CVS tree? Wouldn't it just be
- > confusing to keep it in the source tree?
- > I'm keen to take a snapshot now and start to manage the non-deprecated
- > code as a completely new project.

I would remove it. That's why we have source control.

Mike

--

[www.michaelgalloy.com](http://www.michaelgalloy.com)

