

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 22

Programming languages, their environments and system software interfaces

Secretariat: ANSI (United States)

Document type: Summary of Voting/Table of Replies

Title: Summary of Voting on ISO/IEC PDTS 18661-3, Information Technology -- Programming languages, their environments, and system software interfaces -- Floating-point extensions for C -- Part 3: Interchange and extended types

Status: For information. WG 14 is requested to review the comments, prepare a disposition of comments report and a recommendation on further progression of the work.

Date of document: 2014-09-02

Source: SC 22 Secretary

Expected action: INFO

Email of secretary: mpeacock@ansi.org

Committee URL: <http://isotc.iso.org/livelink/livelink/open/jtc1sc22>

Result of voting

Ballot Information

Ballot reference	ISO/IEC PDTS 18661-3
Ballot type	CD
Ballot title	Information Technology -- Programming languages, their environments, and system software interfaces -- Floating-point extensions for C -- Part 3: Interchange and extended types
Opening date	2014-05-15
Closing date	2014-08-15
Note	

Member responses:

Votes cast (18)	Austria (ASI) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Netherlands (NEN) Portugal (IPQ) Russian Federation (GOST R) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland (SNV) Ukraine (DTR) United Kingdom (BSI) United States (ANSI)
------------------------	---

Comments submitted (0)

Votes not cast (1) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST)

Questions:

Q.1	"Do you agree with approval of the CD text?"
Q.2	"If you approve the CD text with comments, would you please indicate which type ? (General, Technical or Editorial)"
Q.3	"If you disapprove the draft, would you please indicate if you accept to change your vote to Approval if the reasons and appropriate changes will be accepted?"

Votes by members	Q.1	Q.2	Q.3
------------------	-----	-----	-----

Austria (ASI)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Canada (SCC)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
China (SAC)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
Denmark (DS)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
Finland (SFS)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
France (AFNOR)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Germany (DIN)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Italy (UNI)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
Japan (JISC)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
Korea, Republic of (KATS)	Approval as presented	Technical	No
Netherlands (NEN)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
Portugal (IPQ)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Russian Federation (GOST R)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
Spain (AENOR)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Switzerland (SNV)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Ukraine (DTR)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
United Kingdom (BSI)	Approval with comments	All	Ignore
United States (ANSI)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore

Answers to Q.1: "Do you agree with approval of the CD text?"		
10 x	Approval as presented	Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Denmark (DS) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Netherlands (NEN) Russian Federation (GOST R) Ukraine (DTR) United States (ANSI)
1 x	Approval with comments	United Kingdom (BSI)
0 x	Disapproval of the draft	

7 x	Abstention	Austria (ASI) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) Portugal (IPQ) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland (SNV)
------------	-------------------	--

Answers to Q.2: "If you approve the CD text with comments, would you please indicate which type ? (General, Technical or Editorial)"

0 x	General	
1 x	Technical	Korea, Republic of (KATS)
0 x	Editorial	
1 x	All	United Kingdom (BSI)
16 x	Ignore	Austria (ASI) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Netherlands (NEN) Portugal (IPQ) Russian Federation (GOST R) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland (SNV) Ukraine (DTR) United States (ANSI)

Answers to Q.3: "If you disapprove the draft, would you please indicate if you accept to change your vote to Approval if the reasons and appropriate changes will be accepted?"

0 x	Yes	
1 x	No	Korea, Republic of (KATS)
17 x	Ignore	Austria (ASI) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Netherlands (NEN) Portugal (IPQ) Russian Federation (GOST R) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland (SNV) Ukraine (DTR)

**United Kingdom (BSI)
United States (ANSI)**

Comments from Voters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
United Kingdom (BSI)	<i>Comment File</i>	2014-07-31 19:29:39
CommentFiles/ISO_IEC PDTS 18661-3_BSI.doc		

Comments from Commenters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: May 2014	Document:	Project: PDTS 18661-3
----------------	-----------	-----------------------

MB/ NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
GB	Page 4 line 40 to page 5 line 3	5.3		ed	The lists of conditional definitions for pairs of types should include the FP_FAST_* identifiers (currently listed only for the decimal types, not the binary types).	Add the lists of FP_FAST_F* macros from pages 25-26 (not the FP_FAST_D* macros, which are already present) to the lists on pages 4 and 5.	
GB	Page 9 line 1	6		te	The table of decimal interchange format parameters uses the label “w, exponent field width in bits” for a row that in IEC 60559 is identified as “w+5, combination field width in bits”, so the numbers don't add up correctly.	Change “w, exponent field width in bits” to “w+5, combination field width in bits”.	
GB	Page 9 lines 11- 26 and page 10 lines 3- 10.	6		te	The sets of types and formats supported (where not required to be supported) should be explicitly implementation-defined so that the implementation is required to document what types and formats are supported.	At the end of the last sentence on page 9 line 17, insert “; the set of such types supported is implementation-defined”. At the end of the last sentence on line 20, insert “; the set of such types supported is implementation-defined”. At the end of the last sentence on line 25, instead “; the set of non-arithmetic interchange formats supported is implementation-defined”. On page 10, at end of line 10, insert “Which if any of the optional extended floating types are provided is implementation-defined.”.	
GB	Page 22 lines 35- 39	12		te	There are two references to “the type whose format is the evaluation format”, but multiple types may have the same format, so this definition does not distinguish between them. For compatibility with C11 it is desirable that values 0, 1 and 2 keep the same types as before rather than a different type with the same format (and that the definition in the TS should be sufficiently precise as to require this, rather than leaving other possibilities open).	Change, in both places, “whose format is the evaluation format for” to “whose range and precision are specified by 5.2.4.2.2a to be used for evaluating”.	
GB	Pages 38-39	12		te	The functions for conversions between encodings provide the convertFormat operation for non-arithmetic formats, as required by IEC 60559.	On page 39, at the end of clause 12, insert: 'In F.3, add “fMencFN, dMencdecN, dMencbindN and combinations of strfrom and strtO functions” to	

¹ **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

² **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: May 2014	Document:	Project: PDTS 18661-3
----------------	-----------	-----------------------

MB/ NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					However, this is not mentioned in the table in F.3 (added in TS 18661-1) that lists the binding for that operation. Furthermore, as conversions are required for all pairs of formats, including converting between binary and decimal formats, and conversions involving extended formats, in some cases the binding is actually a combination of strfrom / strfromenc and strt0 / strt0enc functions.	the table entry for convertFormat'.	
GB	Page 41 line 45 and page 42 line 13	13		ed	"dobule" is a typo.	Change "dobule" to "double" in both places.	
GB	Page 46 lines 39- 49	14		ed	The cabs and carg functions should have real return types, not complex.	Remove "complex" from the return type in each of the four places.	
GB	Page 46 lines 42-43	14		ed	For consistency with C11, the first argument of the cpow functions should be called x not z.	Change "z" to "x" on both lines.	

¹ **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

² **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial