

Doc No: SC22/WG21/N3121
 PL22.16/10-0111
 Date: 2010-08-20
 Project: JTC1.22.32
 Reply to: Stefanus Du Toit
 Intel Corporation
 stefanus.du.toit@intel.com

Minutes, WG21 Teleconference 2010-07-23

1. Opening and introductions

The meeting was called on 2010-07-23 at 15:00 UTC.

1.1 Roll call of participants

The following persons were in attendance:

Name	Representing
Herb Sutter	Convener
Steve Adamczyk	US
John Benito	US
Tom Plum	US
Howard Hinnant	US
Barry Hedquist	US HoD
Steve Clamage	US
PJ Plauger	US
Tana Plauger	US
Detlef Vollman	CH HoD
Clark Nelson	US
Ville Voutelainen	FI HoD
Pete Becker	US
Michael Wong	CA HoD
Alisdair Meredith	UK HoD
Stefanus Du Toit	US, CA

1.2 Adopt agenda

The agenda was adopted.

1.3 Approve minutes from previous meeting

The minutes were approved.

1.4 Review action items from previous meeting

The group noted that they needed to ensure Keld's website was up to date, with no POSIX liaison.

1.5 Review of project editor and liaison assignments

The assignments are unchanged from the last minutes.

Pete Becker is the main project editor. Backup is Lawrence Crawl.

Robert Klarer and Walter Brown were on decimal FP, but that is completing.

Some discussion that project editors should continue to be listed even for completed projects.

Action: Go back and restore previous project editors, e.g. performance and library TRs, to list. (Sutter)

2. Status, liaison and action item reports

2.1 Small group status reports

Adamczyk stated that CWG had nothing to report. He noted that they had had one ad-hoc conference call, moving issues to Tentatively Ready.

Hinnant noted that LWG has been quiet also. He mentioned that the LWG wiki for Rapperswil is up, with three issues in Ready status to be put on motions page in Rapperswil.

Meredith noted there were about a half dozen new issues coming in that might not be in NB comments, and asked whether these were in scope. Sutter explained that the same criteria as discussed last time will apply to these. He elaborated that editorial changes and bug fixes can be made after FCD, but anything that changes semantics, allowing new functionality that could not be done before, should not be considered.

2.2 Liaison reports

2.2.1 SC22 report

Sutter had nothing new to report since last conference. He noted that the next plenary will be in Ottawa in early September.

2.2.2 SC22/WG14 (C) report

Benito noted that WG14 would be having an editorial meeting with a small group of people, but that WG14 in full would not be meeting again until November.

3. New business

3.1 Review of priorities and target dates

Hedquist noted he expected to get national body comments from about four national bodies. He reported that eight national bodies responded to CD1 with comments, so he expected four more to do so.

Some discussion of outstanding national body comments that needed to be submitted.

Voutillanen asked when the group could expect the official comments from SC22. Sutter explained that this would happen by the beginning of the meeting.

Sutter explained that the priority in Rapperswil would be to discuss what our next steps are going to be. The group would like to issue an FDIS after the FCD, but this would depend on the NB comments.

Sutter noted that he would really like, if possible, by the end of the Rapperswil meeting to see if the group can decide whether to have two or three meetings next year. He noted that this would allow the group to give notice to potential hosts within reasonable time.

Meredith stated he had a major concern about the FDIS deadlines. He explained that if we spent three meetings doing work, and then send out an FDIS, that would cause a lot of churn. He went on to say that if the group was serious about moving directly to an FDIS, then they would need to make a concentrated effort to attack high-importance issues, so they could get through them all in two meetings. If the group needed three meetings, he noted he would prefer another FCD.

Vollman noted that we definitely needed to address all the NB comments. He stated that if we decide to change something based on those NB comments, there's the question of whether we can do an FDIS or an FCD.

Meredith gave an example of comments addressing noexcept usage in the library. If the group didn't accept these because they would require too many changes, an FDIS seemed appropriate to him. Otherwise, he felt an FCD seemed more appropriate given the amount of change that will result.

Voutillanen asked what it meant to have two meetings and publish, and whether that would mean publishing after Madrid.

Meredith stated that the group would be pushing to have the proposed FDIS out after Batavia.

Voutilanen noted he was under the impression that we would be targeting FDIS after Madrid.

Sutter stated that it depended on the NB comments, but that that was indeed the tentative plan.

Voutilanen asked whether, if the group published after Madrid, they would be able to vote anything into the FDIS during Madrid?

Sutter stated that the group could still spend the Madrid meeting working on the last set of comments. He explained that at the end of the meeting, the group would vote on approving the FDIS based on other voted-in changes made that week.

Sutter noted that Meredith's concerns were legitimate, but fell into two categories. The first question is what NB comments must be considered, and he stated that the group must absolutely consider all of them, but of course could respond to NB comments without making changes if an NB comment were out of scope. He stated that the group must disallow feature requests in particular regardless of whether they go to another FCD or FDIS. He explained that the decision of doing another FCD would mainly be based on whether the group thought the standard was ready for FDIS or not – e.g. if major issues come up.

Meredith asked whether adding “noexcept” to the library would be considered a new feature or a fix.

Sutter stated that he would answer more generally to avoid getting into technical details. He explained that, if there is a feature that is not consistently applied to the standard, and there is a conflict, then that must be fixed. If there is a difference in style between different portions of the standard, it is up to the group to make the judgment call as to whether this is really a new feature. If there is a comment that is aimed at adding optimizations, or providing new functionality, then that becomes questionable.

Plum opined that everyone may have a different bar if the group knew they were going from FCD to FDIS, vs. knowing that the group was going to do another FCD. He felt that the same decisions might be made differently depending upon those two options. He added that no-one had seen all the NB comments yet, which to him meant that the group needed to spend some amount of time in Rapperswil assessing the scheduling implications for the body of national comments received.

Sutter agreed that the group absolutely need to spend time at the end of the Rapperswil meeting discussing what the scheduling implications are. Personally, he was not of the opinion that the handling of NB comments should depend on this, because the group had already decided to move to an FCD, which closed the door on

new features and new functionality. Therefore, he did not see the decision between FCD and FDIS affecting the bar of what we should accept.

Hedquist agreed in principle with Sutter. However, he added that it depended on the exact NB comments received, because the group may have to make a decision as to whether to fix something or defer it. He added another issue, which was that the group may not be given the opportunity to have another FCD ballot. As he understood it, the rules for the new ballot process have a drop dead date, where everyone will be forced to adopt them regardless of where they are in the schedule.

Benito noted that this was not his understanding. He was under the impression that anyone already in progress would continue with the old rules.

Hedquist explained he had the impression that there was a deadline in 2012 that applies in this way.

Benito noted that the real issue was that SC22 may look at the sheer number of comments, and simply state that the group needed to do another FCD. However, he agreed that the bar is where it is now, regardless of whether the group is going to FDIS or FCD. He stated that the group needed to have a strong bar on “no new features, period”. If one has to play games as to whether something is a new feature or not, it’s probably a new feature.

Plum thought that Meredith’s example was a valid example of where this is ambiguous. He noted it was very possible that if the group was sure it would go straight to FDIS, Library would decide to not start work on that particular issue. He stated that he believed that the group needed to agree that the schedule plan was to do an FDIS after Madrid, without another FCD. However, he noted that the group may need a new category of disposition for comments such as “assuming we are doing an FDIS after Madrid, we are rejecting this issue, but if that assumption changes, we will revisit”. This would give the group a full week of work under straightforward scheduling assumptions, but allow them to re-visit if the schedule changes.

Sutter stated that he was worried about doing something like this for project management reasons. He felt that we wanted to shut down the process point and get to shipping. He opined that the group should be planning to do an FDIS unless

something came up, and if something did come up, that plan might change, but that should not then suddenly pull in additional work.

Voutilanen felt it would cause confusion to have such an NB comment response category. He stated that the group was supposed to either issue an FDIS or an FCD., and that he would find it very awkward to respond to an NB comment with an unclear answer.

Meredith suggested simply saying something along the lines of “will not handle now, but may in the future”.

Voutilanen and Hedquist agreed with this.

Plum withdrew his suggestion, and suggested instead that the answer to Meredith’s question is that the group had to orient everything it does to the announced schedule, having an FDIS after Madrid. If external changes are applied that impose a different schedule, he thought the group would need to re-orient, but otherwise they should be fully committed to the current schedule without prejudice.

Sutter stated that in politically charged standards environments, adding features was a major concern for delaying standards, and that the group should avoid this from happening.

Sutter stated it was worth taking the parallel to the first standard again, and noted that the group knew there were many things they wanted to avoid from the first time. He claimed that the group already had an FCD in much better shape than the first standard shipped, and that that standard was shipped with three meetings of FCD work.

Meredith wished to know if there was any mechanism that could be used to bring certain NB comments back in scope.

Hinnant noted that it was out of scope in this meeting to decide whether an issue was out of scope or not.

Sutter agreed that this should be handled in Rapperswil.

Plauger appreciated Howard's comment and would like to move this discussion offline.

Meredith asked how this could be discussed offline.

Sutter stated that the procedural answer was that the Library group needed to discuss this in Rapperswil.

3.2 Review of current mailing

It was noted that the current mailing only consisted of administrative papers.

Sutter asked for any discussion on those papers.

No discussion.

Sutter stated that he would be putting in the call-in information for the future meetings. He wondered if, in addition to having the future meetings in the minutes, whether these should be placed in a separate paper as well.

Hedquist asked where the SC22 document was. He noted he would find out if placing the information in the minutes sufficed, and if so, that he would be happy with it.

Sutter stated that he usually provided the notice in convener's report.

Benito stated that one was supposed to do an announcement. He explained that he used a preliminary agenda sent to Marissa when the next meeting is known. Marissa would then send it out as an SC22 document.

Action: Send SC22 secretariat meeting announcements in the future. (Sutter)

Sutter asked if it was sufficient then to have the meetings for WG21 purposes in the minutes only.

No objection.

Sutter stated he would leave it in the minutes for now.

3.3 Any other business

None.

4. Review

4.1 Review and approve resolutions and issues

None.

4.2 Review action items

Action: Go back and restore previous project editors, e.g. performance and library TRs, to list. (Sutter)

Action: Send SC22 secretariat meeting announcements in the future. (Sutter)

5. Closing process

5.1 Establish next agenda

Sutter asked if there were objections to reusing the current agenda.

No objections.

5.2 Future meetings

The future meetings are still planned to be held on:

- Rapperswil Aug 2-7
- Teleconference Sept 3, 2010
- Teleconference Oct 29, 2010
- Batavia Nov 8-13
- Teleconference Dec 10, 2010
- Teleconference March 11, 2011

- Madrid March 21-26
- Teleconference April 22, 2011

5.3 Future mailings

Sutter reviewed the future mailing deadlines:

- Aug 20, 2010 – post-Rapperswil
- Oct 15, 2010 – pre-Batavia
- Nov 26, 2010 – post-Batavia
- Feb 25, 2011 – pre-Madrid
- Apr 8, 2011 – post-Madrid

5.4 Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2010-7-23 16:05 UTC.