WG21 Meeting No. 18
9 March 1997

Crowne Plaza Hotel
2 Somerset Parkway
Nashua, NH USA

1. Opening and introduction

Plum convened the meeting at 18:00 EST on Sunday, 9 March 1997.

Plum noted that the agenda for the meeting is administrative because the CD Ballot is in progress.

1.1 Welcome from host

Meyers, representing Digital, welcomed WG21 to Nashua.

1.2 Roll call of technical experts

The attendance list appears as Appendix A.

1.3 Selection of chair

Plum chaired the meeting.

1.4 Selection of meeting secretary

Corfield was the secretary.

1.5 Selection of language

Plum suggested that WG21 conduct the meeting in English. No one objected.

1.6 Adopt agenda

Plum presented the proposed agenda (document no. SD-0), which WG21 accepted without change.

1.7 Select drafting committee

Plum said that because we would not be drafting WP changes this week, there would be no drafting committee.

1.8 Approve minutes from previous meeting

Corfield submitted N1039 = 97-0221 for approval as the minutes of the previous meeting. WG21 accepted the minutes without change.

1.9 Review actions from previous meeting

The Project Editor had submitted the WP document for registration as the second Committee Draft.

1.10 Recognise documents

None.

2. Liaison reports

All liaison reports were deferred until the meeting with X3J16.

3. New business

The second Committee Draft Ballot closes on 9 June. Plum said Bill Rhinehuls hopes to have the result of the ballot available to WG21 before the July meeting.

Plum asked National Bodies to post an approximation of their ballot comments to the -admin reflector as soon as they are available to help WG21 better prepare for resolving any comments at the July meeting. He noted that the agenda for the New Jersey meeting in November would be similar to that of Kona and would focus on production of the revised WP for submission as DIS. Because the DIS ballot is now only a two-month process Plum said that the US TAG probably needs to establish its position on DIS at the New Jersey meeting. We may have the result of the DIS ballot in time for the France meeting in March 1998.

Unruh suggested that the France meeting would be a good time to begin the process of producing the first corrigendum. Unruh feels we should formulate a schedule for future work and that we should consider whether we actually need the July 1998 meeting. Plum explained the Defect Report process that produces Technical Corrigenda documents.

Plum then discussed N1044 – SC22's work programme review. He asked that interested parties email him relevant notes such as user base size and types of large projects being undertaken in C++.

Lajoie then asked for a sense of the committee regarding the criteria we should use for making changes to the WP in response to problems we find that have not been submitted through NB channels. Glassborow and Unruh felt that all changes must now come through NB channels. Corfield said it was important to focus firmly on NB comments only.

Plum suggested that National Bodies intending to submit just a list of obvious bugs in the draft should vote "yes with comments" and proposed that WG21 give an undertaking to address all of these comments. A straw vote indicated all NBs present supported this.

O'Riordan and Unruh said we should be wary of making purely editorial changes because of the potential instability that some NBs might perceive. Nelson said we should only make changes supported by written proposals and formal committee votes. Plum said the consensus of the committee is that we will not do uninvited editorial work, i.e., changes not invited by NB comments.

Glassborow asked Plum to clarify how many "no" votes we are allowed. Plum said two, although it might now be three since the number of member countries has increased. We already have France and the Netherlands based on past votes. Plum will try to find out more about those two countries' current positions and in particular invite representatives from France and Netherlands to the London meeting.

Discussion returned to how we should handle bugs. Plum said that we should get NB sponsors for all currently known bugs. The UK expressed the position that any bugs found after the ballot has finished should be deferred to a DR. Plum feels that if we have consensus at, say, the London meeting that a bug not listed should be fixed, then we should fix it.

In response to a request from the Netherlands, forwarded by Plum, that the minutes be more concise, Corfield said he would produce two versions of the X3J16 minutes for this meeting – the WG21 minutes are typically fairly concise already.

4. Review and approve resolutions and issues

None.

5. Closing

5.1 Selection of chair for next meeting

Plum volunteered to chair the next meeting.

5.2 Establish next agenda

The agenda of the London meeting will be to resolve CD Ballot comments.

5.3 Future meetings

The following meetings are scheduled:

- 13-18 July 97, London, England, BSI/Programming Research
- 9-14 November 97, New Jersey, NY, ANSI/AT&T
- 8-13 March 98, Sophia Antipolis, France, AFNOR/Ilog
- 12-17 July 98, Rochester, NY, ANSI/Xerox
- 8-13 November 98, Menlo Park, CA, ANSI/Sun Microsystems

5.4 Future mailings

X3 distributes WG21+X3J16 documents within the US. Plum Hall pays X3 to send documents to the national bodies.

5.5 Assign permanent document numbers

None.

5.6 Review action items

None.

5.7 Any other business

None.

5.8 Thanks to host

WG21 thanked Digital for hosting the meeting.

5.9 Recess

WG21 recessed at 20:45 on Sunday and reconvened in joint session with X3J16. See the corresponding WG21+X3J16 meeting minutes (N1059 = 97-0021).

Appendix A

Name	Affiliation; (*) = Head of Delegation
Lajoie, Joseé	Canada (*)
Plum, Tom	Convenor
Unruh, Erwin	Germany (*)
O'Riordan, Martin	Ireland (*)
Andersson, Per	Sweden (*)
Jonsson, Fredrik	Sweden
Corfield, Sean	UK / Secretary
Glassborow, Francis	UK
Rumsby, Steve	UK (*)
Southworth, Mark	UK
Benito, John	USA
Clamage, Steve	USA / X3J16 Chair
Koenig, Andrew	USA / Project Editor
Nelson, Clark	USA (*)
Stroustrup, Bjarne	USA