Minutes of WG14 meeting no 4 held in London
13-14 June 1988

090

SI
ampden House
ondon

.
ill Plauger introduced himself and his role.
ornelia Boldyreff volunteered to chair the meeting, Derek Jones
o take the minutes.

pologies were received from Mr Kelly (Canada).

he minutes of the previous meeting in Amsterdam were approved.
wo items were added to (3) on the agenda of the current meeting:

3.1 Report on existing open issues and responses.
3.2 Future progress.

hose present introduced themselves.

ornelia Boldyreff	BCS/Brunel University
erek Jones	Knowledge Software
.J. Plauger	Convenor/USA
ex Jaeschke	DEC professional- USA
eld Simonsen	University of Copenhagen
arsten Brundt Andersen	Unisys, Denmark
d Keizer	Vrije University, Amsterdam

ountries represented: UK, USA, Denmark, Netherlands and by Proxy France

P handed out copies of documents N046, N047, N048, N049 and N050.
B introduced a new comment document (N051).

.
iason report:

3J11 BP and RJ attended meeting. Meeting voted to draft out next public review. A substantial change was the removal of noalias plus approximately 10 smaller changes. All formal comments (plus informal) were responded to.
May draft has been produced.
Because of CBEMA delays the public review period has not yet started. A start date was not known.
The August meeting was cancelled and the next meeting was expect at the end of September (26?).
BP was thanked for airing the views of the various countries.
BP believes that a 'standard' will be produced by the end of the year.

usr/group Nobody representing this group was at this meeting.
/open Nobody representing this group was at this meeting.

osix. CB gave a report. Group met in March. They agreed to put forward draft ISO standard, as a DIS. Japanese comments were resolved.

ther activities. Some discussion regarding FIPS.

eport on ISO status.

eviewed reasons for NO votes (N046).

eviewed document N033. Unary plus changes made.

ultibyte characters, BP's proposals accepted by Japanese.
he Trigraph suppliment was put forward to ANSI by BP but there was
nsufficient support for the idea.

or ection to minutes of ANSI meeting:
he Trigraph suggestions were not personal comments from
omebody in Denmark; rather they were from the Danish C review
anel.

P expressed the opinion that he was in favour of the idea
ut that he was only a messenger from ISO to ANSI. Denmark made
he point that they would vote NO on an ISO ballot without the
upport for Trigraphs.

K would not support the Trigraph change.

S, KBA submitted document N052.

omments made by the UK that BP believes the May draft addresses:
okenisation, semantics of conditional inclusion, truncation of
iles, equality operators, lines.

uture ISO progress.

S, KBA beleive that Trigraphs have a higher priority than
he ISO and ANSI C standards being the same.

K would vote against an ISO standard that was different from the
NSI standard.

P as per EK.

B and DJ do not preclude the ISO and ANSI standard being different.

reak for lunch.

.
eview of X3J11 Draft Standard (N413 May 1988).

P stated that "Any comment document submitted by any member of the
SO working group would be considered at the next ANSI meeting".

J queried various changes to the Draft Standard. DJ to prepare
comment document.

oint holding up a YES vote on ISO C Standard.

S, KBA - Trigraphs.
B, DJ - Tighter language definition.
K, BP, France, Canada - No further changes.

K to prepare a letter to Joe Cote. Cover letter saying that
O votes will change to YES if ANSI satisfactorily
ddresses the comments raised by those countries voting NO. Also
hat no further substantial changes are made to the May draft.

ovember? Seattle in January?

eeting adjourned for the day.

uesday 14 June.

P suggested a possible solution to the Danish requirements
sing multi-byte characters. KS, KBA to investigate.

n update of the Trigraph proposal (N053) was received from KS, KBA.

ext ANSI meeting after September likely to be March 89.

t was pointed out the US is a signatory to an accord that national
ar auge support should be provided.

K would like it noted that he does not require the changes
equested in N053.

J reported that he had gone through ANSI's responses to the UK's
omments and found that the committes comments addressed most
f the points raised. DJ noted that the work involved in
roducing these comments must have been substantial.

here was a suggestion that if there were any substantial
hanges to the May draft that member countries put out the
atest draft for public comment.

B, DJ agreed that the UK's comments were likely to be
ditorial and aimed at tightening up the langauge definition.

B made the point that many of the comments received by ANSI had
sked for more substantial definitions.

he e was extensive discussion on what should be done if
NSI did/did not accept the Danish/UK proposals.

ow might the ISO voting go?

NSI satisfactorily addresses comments from the UK and Denmark.
oncensus for submitting Draft as a DIS.

f the UK comments satisfactorily addressed, those in favour
f resubmitting as a DP: US, UK, Netherlands. Denmark in favour
f submitting a modified DP.

o votes (in the concensus sense) were cast for doing nothing.

here was concensus for resubmitting a DP.

ctions:

P to get September draft quickly to UK/Denmark.

K require the response to comments more rapidly than the
ctual Draft Standard.

ext WG14 meeting to be in conjunction with X3J11 meeting after
he one in September (in US).

eeting was brought to a close.