

N080
RECEIVED
30 JAN 89

INFORMATION PROCESSING SYSTEMS

Doc No: X3J11/89-002

American National Standards Committee
Operating under the procedures of the
American National Standards Institute

Date: 25 Jan 89
Project: 381-D
Ref Doc:
Reply to: Thomas Plum

X3J11 Procedures

Two recent letters from Cornelia Boldyref to P J Plauger have drawn serious conclusions from incorrect information about our procedures. Since I was responsible for carrying out some aspects of those procedures, I would like to provide my understanding of the facts.

Document 87-103 (letter #L-146) was mailed to members in May 1987. It was not registered with X3, nor was it in any way identified as being other than an informal letter comment:

Feb 20 11:33 1987 ANSI.txt Page 1

Comments on the ANSI draft standard X3.159-198x issued for public review by the X3J11 committee for the programming language 'C' (dated 1-Oct-86).

Alan Mycroft, Computer Laboratory, Cambridge University, UK. 13-Feb-87.

This document was developed with the help of Cambridge University and Acorn Computers Ltd. This document collects comments from disparate sources and there may be duplications or misunderstandings of the draft. If any of the comments below are incorrect due to the draft having been

87-103

[L-146]

It was reviewed by subgroups at the September 1987 meeting. We are required to reply in detail to formal comments, and we did so. We did our best to reply to informal comments as well; I am very sorry that we were not able to answer them all. It took us three meetings during 1987 to answer all the responses to the First Public Comment. Alan Mycroft's subsequent comments (88-041, 88-111) were formally registered with X3. X3J11 replied to all comments in 88-148, mailed 18 Nov 88 (presumably satisfactorily, no objections received from Mycroft). We have done our best to be "timely", but these procedures take time.

With regard to the proposal for more readable trigraphs (87-224, 88-134), that proposal was never treated as an informal comment. Substantial time of the full committee was devoted to this proposal on two occasions. Both Brodie and Plauger informed X3J11 that international approvals were much more likely if we could adopt this proposal. Document 87-248 told X3J11 "WG14 strongly (but not unanimously) supports the alternate notation for braces and brackets, and the proposed keywords (or macros)." After much discussion both times, X3J11 rejected this proposal; see 88-148 pg 71 for our reasons.