De Boelelaan 1081
1081 HV Amsterdam
Telefoon 020-548 8080
email: postbox@cs.vu.nl

dr. P.J. Plaugher
Whitesmith Ltd.
59 Power RD
Westford MA 01886
USA

uw kenmerk	uw brief van	ons kenmerk	datum 9 februari 1989	bijlage(n)

onderwerp

Dear Bill,

I am writing this letter to you because I have not seen any activity of WG14 lately. I expected that the september version of ANSI C would be published for ISO balloting by now, either as DP or as DIS. Even if the Standard would arrive for balloting today, we can not expect any results from that ballot before the end of april. In our last conversation by telephone you mentioned the start of March as the date for the next meeting of X3J11 and thus of WG14. Personally I see no reason for WG14 to meet in march, it would be better to wait for the result of the ballot. The ballot result will then show whether we can do our further work by correspondence or need to meet.

I also expected to see the draft minutes of the last WG14 meeting published as an ISO document. I especially refer to these minutes because the controversy in WG14 about the Danish proposal would than be clear to the international ISO community. The minutes sent to WG14 would need only minor editing before they can be published as SC22 documents.

I would like to call your attention to the recommendations of the last SC22 advisory group in Tokyo, as formulated in SC22/N576. Several of these have effect on our Working Group.

Recommendations 1, 3 and 4 are requests to the convenors of all Working Groups. Recommendation 9 asks for careful synchronization of JTC1 and ANSI activities. Our Working Group is not affected by this request because ANSI already fixed the C standard and no further public review is expected in the US. Recommendation 17 reflects directly on WG14:

> SC22AG requests the Secretariat to communicate its concern to WG14 and
> the US member body to ensure that the utmost is done to ensure
> synchronization of activities and the production of a common Standard
> for C, urging that every effort be made to accommodate WG14 comments.

My impression is that this recommendation is carefully worded to put pressure on WG14 without forcing any issue.

Recommendation 21 asks WG14 to form an opinion on the desirability of a Standard for C++. It is noteworthy that JTC1 decided not to wait for a reply from WG14, before sending out a consultative letter ballot asking for opinions on this issue. I am not a fervent supporter of standardization of C++. The language still seems to be under development by the original author. A standardization committee would probably like to make new and/or different changes. In other words, the language does not seem to be ripe for standardization although there is a growing user community.

The wish to keep standard C a subset of the C++ standard to be, has been expressed by several people. The main problem with this wish is that C++ would have to revert to features considered anachronisms in C++, but explicitly retained in standard C. The old-fashioned method of declaring functions is a good example.

I would like to hear from you soon, especially on the issue of a meeting because I have to start making formal requests for travel expenses.

Sincerely yours,

Ed Keizer