Document Number:	WG21/N1059
	X3J16/97-0021
Date:	25 March 1997
Project:	Programming language C++
Reply-To:	Sean A. Corfield
	sean@ocsltd.com

X3J16 Meeting No. 23
WG21 Meeting No. 18
10-14 March 1997

Crowne Plaza Hotel
2 Somerset Plaza
Nashua, NH, USA

Secretary's note: these formal minutes are, by request, more concise than usual. A full record of committee discussions can be found in N1060 = 97-0022.

1. Opening activities

Clamage convened the meeting as chair at 9:25 EST on Monday, 10 March 1997. Miller was vice-chair, and Corfield was the secretary.

Digital (represented by Meyers) hosted the meeting.

1.1 Opening comments

Clamage welcomed everyone to our 8th year of deliberation.

1.2 Introductions

Corfield circulated an attendance list each day, which is attached as Appendix A of these minutes. Miller circulated a copy of the membership list (SD-2 = 96-0001) for members to make corrections.

1.3 Membership, voting rights, and procedures for the meeting

Clamage reminded the attendees that this is a co-located meeting of WG21 and X3J16. (The joint membership is denoted WG21+X3J16 in these minutes.)

Clamage explained the voting rules:

- In straw votes, all WG21 technical experts may vote, even those who haven't attended previous WG21 meetings. An X3J16 attendee may vote only if he/she is the voting representative of a member organisation that has met the X3's meeting attendance requirements. (The voting representative is the principal member, or an alternate if the principal is not present.) A WG21 technical expert who is also an X3J16 voting member still casts only one vote in a straw vote.
- In WG21 formal votes, only the head of each national delegation may vote.
- In X3J16 formal votes, only one representative from each X3J16 member organisation may vote, and only then if the organisation meets the attendance requirements.

1.4 Distribution of position papers, WG progress reports, WG work plans for the week, and other documents that were not distributed before the meeting

Work plans were discussed under 1.6.

1.5 Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting

Corfield said that he had not received any corrections for the minutes.

Motion by Lajoie/Miller:

> Move we approve N1041 = 96-0223 as the minutes of the previous meeting.

Motion passed X3J16: lots yes, 0 no, 0 abstain.

1.6 Agenda review and approval

Clamage explained the proposed changes to the agenda. Because we are in the middle of the ballot process, we are not voting on changes to the WP. Wednesday will therefore be WG sessions, Thursday will be General Session, Friday will be US TAG. This will be to decide the US position in the CD Ballot. [Note: in fact, the US TAG met on Thursday afternoon.]

Motion by Lajoie/Glassborow:

> Move we adopt the proposed agenda.

Motion passed X3J16: lots yes, 0 no, 0 abstain.

1.7 Report on the WG21 Sunday meeting

Plum summarised the WG21 meeting discussions. [Note: see N1058 = 97-0020 for details.]

1.8 Liaison reports

Benito gave the WG14 (C language) liaison report covering the Kona meeting in February.

No other liaisons were present.

1.9 New business requiring actions by the committee

There was no new business.

2. Working Paper for Draft Proposed Standard

Koenig said that there was no report because there had been no change since Kona.

3. Organise subgroups. Establish working procedures

There were three Core Language Working Groups chaired by Lajoie, Adamczyk and Gibbons, and one Library Working Group chaired by Dawes. Dawes said the Library WG would split into subgroups if necessary.

The committees recessed at 10:30am.

4. WG sessions (Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday)

The committees reconvened at 10:10am on Thursday morning.

5. General session

5.1 Library

Dawes presented the Library WG's review of the Public Comments and issues lists, N1064 = 97-0026. He said that 54 Public Comments were considered to be library related. The WG had decided to reject 12 of these, mostly because they were previously considered on the Library WG's issues list and have already been rejected:

- 9/Owen previously considered except #5 which is an issue,
- 10/Owen previously considered,
- 11/Owen previously considered,
- 18/Ward undesirable, [Note: see below under *5.6 Other Issues*.]
- 23/Parker (18-14 18.5.1) previously considered,
- 23/Parker (20-5 20.2.1) previously considered,
- 28/Robison/Nelson (21.6.1.3) previously considered,
- 29/Shaffer (#5) previously considered,
- 30/Kuehl (#10) duplicate of 30/#1,
- 30/Kuehl (#12) request for extension.

Stroustrup clarified that for issue 20-003, only part of N0849 = 96-0031 is being recommended. Dawes corrected the recommendation to "Relax language rules for returning void as described in...".

Corfield asked about issue 17-003. Nelson clarified that the actual US comment would not show a proposed resolution.

Clamage called a straw vote in favour of adopting N1064 = 97-0026 as modified as the library section of the US comments:

Straw vote passed X3J16: lots yes, 0 no, 0 abstain.

5.2 Core I

Lajoie presented her WG's review of Public Comments and other issues, N1066 = 97-0028. She said there were 16 Public Comments and the WG had rejected five of them.

- 23/Parker (3-20 3.5) request for explanation,
- 24/Moore (#b5) request for explanation,
- 29/Shaffer (#4) request for an extension,
- 29/Shaffer (#6) request for explanation,
- 34/Miller the WP is sufficiently clear.

After some discussion, Lajoie said she would remove the proposed resolution from CD2-core 1-11 and we may drop the issue altogether at London.

Clamage called a straw vote in favour of adding N1066 = 97-0028 as modified to the US comment list:

Straw vote passed X3J16: lots yes, 0 no, 0 abstain.

Lajoie next presented Miller's paper on clarifications to the conformance model, N1061 = 97-0023. Miller said that the part 1 resolution should go on the US comments and part 2 should go on as an issue without resolution.

Clamage called a straw vote in favour of adding N1061 = 97-0023 as modified to the US comments list:

Straw vote passed X3J16: 21 yes, 0 no, 5 abstain.

5.3 Core II

Adamczyk presented his WG's review N1063 = 97-0025. He said the two rejected Public Comments are listed in the paper:

- 29/Shaffer (#7) WG disagreed with the comment,
- 29/Shaffer (#8) WG disagreed with the comment.

After discussion of the proposed resolution to Public Comment 28, Adamczyk agreed to drop the proposed resolution from the comments.

Clamage called a straw vote in favour of adding N1063 = 97-0025 as modified to the US comments:

Straw vote X3J16: lots yes, 0 no, 0 abstain.

5.4 Core III

Gibbons presented N1065 = 97-0027. His WG rejected the following Public Comments:

- 2/DeRocco request for extension,
- 12/Girod (items b-f) the WG considered the comments to indicate a misunderstanding of the draft,
- 15/Horwat this was passed to the Library WG,
- 23/Parker (18-14 18.5.1) request for extension, [Note: this is also on the LWG rejected issues list.]
- 24/Moore (#b2) the draft is sufficiently clear already,
- 26/Clark (b) this was considered informative only.

Clamage called a straw vote in favour of adding N1065 = 97-0027 to the US comments:

Straw vote passed X3J16: lots yes, 0 no, 2 abstain.

5.5 C Compatibility

Plum presented Meyers' paper N1067 = 97-0029 (which will be allocated a public comment number).

Clamage called a straw vote in favour of adding the C compatibility issues from N1067 = 97-0029 to the US comments:

Straw vote passed X3J16: lots yes, 0 no, 3 abstain.

Plum said Public Comment 22 asked three questions about the preprocessor and the draft could be clarified. Since we are trying to retain effectively a copy of the C standard in clause 16, we should take no action and perhaps refer the comment back to WG14.

Clamage called a straw vote in favour of taking no action:

Straw vote X3J16: lots yes, 0 no, 0 abstain.

5.6 Other issues

Schwarz discussed Public Comment 18.

Clamage called a straw vote in favour of adding Public Comment 18 to the US comments:

Straw vote passed X3J16: lots yes, 0 no, 9 abstain.

6. Review of the meeting

Clamage said the committee had successfully reviewed the US Public Comments and WG issues lists to produce a recommended list of US comments for the Ballot response. The US TAG would meet later to decided what to do with this list of recommendations.

6.1 Formal motions

There were no formal motions.

Motion (to thank the host) by Schwarz et al:

> Move we thank Meyers and Digital for hosting the meeting.

Motion passed WG21+X3J16 by acclamation.

6.2 Review action items, decisions made, and documents approved

None.

6.3 Issues delayed until Friday

None.

7. Plans for the future

7.1 Next meeting

The next meeting will be 13-18 July in London, UK, hosted by Programming Research Ltd.

The WG will review NB comments and begin addressing the issues raised.

7.2 Mailings

Miller announced that Friday 28 March is the deadline for the post-meeting mailing. [Note: this is a Public Holiday in some countries so the effective deadline is Thursday 27 March.] The deadline for the next pre-meeting mailing is Tuesday 3 June.

7.3 Following meetings

The following meetings are planned:

- 9-14 November ‘97, somewhere near Murray Hill, NJ, ANSI/AT&T
- 8-13 March ‘98, Sophia Antipolis, France, AFNOR/Ilog
- 12-17 July ‘98, Rochester, NY, ANSI/Xerox
- 8-13 November ‘98, somewhere near Menlo Park, CA, ANSI/Sun Microsystems

Motion by Lajoie/Dawes:

> Move we adjourn.

Motion passed WG21+X3J16: lots yes, 0 no.

The committees adjourned at 16:00 on Thursday.

Appendix A - Attendance

Name	Affiliation	M	T	W	Th
Dawes, Beman	self	V	V	V	V
Gibbons, Bill	self	A	A	A	A
Myers, Nathan	self	A	A	A	A
O’Riordan, Martin	self	A	A	A	A
Koenig, Andrew	AT&T	V	V	V	V
Stroustrup, Bjarne	AT&T	A	A	A	A
Rousseau, Ben	Centerline Software		A	A	A
Charney, Reg	Charney & Day	V	V		V

Comeau, Greg	Comeau Computing			V	V
Swan, Randall	C-Team Inc	A	A	A	A
Stump, Mike	Cygnus Solutions	A	A	A	A
Meyers, Randy	DEC	V	V	V	V
Phillmore, Coleen	DEC		A		
Ward, Judy	DEC	A	A	A	A
Whitman, Sandra	DEC	A	A	A	A
Plauger, P.J.	Dinkumware Ltd	V		V	V
Adamczyk, Steve	Edison Design Group	V	V	V	V
Anderson, Mike	Edison Design Group	A	A	A	A
Spicer, John	Edison Design Group	A	A	A	A
Jonsson, Fredrik	Ericsson Austria AG	V	V	V	V
Vandevoorde, David	Hewlett-Packard	V	V	V	V
Klarer, Robert	IBM	A	A	A	A
Lajoie, Josee	IBM	V	V	V	V
Colvin, Greg	IMR	V	V	V	V
Nelson, Clark	Intel	V	V	V	V
Suto, Gyuszi	Intel	A	A	A	A
Schwarz, Jerry	Intrinsa	V	V	V	V
Andersson, Per	Ipso Object Software AB	V	V	V	V
Abrahams, David	Mark of the Unicorn	A	A	A	
Stanchfield, Scott	Metaware Inc	V	V	V	V
Hsieh, Chih-Hung	Microtec (Mentor Graphics)	A	A	A	A
Wellander, Patrick	Microtec (Mentor Graphics)	A	A	A	A
Kumoluyi, Akin	Motorola	A	A	A	A
Losoff, Alan	Nations Bank	V	V	V	V
Braatz, Brian	Oak Tree Software	A	A		A
Corfield, Sean A.	Object Consultancy Services Ltd	V	V	V	V
Benito, John	Perennial	V	V	V	V
Plum, Tom	Plum Hall	V		V	V
Southworth, Mark	Programming Research	V	V	V	V
Glassborow, Francis	Richfords	V	V	V	V
Sreekumar, Natarajan	Rogue Wave	A	A	A	A
Saks, Dan	Saks & Associates			V	V
Rouse, Jack	SAS Institute	V	V	V	V
Schilling, Jonathan	SCO	V	V	V	V
Austern, Matt	SGI	V	V	V	V
Unruh, Erwin	Siemens Nixdorf	V	V	V	V
Miller, William M.	Software Emancipation Tech	V	V	V	V
Ball, Michael	Sun Microsystems	V	V	V	V
Clamage, Steve	Sun Microsystems	A	A	A	A
Scian, Anthony	Sybase Waterloo	V	V	V	V
Welch, Jim	Sybase Waterloo	A	A	A	A
Rumsby, Steve	UK	A	A	A	A
Crowfoot, Norman	Xerox	V	V	V	V
Total Attending		**49**	**49**	**50**	**51**
Total Voting		**28**	**26**	**29**	**30**