

WG 14 N1759

WG14 CFP meeting minutes for the meeting of 2013/09/10

Attendees: Jim, Rajan, Mike, David (12:00 EST)

Old action items:

Jim: Changes to make to part 2:

Page 1: does not cover -> neither (Reworded differently)

Page 3: Remove lists unless there is an actual change in the identifiers

(Done)

Page 8: Look at the phrase "they have the" to see if other places may have the existing wording (Kept)

Page 19: Line 4: Font on stdio.h is wrong (Done)

Jim: Changes to make to all parts: Want macro name:

__STDC_WANT_IEC_60559_{BFP, DFP, TYPES, FUNCS, ...}__ (Done)

Jim: Send email about WANT macros (Done)

All: Review July 10th email regarding 5.2.4.2.2 reorg (Done)

Next meeting:

September 12th, 2013, 12:00 EST, 9:00 PDT

October 10th, 2013, 12:00 EST, 9:00 PDT

Same teleconference number.

New action items:

Part 1 ballot comments:

Jim: GB-JWT comments: Update the response column to the result of our discussion and make it our teleconference group suggested responses.

Jim: JWT comments: Submit them as "Editor's comments" with "Study group recommendations" with "Agree" in the last column.

Jim: Talk to John to see if we should post a draft with the changes we've agreed to so far.

Part 1 comments:

GB-JWT document:

GB5: We can make this a positive change. i.e. "Part 2 deals with DFP" instead of no change.

Jim: We can keep this as an alternative if "No change" is not accepted.

GB6: Seems good. If they have more objections, let them bring up more concrete issues why it is not good.

GB15: If there is a problem, we should not fix it here (let it be a C11 fix).

GB18: Agree to let WG14 look at it.

GB19: Mike: IEEE did discuss this issue and determined it (other character sets) was outside of scope for them. Note that this does not necessarily mean it is outside of the C11 scope.

C11 uses uppercase. We could defer to WG14 for this since it is referring to existing C11 text.

Mike: Only broken in the Turkish special case. It is a point issue so we should defer to WG14. i.e. This is not specific to this IEEE binding.

Jim: Making this change may make it incompatible with 60559 since it does not refer to uppercase versions.

It would be inconsistent though within the spirit.

The text is displayed in English so should the rules not be interpreted using english conversion rules?

GB20: This is a set of common changes requested to C11 and just happens to be brought up through this TS since it touches near the sections. We should defer these to WG14 and get guidance on how to handle them in the general sense.

GB24: Can help, but not really needed. We can add to make it clearer.

GB26: Doing this would require changes to this TS for any math function changes so it will be a large burden.

GB30: The "Missing the point" is for us, not the commenter. Perhaps we should say "Clarification is needed why a change is necessary."?

GB34: Wasn't this a discussion in WG14 about adding in all the INT macros here? Did we say no?

Jim: The discussion was to add all the width macros here and we just missed these ones.

GB39: Rajan: Should we allow values other than 1? Ex. -1 for indeterminate

*Is it OK for Jim to update the response column to the result of our discussion and make it our teleconference group suggested responses?

Agreed.

Comments from JWT:

*We discussed these already and will submit them as "Editor's comments" with "Study group recommendations" with "Agree" in the last column.

*Jim has a draft with the changes we've discussed so far. He will talk to John to see if we should post it to the WG14 documents page.

Part 2 (cfp2-20130910.pdf):

Looks good since we discussed the rounding mode in emails already.