

Doc No: SC22/WG21/N1333  
J16/00-0047  
Date: 26 October 2001  
Project: JTC1.22.32  
Ref Doc: SC22/WG21/N1320  
J16/01-0034  
Reply to: Herb Sutter  
5 Rowntree Road, #1015  
Etobicoke, Ontario, Canada M9V 5G9  
Tel: +1-416-745-1147  
Fax: +1-520-438-4456  
Email: hsutter@acm.org

## J16 TAG Meeting, 26 October 2001

### Record of Discussion

Motions are recorded as follows:

*Motion (mover, seconder)*

[passed|failed] (# in favor, # opposed, # abstaining, # not present or not voting, total eligible to vote)

#### 1. Opening.

Nelson called the meeting to order at 09:31 PDT.

#### 2. Repeated Ballot on JEFF spec

Subject: ISO/IEC DIS 20970, IT — Programming languages, their environments and system software interfaces — JEFF file format.

Question: The U.S. recommended position for the Publicly Available Specification should be to approve with general, technical and/or editorial comments. (Yes or No).

There was a JEFF letter ballot in August, which failed in J16 due to insufficient votes cast, and it failed all the way up the chain. Rex Jaeschke requested a repeated ballot, which closes October 29 (Monday).

Sutter and Dawes expressed concern about being asked to vote on something we don't necessarily care, or know anything, about. Too often when votes are taken on matters where the voters have little knowledge or interest, many vote Yes as a "sure why not" and bad standards get passed. (This does not imply JEFF is either good or bad, it is a general observation.) Austern asked why we are being asking to vote on this. Plum said that this was a PAS submission and SC22 delegates the votes down to the committees where each committee gets one vote; Cobol gets one vote, C++ gets one vote, and so on. Stroustrup said his first question was whether JEFF could execute C++. Plum said it could be a format for C++ if you are trying to execute a C++ program on a JVM or .NET's CLI. Spicer said he agreed we didn't want to ratify something by default, but we also didn't want to stand in the way of something, so he recommended abstention; he has looked at the spec and doesn't consider himself in a position to take a position on it. There was some further discussion.

Straw poll: How many would prefer that we vote Yes, or Abstain? 6 preferred that J16 vote Yes; lots preferred that J16 abstain.

Motion to explicitly abstain:

**Motion (Sutter, Seymour) passed J16 (13, 4, 0).**

J16 explicitly abstains on this vote.

### 3. Vote on Library Extension TR

Subject: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22 N3334, SC 22/WG 21 Proposal for a New Work Item for a Technical Report of Type 2 on C++ Library Extensions (based on ISO/IEC 14882).

Question: The U.S. recommended position for the New Work Item should be to approve. (Yes or No).

Motion to approve (Yes):

**Motion (Bill Plauger, Brown) passed J16 (16, 0, 0).**

### 4. Select US Delegation to WG21

There was discussion and review of past and present criteria for being in the delegation, such as being a Working Group chair, or Project Editor, or a volunteer, or other.

Nelson asked who volunteers to go to WG21 who isn't already on the delegation: Brown, Seymour, Adamczyk, and Tana Plauger raised their hands.

Stroustrup mentioned that in the past there was awareness of limiting the number of US delegation members so as to avoid the appearance of US overrepresentation. Plum noted that votes are taken by country, one country one vote, and that we had decided we would do nothing in WG21 Sunday meetings that was a technical decision or was controversial, and if on Monday morning with J16 anyone felt something WG21 did was controversial they could bring it up again.

The proposed delegation is:

Steve Adamczyk  
Matt Austern  
John Benito  
Walter Brown  
Steve Clamage  
Greg Colvin  
Clark Nelson (HoD)  
Tana Plauger  
Bill Seymour  
Bjarne Stroustrup

Motion to approve this delegation:

**Motion (Sutter, Bill Plauger) passed J16 (13, 0, 1).**

### 5. Adjourn

Motion to Adjourn:

**Motion (Sutter, Charney) passed J16 (lots, 0, 0).**

Meeting adjourned at 10:11 PDT.