Report of the 2009-05 Batavia Meeting

Contents

If you have an apple and I have an apple and we exchange apples then you and I will still each have one apple. But if you have an idea and I have an idea and we exchange these ideas, then each of us will have two ideas.

— GEORGE BERNARD SHAW

1 Introduction

This paper constitutes a brief report of procedures used and progress made during the recent informal meeting, held at Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory in Batavia, Illinois, USA, from 2009-05-18 through 2009-05-20.

The purpose of the meeting was to process items from the latest draft of the LWG issues list and to make recommendations to the full LWG membership. As before, the hope is that most or all of these recommendations can be processed relatively quickly at the next official meeting (Frankfurt), thus leaving more Committee time for other matters.

2 Participants

The meeting was attended by six on-site participants and (via teleconference technology) three remote participants. In alphabetical order by first name, these individuals were: Alan Talbot,

Alisdair Meredith, Howard Hinnant, Marc Paterno, P. J. Plauger, Pete Becker, Tana Plauger, and Tom Plum. Walter Brown served as the meeting's facilitator and scribe.

3   Mechanics

It has been recent past practice to record LWG deliberations and decisions via the WG21 Wiki. However, such practice had always necessitated a second pass through the Wiki on the part of the issues list maintainer, typically only to re-transcribe and reformat the same information already recorded on the Wiki.

In order to avoid such duplication, we undertook at this meeting to record our deliberations and outcomes by directly editing a draft of the LWG Issues List itself. We published on the Wiki a url to which we regularly uploaded (every 30 to 60 minutes) the then-current updated draft, thus allowing remote participants (and observers, had there been any) equivalent access to our meeting's ongoing work as would have been provided by the Wiki itself.

We believe this experiment has proven successful, at least for use in single-threaded meetings. It is unclear whether the procedure would scale to multiple issues-processing subgroups working in parallel. It did, however, permit much more rapid post-processsing by the issues list maintainer.

4   Accomplishments

In brief, during the meeting we processed:

- all 113 issues previously classified as New,
- all 53 issues previously classified as Review, and
- approximately 15 issues previously classified as Open.

Especially note-worthy is that, in clearing the list of New issues[1], we moved only 45 of the 113 to Open, thus making real progress on the rest.

The following, more detailed, summary of our recommendations was copied verbatim from the post-meeting draft issues list; note that issues 1112, 1113, and 1114 had been newly added by the issues list maintainer before our meeting began, so we triaged them along with all the other then-New issues:

- Added the following Open issues: 1112, 1113, 1114.
- Changed the following issues from New to NAD: 568, 696, 701, 702, 785, 863, 903, 912, 918, 946, 995, 1074.
- Changed the following issues from Open to NAD: 458, 644, 667, 668, 669.
- Changed the following issues from Review to NAD: 901, 1005.
- Changed the following issues from Tentatively Ready to NAD: 988.
- Changed the following issues from New to NAD Editorial: 837, 862, 867, 927, 945, 952, 969, 972, 973, 979, 1058, 1060, 1061, 1077, 1101, 1109.
- Changed the following issues from Open to NAD Editorial: 424, 825, 830, 884.
- Changed the following issues from Pending NAD Editorial to NAD Editorial: 937.
- Changed the following issues from Review to NAD Editorial: 1023.
- Changed the following issues from Open to NAD Future: 96.
- Changed the following issues from New to Open: 716, 727, 865, 900, 911, 916, 917, 920, 933, 935, 939, 941, 947, 951, 953, 954, 955, 956, 977, 978, 985, 989, 996, 1001, 1033, 1054, 1056, 1057, 1059, 1062, 1068, 1069, 1071, 1072, 1076, 1090, 1092, 1096, 1098, 1099, 1104, 1105, 1106, 1108, 1110.

---

[1]The oldest of the New issues had been in that status for more than three years!

- Changed the following issues from Review to Open: 817, 971, 992, 1004, 1010, 1012, 1015, 1019.
- Changed the following issues from New to Review: 780, 835, 897, 919, 957, 983, 1080, 1091, 1093, 1094, 1095, 1097, 1102, 1111.
- Changed the following issues from Open to Review: 921, 987.
- Changed the following issues from New to Tentatively Ready: 810, 898, 906, 910, 913, 914, 915, 925, 974, 976, 981, 982, 984, 990, 998, 999, 1063, 1067, 1070, 1073, 1100, 1103, 1107.
- Changed the following issues from Open to Tentatively Ready: 688, 814.
- Changed the following issues from Review to Tentatively Ready: 899, 907, 909, 934, 938, 940, 943, 950, 965, 970, 975, 986, 991, 993, 994, 997, 1002, 1006, 1011, 1013, 1014, 1021, 1024, 1037, 1038, 1039, 1040, 1044, 1045, 1065, 1066.

The following table provides statistics per issue status:

Status	Pre-mtg	Post-mtg	Net
New	113	0	-113
Open	168	211	+43
Review	53	26	-27
Tentatively Ready	15	70	+55
Dup	37	37	0
NAD	145	165	+20
NAD Editorial	78	100	+22
NAD Future	1	2	+1
Pending NAD Editorial	1	0	-1

Because of a slight misunderstanding on the scribe's part, a few issues were reclassified during postprocessing by the issues list maintainer from NAD to NAD Editorial (or vice versa), Further, the maintainer decided to introduce Tentatively NAD* status, and editorially reclassified issues along those lines. For these reasons, and also because new issues and insights continue to arrive, the statistics in the final document will differ somewhat from those shown above.

5 Availability

As described above, the detailed meeting recommendations and all other post-Summit work were incorporated in a draft version (D65) of the LWG issues list. That version has since been reviewed and post-processed by the LWG issues list maintainer, and made available at the maintainer's usual preview site, http://home.roadrunner.com/˜hinnant/issue_review/lwg-active.html.

All interested parties are urged to inspect this evolving document (or its published version R65) and to make known any questions or concerns as soon as possible in order to facilitate the process of approving the processed issues.

6 Acknowledgments

By almost any measure, the Batavia meeting was remarkably productive. Its achievements, summarized above, are entirely due to the remarkable efforts, energy, skills, knowledge, and perseverance of the meeting's participants. Many, many thanks to one and all.

Finally, a special thank you to my wife, Carol, for baking the treats consumed during this meeting (and for many other things, too!).