

Doc No: SC22/WG21/N3211
 PL22.16/10-0201
 Date: 2010-11-26
 Project: JTC1.22.32
 Reply to: Stefanus Du Toit
 Intel Corporation
 stefanus.du.toit@intel.com

Minutes, WG21 Teleconference 2010-10-29

1. Opening and introductions

The meeting was called on 2010-10-29 at 15:00 UTC.

1.1 Roll call of participants

The following persons were in attendance:

| Name | Representing |
|-------------------|--------------|
| Herb Sutter | Convener |
| Steve Adamczyk | US |
| John Benito | US |
| Tom Plum | US |
| Howard Hinnant | US |
| Barry Hedquist | US HoD |
| Steve Clamage | US |
| PJ Plauger | US |
| Tana Plauger | US |
| Detlef Vollman | CH HoD |
| Clark Nelson | US |
| Ville Voutilainen | FI HoD |
| Michael Wong | CA HoD |
| Alisdair Meredith | UK HoD |
| Stefanus Du Toit | US, CA |
| Lois Goldthwaite | UK HoD |

Vollman asked who was allowed to attend these meetings. Sutter responded that this was a WG21 meeting, and only conveners and officers should be in attendance.

Vollman asked whether WG21 changed these rules recently. Sutter confirmed that the convener had some leeway.

Vollman said he was under the impression that actual face to face meetings were now WG21 meetings, since the group now allowed others there. He said he had had some discussions about allowing others in these meetings in Rapperswil for strictly administrative discussions.

Sutter stated that he had no problem with anyone interested attending, but added that it was always a good idea to check with the respective head of delegation.

1.2 Adopt agenda

The agenda was adopted, with the addition of a section “3.2 Review of the current mailing”.

1.3 Approve minutes from previous meeting

The minutes were approved.

1.4 Review action items from previous meeting

Action: Go back and restore previous project editors, e.g. performance and library TRs, to list. (Sutter)

Sutter reported that he had not done so yet. The action was carried forward.

Action: Send SC22 secretariat meeting announcements in the future. (Sutter)

Sutter reported that he had been doing this.

1.5 Review of project editor and liaison assignments

The assignments are unchanged from the last minutes.

Pete Becker is the main project editor. Backup is Lawrence Crowl.

Robert Klarer and Walter Brown were on decimal FP, but that is completing.

2. Status, liaison and action item reports

2.1 Small group status reports

Core Working Group

Adamczyk reported that in terms of preparing responses to NB comments, the Core Working Group was in good shape. He said that there were only about four comments for which there was no wording yet, and in many cases wording had been tentatively approved. He added that there were a large number of papers on what could be considered new issues or significant adjustments on existing things. He summarized that in terms of what is required to get done, Core is in good shape.

Sutter asked to confirm that proposed wording was available for all NB comments except for the few outstanding items mentioned. Adamczyk confirmed this.

Du Toit asked for a status update on the comments that state that all known issues must be resolved. Adamczyk answered that the interpretation had been that priority 0 and priority 1 issues must be resolved. He mentioned that about two dozen issues were marked as priority 1, and three dozen new issues did not yet have a priority. He noted he would need to see what the status was after classification.

Sutter reminded the group that there was a need to have a resolution to these NB comments, but that response could include that certain issues would simply not be resolved in this version. He added that triaging happened to ensure the important issues are resolved.

Adamczyk added that some of the priority 1 issues might be revisited and reclassified.

Meredith asked how many priority 2 issues were still outstanding. He said he was happy to ignore priority 3 issues, but would be uncomfortable with a large number of outstanding priority 2 issues.

Adamczyk reported that about 50 or 60 priority 2 issues remained.

Meredith said he would like to see fewer than 50, but was not sure how many fewer.

Adamczyk said that the generally feeling had been that priority 2 issues are fairly minor bugs that did not need to be fixed in the standard. Meredith responded that therefore his concern was only about quantity.

Plum asked who from BSI would be following Core to make qualified statements. Goldthwaite responded that she believed at least one, perhaps two BSI members would be coming.

Plum explained that based on Meredith raising this issue about the number of core issues being high being a major issue for BSI, he would like to see someone from BSI participating in Core.

Some discussion ensued on which BSI members would be attending Core.

Plum said he would personally not receive it very well, if BSI raised these issues without participating in Core.

Meredith said there would be a concern with the number of issues at priority 2, but was not sure what the actual reaction would be yet.

Adamczyk stated that personally he did not find the number surprising or concerning given the complexity of the language.

Library Working Group

Meredith reported that despite him being offline for much of the time since the last meeting, the issues list was now caught up. He reported that Beman Dawes and Daniel Kruegler had helped to maintain the issues list, and that a single email address now existed to submit issues to this group.

Meredith reported that LWG had filed a number of papers which had been incorporated into the issues list. He stated that the vast majority of issues against the FCD had been addressed. In terms of FCD comments, he reported that the total number of open issues was just under 200. He added that after applying tentatively

resolved issues, about 150 remained, which he stated was a reasonable number. He noted that of those, about 60-70 were likely to be in concurrency, so parallelization should be possible.

Sutter asked whether the issues had been triaged. Meredith answered that there was nothing that looked problematic. He explained that Library did not triage like Core did, and tended to process all issues. He stated that the biggest work was likely related to noexcept, where a number of papers had come in, but that he had not seen any major showstoppers or anything too small not to do.

Du Toit asked whether Meredith was referring to LWG issues or NB comments. Meredith answered that 90% of these issues were NB comment related.

T. Plauger asked what was meant by “new comments”? Meredith explained that he had meant new issues coming in. He elaborated that this was a new process, with new issues numbered above 2000. He explained that this allowed the group to easily see what is in scope for responding to the NB comments.

T. Plauger asked to confirm that “new issues”, not “new comments”, were meant. Meredith confirmed that this was the case.

2.2 Liaison reports

2.2.1 SC22 report

Sutter reported that the SC22 plenary occurred 2 months ago in Ottawa. He stated that there were no specific WG21-related issues, and that after reporting the WG21 status, SC22 had been pleased that the group was on track not to ask for another extension.

Benito stated that after July 1 2011, all projects would need to comply with the new JTC1 directives. Sutter asked whether only projects that had not already issued an FCD would switch over. Benito confirmed this.

Sutter summarized that therefore the rule changes would not affect the current project, but would affect the next TR or standard.

Vollman asked whether the topic of a liaison with MISRA came up in the SC22 meeting. Sutter answered that it did not.

2.2.2 SC22/WG14 (C) report

Benito reported that there was a WG14 meeting just before the WG21 meeting in Batavia, IL. He said that the group hoped to vote out a CD just after the following meeting, and that there was no need to register because of the new process. He said that this would begin the process of updating the new C standard.

Benito noted that WG14 did not have a meeting schedule set yet for 2011. He said that he had been trying to set up a meeting corresponding to the Madrid WG21 meeting, but was unsuccessful so far, and that therefore the only meeting scheduled for 2011 was Portland in the Fall.

Sutter asked on what cadence WG14 met these days. Benito answered that the group met a year, but also had some meetings in-between meetings, including two editorial meetings between regular meetings last year. He said that WG14 was planning to keep up the schedule of two meetings per year, and could hopefully do only co-located meetings with WG21 once WG21 switched to two meetings per year.

3. New business

3.1 Review of priorities and target dates

Sutter reported that the group was tracking to its plan of record, expecting to vote out an FDIS in Madrid in March.

Sutter said the group should discuss what's next after FDIS. He felt that the group was likely tired, but that it was up to discussion as to whether to have a break or not. He felt there was a lot of interest in a library TR2, and noted that there were already earmarked issues for this even though it did not officially exist yet. He mentioned that this was a Post C++0x priority, so there was no target date for it. He summarized that the group should be ready to have the conversation of what comes next once current project stabilizes.

Meredith said that if the meeting went well in Batavia, he would like to use the Saturday morning time there to start having some discussions around TR2 plans.

3.2 Review of current mailing

Sutter reviewed the 2010-08 mailing with the group.

| Document number | Subgroup | State |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| N3103 | Core | To be discussed |
| N3110 | Library | Ready for Batavia |
| N3112 | Library | To be discussed, depends on resolutions of Core discussions |
| N3113 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3114 | Library | Update in 2010-10 mailing. |
| N3122 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3123 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3124 | Core/Library | To be discussed in CWG, reviewed by LWG |
| N3125 | Core/Concurrency/Library | To be discussed jointly with Concurrency Working Group |
| N3128 | Concurrency/Library | To be discussed |
| N3129 | Concurrency/Library | To be discussed |
| N3130 | Concurrency/Library | To be discussed |
| N3131 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3132 | Concurrency | To be discussed |
| N3136 | Core/Concurrency | To be discussed |
| N3137 | Core/Concurrency | To be discussed |

| Document number | Subgroup | State |
|------------------------|-----------------|---|
| N3139 | Core | To be discussed |
| N3140 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3142 | Library/Core | To be discussed, first in Library, then in Core |

| | | |
|-------|---------------------|--|
| N3143 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3144 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3145 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3146 | Core | To be discussed |
| N3148 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3149 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3150 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3151 | Core | To be discussed |
| N3152 | Concurrency/Core | To be discussed |
| N3153 | Core/Library | To be discussed first in Core, then in Library |
| N3154 | Core | To be discussed |
| N3155 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3156 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3157 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3158 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3163 | Core | To be discussed |
| N3164 | Concurrency/Library | To be discussed |
| N3165 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3166 | Core | To be discussed |
| N3167 | Core | To be discussed |
| N3168 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3169 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3170 | Concurrency/Library | To be discussed |
| N3171 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3172 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3173 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3174 | Core | To be discussed |
| N3178 | Library | To be discussed |
| N3179 | Library | To be discussed |

T. Plauger: No votes were taken in concurrency group during last meeting due to some key members not attending.

Sutter asked if noexcept and implicit move were the two main items for discussion in Core. Adamczyk responded that he thought so, but could not be sure. Meredith added that override syntax could be controversial too. Adamczyk said that the group had had discussion and votes on the direction, but it would depend on the consensus in the group for the papers provided.

3.3 Any other business

None.

4. Review

4.1 Review and approve resolutions and issues

None.

4.2 Review action items

The group carried forward one action item:

Action: Go back and restore previous project editors, e.g. performance and library TRs, to list. (Sutter)

5. Closing process

5.1 Establish next agenda

Sutter said he would add an item “3.2 Review of the current mailing” to future agendas.

5.2 Future meetings

Sutter reported that the future meetings were still planned to be held as follows:

- Batavia Nov 8-13

- Teleconference Dec 10, 2010
- Teleconference March 11, 2011
- Madrid March 21-26
- Teleconference April 22, 2011

Sutter said that he would like to have these teleconferences only after the pre-meeting mailings, about two weeks after each mailing. There were no objections.

Sutter noted that he would not be able to attend the Batavia meeting due to health issues.

5.3 Future mailings

Sutter reviewed the future mailing deadlines:

- Nov 26, 2010 – post-Batavia
- Feb 25, 2011 – pre-Madrid
- Apr 8, 2011 – post-Madrid

5.4 Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2010-10-29 16:05 UTC.