

From: Joe Treat
 Subject: Informal overview of WG6 RPC meeting in Ottawa

Overall the WG8 RPC -- previously WG6 RPC before the SC21 reorganization -- editing meeting went well. There were a few US comments that originated with X3T2 and most of these were either accepted or accepted in principal. There were some changes to the syntax required to resolve all national body comments; however, I believe most of these do not cause a serious break with the IDN as represented by CLID and CLIPC.

Some highlights:

- Removal of '[' and ']' from attributes such as restricted, unaliased, etc., since these are an inherent part of the IDN.

- Extension syntax was changed to:

```
%( [ <extension-source-OID> : ] <extension-text> )%
```

and extensions are now allowed anywhere a comment is allowed, and are treated as comments if not understood.

- Support for 'void' as an alternative of 'choice'.
- Changed the syntactic category name <choice_type> to be <select_type> to emphasize the difference between the type and the ASN.1 choice, the C union and Pascal/Ada variant record concepts. The keyword 'choice' was not changed.
- Arrays with non-constant bounds within records are limited to appearing as the final element in the record (if within a nested record, that record must be the final element in the enclosing record). This restriction was passed by NB majority (2-1-2), with the UK and Canada in favor, the US voting against, France and Japan abstaining.
- A limited form of parameterized types as accepted. Parameters may only be <value-expression> and the parameter list includes the type of the parameter, e.g.:

```
type foo(n: integer) = array ( 1 .. n ) of real;
```

- A general acceptance of the need for a finer granularity of "inness" and "outness" on parameters. The US comment on this subject was recognized as containing a significant technical problem and was, therefore, not accepted. However, the US was asked to prepare a new comment that was technically correct.

Mark and I will probably receive early copies of the revised RPC text and will forward the model and IDN parts to US WG11 members and to Willem, assuming that he is willing to distribute the documents to the WG11 members outside the US.

WG8 RPC expressed their appreciation for WG11's efforts in arranging a joint meeting earlier this year. It was not through lack of interest that WG8 RPC did not meet with WG11. However, due to time and money constraints, it was not felt that enough RPC members could attend to warrant calling it a joint meeting.

WG8 RPC welcomes WG11's comments on the 2nd CD ballot on RPC, which will begin 1 September 1992 and close 1 February 1993. Indeed, the ballot period was selected in order to provide WG11 with sufficient opportunity to review and make ballot comments. WG8 RPC would also welcome a WG11 expert at the 2nd CD editing meeting to represent the WG11 position. This meeting will be held in late March 1993 or early April 1993.

WG8 RPC is still concerned with the apparent lack of progress with the CLIPC standard, which they

perceive as being more important than CLID from an alignment perspective. While they see alignment as important and desirable, they regard a "best-effort" attempt to be sufficient, particularly given the relative schedules of the standards. It is my impression that WG8 RPC is serious about making a best-effort attempt to align the standards, without unduly delaying their standard.

WG8 RPC is also planning on having a rapporteur meeting co-located with the WG11 meeting in Paris, 12 - 16 October. This meeting will be organized either by HP or Netwise. (BTW, I don't recall having seen a meeting announcement for the Paris meeting; any additional detail about the location would be helpful.) It is WG8 RPC's assumption that up to two or three days of this time could be devoted to joint meetings with WG11. While the RPC standard will be in the ballot process at this time (as will CLID & CLIPC?), and WG8 RPC cannot discuss the existing documents formally, WG8 RPC will be able to formulate its position on the CLID and CLIPC documents. Likewise, WG11 will have an opportunity to formulate its position on the RPC documents. One general topic that WG8 RPC would like to discuss with WG11 is procedure modeling with respect to closures, execution contexts, and so forth.

WG8 RPC has also asked that the output of the August WG11 meeting in Finland be circulated to the WG8 RPC members as soon as possible in order to allow as much preparation time as possible for the RPC members.

Finally, some general questions:

I note from the Baltimore minutes that CLIPC WD5 and CLID WD6 were to be distributed to WG11 members in June. Ken has stated that CLIPC WD5 is complete and in the mail. What is the status of CLID WD6? It is also not clear to me when CLID and CLIPC will be going out for CD ballot. Is this scheduled to occur in August or October?

See you in Tampere,

Joe Treat