Subject: Response to Ballot Comments received on the voting on document JTC1/N1818:
            DTR 10182 - Guidelines for Language Binding
From: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22/WG11
Date: October 1992

During the October 1992 meeting of SC22/WG11, WG11 prepared the following responses to the comments received on the TR ballot of DTR 10182 (comments document is JTC1/N2018). Based on the comments WG11 proposes to make a number of changes to the text of the document. All these changes are considered to be editorial.

1. Comments from Austria

1.1 Technical Comments

1. Editor to verify that the references are still accurate.

2. Page 6, last sentence: replace "The method becomes" by "The method can become".

3. Comment accepted; guideline 8 should be moved to section 3.4.2.

4. Comment rejected. Possibly both procedural and native syntax bindings can be developed, but for some languges it may be far more suitable, and more in line with language tradition, to do it one way rather than the other. Examples are Basic (native syntax) vis-a-vis Fortran (procedure binding), with Fortran-90 specifically including a module facility for the purpose. Note also that the Ada standard for example explicitly excludes syntax extensions.
    Also, not all "ISO languages" are procedural and even if they were, this may not always be the case: guidlines must allow for future languages as well as future facilities.
    Since the development of a language binding is to benifit the language community, the language committee, which knows the needs and the appropriate language features to use, must make the decision. This does not mean that they should not consult the facility committee, but in general that committee will have less expertise in the language.

5. Comment accepted; move guidelines 27 and 32 to section 3.2. Replace in guideline 27 "A system facility binding" by "A binding".

6. Comment accepted; rephrase guideline 38 to read "If a language allows the definition of data types equivalent to, or subset of, some basic type, then any data type of the functional interface standard may be bound in different occurences to different types in the programming language."

7. Comment rejected: function names appear in the linkage interface, names of data types do not appear in such linkage interfaces.

8. Comment accepted: add "Informative" to the annexes.

9. Comment rejected; a paragraph explaining the purpose of Annex B should be inserted before the 1st issue.

1.2 Editorial comments

The editorial comments are left to the editor.

2. Comments from Canada

1. Comment rejected. It is a matter of opinion whether the IRDS mechanism is a patchwork. However, it is a possible method.

2. The issue raised in the second paragraph of the comment is not for WG11 to judge. It is more a SC22, or even a JTC1 issue.
Note that at the last SC22 Plenary (September 1992) an Ad Hoc group was established to propose a policy for SC22 on the issues of cross-language standards, and their developments.

3. Comments from Italy

The editorial comments are left to the editor.