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• Reasons for failure to meet the schedule
• Proposal for handling future work

How the Working Paper was produced

• Compressed schedule
  – Known in advance to be tight
  – Considered essential to meet public review schedule requirements
• Lots of volunteers

Compressed schedule

• Post-meeting editing session
• Editing, March 13-24
• Review, March 27-31
• Corrections, April 3-14
• Final deadline: April 14

Editing session

• In Austin immediately after the meeting
• Estimated 110 person-hours of work

Editing session attendees

• Jonathan Caves
• Sean Corfield
• Josée Lajoie
• Nathan Myers
• Tom Plum
• Ben Schreiber
Post-meeting contributors

• Steve Adamczyk
• Nathan Myers
• Jerry Schwarz
• Bjarne Stroustrup
• Mike Vilot (++)
• Please speak up if I’ve forgotten you

Reviewers

• Steve Adamczyk
• Pete Becker
• Bill Gibbons
• Sam Harbison
• Tom Holaday
• Josée Lajoie
• Nathan Myers
• Bill Plauger
• Anthony Scian
• John Skaller
• Bjarne Stroustrup

How much work was done

• 11/94 WP: 51,838 \texttt{troff} source lines
• From 11/94 to 3/95: 4,008 changes that touch 33,831 lines
• 3/95 WP: 54,128 \texttt{troff} source lines
• From 3/95 to 7/95: 6,096 changes that touch 22,447 lines
• 7/95 WP: 60,188 \texttt{troff} source lines

Reasons for failure to meet schedule

• Some of the work was delayed for unavoidable personal reasons
• P.J. Plauger objected to content when he reviewed it on April 12
• Tom Plum and Sam Harbison insisted on satisfying all Plauger’s objections
• Result: two week delay; other people now dissatisfied but chose not to object

Sample objection (21.1.1.1)

• \texttt{all} is defined so that
  \begin{verbatim}
  (collate |...| messages) == all
  \end{verbatim}
• To allow vendor extensions, it should be
  \begin{verbatim}
  (collate |...| messages | all) == all
  \end{verbatim}
• No supporting resolution
• Correction removed from the WP

Another objection:

\texttt{<iostream.h>}

• Extremely widespread, both in literature and implementations
• No supporting resolution
• Removed from WP
Basis for objections

• Tom Plum:
  – It is the responsibility of the Project Editor to draft a CD that implements the decisions of the WG.
  – There is no latitude for “couldn’t do it because of tight schedule.” It simply must be done.
• Bill Plauger: just stating his opinion, not making demands

Why the problem exists

• Not all issues are covered by formal resolutions
• Not all resolutions are found afterwards to be correct and unambiguous
• Not everyone agrees on what is editorial
• Regardless of our attitude, we therefore need a way to decide what to do when the committee is not in session

Why wasn’t that a solution?

• Sam Harbison:
  – each WP is accepted by vote, so
  – any change to the WP contradicts a prior vote
• Tom Plum:
  – there is almost certainly an ISO Directive that prohibited the committee from delegating substantive work
  – unfortunately he could not locate it

The root of the problem

• How do we determine what goes into the WP? Two possible viewpoints
  – The outcome of a meeting is, by definition, what happens in the minutes and is voted in the formal resolutions. Nothing else is relevant.
  – We know it is impossible to obtain a perfect draft, so we do what we can with the available schedule and resources and let the committee decide on future corrections.

Earlier attempt at a solution

• Several meetings ago, John Skaller proposed to allow the Editor to change anything that did not contradict an explicit committee vote, to save time
• This proposal was approved overwhelmingly

The outcome

• All changes requested by Plauger appear in the WP (643 changes, touching 2,179 lines)
• Previous versions are often shown by boxes marked Editorial proposal (27 places)
• It is not clear that there is a consensus as to what the WP should be; this WP is therefore submitted under protest
Postscript

- As soon as the WP was complete, Dmitry Lenkov sent electronic mail saying that ANSI prohibited electronic distribution of the draft
- After consultation, Sam Harbison concluded this prohibition did not apply to WG21
- We therefore went ahead and distributed it electronically, mentioning ISO but not ANSI

Principles for future work

- We must have a clear procedure for producing future WP editions while the committee is not in session
- The procedure cannot require voting or other agreement outside official meetings
- The procedure must ensure completion

Proposal

- The Editor has the last word over the content of the Working Paper
- If the Convener or anyone else believes the WP is incorrect or otherwise inappropriate, that person can attach an addendum explaining that belief
- The committee can (and should) resolve discrepancies at the following meeting(s)

Why this particular proposal?

- The content of the WP must ultimately be decided by some number of people, say $n$
- If $n > 1$, there must be an algorithm for resolving disagreements that terminates before the mailing deadline
- Unless someone finds such an algorithm, that forces $n = 1$ and the only question is whether or not that person is the Editor

Summary

- This WP was, as usual, the result of a great deal of work by many people
- There is no clear consensus as to whether this way of producing the WP is acceptable
- We must have a clear basis for future work