Editorial report
95–0211/N0811

November, 1995
Andrew Koenig

Summary

• How the Working Paper was produced
• What was done
• A few planned changes
How the WP was produced

• Post-meeting editing session in Monterey
• Additional volunteers after the meeting

Editing session attendees

• Sean Corfield
• Andrew Koenig
• Josée Lajoie
• Nathan Myers
• Tom Plum
• Steve Rumsby
• Jerry Schwarz
• Erwin Unruh
Post-meeting contributors

- Beman Dawes
- Josée Lajoie
- Nathan Myers
- Mike Vilot
- Please speak up if I’ve forgotten you

How much work was done
Changes not made

- Clause 21 issues list 21-0646 says that functions like `basic_string::append` must return `basic_string<charT, traits, Allocator>&` instead of just plain `basic_string&`.
- As far as we can tell, the two are equivalent in context, so the change is unnecessary.

General editorial changes

- “processor” changed to “implementation”
- Clause 1 now says that things that appear to be requirements on programs are really abbreviated forms of requirements on implementations.
“Bold changes”

- Clause 1: “In each case the Standard defines a set of allowable behaviors” now says “Where possible, ...”
- Other changes marked with **Change:** inside editorial boxes.
- Some **Editorial proposal:** boxes left over.

**Box and clause numbers**

1(1.8), 11(3.4.2.2), 12(3.4.2.2), 24(5.3.4), 26(5.3.5), 27(5.3.5), 33(7.3.4), 38(9), 41(9.6), 50(13.3.1.2), 51(13.3.1.2), 52(13.4), 69(17.3.4.1), *69(17.3.4.1), 70(17.3.4.6), *70(17.3.4.6), 72(20.1.4), *73(20.4), *75(20.4.1.2), 80(21.1.1.10.8), 81(22.1.1), 83(22.1.1.1.1), *84(22.1.1.1.1), 85(22.1.1.1.1), *86(22.1.1.1.1), *87(22.1.1.2), 89(22.2.1.2), *90(22.2.1.3), *91(22.2.1.3.2), *92(22.2.1.3.3), *95(22.2.5.1.2), 101(23.2.1.1), 102(23.2.4.1), 103(23.2.4.2), 104(23.2.4.3), 126(27.4.2.1), *131(27.4.3), 133(27.4.3.5), *135(27.4.4), 138(27.4.4.2), 145(27.6.1.1), 151(27.6.1.3), 152(27.6.2.1), 176(D.3), *176(D.3), 177(D.4), *177(D.4)
Future planned changes

- Add specializations of the `swap` template for each container that has a `swap` member.
- Reinstate `<iostream.h>`
- I believe (hope?) these will both be non-controversial

It’s time to start wrapping it up

- If the rate of change continues its trend, I will be able to begin a careful editorial pass through the language clauses.
- I would like someone else to do the same for the library clauses.