

X3J16/97-0006

WG21/N1044

beginning of title page _____

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC22

Programming languages, their environments and system software interfaces

Secretariat: U.S.A. (ANSI)

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC22

N2393

January 1997

SUBJECT: SC22 Work Program Review

SOURCE: Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC22

WORK ITEM: N/A

STATUS: Please note that this document contains a special request for information from WG3, WG4, WG5, WG9, WG13, WG14, WG16, WG17, WG19, WG21, WG22 and the United States Member Body.

CROSS REFERENCE: N/A

DOCUMENT TYPE: N/A

ACTION: To SC22 Member Bodies (except the United States) for information.

To the United States Member Body and WG3, WG4, WG5, WG9, WG13, WG14, WG16, WG17, WG19, WG21 and WG22 for response to the SC22 Chairman by JUNE 30, 1997.

Address reply to:

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC22 Secretariat

William C. Rinehuls

8457 Rushing Creek Court

Springfield, VA 22153 USA

Tel: +1 (703) 912-9680

Fax: +1 (703) 912-2973

email: rinehuls@access.digex.net

_____ end of title page; beginning of text _____

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC22

Programming languages, their environments and system software interfaces
Secretariat: U.S.A. (ANSI)

January 15, 1997

To: SC22 National Bodies and Working Group Conveners

Subject: SC22 Work Program Review

The JTC1 Ad Hoc on Re-engineering in October, 1996 reviewed the work program of the JTC1 Subcommittees and recommended cancellation of all projects not meeting certain criteria:

- are there 5 NBS actively supporting the work?
- is the project resulting from a Fast-Track contribution? (Exceptions were made to the 5 NB participation criteria where an external commitment such as fast tracking a standard from an outside source was the main purpose of the project.)
- is the project technology modern/current/new?
- is there market demand for the project?
- is there proof of functionality for the project technology (implementations)?

The review of SC22 resulted in no recommendations for cancellation, in view of the work program review that we did at our last plenary. However, a number of "special actions" were recommended for various SCs, including SC22. The "special action" for SC22 states as follows:

"As the nature of the SC22 work program is such that a significant number of projects relate to specialized, limited-use languages, the continuation of these in the SC22 work program should be viewed in accordance with the key technology directions to be established by JTC1; SC22 review the ITTF 'late standards' list and accelerate, cancel or correct status as appropriate; SC22 report on its consistency with new technology directions, especially with regard to 'special interest' projects; SC22 review 47.n, 14977 and 15145 at the end of the current fast track process."

At its December plenary, JTC1 endorsed the "special actions," including the one above, and requested a response from SC22 in time for the September 1997 JTC1 plenary. At the December plenary, I questioned the meaning of "specialized, limited-use languages" since I strongly suspect that the list of languages that some in JTC1 would include in this category may differ significantly from the views within SC22. Since no one had a list of which languages were intended by this phrase, SC22 was directed to address all of its languages.

While this task will take a bit of effort, I believe it is a real opportunity. It is quite evident to me that there are many in JTC1 who do not appreciate the importance of our language standards, or the breadth of their usage. Even where they are aware of wide usage, they may not appreciate the current nature of the applications but rather look at some of our better known languages as obsolete. This is our chance to set the record straight.

At our last plenary, our WG3 convener cited a number of examples of the relevance of the APL language to some important applications in the business world. This is exactly the sort of thing we need to document for all of our languages.

In order to answer this JTC1 request, please respond to the following

action items by 30 June 1997 so that your responses can be consolidated into a single document for review at our plenary in August prior to submission to JTC1. I will distribute a separate memorandum on the subject of the ITTF "late standards" list which has not yet been distributed to SC22.

1. ACTION ITEM for All Programming Language WG Conveners:

Please document the market relevance of your standard language. Consider inclusion of such items as:

- estimated number and types of users;
- important application areas where the language is used (for example, air traffic control; on-line banking and funds transfer; command and control; inventory management; or whatever);
- approximate financial value of any important applications, if known;
- "current" technology incorporated in the language;
- any other factors you believe would be relevant for your language.

The objective is not "completeness" but rather to highlight areas that demonstrate the importance of our language standards in today's marketplace. I am looking for something no longer than one page in length per language.

2. ACTION ITEM for the WG22 Convener:

Please provide appropriate input on market relevance of the 47.n projects.

3. ACTION ITEM for the WG19 Convener:

Please provide appropriate input on market relevance of ISO/IEC 14977, Syntactic Metalanguage - Extended BNF.

4. ACTION ITEM for the United States National Body:

Please provide appropriate input on market relevance of ISO/IEC 15145, FORTH.

Thank you.

Robert H. Follett
Chairman

_____end of SC22 N2393_____