

From: STANDARD--STLVM7

Date and time 01/17/89 09:36:27

Date: 12 January 1989, 08:29:26 PST

STANDARD at STLVM7

From: IBM HLL Standards

To: FOLLETT at BETVMIC1

Subject: Forward of message on ANSI C from BSI

Re: Forwarding note

N079
RECEIVED
30 JAN 89

----- Referenced Note -----

Received: from uunet.uu.net by ibm.COM on 01/10/89 at 07:03:31 PST
Received: from uunet.uu.net by RELAY.CS.NET id aa00909; 9 Jan 89 22:14 EST
Received: from mcvox.UUCP by uunet.UU.NET (5.59/1.14) with UUCP
id AA09967; Mon, 9 Jan 89 22:03:39 EST
Received: by mcvox.cwi.nl via EUnet; Tue, 10 Jan 89 02:56:46 +0100 (MET)
Received: by dkuug.dk (3.2/diku/ease)
id AA08909; Mon, 9 Jan 89 23:48:28 +0100
Date: Mon, 9 Jan 89 23:48:28 +0100
From: Keld J|rn Simonsen <mcvox!dkuug.dk!keld@uunet.uu.net>
Message-Id: <8901092248.AA08909@dkuug.dk>
To: standard@IBM.COM
Subject: Forward of message on ANSI C from BSI
Cc: Cornelia.Boldyreff%brunel.ac.uk@RELAY.CS.NET

Dear Bob Follett,

I hereby forward a letter I got from Cornelia Boldyreff from BSI, on her request. It is concerning the ISO C standard, on which the Danish Standards Association and you also had some communication recently.

Yours
Keld Simonsen

From ukc!brunel.ac.uk!cornelia.boldyreff Thu Jan 5 12:46:43 1989
Received: by dkuug.dk (3.2/diku/ease)
id AA12850; Thu, 5 Jan 89 12:46:38 +0100
Received: from brunel.ac.uk by kestrel.Ukc.AC.UK via Janet (UKC CAMEL FTP)
id aa01261; 5 Jan 89 10:57 GMT
Received: from Saturn.cs.brunel.ac.uk (Saturn) by Pluto.me.brunel.ac.uk; Thu,
5 Jan 89 10:57:48 GMT
From: Cornelia Boldyreff <Cornelia.Boldyreff@brunel.ac.uk>
Date: Thu, 5 Jan 89 10:53:33 GMT
Message-Id: <3790.8901051053@Saturn.cs.brunel.ac.uk>
To: keld@dkuug.dk
Subject: C X3J11
Cc: corn@brunel.ac.uk
Status: RO

Status: R

Thank you for your informative mail regards the Danish position on the C standard. We too have had a letter from Bill Plauger in a similar vein to the one you outlined; I've not yet responded to it. We did suggest that X3J11 defer registration of their draft until the ISO comments have been addressed, but they have gone ahead because they think it is "good enough". The UK position is that it could be a bit better; and

we feel that it is important to reach consensus at ISO level as well. The best solution would be for ANSI to delay ratifying the draft until these issues have been resolved at ISO level, and then simply include them in the the ANSI standard without refering the matter back to X3J11 so that they won't have to do any more work on the draft. Their position is that they have been working on it for five years and have not got the energy to make any further changes.

Your requested changes are relatively straightforward compared to the UK which is still unhappy about the general lack of precision in the draft, but we would be satisfied with a further DP ballot and the opportunity it would give us to make a final pass over the text.

We do consider that the changes we would request would be editorial in nature. Looking forward to hearing from you,

Cornelia.

p.s. Do you have Bob Follett's e-mail address? If it's not too much trouble perhaps you could forward a copy of my message above to him. Thanks.