

## Atomic Bitfields Implementation Defined N1530

Blaine Garst  
Nov 3, 2010

The WG14 committee requested that a small working group consisting of the volunteers Nick Stoughton, Clark Nelson, Tom Plum, and me to meet and discuss issues regarding the treatment of `_Atomic` in the current working draft *n1516*.

Specifically there was specific strong direction given by the committee to draft new wording that would change `_Atomic`-qualified bitfields from required status to one that was permitted. This issue arose primarily from a request from the C++0x concurrency subcommittee liaison report *n1508* authored by Lawrence Crowl.

Here is that wording:

Section 6.7.2.1 Structure and union specifiers, paragraph 5

A bit-field shall have a type that is a qualified or unqualified version of `_Bool`, `signed int`, `unsigned int`, or some other implementation-defined type.

should be replaced with:

A bit-field shall have a type that is a qualified or unqualified version of `_Bool`, `signed int`, `unsigned int`, or some other implementation-defined type, and it is further implementation defined whether the type may be `_Atomic`-qualified.