

WG11/N11

Accredited Standards Committee  
X3, INFORMATION PROCESSING SYSTEMS\*

Doc. No.: X3J4/X-951

Date: January 16, 1987

Project:

Ref. Doc.:

Reply to: Don Schriker  
M/S 013-790  
Wang Laboratories  
One Industrial Ave  
Lowell, MA 01851  
Tel: (617)967-7628

**RECEIVED**  
JAN 20 1987  
D. F. NELSON

TO: ISO/TC97/SC22/WG11

SUBJECT: Comments on ISO/TC97/SC22/WG11-First Working Draft  
on Guidelines For Language Bindings

X3J4 is not in favor of the "First Working Draft on Guidelines For Language Bindings" proposed by WG11 as either a standard or a technical report. We have the following overall objections to the nature of this document:

- 1) The format of this document is inappropriate for an ISO publication.
- 2) The guidelines are too general. There needs to be an underlying reference model. This may be accomplished when work items are complete on standard calling sequences and common data types.
- 3) Pros, cons, and historical records are not appropriate materials for a guidelines document.
- 4) The adoptions of many of the guidelines would severely burden standards developers, lengthen the standardization process, and require more resources than are likely to be available.

In addition to the objections to the nature of the document, X3J4 finds most of the guidelines controversial. The following are a few examples:

**GUIDELINE 1**

X3J4 believes that standard bindings should be developed only for system facilities for which standards exist. Standard bindings are not necessary for all programming languages for all standard systems facilities.

\*Operating under the procedures of The American National Standards Institute.  
X3 Secretariat: Computer and Business Equipment Manufacturers Association  
311 First Street, N.W., Suite 500, Washington, DC 20001-2178

**GUIDELINES 2 and 3**

X3J4 feels that policy guidelines should not be part of a standard or technical report.

**GUIDELINE 8**

Although a functional specification should avoid being influenced by a particular programming language, that specification must take into consideration existing "real world" applications after which specifications may be modeled.

**GUIDELINES 15 and 47**

The contents and format of documentation is dependent on the target users, system environment, and associated program development tools. Therefore, documentation specifications should not part of the guidelines.

**GUIDELINES 21 and 22**

Each programming language dictates the requirements for array lengths, identifier lengths, and punctuations. The guidelines as specified may not be compatible with all programming languages and should not be included in language binding specifications.

**GUIDELINES 34,35,36 and 38**

Parameter definitions, ordering, and combinations as well as data type binding are very language dependent. Such specifications are best left to the language groups.

Sincerely,



Don Schriker  
Chairman, X3J4