

Doc No: SC22/WG21/N3097
 PL22.16/10-0087
 Date: 2010-06-25
 Project: JTC1.22.32
 Reply to: Stefanus Du Toit
 Intel Corporation
 stefanus.du.toit@intel.com

Minutes, WG21 Teleconference 2010-06-18

1. Opening and introductions

The meeting was called on 2010-06-18 at 15:00 UTC.

1.1 Roll call of participants

The following persons were in attendance:

Name	Representing
Herb Sutter	Convener
Barry Hedquist	US HoD
Howard Hinnant	US
Tana Plauger	US
Steve Adamczyk	US
Stefanus Du Toit	US
Steve Clamage	US
Detlef Vollman	CH HoD
Lois Goldthwaite	UK HoD
Clark Nelson	US
Pete Becker	US
Tom Plum	US
Michael Wong	CA HoD
Daniel Garcia	ES HoD
Alisdair Meredith	UK

1.2 Adopt agenda

Sutter: Any changes to the agenda?

None were suggested.

1.3 Approve minutes from previous meeting

Not applicable.

Sutter: Not sure how this interacts with face to face meetings in the future?

Hedquist: Resolve during Rapperswil meeting. These minutes will be approved at that time as well.

1.4 Review action items from previous meeting

Not applicable.

1.5 Review of project editor and liaison assignments

Sutter reviewed the current projects.

Sutter reviewed the current liaison assignments, which consist of the following WG14 liaisons: Steve Clamage, Michael Wong, Clark Nelson, P.J. Plauger, Tana Plauger, Tom Plum.

Sutter asked whether there were any suggestions for changes. None were suggested.

Vollman asked whether there was currently an official POSIX liaison. Sutter responded that there was not.

2. Status, liaison and action item reports

2.1 Small group status reports

Adamczyk stated that there was nothing to report from CWG at this point, but a conference call was upcoming. Sutter asked whether CWG only expected to have one conference call before the Rapperswil meeting. Adamczyk responded that he was not yet sure, but that it was likely this would be the only one.

Hinnant stated that LWG also had little to report as they were waiting for the NB comments. He noted that there were two updates to the LW issues list which would be mailed after the Rapperswil meeting.

2.2 Liaison reports

2.2.1 SC22 report

Sutter stated that there was not much to report. He reminded the group that the JTC1 and SC22 direction changes were still coming and expected in July. He noted that training would be available at an SC22 plenary meeting at Ottawa in September.

Alisdair asked whether any updates on the direction changes would appear earlier than September. Sutter responded that these changes are starting at JTC1 and make their way down the organization, and that at this point WG21 would not be affected by these changes yet.

Sutter noted that apart from two active projects completing, there was no additional news to report at this point.

2.2.2 SC22/WG14 (C) report

Sutter noted that several WG21 members were able to attend by teleconference with several topics discussed, and invited the group to make specific comments.

Meredith asked how WG14 was approaching the issue of alignment syntax, noting that previous discussions were around the time of the FCD period. Plum provided some insight into the matter. Meredith raised a concern of whether this would need to be discussed at Rapperswil. There was discussion of the deadlines for NB comments from various groups.

Plum asked whether the minutes from the WG14 meeting were available. Hedquist answered that they were not available yet but would be with the next pre-meeting mailing. Plum suggested that Meredith directly get in touch with Benito to answer his specific questions.

Hedquist stated that his recollection was for there to be a goal in WG14 of having solutions as compatible as possible with what WG21 was doing.

Meredith state that he would file an NB comment on the topic, which could be quickly rejected if it turned out to be unnecessary.

Nelson raised the issue of the adoption of the “atomic qualifier,” and Sutter stated that this had surprised him as well. Wong noted that Canada expects to make NB comments regarding this.

The group agreed to discuss the matter in Rapperswil.

3. New business

3.1 Review of priorities and target dates

Sutter noted that the current ballot was ending on July 27. He stated that he hoped to have the comments available at the start of, or worst case during, the Rapperswil meeting. He added that he expected the group to spend about another three meetings on processing NB comments.

Hedquist stated that it was his impression that the target date for the FDIS was at the end of August 2011. He noted that he had since talked to staff at ITI who believed the deadline was at the end of July 2011. Sutter stated that he would check on this matter.

Sutter asked the NB heads of delegation to report on whether there was a general sense of what the expected comment volume was relative to CD1, if such a report was feasible at this time.

Meredith noted that UK had fewer comments than last time, but still expected to have many more than other national bodies.

Wong reported that CA had more comments in this round, but that CA had previously had very few comments during the CD1.

Hedquist reported that the US comment count would be higher.

Becker noted that the significance of these numbers also depended on the complexity of the issues.

Sutter explained that one reason to ask this question was to get a sense of how to arrange meetings in 2011. He stated that there had been several suggestions to dropping back to two meetings per year. He added that his goal was to know by the end of the Rapperswil meeting whether the group should plan for two or three meetings in 2011. He noted that this would be helpful information early on for the purposes of planning by potential hosts.

Meredith asked what the consequence of not hitting the FDIS deadline would be. Sutter answered that if the group was not on track for FDIS, they would need to ask for yet another extension. He added that he would strongly prefer not to have to ask for an extension, and that doing so was no small matter.

3.2 Review of current mailing

Sutter reported that there was no current mailing, and reminded the group that the informal minutes from the previous ad-hoc phone conference included a brief processing of papers to be discussed in Rapperswil.

Plauger asked what “Administrative” meant in terms of the classification in the previous minutes. Du Toit answered that such papers pertained to administrivia that would not require discussion, such as membership lists and issue list snapshots.

3.3 Any other business

Plauger asked whether there would be another conference call before the Rapperswil meeting. Sutter responded that there would be, and that this would be discussed as part of Section 5.2.

4. Review

4.1 Review and approve resolutions and issues

None.

4.2 Review action items

None.

5. Closing process

5.1 Establish next agenda

Sutter stated that he planned to reuse the agenda for this meeting in the future, and asked whether there were any objections.

Vollman noted that he would prefer if the liaison reports were deferred to face to face meetings.

Meredith stated that he certainly did not want to get into technical discussion, but would find it useful to have an early idea of whether time should be scheduled for liaison-related discussions in upcoming face to face meetings.

Plauger indicated that these discussions should be saved for the face to face meetings.

Sutter agreed with Plauger, noting that while the SC22 liaison will definitely need to report at these calls, deferring the liaison report to face to face meetings appeared to be reasonable. He added that if someone did have a specific concern and wanted to ensure time was allocated at future meetings, they could do so separately.

Meredith noted he would prefer to have such concerns under the heading of C liaison reports nonetheless so that they would get lost. Plauger asked if this would mean the liaison would still have to stay.

Sutter noted that in the past, these discussions would occur during the Sunday pre-meeting and be deferred to Monday, but that this pre-meeting had been replaced by these phone calls.

Sutter noted that certain agenda items were required to be on the agenda. He suggested leaving section 2.2.2 on the agenda, but using the experience gained during this call as a lesson to avoid getting into the expression of technical opinions. He added that the group should merely note if an issue had been raised and ensure that time would be allocated during the face to face.

Hedquist noted that in the short term the group should expect to have to allocate time during face to face meetings for the discussion of WG14 compatibility issues in any case.

Finally, Sutter stated that even for the Monday face to face sessions, his preference would be to discuss the details in sub-groups rather than full plenary sessions as much as possible.

5.2 Future meetings

Sutter suggested the following dates for future meetings:

- July 23
- Sept 3
- Oct 29
- Dec 10

There was some discussion of moving the date of the July 23 meeting, but it was decided to keep the meetings on Fridays for consistency.

5.3 Future mailings

Sutter reviewed the future mailing deadlines:

- July 9 – pre-Rapperswil
- Aug 20 – post-Rapperswil
- Oct 15 – pre-Batavia
- Nov 26 – post-Batavia

5.4 Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2010-06-18 16:01 UTC.