

Forth 200x Standards Committee #2
Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge University, England
14–15 September 2006

Minutes

1. Participants

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|------------|
| Willem Botha | CCS, South Africa | | |
| Federico de Ceballos | University of Cantabria, Spain | | |
| M. Anton Ertl | Technische Universität Wien, Austria | | (Chair) |
| N. J. Nelson | Micross, England | | (Observer) |
| Dr. Peter Knaggs | University of Bournemouth, England | | |
| Stephen Pelc | MPE, England | | |
| Jannus Pöial | Estonian Information Technology College, Tallinn | | (Observer) |
| Dr. Bill Stoddart | University of Teesside, England | | (Observer) |
| Carsten Strotmann | | | (Observer) |

2. Consideration of Proposals

| Proposal | Comments | Vote | Action |
|------------|--|-------|--------|
| X:keys | EKEY>FKEY, K-F1 and friends. Referred for clarification | 5/0/0 | AE |
| X:fp-stack | Referred for clarification of document changes, revised proposal to be re-submitted. | 5/0/0 | AE |
| X:require | Parsing INCLUDE plus REQUIRE and REQUIRED | 5/0/0 | AE |

3. Discussion of draft proposals

| Proposal | Comments | Status | Action |
|-----------------|---|----------|--------|
| escaped-strings | Should pass to CfV. | Ongoing | SP |
| forward | Referred for redrafting, use non-substantive RfD route | Referred | PK |
| to | A re-wording of the TO is required to allow multiple targets without adding many new definitions. | Raised | AE/PK |
| f-value | Referred pending the redrafting of TO. | Referred | AE |
| extended-locals | Referred pending the redrafting of TO. | Referred | SP |
| represent | Survey of current practise is required | Ongoing | SP |
| | | Referred | AE |
| structures | Referred back for minor revisions | Ongoing | SP |
| synonym | Referred back for minor revisions | Ongoing | SP |
| thow-iors | Referred back for minor revisions | Ongoing | SP |
| xchars | Not discussed due to time limitations | Ongoing | AE |

4. Other Business

a) Publication of Minutes

A separate record of the minutes should be kept as an independent record of the committees proceedings. The minutes should continue to be made available on the web site. The committee should approach a number of bodies to determine if they would be willing to publish.

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Approach ACM SigPlan | Action: PK |
| Approach FIG (US) | Action: PK |
| Approach FIG UK (ForthWrite) | Action: PK |
| Approach Forth-Gesellschaft e.V. | Action: AE |

b) Review of RfD/CfV process

Now that a number of RfDs have been published by people other than Anton, it was felt that the procedure required additional clarification:

- 1) An RfD/CfV will be considered as published only when a copy is made available on the web site and a copy, or at least an announcement for large documents) is given on both `comp.lang.forth` and the `forth200x` email list.
 - 2) The web site will contain a copy of all RfD/CfV, current standings of the CfV, accepted and rejected proposals. Including any archived copies of revised documents.
 - 3) The Current Status of a CfV poll will normally be published within two weeks of the CfV being published. The extension name (X:...) will be allocated at this time.
 - 4) For a proposal to be considered at a meeting, the *Current Standing* must be published at least 4 weeks prior to the meeting.
 - 5) A proposal may only be accepted into the new draft by a consensus of those present at an open standards meeting.
 - 6) A new procedure will be introduced for non-substantive changes to the document, in particular rephrasing of the document text. Because there is no effect on implementations and programs, one cannot ask system implementers and programmers whether they are going to implement/use the proposal. Therefore, after the proposal has gone through possible revisions, the committee will decide about the adoption into the standard document.
- c) Appointment of a Secretary It was felt that the Chair and Editor are performing the functions of a secretary. Thus a Secretary would not be required.
Both the Chair and the Editor would maintain separate notes of the meeting which can be referred to when drawing up these minutes.
- d) Development Reports:
- 1) Federico de Ceballos
RfDs have been produced but not as yet published, they should be published for comment. **Action: FC**
 - 2) M. Anton Ertl
RfDs have been published and polls taken on three of them. These are to be considered under item 2.
 - 3) Peter Knaggs
 - John Hayes has given permission to use his test suite, which appears in Annex F.
 - A basis document has been published and is due for consideration under item 4e.
 - 4) Stephen Pelc
RfDs have been published and are due for discussion under item 3.
 - 5) Bill Stoddart
It was felt that section 3.4.1 Parsing covers the white space issue sufficiently. Thus no action should be taken.
- e) Review of the Forth2006.2 basis document.
- 1) The draft revision number is based on a two digit year followed by an issue number within the year. Hence, 06.2 is the second issue to be published in 2006.
 - 2) The X:defined extension is not listed in the extensions table, table 3.6 on page 16. [DEFINED] is listed in the TOOL EXT wordset, but the glossary entry places it in the CORE EXT wordset. **Action: PK**
 - 3) *Inlineing* of the rationale and validation code as sections with the main text was considered to be too confusing. It should be removed into the appropriate appendix. **Action: PK**
 - 4) The phrase “Validation” was not felt to correctly describe John Hayes’ tester package, and implies a full validation suite. This section should be re-named “Testing” and integrated into the rationale rather than being presented in a separate Annex. **Action: PK**
While these changes are substantive in quantity, they do not effect the normative part of the document. It was felt that these changes should not go through the normal RfD procedure but should be announced.

- 5) The size of the document prohibits people from searching out the changes from one revision to another, despite the use of change bars. A new appendix should be included which identifies the changes made since the previous revision and the proposal associated with the change. **Action: PK**
- 6) The minor differences between 06.1 and 06.2 were pointed out. The addition of reference implementations, where available. It was felt that reference implementations should be given in the rationale for the word. This is considered particularly important when a word can not be implemented in standard forth. **Action: PK**
- 7) The “Members” section of the document should be revised to reflect the contact details of the Committee members so that people who would like to lobby the committee rather than attend a meeting. **Action: PK**
- 8) The basis documents will be made public on the web site. **Action: PK/AE**
- 9) The L^AT_EX source code for the basis document will be made public on the web site. **Action: PK/AE**

5. Date of Next Meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting should be held the day before the next EuroForth conference in Dagstuhl on 13–14 September 2007. The possibility of an interim meeting in person or via skype was discussed. It was agreed that a decision would be dependent on the number of CfVs to be discussed.