

**Disposition of comments to the registration and PDAM ballots
for Amendment #1 to TR 10176 - Guidelines for the preparation of
programming language standards
(Ballot: SC22 N2897, Comments: SC22 N2936)**

October 8, 1999

Ballot result:

The following responses have been received on the subject of registration:

"P" Members supporting approval without comment	10
"P" Members supporting approval with comment	0
"P" Members not supporting approval	1
"P" Members abstaining	2
"P" Members not voting	9
"O" Members abstaining	1

The following responses have been received on the subject of approval:

"P" Members supporting approval without comment	10
"P" Members supporting approval with comment	0
"P" Members not supporting approval	1
"P" Members abstaining	2
"P" Members not voting	9
"O" Members abstaining	1

The comment accompanying the abstention vote from Australia was: "No technical expertise."

The comment accompanying the abstention vote from France was: "Due to lack of resources."

The comment accompanying the abstention vote from Sweden was: "Due to lack of expertise."

Registration ballot

PDAM 1 to ISO/IEC TR 10176:1998 has been registered.

UK comments on ISO/IEC TR 10176/PDAM 1 registration ballot**UK-1**

Whilst the UK is in agreement that the current Annex A to TR 10176 is incorrect, it does not consider that the proposed amendment will provide a satisfactory solution to the problem.

Disposition: rejected

WG20 does see the correction of obvious errors as a solution.

PDAM 1 approval ballot

UK comments on ISO/IEC TR 10176/PDAM 1 approval ballot

UK-2

This Annex is not needed, as the text (from memory, in clause 4) of the standard specifies the type of characters that should be used in identifiers;

Disposition: rejected.

This annex was specifically added due to requests from programming language committees, which prefer a clearly defined list for their specification of conformance of implementations.

UK-3

A specific list is not needed, as this would require updating in line with future amendments to ISO/IEC 10646 in order to be most useful to users;

Disposition: rejected

WG20 decided that a correct, well defined list is preferable over incompatible implementations of programming languages.

UK-4

If a specific list of characters to be used in identifiers in an Annex to ISO/IEC TR 10176 were to be produced during 1999, this should reflect the contents of ISO/IEC 10646-1:1999, not just the contents of ISO/IEC 10646-1:1993, as apparently there is no intention to keep this list in this Annex updated

Disposition: rejected

WG20 decided to keep the list of characters to be used in identifiers in the future synchronized with the contents of major editions of ISO/IEC 10646. Considering the time for newly coded characters to be readily available in fonts and to appear in data, it seems prudent to tie the list to major editions of the standard rather than a set of amendments (published or unpublished). The need for a correct list of characters is now, additional characters can be added after the second edition of ISO/IEC 10646 has been published and is reflected in fonts and data.

WG20 invites the UK to contribute alternative ideas for the next edition.

End of document SC22/WG20 N698