

P1450.4 syntax subgroup meeting minutes – 12/14/05

Attendees: Dave Dowding, Doug Sprague, Jim O'Reilly, Greg Maston

Not present:

Issue: Today's Urgent Syntax Group Call Topics

See Dave's email (subject: Today's Urgent Syntax Group Call Topics, date Wed 12/14/2005 12:59 PM PST) and Tony's email (subject: Re: [STDS-1450.4:] STIL.4 - stil version of SB's otpl code, dated Tue 12/13/2005 8:50 PM PST) – for reference. Tony's email was sent via the reflector, and should be available to subscribers; Dave's email is included below for reference.

Actions:

- Map terminology differences between syntax document and conceptual model
- Reconcile syntax document and conceptual model terminology.
- Establish mechanism for feeding issues from conceptual model TWG into syntax TWG and vice versa.
 - Develop itemized issues list in order to resolve differences.
 - For now, any issue is fair game to be added to the list
 - However, an issue being on the list does NOT imply that it will automatically be included in the final standard.
- No other activity until the above issues are resolved.
 - No more examples

For reference STIL .4 information can be found at the IEEE STIL website:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/1450/> (select the [P1450.4](#) link from the table) or use the direct link <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/1450/dot4/index.html>

From: DOWDING,DAVE (A-Loveland,ex1)

Sent: Wednesday, December 14, 2005 1:59 PM

To: O'REILLY,JIM (A-SantaClara,ex1); 'dsprague@us.ibm.com'; 'Greg.Maston@synopsys.com'; 't.taylor@ieee.org'

Subject: Today's Urgent Syntax Group Call Topics

Greetings,

I wanted to provide some information to discuss today. I only allowed for a 30 minute call, so we will need to move quickly. First of all I want to supply Tony's response to my question to him on what he thinks we should do in the dot4 working group. Here are Tony's proposal points from an e-mail to me:

I think that as part of the dot4 effort, we need to do three things:

(From earlier in his same response, I am adding a 0th point to his three points):

0. I am proposing that until we resolve the dot4 issues that we discontinue comparisons with OTPL.

1. Move beyond the conceptual document and put whatever parts of it make sense into the new full dot4 document along with the syntax.

2. Resolve whatever problems remain in the syntax. I think it around 90% complete, but there are still areas that I am not satisfied or clear about.

3. Create lots of code examples and review them with the full dot4 working group. The OTPL example can be one of the ones to discuss ... until the wg decides how best to address the differences.

Once we have accomplished the above, we can then apply the language to applications... like OTPL. It's no use trying to do this until we agree on what can be done in dot4 STIL.

Generally, I agree with his proposal points. The issue is also how we got to the point of him sending his e-mail after the Conceptual model conference call yesterday.

1. The conceptual model group agreed to look at SB's example to determine where he saw undesirable complexity in the Post Actions/ExitPort syntax. Tony was kind enough to attend the call. Tony gave a very clear comparison example and did a great job showing some differences, etc. Thanks Tony!

2. Ernie used this as a springboard to address what I will call his "agenda". His agenda encompasses many things and some of those this are good and important and others change with each new discussion. He tried to address a gap that was discussed at length in last week's Wednesday conference call. Unfortunately there are no meeting notes and Tony was not in on that call, so he was blind-sided with Ernie's ideas about how to start and instantiate TestMethods.

I have run out of time and will send this out.

My proposal is to have some type of process to give feedback to the Syntax subgroup and a process for them to give back response.