

US National Activity Report
WG5, Nov'95, San Diego

X3J3 has met twice since the Tokyo meeting of WG5, in Maui HI the last week of April and in Breckenridge CO the last week of August. The US public review of the Fortran 95 CD draft took place July 5 - Sept 5.

The Maui meeting focused primarily on three activities: (1) preparing the CD draft in accordance with the WG5 directions from Tokyo, (2) responding to the WG5 Tokyo resolutions, and (3) continuing to process Fortran 90 defect items. The CD draft was delivered to WG5 on schedule, and the CD ballot took place during the months of July, August, and September.

In Maui X3J3 concurred with most of the Tokyo resolutions, but had one general reservation and one specific reservation about the technical report (TR) process. (X3J3 did not have an opportunity to discuss the TR process with the US delegation prior to the Tokyo meeting.) The general reservation involves the "no change" policy of incorporating a TR into Fortran 2000 - this is inconsistent with both (a) proper integration and (b) the intended TR role of "beta test". The specific reservation is the inclusion of parameterized derived types in one of the TRs - X3J3 does not believe that parameterized derived types meet the WG5 criteria for a TR candidate.

The Breckenridge meeting focused primarily on three activities: (1) responding to the public review comments on the CD draft and formulating the US vote therefrom, (2) preparing the US requirements for Fortran 2000 and otherwise preparing for the San Diego WG5 meeting, and (3) continuing to process Fortran 90 defect items. Twelve comment letters were received during the US public review period, with a total of about 450 individual comment items.

The comment processing resulted in 20 problems with the Fortran 95 draft that the US believes should be fixed before the DIS ballot; accordingly the US vote on the CD ballot is NO, pending resolution of the 20 problems. The 20 problems have been presented to WG5 as "Required Repairs", with a problem statement and possible solution for each. In addition the US ballot contained 172 suggested "Quality Improvement" edits of a minor technical nature and 154 suggested "Editorial Improvements". One action taken in Breckenridge as a result of the comment processing, and inadvertently omitted from the "Quality Improvements" part of the US ballot, is to remove assumed-size arrays from the list of obsolescent features.

In Breckenridge the US identified 6 "high priority" requirements for Fortran 2000

and 17 "medium priority" requirements. These have been included in the WG5 requirements repository for consideration by WG5 for Fortran 2000. In addition, the US is responding to the WG5 invitation in Tokyo resolution T11 for proposals for collateral standards for a Fortran preprocessor. A proposal has been submitted to split the work item to produce a collateral standard for conditional compilation; a project editor has been nominated for this activity.

The US reservations about the TR process continued in Breckenridge, where it was noted that in the area of X3J3 concern the TR process is inconsistent with the WG5 strategic plan. The US has therefore submitted a proposal to modify the TR process to make it consistent with the strategic plan. (The US believes that the strategic plan has worked well for Fortran 95 and that therefore its basic principles should not be altered for Fortran 2000.)

X3J3 continues to work hard addressing the Fortran 90 defect items. A report on the status of this processing will be given at the San Diego meeting. Since technical Corrigendum 3 is to be the final official corrigendum for Fortran 90, presumably subsequent work on defect items will pertain to Fortran 95, not Fortran 90.

Respectfully submitted for the US,

Jerrold L. Wagener