Minutes of the Forth 200*x* Meeting #1

*Forth 200*x *Standards Committee*

Hotel Santemar in Santander, Spain
21–23 October 2005

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	
Dr. Bill Stoddart	University of Teesside, England	(Observer)

Action on proposals

Proposal	Comments	Vote	Action
X:deferred	`DEFER, DEFER@, DEFER!, IS, ACTION-OF`	5/0/0	PK
X:defined	`[DEFINED]` and `[UNDEFINED]`	5/0/0	PK
X:parse-name	`PARSE-NAME`	5/0/0	PK
X:extension-query	Modification to `ENVIRONMENT?`, revised to remove auto-loading of requested extensions	5/0/0	PK

Other Business

1. Integration into the standards document

   Should new words be put into the established wordsets, or into new ones?

   The eventual goal is to usually integrate the new words into existing wordsets with related functionality; in some cases it may be more appropriate to create a new word set. However, as an intermediate step the new proposals will at first be kept separate, to make it easier for readers of the document to see what is changing.

2. How are the extension-query names reflected in the standard (if at all)?

   The glossary header for new words includes the extension-query string for the extension that proposed it. In addition, there will be a chapter or normative appendix that lists all the extensions, their extension-query strings and the components (word definitions etc.) that it consists of.

3. Should the tests of a proposal or the reference implementation become normative?

   No. This could lead to conflicting normative sections; also, making the reference implementation normative would lead to over specification.

4. Review of the RfD/CfV process

   How well is the RfD/CfV process working at generating high- quality proposals for standardisation and getting information about their popularity? What could be improved? Or should we do something completely different?

   Many of the participants were not very familiar with how well the process worked in practice, and had no suggestions for improvements.

   The (normative part of the) proposals required adoption before integrating them into the document, but there was a widespread feeling among the participants that proposals

in the form of unambiguous instructions to the document editor (which is the form that would be voted on by the standards committee) would be harder to understand for the CfV audience.

The resulting idea was to have two forms of the proposal, with the same content: First the not-so-formal form used in the CfV, and later a form for integrating it into the document.

5. Official standards body

   Should we run the standard through a standards body like ANSI, ISO, IEEE, etc.? If so, which one?

   Some participants consider the blessing of the future standards document by an official standards body very important, and we agreed to work towards this goal by writing the document in the appropriate style, and by keeping documentation about all our steps. However, the general idea was to first develop the document without involving a standards body, and deal with them at the end.

   Various candidate standards bodies were discussed; none was decided on, but it might be that going through ANSI again might be the easiest route.

6. Chairman and Editor M. Anton Ertl was appointed as the chair of the committee unopposed.

   Dr. Peter Knaggs was appointed editor unopposed.

7. Which standard documents should we start from?

   Peter Knaggs has a version of dpANS99a in LaTeX form, convertible into a fully hyperlinked PDF file. However, it is yet unclear how this document differs from the ANS/ISO Forth documents and dpANS6.

8. Integration of CfV into the Standard

   How do we get from the CfV proposal to the form for integration into the document? One opinion was that the original proponent should do it.

9. Proposal Champions

   There was the opinion that a proposal (de-facto) needs a champion in the committee to get approval by the standards committee. So, if the proponent finds a champion in the committee, they could produce the for-the-document version of the proposal together.

10. Improvements for future standard meetings

    – The participants should familiarise themselves with the proposals beforehand.

    – Paper printouts of the proposals should be available at the meeting.

    – Proposals should be available in the form needed for integration into the standards document in addition to the CfV form.

    – There should be a champion for the proposal in the meeting.

Action Items

1. Federico de Ceballos was asked to look into providing a proposal to cover the following topics:

   – number prefixes

   – 0 for `NIL`

   – `!` and `@` for 16-bit and 32-bit signed and unsigned integers, bytes, octets

2. M. Anton Ertl was asked to look into the implications of the following and develop proposals for them:

- separate FP stack
- required
- directory stuff in general
- directory handling for included and required
- key names for`EKEY` results

3. Stephen Pelc was asked to look into the implication of the following topics, and develop proposals for:
    - { (`locals`), fp locals, buffer locals
    - `S\"` and `.\"`
    - `iors` can be `THROW`n
    - `SYNONYM`
    - structures

4. Bill Stoddart was asked to investigate the implications of allowing the parser to ignore white space (TAB, CR, LF, and FF) in source code, and develop a proposal.

5. Peter Knaggs to contact John Hayes to obtain permission to include the validation suite into the document and to produce a basis document based on the ANS Forth standard with the four accepted proposals and validation suite included.

Next Meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting would take place immediately before the next euroForth conference to be held in Cambridge, England.