

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 22/WG 23 N 0239

Disposition of Results of Balloting on PDTR.2 24772: Collated NB comments
November 24, 2009

Dispositions completed by editor to create N0239

Dispositioned at meeting #12 as N230

Corrected comments posted as N0224

Corrects the original balloting results, posted as N 0223

Added Japanese comments: 25 Sep 2009

Noted missing number in Netherlands comments, 26 Sep 2009

Corrected Canada's vote, 27 Sep 2009

Noted separate list of US editorial comments, 27 Sep 2009

Original document was N0230

Ballot document: PDTR2 - 24772 - Collated comments											
Vote:											
NB (ISO 3166)	No.	Category	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition	Disposition Details	Useful for sorting by clause	Useful for sorting by clause	Useful for sorting by clause
UK	1	ed	General		There is a mixture of British and American spelling, e.g. 'behaviour' and modelling'. This is distracting. I don't care which it is but it should be consistent.	Check with a spelling checker.	Reject	According to the Editing Directives, the spelling in an ISO/IEC standard is neither "British" nor "American" but is as specified by the Oxford English Dictionary. Any comments regarding spelling should be checked against the OED. By the way, we know of no spelling checker that supports Oxford English. Both "behaviour" and "modelling" are spelled as shown in the OED.	0	0	0
UK	2	ed	General		There are 45 occurrences of 'In future standardization activates, ...'. Is this English?	Should it not be 'In future standardization activities, ...'?	Accept	Will change all occurrences of "activites" to "activities". Should be "activates" to "activities" .	0	0	0
UK	3	ed	General		This document is very wordy and would have much more impact if it were shorter and less repetitive.		AIP	This may be true, but the comment as written cannot be dispositioned because no specific suggestions for improvement are offered. It was noted that "in order to" can be systematically replaced by "to" throughout the document. (This is not intended to trivialize the UK concern, but simply to make one contribution, albeit small, to accomplish the goal.)	0	0	0

UK	4	ed	General		Floating-point arithmetic should not be listed as a blanket vulnerability. Getting floating-point calculations correct is part of numerical analysis and outside the scope of this TR.	Any reference to the use of floating-point types should be to specific software-engineering, not mathematical, issues.	Rejection	The working group discussed previously the issue raised by the balloter and decided that there are simple (mis)uses of floating point that do not involve numerical analysis. We have attempted to describe them without discussing numerical analysis. Numerical analysis concerns the correct use of floating point types; the discussion in the TR solely concerns misuses of floating point types.	0	0	0
US	1	ed	General		A list of editorial suggestions was provided in a separate text file.	[For consideration by editor]	AIP	Most were implemented by the editor.	0	0	0
JP	1	Ed	Introduction	3rd bullet	"PLP" would be a misspelling of "PLF". It should be enclosed by braces.		Accept	In the Introduction, the mention of "PLP" should be changed to "PLF".	0	1	0
JP	2	Ge	Introduction	last paragraph	The phrase "contains few annexes" seems to imply that the first edition may contain a small number of language-specific annexes. This is not acceptable. Since this PDTR ballot is the last opportunity for us to check the content of the TR in SC22 level, it should be presented in its complete form.		AIP	Add bullet to preceding paragraph: "Language-specific annexes". Delete final paragraph.	0	1	0
NL	1	ed	Introduction	listing	The first entry in the list states that OO-features are not discussed in this document. The such is not entirely true as there is a section called RIP. The Numerical analysis item refers to PLP, which cannot be found in the document.	Add note such as with Numerical analysis. Clarify PLP.	Accept	Add to first bullet of list: "(although some simple issues related to inheritance are described in RIP.)" Also change "treatment" to "comprehensive treatment" in the paragraph preceding the list. Also remove "Some issues related to" in the final item of the list. Change "PLP" to "PLF".	0	1	0

NL	2	ge	Introduc tion	listing	The lack of discussion on Concurrency seriously reduces the usefulness of this PDTR		AIP	We agree with the sentiment. Omitting concurrency was a decision intended to focus scarce resources. We plan to add treatment of concurrency in future editions of the TR.	0	1	0
NL	3	ed	Introduc tion	last sentence	Probably this sentence should read ... contains _a_ few annexes.	Improve sentence.	AIP	See JP-2	0	1	0
NL	4	ed	Introduc tion	last sentence	The causal relationship in this sentence is not clear; partly because the contents of the current annexes deviates from what has been written here. See also section 1.5 lines 39, 40 where the intention is probably stated correctly.	Improve sentence; make contents compatible with current contents of annexes.	AIP	See JP-2	0	1	0
UK	5	ed	Introduc tion	p. ix	PLP is not explained (nor so far as I can see is CWE or CERT/CC and probably other abbreviations I have not checked). Also RCTA is inadequately referenced.		AIP	See NL-1. We can't find any occurrences of "RCTA" in the document. "RTCA" is included in the References. Add text to 4 correlating the abbreviations to numbered documents in the Bibliography. Change all occurrences of "CERT/CC" to " CERT C ". Change Reference 14 to be the Addison-Wesley book: "[14] Seacord, Robert. The CERT C Secure Coding Standard. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley, 2008."	0	1	0
NL	5	ed	1	Scope - lines 13, 14	These lines do not belong in a section called "Not in Scope"	Put these lines at more appropriate place in document.	AIP	In the opinion of the working group, this material adds value. Precise formatting will be performed in consultation with the ISO editor. Move line 13 to the "In Scope" section. Delete line 14.	1	0	0
NL	6	ed	1	line 14	What is stated here is not consistent with the current content of the annexes.	See NL-4.	Acce pt	See NL-5.	1	0	0

NL	7	ed	1	<p>section 1.3 and many other places in the report</p>	<p>There is some confusion about the two notions of 'guideline' and 'guideline recommendation'. The notion of 'guideline' is used freely in the report; without a clear definition. The notion of 'guideline recommendation' is also not defined, but section 6.2.2 (line 24)(also in other places in the document) gives the suggestion that any of these [ABC] items is a guideline recommendation. Annex A is expressed partly in terms of Guideline Recommendations; partly in terms of 'guidelines'. Annex B is expressed in guidelines, but states in line 32 that Annex A provides a template 'guideline', which should probably read ...'guideline recommendation'.</p>	<p>Clarify these notions throughout the report.</p>	AIP	<p>Implement the solution described in document N0232, including the deletion of Annex A.</p>	1	0	0
NL	8	ed	1	<p>section 1.5 lines 36, 37</p>	<p>It is clear why the authors want to use an unique identifier for identification of 'vulnerability descriptions'. It is unclear why they want a non-mnemonic code. Using a non-mnemonic code makes searching for 'vulnerability descriptions' more difficult than needed.</p>	<p>Use mnemonic identifiers.</p>	Rejection	<p>Mnemonic identifiers only work in a single language. Furthermore, the titles of the descriptions may evolve, but the identifiers are intended to be immutable.</p>	1	0	0

NL	9	ed	1	section 1.5 lines 36, 37	Searching through the document could be made easier by providing a table mapping 'vulnerability descriptions' to document sections to pages. Such a table can be generated automatically.	Provide such a table.	AIP	This sounds like a good idea, but we are not sure of what is requested. If NL will send us a sample in a timely fashion, we will include such a table in the draft submitted for DTR ballot.	1	0	0
NL	10	ed	1	section 1.5 lines 36, 37	Aren't these 'vulnerability descriptions' just 'guideline recommendations'? (See also NL-7).	Adjust terminology.	AIP	See NL-7	1	0	0
NL	11	ed	1	section 1.5	This section is titled 'How to Use This Document'. This section should be used to: Introduce the purpose of the sections 5, 6, 7 and the annexes (current and future). Regarding the annexes it would be fruitful to mention the intended users and procedures on obtaining the information needed.	Extend document to include requested items.	AIP	See N0235.	1	0	0
NL	13	ed	1	all (sub)clauses	Inconsistent capitalization in headers.	Correct capitalization.	AIP	The ISO editor will check and correct these.	1	0	0
UK	7	ed	1.3	p 1 line 17-19	'The impact of the guidelines in this Technical Report ^is likely to be highly leveraged in that they are likely to affect many times more people than the number that worked on them. Therefore guidelines such as these have the potential to make large savings, for a small cost, or to generate large unnecessary costs, for little ^benefit'.	This may be suitable for a project proposal. It is irrelevant in a finished report. Delete.	Reject	The document is a Technical Report. The text in question explains some of the choices made by the drafters. It serves as Rationale, which is appropriate in a TR.	1	3	0

UK	6	ed	1.4		Section 1.4, 5, 5.1, 6.: Breaks the editorial guidelines. The text here needs to be made into 1.4.1 and the later subclauses should be renumbered.		AIP	We think that this rule applies only to top-level clauses. However, we will check with the ISO editor and correct as necessary.	1	4	0
JP	3	Ed	3.1	Note	The last two sentences both start with “On the other hand, the absence of ...”. One of them seems obsolete and should be deleted.		Accept		3	1	0
NL	12	ed	3.1	lines14..17	Duplication in text.	Remove duplication.	Accept		3	1	0
JP	4	Ed	3.6		The word “fulfils” seems to be a misspelling of “fulfills”. The latter form “fulfil” appears in 6.39.5. If you prefer “fulfil”, change “fulfil” in 6.39.5 to “fulfil”.		Accept	The OED uses the spelling “fulfil”. Change all instances to read as such. Only one occurrence.	3	6	0
JP	5	Ed	5.2	2nd paragraph	The word “chose” in “and coders will chose” is a misspelling of “choose”.		Accept		5	2	0
UK	8	ed	5.5	p 12: lines18-23	Reason: ruled out on page ix, bullet 1.	Delete paragraph.	Accept		5	5	0
CA	29	Te	6		Missing a vulnerability on visibility and hiding of names.	See attached sheet for Canada 29, listed as pdtr-24772-cd2-canada-2.pdf. This is wg23-n-197 from Erhard Ploedereder about visibility vulnerabilities. It is submitted for potential inclusion in the document. We see nothing controversial in this potential vulnerability.	Accept	Add the description. Used N0229 for text for the vulnerability.	6	0	0

NL	15	ed	6.1.2	... and further: cross reference	All cross reference sections mention documents that have been nowhere correctly referenced in a literature list of some kind. If one doesn't know what JSF or CWE means, the only option seems to Google for these words.	Place correct references to all documents mentioned in the cross reference sections in one place, either section 2 or in the bibliography at the end of the document.	AIP	See UK-5	6	1	2
JP	6	Ed	6.1.6		The word "activates" in "In future standardization activates" seems inappropriate in this context. Isn't it a misspelling of "activities"? This comment applies to all 6.x.6 subclauses.		Accept		6	1	6
UK	9	ed	6.1.6	p 14 line 12, p 16 line 34, p18 line 22, p19 line 27	'Language designers should provide language directives that optionally disable obscure language features'. Pie in the sky! Who is to decide what is obscure and what is not? Why have obscure features been incorporated in the first place?	Delete.	Reject	This is advice to language designers. They can determine how to apply the principle. In fact, many language standards committees have a mechanism to identify such features.	6	1	6
NL	16	ed	6.1.7	bibliography	The reference to Hatton 17 ... is unclear. Is this the Hatton in Bibliography number [22]? What does 17 mean? Chapter? There is no mentioning of Hatton in the text. This reference is unnumbered, whereas C.1.7. states that references should be numbered.	Correct references.	AIP	The "bibliography" portion of each description is simply a working area. In the published TR, there will be only a single bibliography at the end. This reference will be fixed as part of that process.	6	1	7

UK	10	ed	6.2	pp 14-15.	This has already been said much better in 5.1.3.	Delete 6.2.	Rejection	6.2 is guidance. 5.1.3 is rationale for the guidance.	6	2	0
JP	7	Ed	6.2.5	3rd bullet	The term "shall" in "shall be enumerated" is inappropriate in this context. It has a very strong meaning in these documents.		AIP	Change "shall" to "should".	6	2	5
UK	11	ed	6.3	pp 15-16	It would be much better to expand 5.1.4 to parallel 5.1.3 then delete 6.3.		Rejection	6.3 is guidance. 5.1.4 is rationale for the guidance.	6	3	0
JP	8	Ed	6.3.6	3rd bullet	The term "obscure language features" seems inappropriate in this subclause. The subject of this subclause is "Undefined Behaviour", not "Obscure Language Features". The same comment also applies to 6.4.6 and 6.5.6.		Rejection	The guidance is intended to suggest that compilers should provide a single switch, not three different switches. See N0234.	6	3	6
UK	12	ed	6.4	pp 17-18	This has already been said much better in 5.1.3.	Delete 6.4.	Rejection	6.4 is guidance. 5.1.3 is rationale for the guidance.	6	4	0
CA	1	Te	6.4.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 7.1.5 encapsulating implementation dependencies, 7.1.6 Implementation add-on features	Accept	For this and similar comments, add the cross references and add a URL for the "Ada Quality and Style Guide" to the Bibliography.	6	4	2
JP	9	Ed	6.4.5	1st bullet	A period should be added at the end of the sentence.		Accept		6	4	5
UK	13	ed	6.5	pp 18-19	The point 6.5 is making is simple. It would have more impact on the reader if written shorter.	Shorten 6.5.	Rejection	We don't know how to implement this comment. A contribution would have been helpful.	6	5	0

CA	2	Te	6.5.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 7.1.1 Obsolescent Features	Accept	See CA-1	6	5	2
NL	17	ed	6.6.2	cross reference	The reference to Holtzmann-8 is in error: The name is spelled incorrectly. What does 8 mean? chapter 8? There is no full reference for Holzmann in 6.6.7 There is no full reference for Holzmann in the Bibliography.	Correct references and name.	AIP	The "bibliography" portion of each description is simply a working area. In the published TR, there will be only a single bibliography at the end. This reference will be fixed as part of that process.	6	6	2
JP	10	Ed	6.6.3		The first paragraph does not discuss "Mechanism of Failure". We think that it should be moved to 6.6.5.		AIP	Rephrase as: "Readability and maintainability may be greatly decreased if preprocessing directives are used instead of language features."	6	6	3
UK	14	ed	6.7.1	p 21 line 26	'visually identical letters'	Should be 'visually similar characters'.	Accept		6	7	1
CA	3	Te	6.7.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide section 3.2 Naming Conventions and subsections	Accept	See CA-1	6	7	2
NL	18	ed	6.7.7	bibliography	The references are unnumbered whereas C.1.7 states that references should be numbered.	Correct references.	AIP	The "bibliography" portion of each description is simply a working area. In the published TR, there will be only a single bibliography at the end. This reference will be fixed as part of that process.	6	7	7
CA	4	Te	6.10.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 5.6.1 Nesting, 5.7.1 The Use Clause	Accept	See CA-1	6	10	2

CA	5	Te	6.11.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide section 3.4 Using Types And subsections	Accept	See CA-1	6	11	2
JP	11	Ed	6.12.1		A period should be added after the end of the very last sentence.		Accept		6	12	1
CA	6	Te	6.12.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 7.6.1 through 7.6.9, 7.3.1	Accept	See CA-1	6	12	2
JP	12	Ed	6.12.4		A period should be added after the end of the sentence in the first bullet.		Accept		6	12	4
NL	19	ed	6.12.7	bibliography	There is no occurrence of [1] in the body of the text.	Correct references.	AIP	Will fix during the editing of the Bibliography.	6	12	7
UK	15	ed	6.13	pp 30-31	To describe floating-point arithmetic as a vulnerability is ridiculous.	Delete 6.13.	Reject	Like any other language feature, it's the *misuse* of floating point that is the vulnerability.	6	13	0
CA	7	Te	6.13.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 5.5.6 Accuracy of Operations with Real Operands, 7.2.1 through 7.2.8	Accept	See CA-1	6	13	2
JP	13	Ed	6.13.5	3rd bullet	A comma should be inserted between "is simple" and "an expert".		Accept		6	13	5
JP	14	Ed	6.13.7	[7]	10967-3 is cited, but this document is not referenced in the main text. 10967-1 and 10967-2 should be cited.		AIP	Editor will investigate and correct as necessary.	6	13	7
NL	20	ed	6.13.7	bibliography	There is no occurrence of [1] .. [7] in the body of the text.	Correct references.	AIP	This will be treated when the final Bibliography is prepared for publication.	6	13	7

CA	8	Te	6.14.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 3.4.2 Enumeration Types	Accept	See CA-1	6	14	2
NL	21	ed	6.14.2	cross reference	The reference to Holtzmann-6 is in error The name is spelled incorrectly. There is no full reference for Holzmann in 6.14.7 There is no full reference for Holzmann in the Bibliography.	Correct references.	AIP	The "bibliography" portion of each description is simply a working area. In the published TR, there will be only a single bibliography at the end. This reference will be fixed as part of that process.	6	14	2
NL	22	ed	6.15.6	...and many other places in the report: line 14	activates -> activities	Make correction.	Accept		6	15	6
NL	23	ed	6.15.7	bibliography	References [1], [2], [4] and [5] are not mentioned in the body of this clause.	Correct references.	AIP	The "bibliography" portion of each description is simply a working area. In the published TR, there will be only a single bibliography at the end. This reference will be fixed as part of that process.	6	15	7

UK	16	te	6.17	pp 37-42	These are all about the same thing - bounds checking.	Merge 6.17-6.20.	Reject	Although the underlying mechanisms may be similar, the consequences are different. Rewriting the descriptions would be a substantial change late in the balloting for this edition of the TR. Without recommended text, it is impossible to evaluate and dispose this comment. The working group agrees to consider any offered proposals for changes prior to the balloting of the next edition. In addition, it was decided to add the following words of rationale to 5.3, as a new paragraph following line 14: "Furthermore, a simple coding error in one location may cause a person reading the code to lose understanding of subsequent execution of the program. The subsequent program behaviour may mask or amplify the original error." This clarifies that there may be a wide variety of consequences of coding errors.	6	17	0
JP	15	Ed	6.17.3	4th bullet	The word "functions" in "functions return address" and "programs" in "programs control flow" seems wrong. An apostrophe should be inserted before the last "s".		Accept		6	17	3
CA	9	Te	6.18.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 5.5.1 Range Values, 5.5.2 Array Attributes, 7.6.7 Unchecked_Access, 7.6.8.Unchecked_Conversion	Accept	See CA-1	6	18	2

JP	16	Ed	6.18.3	2nd paragraph	The term "extent" in "or violate the bounds of a particular extent" seems to be a language-specific term, and not a general term in programming languages.		AIP	Change "extent" to "index".	6	18	3
CA	10	Te	6.19.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 7.6.7 Unchecked_Access, 7.6.8.Unchecked_Conversion	Accept	See CA-1	6	19	2
JP	17	Ed	6.19.4	1st bullet	The term "Standard" should not be capitalized.		Accept		6	19	4
CA	11	Te	6.21.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 7.6.7 Unchecked_Access, 7.6.8.Unchecked_Conversion	Accept	See CA-1	6	21	2
NL	24	ed	6.21.2	Clause 6.21.2 and 6.21.7 and more clauses in the rest of the document.	References to Hatton unclear (see above).	Correct references.	AIP	The "bibliography" portion of each description is simply a working area. In the published TR, there will be only a single bibliography at the end. This reference will be fixed as part of that process.	6	21	2
CA	12	Te	6.23.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 5.4.5 Dynamic Data	Accept	See CA-1	6	23	2
JP	18	Ed	6.23.6		The first bullet is written as an observation. It should be rewritten as an advice to language designers.		AIP	Editor will resolve.	6	23	6

CA	13	Te	6.24.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 5.4.5 Dynamic Data, 7.3.3 storage Pool Mechanisms, 7.6.6 Unchecked Deallocation	Accept	See CA-1	6	24	2
JP	19	Ed	6.24.5	1st bullet	This bullet seems to be misplaced. It should be moved to 6.24.4.		Accept	Move the text to 6.24.4	6	24	5
CA	14	Te	6.25.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 8.3.1 through 8.3.8 , 8.4.2, all on generics	Accept	See CA-1	6	25	2
CA	15	Te	6.26.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide chapter 9 (all sections) on object oriented programming	Accept	See CA-1	6	26	2
JP	20	Ed	6.26.3	4th bullet	The word "cause" in "can be cause" would be a misspelling of "caused".		Accept		6	26	3
NL	25	ed	6.26.7	bibliography	References [1], [2] and [3] are not in the body of this clause.	Correct references.	AIP	The "bibliography" portion of each description is simply a working area. In the published TR, there will be only a single bibliography at the end. This reference will be fixed as part of that process.	6	26	7
UK	17	te	6.27	p 50 lines 25-27		Add something like, 'This commonly occurs with local variables in a procedure whose values have not been saved explicitly'	Reject	Upon correspondence with the original offeror of the comment, we discovered that the issue, in its expressed form, is not generic, but language-specific. It should be covered in appropriate language-specific annexes.	6	27	0
CA	16	Te	6.27.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 5.9.6 Initialization	Accept	See CA-1	6	27	2

JP	21	Ed	6.30.1		The form of bibliography reference is not uniform. In other subclauses, documents are referenced using numbers, not titles.		AIP	This will be corrected when the document is edited for publication.	6	30	1
NL	26	ed	6.30.1		Spurious literature reference.	Replace by call to litt.ref.	AIP	Will be corrected during editing of bibliography for publication.	6	30	1
UK	18	ed	6.30.1	p 54 lines 16-17	This reference in the text should be separated out into the bibliography like others.		AIP	See NL-26	6	30	1
CA	17	Te	6.30.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 7.1.8 Parameter Passing Mechanisms, 7.1.9 Arbitrary Order Dependencies	Accept	See CA-1	6	30	2
UK	19	ed	6.30.6	p 55 lines 13-14	'Language designers should develop an ISO standard ^containing one (or at most a few) accepted precedence orders'. Come on! This is relevant only to totally new languages. You can't change rules for existing languages	Delete.	Accept		6	30	6
JP	22	Ed	6.30.7		The style of the document reference is not uniform. The author name should be the first.		AIP	This will be corrected when the document is edited for publication.	6	30	7
CA	18	Te	6.31.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 7.1.8 Parameter Passing Mechanisms, 7.1.9 Arbitrary Order Dependencies	Accept	See CA-1	6	31	2

UK	20	ed	6.32	pp 57-58	Fortran allows the evaluation of an expression as any [^] mathematically equivalent expression. This regularly leads to debates on whether in an expression like [^] (1-1) * f(x) [^] the function, which may have side-effects, needs to be evaluated.	I didn't notice anything on this topic in section 6.31 or 6.32. Of course the 'reasonably competent programmer' does not get into this situation.	AIP	In 6.31.1, line 23, change "Some languages allow subexpressions to be evaluated in an unspecified ordering." to read as "Some languages allow subexpressions to be evaluated in an unspecified ordering, or even removed during optimization.".	6	32	0
JP	23	Ed	6.32.3		Is the word "Incorrect" in "Incorrect calculated result" correct? Isn't it a misspelling of "Incorrectly"?		Accept		6	32	3
CA	19	Te	6.34.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 5.6.1 Nesting, 5.7.1 The Use Clause	Accept	See CA-1	6	34	2
CA	20	Te	6.35.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide Chapter 3 Readability, sections 5.6.1 through 5.6.10	Accept	See CA-1	6	35	2
JP	24	Ed	6.35.3		There should be a grammatical error in "a part of it the statement".		AIP	The editor will correct the sentence that spans lines 28-30.	6	35	3
UK	21	ed	6.36.1	p 62 lines 27-28, lines 36-37	One of these is redundant.	Delete 27-28.	Reject	6.36.1 is a summary. It's not surprising that it includes information that appears elsewhere.	6	36	1
UK	22	ed	6.38.1	p 65 lines 3-5		Could add 'and more likely to be incorrect'.	Accept		6	38	1

CA	21	Te	6.38.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide chapters 3 Readability 4 Program Structure sections 5.4 Data Structures (all) 5.6 Statements (all) 5.7 Visibility	Accept	See CA-1	6	38	2
NL	27	ed	6.38.6	bibliography	See NL-21.	Correct references.	AIP	The "bibliography" portion of each description is simply a working area. In the published TR, there will be only a single bibliography at the end. This reference will be fixed as part of that process.	6	38	6
CA	22	Te	6.39.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 5.2 Parameter Lists 8.3 Adaptability	Accept	See CA-1	6	39	2
NL	28	ed	6.39.7	bibliography	References [1] and [2] are not mentioned in the body of this clause.	Correct references.	AIP	The "bibliography" portion of each description is simply a working area. In the published TR, there will be only a single bibliography at the end. This reference will be fixed as part of that process.	6	39	7
CA	23	Te	6.40.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 7.6.7 unchecked_access 7.6.8 unchecked_conversion 10.7.6 pragma suppress	Accept	See CA-1	6	40	2
CA	24	Te	6.41.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 5.6.6 Recursion and Iteration bounds	Accept	See CA-1	6	41	2
JP	25	Ed	6.41.5	1st bullet	The term "parameter signatures" should be changed to "subprogram signatures". The latter is used in the title.		Accept		6	41	5

JP	26	Ed	6.43.4	6th bullet	Is the term "a subprogram" appropriate here? Shouldn't it be changed to "the program"?		AIP	Delete "by a subprogram".	6	43	4
NL	28	ed	6.43.7	bibliography	References [1] and [2] are not mentioned in the body of this clause.	Correct references.	AIP	The "bibliography" portion of each description is simply a working area. In the published TR, there will be only a single bibliography at the end. This reference will be fixed as part of that process.	6	43	7
CA	25	Te	6.44.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 5.8 Using Exceptions 7.5 Exceptions (all subsections)	Accept	See CA-1	6	44	2
NL	29	ed	6.44.5		The text mentions ISO/IEC TR 24731-1, but there is no reference to this document.	Correct references.	AIP	The "bibliography" portion of each description is simply a working area. In the published TR, there will be only a single bibliography at the end. This reference will be fixed as part of that process.	6	44	5
JP	27	Ed	6.45.2		6.45.2 and 6.45.7 are empty. In such cases, "[None]" is inserted in other subclauses.		Accept	6.x.7 has been removed for this version of the TR.	6	45	2
NL	30	ed	6.45.7	bibliography	'[None]' missing.	Correct references.	AIP	The "bibliography" portion of each description is simply a working area. In the published TR, there will be only a single bibliography at the end. This reference will be fixed as part of that process.	6	45	7
CA	26	Te	6.46.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 7.6.7 Unchecked_Access 7.6.8 Unchecked_Conversion	Accept	See CA-1	6	46	2

CA	27	Te	6.47.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 7.3.3 Storage Pools 5.4.5 Dynamic Data 5.9.2 Unchecked_Deallocation	Accept	See CA-1	6	47	2
NL	31	ed	6.48.7	bibliography	The reference to Holtzmann-7 is in error: The name is spelled incorrectly. There is no full reference for Holzmann in 6.48.7 There is no full reference for Holzmann in the Bibliography.	Correct references and name.	AIP	The "bibliography" portion of each description is simply a working area. In the published TR, there will be only a single bibliography at the end. This reference will be fixed as part of that process.	6	48	7
CA	28	Te	6.51.2		missing reference to Ada Quality Style and Guide	Add reference to Ada Quality and Style Guide sections 5.8 Exceptions and subsections, 7.5 Exceptions and subsections	Accept	See CA-1	6	51	2
JP	28	Ed	6.51.3		The term "implementation dependant behaviour" would be a misspelling of "dependent". Moreover, this term is not defined anywhere in this TR. The term "implementation-defined behaviour" is defined, but "implementation dependent behaviour" is not.		AIP	Change "implementation dependent behaviour" (and any misspellings of it) to "implementation-defined behaviour". Change line 16 to read "lead to unexpected implementation-defined behaviour". In line 17 and elsewhere, change "throws" to "raises".	6	51	3
JP	29	Ed	6.51.5	1st bullet	The word "later" in "note that the later isn't" would be a misspelling of "latter". The word "in" in "before main in entered" would be a misspelling of "is".		Accept		6	51	5

UK	23	te	7	pp 85-105	Section 7 is not within the scope of the TR.	Delete section 7.	Reject	An identical comment from the UK was dispositioned on the previous ballot. The disposition on that ballot was: "Reject. This issue has been discussed repeatedly in the meeting. The WG has always come to the conclusion that Clause 7 is appropriate to deal with issues that are not programming language vulnerabilities per se, but are, in fact, strongly related to use of programming languages." See N0231.	7	0	0
NL	32	ed	7.4.2	cross reference	JSF Rule -> JSF AV Rule.	Correct text.	Accept		7	4	2
JP	30	Ed	7.12.2		The word "Behaviorial" in 207 would be a misspelling of "Behavioural".		Accept	No, these are taken from the CWE, and the CWE spelling is <i>Behavioria</i> l.	7	12	2
NL	33	ed	Annex A	A.6	very -> vary.	Correct word.	Accept	Annex has been removed from this version of the TR.	A	0	0
JP	31	Ed	C.1.6		Isn't the word "application" in "summarizing the description of application vulnerability" a misspelling of "language"?		Reject	This is worded as intended.	C	1	6
JP	32	Ed	D.1.0		The last sentence beginning with "With the current" should be a part of the previous sentence.		AIP	As noted, this section will be removed. If another draft is produced, the editor will fix it.	D	1	0
NL	44	ed	Annex E		It is rather unclear what use can be made of this Annex.	Remove Annex or replace by table as requested in NL-9.	AIP	See disposition of NL-9.	E	0	0
NL	45	ed	Bibliography	page 117, 118	Many of these numbered items are not referred to in the body of this document. Moreover, the numbers used here, interfere with numbers used in the bibliography sections 6.x.7.	Correct references.	AIP	The "bibliography" portion of each description is simply a working area. In the published TR, there will be only a single bibliography at the end. This reference will be fixed as part of that process.	G	0	0

NL	46	ed	Bibliography	all	Seen all previous clauses it seems certainly worthwhile to obtain a good technical solution to all of the referencing material in section 2 (empty now), the cross reference clauses, the bibliography clauses and the main bibliography at the end.	An investment now, but highly leveraged later.	AIP	This will be done in the draft prepared for publication.	G	0	0
NL	34-43	ed	General		[These numbers were not used in the comment file from NL.]	[No action]	OBE	No action needed.	Z	999	999
								Incorporate document N0217 into the DTR draft. <i>Noted.</i>			

Voting Summary

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7/WG 7 N0808

2004-09-05

8 Abstain

Austria (ASI)
Denmark (DS)
Finland (SFS)
France (AFNOR)
Italy (UNI)
Spain (AENOR)
Switzerland (SNV)
Ukraine (DSSU)

8 Yes

Canada (SCC)
China (SAC)
Germany (DIN)
Japan (JISC)
Korea, Republic of (KATS)
Netherlands (NEN)
Romania (ASRO)
USA (ANSI)

1 No

United Kingdom (BSI)