

**X11/95-91**

## **MUMPS Development Committee**

Extension to the MDC Standard  
Type A Release of the MUMPS Development Committee

### **\$ORDER definition** June 1995

Produced by the MDC Subcommittee #13  
Data Management and Manipulation

Ed de Moel, Chairman  
MUMPS Development Committee

Dan Bormann, Chairman  
Subcommittee #13

The reader is hereby notified that the following MDC specification has been approved by the MUMPS Development Committee but that it may be a partial specification that relies on information appearing in many parts of the MDC Standard. This specification is dynamic in nature, and the changes reflected by this approved change may not correspond to the latest specification available.

Because of the evolutionary nature of MDC specifications, the reader is further reminded that changes are likely to occur in the specification released, herein, prior to a complete republication of the MDC Standard.

© Copyright 1995 by the MUMPS Development Committee. This document may be reproduced in any form so long as acknowledgment of the source is made.

Anyone reproducing this release is requested to reproduce this introduction.

MDC Secretariat  
1738 Elton Road  
Suite 205  
Silver Spring  
Maryland 20903  
(301) 431-4070  
Fax (301) 431-0017

1.1 Title: **\$ORDER definition**

1.2 MDC Proposer and Sponsor:

James Domingo  
University of California  
Division of Computer Science  
Davis, California 95616  
(916) 752-2680

Wally Fort  
VA ISC-SF  
301 Howard St., Suite 600  
San Francisco, CA. 94105  
(415) 744-7520  
forum

1.3 Motion: No Motion. Final write-up after proposal was accepted as MDC type A extension.

1.4 History:

Oct. 1995	X11/95-91	MDC type A document.
June 1995	X11/SC13/95-3	Passed as MDC type A (34:0:1)
Jan. 1995	X11/SC13/94-46	Passed by SC13 as a SC13 type A (16:0:2) Passed by SC13/TG13 unanimously.
June 1994	X11/SC13/94-23	Replacement type B, Passed (19:0:6) as amended. (the word ALL has been dropped from RMDSv9) X11/SC13/94-23 was voted on (8:2:13)
February 1994	X11/SC13/94-12	Remanded to task group to address issues from X11/SC13/TG13/94-2
October 1993	X11/SC13/93-49	Proposed as SC13 type A. (passed 7:1:5) Updated to reference RMDSv6. Pro: Corrects a problem. Con: 1. Changes good text to non-sense 2. no real problem to correct.
June 1993	X11/SC13/TG13/93-3	Approved as SC13 type B. (13:0:3)
February 1993	X11/SC13/93-4	Amended by task group.
October 1992		Accepted by TG13.
30 August 1992	X11/SC13/92-48	The term "defined node" was ambiguous and changed to reference \$DATA, updated to reference RMDS v4
21 August 1992	X11/SC13/92-25	approved by MDCC-E 8:0:0
11 June 1992	X11/SC13/92-25	approved by task group 6:0:0
29 April 1992	X11/SC13/92-25	initial proposal

2. Justification of Proposed Change

2.1 Needs

The paragraph that defines the set A has misleading wording for the description of A. "If  $S_n$  is "", let A be the set of all subscripts." This could be read as \*possible\* subscripts? What it implies is "all subscripts that satisfy condition b".

The next sentence suffers from the same wording ailment: "If  $S_n$  is not "", let A be the set of all subscripts that follow  $S_n$ ". This could be read as "all possible subscripts" as opposed to just those whose  $S_d = 0$ .

2.2 Existing Practice in Area of the Proposed Change

X11 1.1 1990

3. Description of Proposed Change

3.1 General Description of the Proposed Change.

Clarify the definition of set A.

3.2 Annotated Examples of Use

none

3.3 Formalization

I.7.1.5.11 \$ORDER

(Paragraph numbers reference RMDS v9)

In the 10th paragraph, third sentence,  
Change

Let A be the set of subscripts that follow  $S_n$ . That is, for all s in A:

To

Let A be the set of subscripts such that, s is in A if and only if

In the 12th paragraph, Change 'subscripts which' to 'subscripts in A which' so it reads

... that is, all other subscripts in A which follow  $S_n$  also follow t.

In the 23th paragraph, third sentence,  
Change

Let A be the set of all subscripts that precede  $S_n$ . That is, for all s in A:

To

Let A be the set of subscripts such that, s is in A if and only if

In the 25th paragraph, Change 'subscripts which' to 'subscripts in A which' so it reads

... that is, all other subscripts in A which precede s also precede t.

#### 4. Implementation Impacts

##### 4.1 Impact on Existing User Practices and Investments

Negligible.

##### 4.2 Effect on Existing Vendor Practices and Investments

Negligible.

##### 4.3 Techniques and Costs for Compliance Verification

Does not change compliance verification.

##### 4.4 Legal Considerations

none.

#### 5. Closely Related Standards Activities

##### 5.1 Other X11 Proposals Under Consideration.

none

##### 5.2 Other Related Standards Efforts

none

##### 5.3 Recommendations for Coordinating Liaison

none

#### 6. Associated Documents

X11/SC13/TG13/94-2

#### 7. Issues, Pros and Cons, and Discussion

June 1994                      Amendment pass (8:2:13) to change from:

Let A be the set of subscripts such that, for all S in A:

to

Let A be the set of subscripts such that, s is in A if and only if.

Jan 1995

Pro

Change S to s in 3 places.

1. Improves the definition of \$ORDER

#### 8. Glossary

none

#### 9. Appendix

none

