MUMPS Development Committee

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

Add JOB to Routine Execution

March 23, 1996

Produced by the MDC Subcommittee #15
Programming Structures

Ed de Moel, Chairman
MUMPS Development Committee

Art Smith, Chairman
Subcommittee #15

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.

Anyone reproducing this release is requested to reproduce this introduction.

1. Identification of the Proposed Change

1.1 Title

Add JOB to Routine Execution

1.2 MDC Proposer and Sponsor

Proposer:
Arthur B. Smith, Univ. of Missouri
A353 Clydesdale Hall
379 East Campus Drive
Columbia, MO 65251 USA
Voice: (573) 882-2666
FAX: (573) 882-5444
Internet: art@vets.vetmed.missouri.edu

Sponsor:
MDC X11/TG17
Task Group 17 – Interpretations
Chair: Kate Schell

1.3 Motion

None. Supersedes X11/SC15/96-9.

1.4 History

Aug. 1996	X11/96-58	<this document> Final write-up.
Mar. 1996	X11/SC15/96-9	Accepted as MDC Type A (26:0:1)
Oct. 1995	X11/SC15/95-30	Accepted as Subcommittee Type A (26:0:2)
Jun. 1995	X11/SC15/95-25	Accepted as Subcommittee Type B (17:0:2)

1.5 Dependencies

None.

2. Justification of the Proposed Change

2.1 Needs

NIST Issue ID#33 ("Entry Point of Routine invoked by JOB Command is not specified"), raised and reexamined by the MUMPS Systems Laboratory, notes that the JOB command was omitted from two lists in Section 6.3 (Routine Execution) of the Canvass document. This proposal corrects those omissions.
the list of instances that dynamically invoke routines and from the list of routines invoking elements where if no label is specified the first line

2.2 Existing Practice in the Area of the Proposed Change

All known implementations correctly treat JOB like the other commands in the lists.

3. Description of the Proposed Change

3.1 General Description of the Proposed Change

In NIST Issue #33 ("Entry Point of Routine invoked by JOB Command is not specified"), MUMPS System Laboratory notes that the JOB command is excluded from the list of instances that dynamically invoke routines, and from the list of routine invoking elements where, if no label is specified, the first line of the routinebody is used (both lists in Section 6.3 (Routine Execution). This proposal adds the JOB command to those two lists.

3.2 Annotated Examples of Use

N.A.

3.3 Formalization

Replace the opening of the first paragraph of Section 6.3 (Routine execution) with the following paragraph (new text appears in *italics*, comments in [square brackets] are editorial notes not to be included):

Routines are executed in a sequence of blocks. Each block is dynamically defined and is invoked by the instance of an argumentless DO command, *a JOB command (in the new process)* a doargument, an exfunc, or an exvar. Each block consists of a set of lines that all have the same LEVEL; the block begins with the line reference implied by the DO, *JOB*, exfunc, or exvar and ends with an implicit or explicit QUIT command. If no label is specified in the doargument, *jobargument*, exfunc, or exvar, the first line of the routinebody is used.[... Remainder of paragraph is unchanged.]

4. Implementation Effects

4.1 Effect on Existing User Practices and Investments

Existing MUMPS code will be unaffected by this proposal.

4.2 Effect on Existing Vendor Practices and Investments

All known MUMPS implementations will be unaffected by this proposal. Informal discussions with three vendors indicate that this proposal will not adversely affect them in any way.

4.3 Techniques and Costs for Compliance Verification

Unchanged by this proposal.

4.4 Legal Considerations

None known.

5. Closely Related Standards Activities

5.1 Other X11 Proposals Under Consideration
None.

5.2 Other Related Standards Efforts
None known.

5.3 Recommendations for Coordinating Liaison
None.

6. Associated Documents

X11/95-60   NIST Issues 1-45 revisited.

7. Issues, Pros and Cons, and Discussion

June 1995, Chicago
Brought forward by X11/TG17 for type B. Two Pros were cited: "Addresses NIST issue" (cited once) and "Makes standard consistent" (cited three times). No Cons were raised. The motion passed 17:0:2.

October 1995, New Orleans
Brought forward by X11/TG17 for Subcommittee type A. The same two Pros were cited: "Addresses NIST issues" (cited five times) and "Makes standard consistent" (cited twice). No Cons were raised. The motion passed 26:0:2.

March 1996, Boston

Brought to the full MDC for MDC Type A approval. The same two Pros were cited: "Addresses NIST issues" (cited twice) and "Makes standard consistent" (cited once). No Cons were raised. The motion passed 26:0:1