

1. Identification of the proposed change

1.1. Title

Define Variable m in \$PIECE

1.2. MDC Proposer and Sponsor

This proposal originates from Bernie Schoch.

The document editor is Ed de Moel.

Motions regarding the status of this document will be made by Subcommittee 13 (Data Management and Manipulation).

Ed de Moel can be reached at:

· 800 Nelson Street, Rockville, Maryland 20850-2051

· home phone: 301 762 8333

· telefax: 301 762 8999

· email: demoel@radix.net

1.3. Motion

No motion.

1.4. History of MDC actions

Date	Document	Action
September 1999	X11/1999-3	Final write-up
September 1998	X11/SC13/1998-13	Presented for consideration as MDC Type A, accepted 15:0:1
June 1998	X11/SC13/1998-6	Presented for consideration as SC#13 Type A, accepted 13:0:2.
March 1998	X11/SC13/1998-1	Presented for consideration as SC#13 Type B; accepted 15:0:2.
September 1997	X11/SC13/97-6	Initial document. Presented for acceptance as Type C, accepted 18:0:1.

1.5. Dependencies

None.

2. Justification of Proposed Change

2.1. Needs

The definition of the function \$PIECE uses a variable m in its explanatory text; the meaning and value of this variable is not explicitly specified.

2.2. Existing Practice in Area of the Proposed Change

All implementations known to the authors of this proposal behave according to the proposed addition to the standard.

3. Description of the proposed change

3.1. General Description of the Proposed Change

This proposal adds explicit text to the standard that establishes the meaning and value of the variable m as “intuitively” assumed by all readers so far.

3.2. Annotated Examples of Use

None.

3.3. Formalization

In Section I, clause 7.1.5.2, definition of \$PIECE (September 1996 draft Millennium Standard), just

below the start of the explanation of \$PIECE with 4 parameters, change:

Let n be the integer value of intexpr₂.

to

Let m be the integer value of intexpr₁. Let n be the integer value of intexpr₂.

4. Implementation impacts

4.1. Impact on Existing User Practices and Investments

None; this proposal only corrects an omission in the text of the standard.

4.2. Impact on Existing Vendor Practices and Investments

None; this proposal only corrects an omission in the text of the standard.

4.3. Techniques and Costs for Compliance Verification

None needed. All implementations already behave as if this text were present.

4.4. Legal considerations

None.

5. Closely related standards activities

5.1. Other X11 Proposals (Type A or Type B) Under Consideration

None.

5.2. Other Related Standards Efforts

None.

5.3. Recommendations for Co-ordinating Liaison

None.

6. List of Associated Documents

None.

7. Issues, Pros and Cons, and Discussion

7.1. September 1997, Chicago, Illinois

Initial proposal discussed.

Pro: 1. Corrects flaw in the current standard.

7.2. March 1998, Buckhead, Georgia

No cons raised.

Pro: 1. Corrects flaw in the current standard.

7.3. June 1998, Waltham, Massachusetts

No cons raised.

Pro: 1. Corrects flaw in the current standard.

7.4. 19 September 1998, Seattle, Washington

No cons raised.

Pro: 1. Corrects flaw in the current standard.