

# ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 0499

Date: 2000-07-31

REPLACES: --

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Data Management and Interchange</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Secretariat: United States of America (ANSI)</b> <b>Administered by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory on behalf of ANSI</b></p>
---

<b>DOCUMENT TYPE</b>	Meeting Report
<b>TITLE</b>	Meeting Report - DCOR EDITING MEETING ISO/IEC DCOR 9075:Cor.1 3 rd July – 14 th July 2000 Warwick, England
<b>SOURCE</b>	Stephen Cannan (Netherlands)
<b>PROJECT NUMBER</b>	1.32.03.04.99.00
<b>STATUS</b>	Output from ISO/ IEC JTC1/ SC32 Editing Meeting on the ISO/ IEC 9075: 1999 TC# 1 DCOR ballot
<b>REFERENCES</b>	
<b>ACTION ID.</b>	FYI
<b>REQUESTED ACTION</b>	
<b>DUE DATE</b>	
<b>Number of Pages</b>	69
<b>LANGUAGE USED</b>	English
<b>DISTRIBUTION</b>	P & L Members SC Chair WG Conveners and Secretaries

Douglas Mann, Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory \*, 901 D Street, SW., Suite 900, Washington, DC, 20024-2115, United States of America

Telephone: +1 703 575 2114; Facsimile: +1 703 681 9180; E-mail: [MannD@battelle.org](mailto:MannD@battelle.org)

available from the JTC 1/SC 32 WebSite <http://www.jtc1sc32.org/>

\*Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNL) administers the ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 Secretariat on behalf of ANSI

2000-07-27

## DCOR EDITING MEETING

### ISO/IEC DCOR 9075:Cor.1

#### ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32

3<sup>rd</sup> July – 14<sup>th</sup> July 2000

Warwick, England

Last Updated: 2000-07-27

## 1 Introduction Of Participants

<b>Mark Ashworth</b>	<b>(Canada)</b>
<b>Graham Brown</b>	<b>(UK)</b>
<b>Phil Brown</b>	<b>(UK)</b>
<b>Charles Campbell</b>	<b>(USA)</b>
<b>Stephen Cannan</b>	<b>(Netherlands) WG3 Convenor</b>
<b>Hugh Darwen</b>	<b>(UK)</b>
<b>Simon David</b>	<b>(UK)</b>
<b>Lex de Haan</b>	<b>(Netherlands)</b>
<b>Takashi Kotera</b>	<b>(Japan)</b>
<b>Krishna Kulkarni</b>	<b>(USA)</b>
<b>Jim Melton</b>	<b>(USA) Project Editor</b>
<b>Jim Murray</b>	<b>(AUS)</b>
<b>Wolfgang Panny</b>	<b>(AUT)</b>
<b>Baba Piprani</b>	<b>(Canada)</b>
<b>Friedemann Schwenkreis</b>	<b>(DEU)</b>
<b>Takaaki Shiratori</b>	<b>(Japan)</b>
<b>Mike Sykes</b>	<b>(UK)</b>
<b>Masashi Tsuchida</b>	<b>(Japan)</b>
<b>Robert Uleman</b>	<b>(Netherlands)</b>
<b>Fred Zemke</b>	<b>(USA)</b>

## 2 Distribution Of Documents

All participants either had or were provided with all documents on the document register. The Local Area Server contained all documents at the start of the meeting
---

## 3 Selection Of Secretary And Resolution Recorder

Chuck Campbell agreed to record the minutes. Stephen Cannan agreed to record the resolutions.
--

## 4 Approval Of Agenda

Approved as amended and published.
------------------------------------

## 5 Administrative Matters

### 5.1 Calling notice for DCOR Editing Meeting (SC32 N00434) (BHX-020)

<b>BHX-020</b> TITLE: Notice of DCOR Editing Meeting for ISO/IEC 9075, Database Language SQL SOURCE: SC 32 Secretariat DATES: 3 rd July – 14 th July 2000
--

2000-07-27

VENUE: I.B.M., Warwick, England  
TIME: 09:00 on 3 rd July 2000 until 17:00 on 14 th July 2000  
PURPOSE: To resolve the ballot comments on for ISO/IEC DIS 9075 Cor.1, Technical Corrigendum and to prepare revised text, a disposition of comments report, and a recommendation on publication.

## 5.2 ISO 9075 TC#4 DCOR text (SC32 N00431) (BHX-017)

**BHX-017**  
**(Draft)**  
**Information technology - Database Languages — SQL**  
TECHNICAL CORRIGENDUM 4  
Technologies de l'Information - Langages de base de données — SQL  
RECTIFICATIF TECHNIQUE 4  
Technical corrigendum 4 to International Standard ISO/IEC 9075 was prepared by Joint Technical Committee  
ISO/IEC JTC1, Information technology.

## 5.3 Results of SC32 Ballot on FCD 9075 Cor1 (SC32 N00484, BHX-032)

**BHX-032**  
**DOCUMENT TYPE** Summary of Voting/Table of Replies  
**TITLE** Table of Replies - SC 32 N 0431 - ISO/IEC DCOR 9075 Information technology --Database Language SQL - Technical Corrigendum 4  
**SOURCE** SC 32 Secretariat  
**PROJECT NUMBER** 1.32.03.04.99.00  
**STATUS** SC 32/WG 3 is directed to consider the comments of this ballot  
**REFERENCES**  
**ACTION ID.** ACT  
**REQUESTED ACTION**  
SC 32/WG 3 is directed to consider the comments of this ballot  
**DUE DATE**  
**Number of Pages** 40  
**LANGUAGE USED** English  
**DISTRIBUTION** P & L Members  
SC Chair  
WG Conveners

## 5.4 DCOR 9075 Consolidated Ballot Comments (BHX-029R3)

**BHX-029R3**  
**Project:** ANSI: 1234D — ISO: 1.32.3.4  
**Title:** Consolidated comments for SQL: 1999 TC# 1 DCOR Editing Meeting  
**Status:** To assist ISO/ IEC JTC1/ SC32 during its Editing Meeting on the ISO/ IEC 9075: 1999 TC# 1 DCOR ballot  
**Author:** Jim Melton (USA)  
**Abstract:** A DCOR Ballot was held in early 2000 to determine whether or not Technical Corrigendum #1 to ISO/ IEC 9075: 1999 should be progressed to COR status. An Editing Meeting will be held to resolve comments submitted in response to that ballot. The comments from all National Bodies submitting comments are collected together into a single document to assist the Editing Meeting in accomplishing its job.

## 5.5 Convenor's Definition of Consensus

**The usual rules apply:**

- 1. Fixing a feature – a simple majority.**
- 2. Adding or Removing Functionality – a majority with at least two national bodies, however will also consider the number of YES and NO votes versus ABSTENTIONS.**

2000-07-27

## 6 National Body Opening Comments

### 6.1 Australia (BHX-048)

#### BHX-048

**Title:** Information Technology - Database Language SQL - Part 9: Management of External Data

**Status:** Comments on Draft ISO/ IEC 9075- 9.

**Author:** Jim Murray (Australia)

**Comment:** The attached comments are for the information of WG3. They were not sent as ballot comments to the final co are too late for consideration in the editing meeting. However, it may be possible to address them when resolving national bodies?

#### Opening Comments:

There was no opening statement.

### 6.2 Belgium

Not Present

### 6.3 Brazil

Not Present

### 6.4 Canada (BHX-070)

#### BHX-070

**Title:** Comments on DCOR 4 to ISO/IEC 9075-1 through -5:1999

**Source:** Canada

**Status:** Approved Canadian Position

#### Opening Comments:

Canada's Opening Comments DCOR

Canada feels that it is important to progress the DCOR quickly and is hopeful of resolving every comment to the satisfaction of respective national bodies.

### 6.5 China

Not Present

### 6.6 Czech Republic

Not Present

### 6.7 Denmark

Not Present

### 6.8 Finland

Not Present

### 6.9 France

Not Present

### 6.10 Germany

#### Opening Comments:

Germany would like to apologize for the unavailability of its comments as a separate paper. The German chair actually did not know that usually ballot comments are submitted to SC32 as well as a separate contribution to the editing meeting.

Germany is looking forward to the editing meeting and we are convinced that all DCOR comments can be addressed at the meeting.

2000-07-27

6.11 Italy

Not Present

6.12 Japan

Opening Comments:

There was no opening statement.

6.13 Netherlands

Opening Comments:

The Netherlands notes that these four meetings are again pushing the boundaries of what is possible to achieve in a fortnight. We see a lot of work to do especially given that 116 comments for the Editing Meeting are not yet addressed by any paper. However, we are generally pleased with the situation and look forward to a successful outcome from these meetings.

6.14 Norway

Not Present

6.15 Republic of Korea

Not Present

6.16 United Kingdom (BHX-053)

**BHX-053**

**Title:** A Compendium of Possible Problems in SQL: 1999

**Status:** Document to accompany DCOR ballot response

**Author:** Hugh Darwen (ed.)

**Abstract:** We present a compendium of Possible Problems we have found in SQL: 1999. We attach this document to UK's response to the DCOR ballot on Technical Corrigendum 1 for SQL: 1999 because we believe that some of these— in particular those in coloured shading— should be addressed in the TC.

Opening Comments:

UK DCOR editing meeting NB opening comments

We think the TC should be published as soon as possible. For that reason, most of the comments in the document accompanying our ballot response are Possible Problems that we do not require to be addressed in the TC about to be published—they can be closed with no action apart from filing as Possible Problems with SQL:1999 as far as we are concerned.

A significant exception is our major technical comment of the lack of a proper definition of value identity in SQL:1999, as discussed at length in Santa Fe. We have submitted a proposal, BHX-049r1, to address this issue and the USA has submitted a welcome response mentioning concerns with our proposal that they need to be addressed before they can accept it. Their points are well taken and we hope that we can work together to achieve an outcome that is agreeable to all national bodies.

6.17 United States (BHX-060)

**BHX-060**

**Title:** USA ballot comments for SQL:1999 TC#1 DCOR Editing Meeting

**Status:** For submission to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32 as USA comments on the ISO/IEC 9075:1999 TC#1 DCOR ballot

**Author:** Jim Melton (USA)

**Abstract:** A DCOR Ballot was held in early 2000 to determine whether or not Technical Corrigendum #1 to ISO/IEC 9075:1999 should be progressed to COR status. The USA submits its comments on the balloted document.

2000-07-27

**Opening Comments:**

USA has tabled a number of papers to the DCOR editing meeting that together resolve all the ballot comments it has submitted. USA is thankful to other national bodies for their contributions and hopes that the editing meeting succeeds in addressing the ballot comments to the satisfaction of all. USA further hopes that the editing meeting recommends the publication of SQL-99 TC#1 soon after the output document is available.

**6.18 Austria**

**(BHX-076)**

**BHX-076**

**Title:** Comments on DCOR 4 to ISO/IEC 9075-1:1999 through ISO/IEC 9075-5:1999

**Source:** Austria

**Status:** Austrian Position

**Opening Comments:**

There was not opening statement.

**6.19 Russian Federation**

**Not Present**

**6.20 Sweden**

**(BHX-077)**

**BHX-077**

WG3:BHX-077

SQL:1999 TC#1 DCOR Ballot Response

From Sweden

During our implementation of the SQL99 standard, we found the following:

**Opening Comments:**

Sweden did not attend the editing meeting.

2000-07-27

## **7 Ballot Comments already Processed by the Editor**

- 7.1 Seq#001 (USA-STC-001) (see comment)
- 7.2 Seq#003 (SWE-STC-038) (see comment)
- 7.3 Seq#011 (USA-STC-003) (see comment)
- 7.4 Seq#014 (GBR-STC-010) (see comment)
- 7.5 Seq#020 (USA-STC-007) (see comment)
- 7.6 Seq#026 (SWE-STC-007) (see comment)
- 7.7 Seq#027 (SWE-STC-008) (see comment)
- 7.8 Seq#029 (SWE-STC-010) (see comment)
- 7.9 Seq#031 (SWE-STC-012) (see comment)
- 7.10 Seq#032 (SWE-STC-013) (see comment)
- 7.11 Seq#033 (SWE-STC-014) (see comment)
- 7.12 Seq#036 (USA-STC-010) (see comment)
- 7.13 Seq#046 (USA-STC-015) (see comment)
- 7.14 Seq#047 (USA-STC-021) (see comment)
- 7.15 Seq#048 (USA-STC-016) (see comment)
- 7.16 Seq#049 (USA-STC-017) (see comment)
- 7.17 Seq#050 (USA-STC-018) (see comment)
- 7.18 Seq#051 (USA-STC-019) (see comment)
- 7.19 Seq#052 (USA-STC-020) (see comment)
- 7.20 Seq#055 (SWE-STC-017) (see comment)
- 7.21 Seq#059 (SWE-STC-019) (see comment)
- 7.22 Seq#062 (USA-STC-023) (see comment)
- 7.23 Seq#063 (USA-STC-024) (see comment)
- 7.24 Seq#064 (GBR-STC-022) (see comment)
- 7.25 Seq#066 (USA-STC-025) (see comment)
- 7.26 Seq#068 (SWE-STC-021) (see comment)
- 7.27 Seq#069 (AUT-STC-001) (see comment)

2000-07-27

7.28 Seq#071 (SWE-STC-023) (see comment)

7.29 Seq#072 (SWE-STC-024) (see comment)  
(BHX-100)

**The Editor and BHX-100 provided the same solution.**

7.30 Seq#078 (USA-STC-026) (see comment)

7.31 Seq#079 (SWE-STC-027) (see comment)

7.32 Seq#080 (SWE-STC-028) (see comment)

7.33 Seq#081 (SWE-STC-029) (see comment)

7.34 Seq#082 (SWE-STC-030) (see comment)

7.35 Seq#083 (SWE-STC-031) (see comment)

7.36 Seq#084 (SWE-STC-032) (see comment)

7.37 Seq#087 (SWE-STC-034) (see comment)

7.38 Seq#088 (SWE-STC-035) (see comment)

7.39 Seq#089 (SWE-STC-036) (see comment)

7.40 Seq#090 (SWE-STC-037) (see comment)

7.41 Seq#091 (SWE-STC-039) (see comment)

7.42 Seq#092 (SWE-STC-040) (see comment)

7.43 Seq#094 (SWE-STC-041) (see comment)

7.44 Seq#095 (SWE-STC-042) (see comment)

7.45 Seq#096 (SWE-STC-043) (see comment)

7.46 Seq#097 (SWE-STC-044) (see comment)

7.47 Seq#100 (GBR-STC-026) Rejected

**Rejected as Out of Scope for a TC.**

**UK—Hugh Darwen—This was proposed as a LO, Language Opportunity.**



2000-07-27

- 7.48 Seq#101 (GBR-STC-029) (see comment)
- 7.49 Seq#102 (SWE-STC-045) (see comment)
- 7.50 Seq#103 (SWE-STC-046) (see comment)
- 7.51 Seq#104 (SWE-STC-047) (see comment)
- 7.52 Seq#105 (SWE-STC-048) (see comment)
- 7.53 Seq#106 (SWE-STC-049) (see comment)
- 7.54 Seq#107 (SWE-STC-050) (see comment)
- 7.55 Seq#108 (SWE-STC-054) (see comment)
- 7.56 Seq#109 (SWE-STC-055) (see comment)
- 7.57 Seq#110 (SWE-STC-056) (see comment)
- 7.58 Seq#111 (SWE-STC-057) (see comment)
- 7.59 Seq#112 (SWE-STC-051) (see comment)
- 7.60 Seq#113 (SWE-STC-052) (see comment)
- 7.61 Seq#114 (SWE-STC-053) (see comment)
- 7.62 Seq#115 (SWE-STC-058) (see comment)
- 7.63 Seq#116 (SWE-STC-059) (see comment)
- 7.64 Seq#117 (SWE-STC-060) (see comment)
- 7.65 Seq#118 (SWE-STC-061) (see comment)
- 7.66 Seq#119 (SWE-STC-062) (see comment)
- 7.67 Seq#120 (SWE-STC-063) (see comment)
- 7.68 Seq#121 (SWE-STC-064) (see comment)
- 7.69 Seq#122 (GBR-STC-030) (see comment)
- 7.70 Seq#123 (GBR-STC-031) (see comment)
- 7.71 Seq#125 (SWE-STC-065) (see comment)
- 7.72 Seq#133 (SWE-STC-067) (see comment)
- 7.73 Seq#137 (SWE-STC-068) (see comment)
- 7.74 Seq#141 (SWE-STC-069) (see comment)
- 7.75 Seq#142 (SWE-STC-070) (see comment)

2000-07-27

- 7.76 Seq#143 (SWE-STC-071) (see comment)
- 7.77 Seq#146 (SWE-STC-074) (see comment)
- 7.78 Seq#147 (SWE-STC-075) (see comment)
- 7.79 Seq#153 (GBR-STC-042) (see comment)
- 7.80 Seq#158 (USA-STC-030) (see comment)
- 7.81 Seq#159 (USA-STC-031) (see comment)
- 7.82 Seq#160 (USA-STC-032) (see comment)
- 7.83 Seq#161 (USA-STC-033) (see comment)
- 7.84 Seq#162 (USA-STC-034) (see comment)
- 7.85 Seq#163 (USA-STC-035) (see comment)
- 7.86 Seq#164 (USA-STC-036) (see comment)
- 7.87 Seq#165 (USA-STC-037) (see comment)
- 7.88 Seq#166 (SWE-STC-076) (see comment)
- 7.89 Seq#167 (SWE-STC-077) (see comment)

## 8 Resolution of Ballot Comments

8.1 Seq#002 (GBR-STC-001) See also: 8.1, 8.13, 8.26, & 8.80

<p><b>Seq#002 GBR- STC- 001</b> 2- Minor Technical P01- No specific location</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Although [CWB- 051] inserted text into SQL/ Framework that refers to forms of use, it made no comment on their usefulness. We believe that, now that SQL has adopted Unicode, there are two concepts which may need to be distinguished: <i>encoding</i> and <i>transformation format</i>. But perhaps the Unicode term <i>transcoding</i> (Conversion of character data between different character sets) will cover conversion of either sort.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment.</p>
--

<p><b>STATEMENT: UK—Hugh Darwen—Accepted the position of making these PPs.</b></p> <p><b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> [1] US – Krishna – US has a position on this paper. Wanted to clarify the UK position. US is not to accept any solutions developed during this meeting. [2] UK – Hugh – Said that they are opened as to the solutions and will consider how they are closed.</p> <p><b>Amendments: None.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Resolved as a PP, Possible Problem.</b></p> <p><b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b></p>
---

8.2 Seq#004 (GBR-STC-004) (see comment)

<p><b>Seq#004 GBR-STC-004</b></p>
-----------------------------------

2000-07-27

4-Minor Editorial *P02-02, Normative references*

**Comment:**

We note that, if Unicode Version 3.0 is not already available, it will be before the next revision of SQL is published.

**Solution:**

Amend the reference accordingly.

**STATEMENT:** UK—As written

**Questions & Comments:** None recorded.

**Amendments:** None.

**ACTION:** Decline -- Goes against ITEF procedures.

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

**8.3 Seq#005 (GBR-STC-005) (see comment)**

**Seq#005 GBR-STC-005**

4-Minor Editorial *P02-02, Normative references*

**Comment:**

The reference to SQL/CLI is to the FDIS, but 9075-3:1999 is an IS now.

**Solution:**

Modify Clause 2 "Normative references", as follows:  
ISO/IEC **FDIS** 9075-3:1999, Information technology - Database languages - SQL - Part 3: Call-Level Interface (SQL/CLI).

**STATEMENT:** USA—Jim Melton & Netherlands—Stephen Cannan—Presented position.

**Questions & Comments:** [1] Goes against ITEF procedures.

**Amendments:**

**ACTION:** Decline

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

**8.4 Seq#006 (GBR-STC-006) (BHX-152R1) See also 8.4 & 8.5**

**Seq#006 GBR- STC- 006**

2- Minor Technical *P02- 03.01 .01, Definitions taken from ISO/ IEC 10646*

**Comment:**

This subclause states that "this part of ISO/ IEC 9075 makes use of" six terms, but in actual fact uses only two, *character*, and *repertoire*. However, it redefines the latter, without explicitly stating whether it is unnecessarily repeating the definition in ISO/ IEC 10646, or replacing it. It (Part 2, Foundation) does not make use of the terms *coded character*, *coded character set*, *control function*, or *private use plane*.

**Solution:** None provided with comment.

**BHX-152R1**

**Title:** SQL/MED Conformance Statement

**Status:** Change proposal for **FCD 9075-9 (SQL/MED) Editing Meeting**

**Author:** Jim Melton (USA)

**Abstract:** The conformance statement for SQL/MED is incomplete. It considers four features but fails to recognize more complex relationships between certain features that are not yet identified by feature IDs. Several comments identify problems with the conformance statement (as distinguished from Conformance Rules, which comments are not addressed by the present paper.

**STATEMENT:** AUS—Jim Murray—Presented BHX-152R1

**Questions & Comments:** None recorded.

**Amendments:** None.

**ACTION:** Accepted as written

2000-07-27

**VOTE: UNANIMOUS**

**8.5 Seq#007 (GBR-STC-007) (BHX-152R1) See also 8.4 & 8.5**

**Seq#007 GBR- STC- 007**

2- Minor Technical P02- 0 3.01.02, Definitions taken from Unicode

**Comments:**

This subclause states that "this part of ISO/ IEC 9075 makes use of" six terms, but uses only one: *control character* (in the context of ISO8BIT); another, *code value*, occurs only in Clause 22.1 "SQLSTATE", Table 27-" SQLSTATE class and subclass values".

**Solution:** None provided with comment.

**BHX-152R1**

**See 8.4**

**STATEMENT:**

**Questions & Comments:**

**Amendments:**

**ACTION: See 8.4**

**VOTE:**

**8.6 Seq#008 (USA-STC-002) (BHX-035)  
(BHX-049R2)  
(BHX-093) (BHX-116)**

**STATEMENT: USA—Fred Zemke—Presented BHX-035.**

**Questions & Comments:**

[1] UK—Mike Sykes--BHX-049r1: Might be better in other ways then presented in BHX-035. This is a comment in passing. The group needs to agree. Nothing in conflict. Just looking at Definition. Needs to be defined in one place. Would look at Distinct Predicate. BHX-035 is fine except as stated in BHX-049r1.

[2] USA—Jim Melton—Offered a proposal for bullet points in the definition. Jim can only go in two levels of Bullet Points.

**Process BHX-035**

[3] UK—Hugh Darwen—Comment on 3.1 last sentence in points one. (1) TWO COMPERABLE VALUES. Delete two rows or two arrays or (2) insert the word scalars. This fixes existing text.

[4] USA—Krishna Kulkarni--Ok on this as well. First solution

[5] US – Krishna – Insert Values in Section 3.1 in the Bolded part. "Values of User defined types."

**SUPPORT for BHX-035**

**Process BHX-049r1**

[6] Presented by Mike Sykes. Casting strings to bits. Presented parts that don't intersect with BHX-035. There are things that need to be fixed in this paper and I am agreeable to bring it back after the changes are made.

[7] USA—Fred Zemke—BHX-093 – UK agrees in BHX-116 as stated there are thing that the UK is concerned with. However, they will back down. if the group accepts BHX-093. Fred believes that there is a need for BHX-049r1.

[8] USA—Krishna Kulkarni—Had talked to Hugh to cover other points the US had problems with.

**ACTION BHX-049r1 to be revised**

[9] UK will take the paper back and redo the paper then represent it later in the meeting. Remove 3.7. 3.10 needs to be changed as stated in BHX-116, 3.8 Revised a cast to bit string, and

2000-07-27

<p>3.9 also deleted.</p> <p>[10] USA—Jim Melton--Restates proposed solution and asked if anyone would oppose if the changes were made as proposed. No one objected.</p> <p>[11] USA—Krishna Kulkarni--US supports the UK direction.</p>
<p><b>Amendments:</b></p> <p><b>BHX-035</b></p> <p>[1] Insert "values of" between "is not defined for" and "user-defined types" in the last bolded sentence. In section 3.1.</p> <p>[2] In the last sentence: delete "<del>, two rows, two arrays</del>" insert "comparable" between "two" and "values" In section 3.1</p> <p>[3] Insert "values of" between "is not defined for" and "user-defined types" in the last bolded (see WD change) sentence. In section 4.1.</p> <p>[4] In the last sentence: delete "<del>, two rows, two arrays</del>" insert "comparable" between "two" and "values" In section 4.1</p> <p><b>BHX-049R2</b></p> <p>[5] <b>ADOPTED</b></p> <p>Apply changes to the WD text to the TC text. Apply WD change for the definition of distinct to the TC (in preference to definition bhx-035).</p> <p>[6] Replace "<del>Neither equal nor both null.</del>" with "<b>Informally, not equal, or not both null, or having a pair of corresponding components that are distinct.</b>"</p> <p><b>Two null values are not distinct.</b></p> <p><b>A null value and a nonnull value are distinct."</b></p> <p>In section 3.1.3.</p> <p>[6] replace "values" with "fields" in the penultimate bullet (Two rows (or partial ...)</p> <p>[7] a.0) If V1 and V2 are both null, then V1 is identical to V2.</p> <p>a.01 If V1 is null and V2 is not null or V2 is null and V1 is not null, then V1 is not identical to V2.</p> <p>delete 2) a) i) 1).</p>
<p><b>ACTION: Accepted as amended.</b></p>
<p><b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b></p>

8.7 Seq#009 (SWE-STC-003) (see comment)

<p><b>Seq#009 SWE- STC- 003</b></p> <p>4- Minor Editorial P02- 03.01.05, Definitions provided in Part 2</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> &lt;identifier ignorable character&gt; s defined as &lt;white space&gt;</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Under "vv) white space:" delete the following definitions: — U+ 200C, Zero Width Non- Joiner — U+ 200D, Zero Width Joiner — U+ 200E, Left- To- Right Mark — U+ 200F, Right- To- Left Mark — U+ FEFF, Zero Width No- Break Space</p>
--

**STATEMENT: See comment Jim Melton proposed the Unicode characters declare as editorial.**

**Questions & Comments:**

[1] UK – Mike Sykes– Define whites space in the way that Unicode does.

2000-07-27

<b>Amendments:</b> <b>None.</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> <b>Deemed Editorial</b>
<b>VOTE:</b> <b>UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.8 Seq#010 (USA-STC-004) (BHX-062R1)**

<b>Seq#010 USA- STC- 004</b> 1- Major Technical P02- 04.01, Data types
<b>Comment:</b> The Syntax Rules and Conformance Rules in SQL: 1999 Foundation relative to operations that depend on ordering are inconsistent, and should be fixed in the TC. <b>Solution:</b> See "Addressed by"
<b>BHX-062R1</b> Author: Fred Zemke Source: U. S. A. Status: TC, WD and OLAP Amendment change proposal Date: May 30, 2000 <b>Abstract</b> This paper undertakes a thorough study of the Syntax and Conformance Rules regarding comparison operations, that is, those operations that depend on a <comparison predicate>. Numerous inconsistencies are found: some rules are too permissive, while others are too restrictive. The rules that are too permissive are bugs to be fixed in the TC. The rules that are too restrictive are language opportunities, to be fixed in the WD. To mitigate the problem of inconsistent rules regarding ordering, it is further proposed for the WD to have three categories of operation, called equality operation, grouping operation and order operation, with the relevant rules collected in as many subclauses.

<b>STATEMENT: USA—Fred Zemke—Presented BHX-062R1.</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>  <b>[1] USA—Fred Zemke—Section 1.1 proposed vocabulary. Table 1 was created within the paper and is color-coded. This will be a first time of referencing a feature in a conformance rule.</b>  <b>[2] USA—Chuck Campbell—Use of color in the documents in general an in the Table 1 in the case of this paper helps understanding. Jim Still has a restriction in his processor and color is not an option for the standard. We need to find a way around this limitation.</b>  <b>[3] UK—Hugh Darwen—Question about Hashing. But it has no affect on the paper.</b>
<b>Amendments:</b> <b>None.</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> <b>Accepted as written.</b>
<b>VOTE:</b> <b>UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.9 Seq#012 (GBR-STC-008) (BHX-149) See also 8.9 & 8.34**

<b>Seq#012 GBR- STC- 008</b> 2- Minor Technical P02- 04.02.04, Named character sets
<b>Comment:</b> The set of names being defined here is not consistently specified, and their denotations are not clearly distinguished. On the one hand, we have: <b>ISO8BIT (or ASCII_ FULL) specifies the name of ...</b> Which appear to be two names for the same thing, though each names a character set (descriptor), and hence gets a row in CHARACTER_ SETS base table. On the other, we have: <b>UTF16 and ISO10646 specify the name of ...</b> Which also appear to be two names for the same thing. Moreover, the relationships between ISO10646 (the name of an ISO/ IEC standard), UCS2 (which we understand to be the name of a character set defined by that standard) and the UCS transformation formats UTF8 and UTF16 are not clear. <b>Solution:</b>

2000-07-27

None provided with comment

**BHX-149**  
**Title:** Addressing DCOR ballot comments SEQ#012 and SEQ#053  
**Author:** J M Sykes (United Kingdom)  
**Source:** UK Expert  
**Status:** Draft comment resolution  
**Abstract:** We analyse the situation regarding named character sets and suggest a possible way forward.

**STATEMENT: UK-Mike-Presented BHX-149**

**Questions & Comments:**  
**[1] NL-Steven-Part one of this proposal is out of scope for the TC.**  
**[2] US-Jim Melton- Stated that he went to the Unicode standards body to get the information that is currently in the standard and disagree with the sprit with this paper. There seems to be some misunderstanding by the author of the document on the differences of some of these standard charter sets.**

**Amendments:**  
**[1] Divide this paper into two. Changes proposal for 4.4.2 as a LO in the WDand to withdraw 2.1. from consideration. and to correct the typo error**

**ACTION: Accepted as amended**

**VOTE: UNANIMOUS**

**8.10 Seq#013 (GBR-STC-009) (see comment)**

**Seq#013 GBR- STC- 009**

2- Minor Technical P02- 04.02.04, *Named character sets*

**Comment:**

The last paragraph is:

The character sets SQL\_ CHARACTER, GRAPHIC\_ IRV (or ASCII\_ GRAPHIC), LATIN1, ISO8BIT (or ASCII\_ FULL), and UNICODE (or ISO10646) have both a “ floor” and “ ceiling” requirement to consist of exactly the characters specified. Any character data type associated with one of these character sets has an implied integrity constraint limiting a value of the data type to be a character string consisting only of characters from the specified character set. The SQL\_ TEXT and SQL\_ IDENTIFIER character sets have a similar “ floor” requirement in that they must contain all characters that are in other character sets supported by the imple- mentation (for SQL- data and for <identifier> s, respectively); however, SQL\_ TEXT and SQL\_ IDENTIFIER do not have a “ ceiling” requirement.

The first sentence uses undefined terms "floor" and "ceiling" whose meaning is not made clear by enclosing them in quotes. In any case, the character sets referred to here are all more precisely defined in earlier paragraphs of the same subclause. (Actually, UNICODE is not exactly defined earlier, but is mention as "Unicode" in the paragraphs defining UTF16, ISO10646 and UTF8. This is possibly a separate issue from the main one being raised by this comment, but we hope it can be addressed at the same time anyway.) The second sentence is also not very clear but it appears to be making a statement that we thought would apply to every character type and not just those that specify one of the character sets mentioned in this paragraph. The third sentence appears to be redundant for reasons similar to those we have given in connection with the first sentence.

**Solution:**

Delete the paragraph and insert the following sentence (to serve the apparent purpose of the second deleted sentence), possibly as a new paragraph, at the end of Subclause 4.2, "Character strings":  
**The result of evaluating a character string expression whose data type descriptor specifies character set CS is constrained to consist of characters drawn from the character repertoire of CS.**

**STATEMENT: UK—Mike Sykes—Presented the comment.**

**Questions & Comments:**  
**[1] UK—Mike Sykes—Not much discussion has taken place yet. Unicode questions again. Discussion was a first Deferred.**

2000-07-27

[2] USA—Jim Melton—How does the solution relates to the comment?
[3] UK—Mike Sykes—Reasonable point. May be an editing problem.
[4] Netherlands—Stephen Cannan—Replace suggested solution by converting last bullet to a note
<b>Amendments:</b> Replace suggested solution by converting the last bullet to a note.
<b>ACTION:</b> Accepted as amended.
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

**8.11 Seq#015 (USA-STC-005) (see comment)**

<b>Seq#015 (USA-STC-005)</b>
4- Minor Editorial P02- 04.07.03, Operations involving datetimes and intervals
<b>Comment:</b> Additional change: change <extract expression> to <extract function>
<b>Solution</b> Rationale: Editorial correction to BNF nonterminal Replace the sixth paragraph with the following: <extract function> operates on a datetime or interval and returns an exact numeric value representing the value of one component of the datetime or Rejected.

<b>STATEMENT:</b> USA—Krishna Kulkarni—Presented the comment.
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> [1] Editor—Jim Melton-- Comment is mistaken. [2] USA—Krishna Kulkarni—was not able to justify.
<b>Amendments:</b> None.
<b>ACTION:</b> Resolved by REJECT COMMENT
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

**8.12 Seq#016 (USA-STC-006) (see comment)**

<b>STATEMENT:</b> USA—Krishna Kulkarni—Presented the comment.
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> [1] USA—Krishna Kulkarni—Unclear wording. Needs to be reworded. [2] Implicit defined constructor function wording needs to be revised, Jim Melton will provide the wording.
<b>Amendments:</b> Editor—Jim Melton to provided wording.
<b>ACTION:</b> Resolved by Revised comment Solution.
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

**8.13 Seq#017 (GBR-STC-012) See also: 8.1, 8.13, 8.26, & 8.80**

<b>Seq#017 GBR- STC- 012</b>
1- Major Technical P02- 04.12, Type conversions and mixing of data types
<b>Comment:</b> The second paragraph starts: Values corresponding to the data types CHARACTER, CHARACTER VARYING, and CHARACTER LARGE OBJECT are mutually assignable if and only if they are taken from the same character repertoire. If they are from different character repertoires, then the value of the source of the assignment must be translated to the character repertoire of the target before an assignment is possible. Such translation may be implementation- defined and implicitly performed, in which case the two character data types are also mutually assignable. The values are mutually comparable only if they are mutually assignable and can be coerced to have the same collation. (a) In Subclause 4.2.1, "Character strings and collating sequences", we find the following statements: "All character strings of a given character repertoire are comparable", and "Given a collating sequence, two character strings are identical if and only if they are equal in accordance with the comparison rules specified in Subclause 8.2, '< comparison predicate> '". These statements appear to be more restrictive than the cited paragraph and so are potentially misleading. (b) There is no mention of this implementation- defined functionality in Annex B, "Implementation-



2000-07-27

defined elements".  
(c) We are unable to correlate this text reliably with anything specified in syntax rules or general rules. Possibly <form- of- use conversion> and <character translation> as defined in Subclause 6. 18, "< string value function>" are relevant and could usefully be referenced here, but even that would not justify the final sentence's mention of implicit translations. We note that SR9) of 6. 22, "< cast specification>" rules out the possibility of translations being implicitly invoked via CAST.  
**Solution:** None provided with comment.

<b>STATEMENT:</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>
<b>Amendments:</b>
<b>ACTION: See 8.1</b>
<b>VOTE:</b>

**8.14 Seq#018 (GBR-STC-011) (BHX-132)**

Seq#018 GBR-STC-011  
2-Minor Technical P02-04.12, *Type conversions and mixing of data types*

**Comment:**  
The title of this subclause uses the term "type conversion" for what is apparently the same concept as that referred to by "data conversions" in the title of Subclause 4.13, "Data conversions". It appears that 4.13 is mainly about explicit conversions (via CAST) while 4.12 is about implicit ones. We suggest switching the two subclauses so that explicit conversions are described first, retitling them as "Data conversions" and "Implicit data conversions" and redrafting them as necessary to be consistent with the new titles.  
**Solution:** None provided with comment.

**BHX-132**  
Title: **Closing DCOR #18 as an LO**  
Author: Fred Zemke  
Source: U.S.A.  
Status: Change proposal  
Date: July 6, 2000  
**Abstract**  
DCOR comment #18 requests editorial actions that are too minor for the TC.

<b>STATEMENT: US-Fred-Presented BHX-132</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments: None recorded.</b>
<b>Amendments: None.</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as written</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.15 Seq#019 (GBR-STC-013) (see comment)**

Seq#019 GBR- STC- 013  
2- Minor Technical P02- 04.18.01, *General rules and definitions*

**Comment:**  
The eighth paragraph is:  
In the following Subclauses, let a column *C1* be a *counterpart* of a column *C2* under qualifying table *QT* if *C1* is specified by a column reference (or by a <value expression> that is a column reference) that references *C2* and *QT* is the qualifying table of *C2*. If *C1* is a counterpart of *C2* under qualifying table *QT1* and *C2* is a counterpart of *C3* under qualifying table *QT2*, then *C1* is a counterpart of *C1* under *QT2*.  
The antepenultimate word should be "C3", not "C1".  
**Solution:**  
Add the following new item for Subclause 4.18.1, "General rules and definitions"  
1. *Rationale: Correct erroneous symbol*

2000-07-27

*Source: BHX- 053*  
Replace the eighth paragraph with  
In the following Subclauses, let a column *C1* be a counterpart of a column *C2* under qualifying table *QT* if *C1* is specified by a column reference (or by a <value expression> that is a column reference) that references *C2* and *QT* is the qualifying table of *C2*. If *C1* is a counterpart of *C2* under qualifying table *QT1* and *C2* is a counterpart of *C3* under qualifying table *QT2*, then *C1* is a counterpart of *C3* under *QT2*.

<b>STATEMENT:</b> UK—Hugh Darwen presented comment.
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> [1] USA—Jim Melton—Inference on Functional Dependencies has a typo that we didn't catch in the past. Jim will resolve.
<b>Amendments:</b> Typo
<b>ACTION:</b> Accepted with typo
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

8.16 Seq#021 (USA-STC-008) (BHX-163)

<b>Seq#021 USA- STC- 006</b> 3- Major Editorial P02- 04.08.02, Constructors
<b>Comment:</b> The wording of the first paragraph is unclear – the first sentence indicates that a constructor function is implicitly defined when <i>ST</i> is defined, whether it is instantiable or not, whereas the second sentence further restricts the existence of the constructor function
<b>Solution:</b> Rationale: Unclear wording Replace the first paragraph with the following: “Associated with every structured type <i>ST</i> is one constructor function, implicitly defined if and only if <i>ST</i> is instantiable.
<b>BHX-163</b> <b>Status:</b> Change proposal to resolve DCOR comment #21 <b>Author:</b> Jim Murray (Australia ) <b>Abstract:</b> It is proposed to remove unnecessary cross references from 3.1.1, Definitions taken from ISO/IEC 10646

<b>STATEMENT:</b> AUS—Jim Murray—Presented BHX-163
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> None recorded.
<b>Amendments:</b> None.
<b>ACTION:</b> Accepted as written
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

8.17 Seq#022 (USA-STC-009) (BHX-036)

<b>Seq#022 DEU- STC- 001</b> 3- Editorial P02- 04.32, SQL-transactions
<b>Comment:</b> The following text Closing the cursor causes an effective check of all table constraints and assertions, the effective execution of all referential actions, and the re-evaluation of all matching rows and unique matching rows. might have been in place in this Subclause when there was the concept of CASCADE ON/ OFF. Without that concept, this text needs to be moved to Subclause 4.29, "Cursors". In addition, it is not clear whether that text is sufficiently reflected in Subclause 14.4, "< close statement>".
<b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment.
<b>BHX-036</b> Title: TC for equivalent identifiers Author: Fred Zemke Source: U.S.A.

2000-07-27

Status: Change proposal for DCOR (TC) and Foundation WD  
Date: February 24, 2000

**Abstract**

Various definitions related to “equivalent identifier” are cleaned up.

**STATEMENT: USA—Fred Zemke—Presented BHX-036**

**Questions & Comments:**

[1] UK—Mike Sykes--We made a similar comment in Seg#35.

[2] UK – Hugh – Difference in the proposal with the standard and the WD. Align the working draft with the TC.

**Amendments: Need to also look at Seq#022 Seq#035**

**ACTION: Accepted as PP**

**VOTE: UNANIMOUS**

**8.18 Seq#023 (SWE-STC-004) (see comment)**

**Seq#023 SWE- STC- 004**

4- Minor Editorial P02- 05.02, <token> and <separator>

**Comment:**

<underscore> is defined in <identifier part>.

**Solution:**

In the Format, replace the production for <identifier body> with the following:

```
<identifier body> ::=  
<identifier start> [ { <identifier part> }... ]
```

**STATEMENT: As written.**

**Questions & Comments:**

[1] USA—Krishna Kulkarni—Do we agree with the solution? Needs a conformance clause as well. Needs work on CR1.

**Amendments: Add conformance clause.**

**ACTION: Resolved with amendment.**

**VOTE: UNANIMOUS**

**8.19 Seq#024 (SWE-STC-005) (see comment)**

**Seq#024 SWE- STC- 005**

4- Minor Editorial P02- 05.02, <token> and <separator>

**Comment:**

Editorial. Misplaced non- reserved word.

**Solution:**

In the Format, in the production for <non- reserved word>, add the text:

```
| EVERY
```

in the correct alphabetical order. In the Format, in the production for <reserved word>, delete the text:

```
| EVERY
```

**STATEMENT: As written**

**Questions & Comments: None recorded.**

**Amendments: None.**

**ACTION: Resolved by comment**

**VOTE: UNANIMOUS**

**8.20 Seq#025 (SWE-STC-006) (see comment) (BHX-155) See also: 8.20, 8.55, 8.68, & 8.69**

**Seq#025 SWE- STC- 006**

4- Minor Editorial P02- 05.02, <token> and <separator>

**Comment:**

Editorial. Misplaced reserved words.

2000-07-27

**Solution**  
In the Format, in the production for <non- reserved word>, delete the texts:  
ASYMMETRIC  
BETWEEN  
EXISTS  
HOLD  
METHOD  
OVERLAPS  
SIMILAR  
SYMMETRIC  
In the Format, in the production for <reserved word>, add the texts:  
ASYMMETRIC  
BETWEEN  
EXISTS  
HOLD  
METHOD  
OVERLAPS  
SIMILAR  
SYMMETRIC  
in the correct alphabetical order.  
See comment

BHX-155  
Title: **Response to various keyword comments**  
Author: Fred Zemke  
Source: U.S.A.  
Status: Change proposal  
Date: July 10, 2000  
*"How SWEet it is!" - Jackie Gleason*  
**Abstract**  
This paper examines the following DCOR comments:

**STATEMENT:** USA--Fred Zemke—Presented BHX-155  
**Questions & Comments:** Netherlands—Stephen Cannan—Suggested amendment.  
**Amendments:** SEE XXX  
**ACTION:** Accepted as amended.  
**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

8.21 Seq#028 (SWE-STC-009) (see comment) XXX

Seq#028 SWE- STC- 009  
4- Minor Editorial P02- 05.02, <token> and <separator>  
**Comment:**  
Editorial. Non- reserved words not in syntax.  
**Solution**  
In the Format, in the production for <non- reserved word>, delete the texts:  
BITVAR  
EXISTING  
INFIX  
SUBLIST

**STATEMENT:** As written.  
**Questions & Comments:**  
**Amendments:**  
**ACTION:** Accepted as amended.  
**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

8.22 Seq#030 (SWE-STC-011) (see comment)

Seq#030 SWE- STC- 011  
4- Minor Editorial P02- 05.02, <token> and <separator>  
**Comment:**

2000-07-27

<p>Non- reserved words not in alphabetical order.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> In the Format, in the production for &lt;non- reserved word&gt;, rearrange:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding-right: 5px;">MIN</td> <td>NUMBER</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding-right: 5px;">SUBSTRING</td> <td>SUM</td> </tr> </table> <p>in the correct alphabetical order.</p>	MIN	NUMBER	SUBSTRING	SUM
MIN	NUMBER			
SUBSTRING	SUM			

<b>STATEMENT:</b> <b>As written.</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> <b>USA—Jim Melton—Reject this in the TC, but am will to accept as Editorial in WD.</b>
<b>Amendments:</b> <b>[1] Rejected in the TC.</b> <b>[2] Accepted as editorial for WD.</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> <b>Accepted as amended.</b>
<b>VOTE:</b> <b>UNANIMOUS</b>

8.23 Seq#034 (SWE-STC-015) (see comment)

<p><b>Seq#034 SWE- STC- 015</b> 4- Minor Editorial P02- 05.02, &lt;token&gt; and &lt;separator&gt;</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Editorial.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Replace Conformance Rule 1) with: 1) Without Feature F391, "Long identifiers", in a &lt;regular identifier&gt;, the number of &lt;identifier part&gt; s shall be less than 18.</p>
---

<b>STATEMENT:</b> <b>As written.</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> <b>None recorded.</b>
<b>Amendments:</b> <b>None.</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> <b>Accepted as Editorial</b>
<b>VOTE:</b> <b>UNANIMOUS</b>

8.24 Seq#035 (GBR-STC-014) (see comment)

<p><b>Seq#035 GBR- STC- 014</b> 2- Minor Technical P02- 05.02, &lt;token&gt; and &lt;separator&gt;, Syntax Rules 23) &amp; 24)</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> These SRs look like an unnecessary carry- forward from before the introduction of SRs 21) which defines the <i>case- normal form</i> of an &lt;identifier body&gt; in terms of Unicode, and 22).</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Delete 5.2 "&lt; token&gt; and &lt;separator&gt;", Syntax Rule 23) and modify SR 24) as follows: 24) The <b>case- normal form of &lt;identifier body&gt;</b> of a &lt;regular identifier&gt; <del>(with every letter that is a lower case letter replaced by the corresponding upper case letter or letters), treated as the repetition of a &lt;character string literal&gt; that specifies a &lt;character set specification&gt; of SQL_IDENTIFIER,</del> shall not be equal, according to the comparison rules in Subclause 8.2, "&lt; comparison predicate&gt;", to <b>the case- normal form of any &lt;reserved word&gt;</b> <del>(with every letter that is a lower case letter replaced by the corresponding upper case letter or letters), treated as the repetition of a &lt;character string literal&gt; that specifies a &lt;character set specification&gt; of SQL_IDENTIFIER.</del></p>
---

<b>STATEMENT:</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>

2000-07-27

<b>USA—Fred Zemke—Case Normal Form. Proposes accepting 1<sup>st</sup> half. Not the second half with the reserve word.</b>
<b>Amendments:</b> <b>[1] Proposes accepting 1<sup>st</sup> half. Not the second half with the reserve word,</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as amended.</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.25 Seq#037 (GBR-STC-015) (see comment)**

<b>Seq#037 GBR- STC- 015</b> 2- Minor Technical P02- 06.05, <identifier chain>
<b>Comment:</b> SR6) a) includes the sentence, "Let the phrase <i>possible scope tags</i> denote those exposed <table name> s, <correlation name> s, and <routine name> s." Unlike the text that precedes it, this fails to take query names into account.
<b>Solution:</b> In the offending sentence, change "< table name> s" to "< table or query name> s".

<b>STATEMENT: UK—Hugh Darwen—As written.</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> <b>Netherlands—Stephen Cannan—SR6a should be SR 7a. Also there is a typo in the comment.</b> <b>The Editor—Stephen Cannan—Will handle when he does the TC editing.</b>
<b>Amendments:</b> <b>[1] Number SR 6a-is 7a.</b> <b>[2] Typo in the comment</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as amended.</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.26 Seq#038 (GBR-STC-016) See also: 8.1, 8.13, 8.26, & 8.80**

<b>Seq#038 GBR- STC- 016</b> 2- Minor Technical P02- 06.22, <cast specification>
<b>Comment:</b> GR8) d) is: d) If <i>SD</i> is a fixed- length bit string or variable- length bit string, then let <i>LSV</i> be the value of BIT_ LENGTH( <i>SV</i> ) and let <i>B</i> be the BIT_ LENGTH of the character with the smallest BIT_ LENGTH in the form- of- use of <i>TD</i> . Let <i>PAD</i> be the value of the remainder of the division <i>LSV</i> / <i>B</i> . Let <i>NC</i> be a character whose bits all have the value 0 (zero). If <i>PAD</i> is not 0 (zero), then append ( <i>B</i> _ <i>PAD</i> ) 0- valued bits to the least significant end of <i>SV</i> ; a completion condition is raised: <i>warning — implicit zero- bit padding</i> . Let <i>SVC</i> be the possibly padded value of <i>SV</i> expressed as a character string without regard to valid character encodings and let <i>LTDS</i> be a character string of <i>LTD</i> characters of value <i>NC</i> characters in the form- of- use of <i>TD</i> . <i>TV</i> is the result of SUBSTRING ( <i>SVC</i>    <i>LTDS</i> FROM 1 FOR <i>LTD</i> ) (a) "BIT_ LENGTH of the character ..." would be better expressed as "BIT_ LENGTH ( 'SC' ) where <i>SC</i> is the character ..." and then the second occurrence of BIT_ LENGTH should perhaps be "length in bits". (b) "Let <i>NC</i> be a character ..." is clearly ambiguous. Possibly "the character whose length in bits is <i>B</i> and whose constituent bits all ..." would remove the ambiguity. (c) "... characters of <i>NC</i> characters in the form- of- use of <i>TD</i> " doesn't seem to make sense. Presumably the second occurrence of "characters" should be deleted, but perhaps the words that follow it can safely be deleted too. (d) We are not convinced that every character set has a character whose representation accords with the definition of <i>NC</i> . The definitions of the named character sets given in Subclause 4. 12 don't explicitly mention such a character. Perhaps "< space>" would make better sense than <i>NC</i> . <b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment.

<b>STATEMENT:</b>
-------------------

2000-07-27

<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>
<b>Amendments:</b>
<b>ACTION: See 8.1</b>
<b>VOTE:</b>

**8.27 Seq#039 (GBR-STC-017) (see comment)**

<p><b>Seq#039 GBR- STC- 017</b> 2- Minor Technical P02- 06.22, &lt;cast specification&gt;</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> GR11) a) is: If <i>BLSV</i> [the bit length of the source value] is equal to <i>LTD</i> [the bit length of the target bit type], then <i>TV</i> is <i>SV</i> expressed as a bit string with a length in bits of <i>BLSV</i>. New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary says, for "express": 7 v. t. Represent by a symbol or symbols, symbolize; Math. represent (a number, relation, property, etc.) by a figure, symbol, or formula, esp. (a quantity) in terms of another.) Thus, the GR suggests a change of representation, rather than a different way of looking at the same (binary) representation. Under that interpretation, the result of CAST ('01010101' AS BIT VARYING (5000) ) could well be the bit string consisting of 8 bits, alternating in value as shown; similarly, it might be expected that the result of CAST ( BIT '01010101' AS VARCHAR (5000) ) would be '01010101', while CAST ( 'Doris Day' AS BIT VARYING (5000) ) would raise an exception, for which there is no specification. We believe the intended meaning would be better conveyed by "regarded as", which better conveys the concept of a different way of looking at the same representation. This comment (probably) applies also to several other occurrences of "expressed as" in this subclause.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Replace all occurrences of "expressed as" in the GRs of Subclause 6.22, "&lt; cast specification&gt;" by "regarded as".</p>
--

<b>STATEMENT: UK—Mike Sykes—Presented comment.</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments: None recorded.</b>
<b>Amendments: None.</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as proposed.</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.28 Seq#040 (USA-STC-011) (BHX-131)**

<p><b>Seq#040 USA-STC-011</b> 2-Minor Technical P02-07.01 &lt;row value constructor&gt;</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The conformance rules of Subclauses 7.1, "&lt;row value constructor&gt;", and 7.3, "&lt;table value constructor&gt;" were not edited to reflect the split that created &lt;contextually typed row value constructor&gt; and &lt;contextually typed table value constructor&gt;, and this has not been corrected in the TC yet.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment</p>
<p><b>BHX-131</b> Title: <b>Addressing DCOR #40 (USA-STC-011)</b> Author: Fred Zemke Source: U.S.A. Status: Change proposal Date: July 6, 2000 <b>Abstract</b> This paper addresses DCOR comment #40 (USA-STC-011)</p>

<b>STATEMENT: US-Fred Zemke-Presented BHX-131</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>
<b>US-Jim Melton-These will need to be placed in the ANNEX "A"</b>
<b>Amendments: These will need to be placed in the ANNEX "A"</b>

2000-07-27

**ACTION: Accepted as ammended.**

**VOTE: UNANIMOUS**

**8.29 Seq#041 (USA-STC-012) (BHX-037)**

**Seq#041 USA- STC- 012**

2- Minor Technical P02- 07.06, <table reference>

**Comment:**

There are various errors in SQL: 1999 Foundation Subclause 7.6, "< table reference>", regarding syntactic containment that have not been addressed in the TC yet.

**Solution:**

See "Addressed by"  
WG3: BHX- 037

**BHX-037**

Title: **TC for <table reference>**

Author: Fred Zemke

Source: U.S.A.

Status: TC and WD change proposal

Date: February 24, 2000

**Abstract**

Various errors in 7.6 <table reference> are rooted out.

**STATEMENT: USA—Fred Zemke—Presented BHX-037**

**Questions & Comments:**

[1] USA—Jim Melton—On page 5 GR1 differs on page 9 in scope.

[2] UK—Hugh Darwen—TR doesn't have scope.

[3] USA—Fred Zemke—Maybe we should strike PG 9 reference to SCOPE.

[4] UK—Hugh Darwen--Fix another Bug while you're there. CONTAINS SR1 – added to amendment.

[5] UK—Hugh Darwen—No PROLOG. TC PROPOSAL Page 9 of the paper.

**AMENDMENTS:**

[1] Change "**specifies**" to "**simply contains**" in 3.1 Changes to 7.6 <table reference>

[2] Delete new text:

6. EDIT GENERAL RULES 1) AS FOLLOWS:

1) A <correlation name> or exposed <table or query name> **simply** contained in a <table reference> defines that <correlation name> or <table or query name> to be an identifier of the table identified by the <table or query name> or , <derived table> or <lateral derived table> of that <table reference> **within the scope of TR.**

[3] Change "**specifies**" to "**simply contains**" in SR1)

[4] At the very end of the paper: Delete new text "**within the scope of TR**"

**ACTION: Accept with Amendment**

**VOTE: UNANIMOUS**

**8.30 Seq#042 (USA-STC-013) (BHX-061)**

**Seq#042 USA-STC-013**

1-Major Technical P02-07.09, <group by clause>

**Comment:**

<group by clause> still has significant problems, especially with the Format and the syntactic transformation in the Syntax Rules, which should be corrected in the TC.

**Solution:** See "Addressed by" WG3:BHX-061

**BHX-061**

Title: **Another TC for <group by clause>**



2000-07-27

Author: Fred Zemke  
Source: U.S.A.  
Status: Change proposal for DCOR (TC) and Foundation WD  
Date: April 7, 2000

**Abstract**

Various problems with the GROUP BY clause, especially the new ROLLUP, CUBE and GROUP-ING SETS capabilities, are discovered. Unfortunately the best solution appears to be a thorough rewrite. In the interests of greater orthogonality and a cleaner presentation, the rewrite adds some nesting capabilities that were not previously possible. To prevent a growth in functionality, these new possibilities are forbidden by Syntax Rules in the TC, and are relegated to an advanced feature by Conformance Rules in the WD.

**STATEMENT: USA—Fred Zemke—Presented BHX-061**

**Questions & Comments:**

**UK—Hugh Darwen—Thinks it is a good idea, some are cosmetic but this is the best way to get them in. He has concern that this may not be bug free.**

**Amendments: None.**

**ACTION: Accepted as written**

**VOTE: UNANIMOUS**

**8.31 Seq#043 (GBR-STC-018) (see comment)**

**Seq#043 GBR-STC-018**

1-Major Technical P02-07.11, <query specification>

**Comment:**

SR10) is:

10) Each column reference directly contained in each <value expression> and each column reference contained in a <set function specification> directly contained in each <value expression> shall unambiguously reference a column of T.

This suffers from a minor problem and a major one. The minor one is the ambiguity caused by too many uses of the word "each". We don't think the rule was intended to cover just those column references that appear in every <select list> entry!

The major problem is that it appears to be attempting to outlaw the use of outer references. This doesn't seem to be reasonable. Consider the following example:

```
Select *
From t1
Where a > ( select t2.b - t1.c
from t2
where t1.d = t2.d )
```

We can see no reason to prohibit that reference to t1.c in the subquery. Furthermore, there appears to be a workaround that makes the rule even more suspect. The following query is logically equivalent to our illegal example but is legal:

```
select *
from t1
where a > ( select t2.b - ( select t3.c from t1 as t3 where t3.d = t2.d )
from t2
where t1.d = t2.d )
```

**Solution:**

Add the following new item between the items 2 and 3 currently given for Subclause 7.11, "<query specification>" (editor note that the bolding we give here is for present reviewers' information only and the bolded text is not intended to appear as bold in the TC): 3. Rationale: Disambiguate and allow outer references in <select list>s. Source: BHX-053 Replace Syntax Rule 10) with

10) Each column reference directly contained in a <value expression> that is simply contained in <select list> and each column reference contained in a <set function specification> directly contained in a <value expression> that is simply contained in <select list> shall unambiguously reference a column of T or be an outer reference.

**STATEMENT: UK—Hugh Darwen—Presented the comment.**

2000-07-27

<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> <b>UK—Hugh Darwen—Take no action but make it a PP in the working draft.</b>
<b>Amendments: Take no action but make it a PP in the working draft.</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as amended</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.32 Seq#044 (SWE-STC-016) (see comment)**

<b>Seq#044 SWE-STC-016</b> 4-Minor Editorial P02-08.04, <in predicate>
<b>Comment:</b> Allow <in value list> to contain only one <row value expression>.
<b>Solution:</b> In the Format, replace the production for <in value list> with the following: <in value list> ::= <row value expression> [ { <comma> <row value expression> }... ]

<b>STATEMENT: USA—Krishna Kulkarni—Presented Comment</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments: USA—Jim Melton—This was done consciously, close with no action</b>
<b>Amendments: Close with no action</b>
<b>ACTION: Closed with no action</b>
<b>VOTE:</b> <b>AU abstains</b> <b>All others YES</b>

**8.33 Seq#045 (USA-STC-014) (BHX-087)**

<b>Seq#045 USA- STC- 014</b> 2- Minor Technical P02- 08.06, <similar predicate>
<b>Comment:</b> General Rules 5) a), 6) e), 6) g), and 6) i) reference the string 'pattern P'. However, there is no definitions of exactly what the 'pattern P' is. 'pattern P' probably should be <i>PCV</i> (in italics) which is defined in GR 1).
<b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment
<b>BHX-087</b> <b>Title:</b> Correcting a small bug in <similar predicate> <b>Author:</b> Keith W. Hare <b>Project:</b> SQL Profiles <b>Status:</b> Response to comment on Draft Corrigendum

<b>STATEMENT: USA—Krishna Kulkarni--Presented BHX-087</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments: None recorded.</b>
<b>Amendments: None.</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as written</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.34 Seq#053 (GBR-STC-019) (BHX-149 See also 8.9 & 8.34)**

<b>Seq#053 GBR- STC- 019</b> 1- Major Technical P02- 10.06, <character set specification>
<b>Comment:</b> Syntax Rule 3) says: 3) The <standard character set name> s shall include: SQL_CHARACTER, GRAPHIC_IRV, ASCII_GRAPHIC, LATIN1, ISO8BIT, ASCII_FULL, UNICODE, and ISO10646, with definitions as specified in Subclause 4. 2. 4, "Named character sets". This list is different from the list in P02- 04. 02. 04 "Named character sets", in that UNICODE appears

2000-07-27

in this list, while UCS2, UTF8 and UTF16 do not. <b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment
<b>BHX-149</b> <b>See 8.9</b>

<b>STATEMENT:</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>
<b>Amendments:</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> <b>See 8.9</b>
<b>VOTE:</b>

**8.35 Seq#054 (DEU-STC-002) (BHX-164)**

<b>Seq#054 DEU- STC- 002</b> 1-Major Technical P02- 10.07, <specific routine designator>
<b>Comment:</b> This subclause uses the concept of a declared type that is <b>identical</b> to some other type. It is not clear whether the concept of "Data type identity" as defined by Subclause 10.14 can or should be used instead. <b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment.
BHX-164 <b>Subject:</b> TC Change Proposal <b>Source:</b> Germany <b>Title:</b> Resolving DCOR #54 (DEU-STC-002) <b>Author:</b> Friedemann Schwenkreis

<b>STATEMENT:</b> <b>DEU-- Friedemann Schwenkreis—Presented BHX-164</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> <b>None recorded</b>
<b>Amendments:</b> <b>None.</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> <b>Accepted as written.</b>
<b>VOTE:</b> <b>UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.36 Seq#056 (SWE-STC-018) (see comment)**

<b>Seq#056 SWE-STC-018</b> 4-Minor Editorial P02-11.01, <schema definition>
<b>Comment:</b> Missing <schema element>s.
<b>Solution</b> In the Format, in the production for <schema element>, add the texts:   <user-defined cast definition>   <user-defined ordering definition>   <transform definition>

<b>STATEMENT:</b> <b>Netherlands—Stephen Cannan—Presented the comment.</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> <b>Netherlands—Stephen Cannan—Why are they missing, and are we adding functionality?</b> <b>USA—Jim Melton—Researched issues with the help of Stephen. It looks like an oversight.</b>
<b>Amendments:</b> <b>Non ee.</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> <b>Accepted as proposed</b>
<b>VOTE:</b> <b>UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.37 Seq#057 (GBR-STC-020) (see comment)**

<b>Seq#057 GBR-STC-020</b> 2-Minor Technical P02-11.30, <character set definition>
---

2000-07-27

<p><b>Comment:</b> GR4) says, unnecessarily: 4) The character set that is created contains every character in each of the character sets identified by &lt;existing character set name&gt;s, if specified, and in the &lt;character set list&gt;, if specified. Any redundant duplicate characters are deleted from the created character set. Moreover, the text references two undefined BNF symbols, uses "contains" instead of "consists of", and appears (in the last sentence) to admit to the notion of duplicate elements of a set. <b>Solution:</b> Delete GR4) of 11.30, "&lt;character set specification&gt;".</p>
---

<b>STATEMENT: UK—Hugh Darwen—Presented the comment.</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> <b>USA—Jim Melton—Liked solution but for other reasons. This looks like it is a hangover.</b>
<b>Amendments: None.</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as proposed</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.38 Seq#058 (DEU-STC-003) (BHX-168)**

<p><b>Seq#058 DEU- STC- 003</b> 1- Major Technical P02- 11.38, &lt;trigger definition&gt;</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> This subclause allows for the definition and use of &lt;old values correlation name&gt; s, &lt;new values correlation name&gt; s, &lt;old values table alias&gt; s and &lt;new values table alias&gt; s. E. g, the aliases OT and NT should be usable in the WHEN of the &lt;triggerred action&gt; for the &lt;search condition&gt;: (1+ SELECT COUNT(*) FROM OT) &lt; (SELECT COUNT(*) FROM NT) It is not clear though whether this use of OT and NT is properly covered by Subclause 7.6, "&lt; table reference&gt;". It is not clear either whether the use of &lt;old values correlation name&gt; s and &lt;new values correlation name&gt; s is sufficiently covered by Subclause 6.5, "&lt; identifier chain&gt;". <b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment.</p>
--

<p><b>BHX-168</b> Title: <b>Discussion of DCOR #58 (DEU-STC-003)</b> Author: Fred Zemke Source: U.S.A. Status: Change proposal Date: July 12, 2000 <i>What kind of an animal are you? - children's song</i></p> <p><b>Abstract</b> This paper finds many discussion topics occasioned by DCOR comment #58 (DEU-STC-003). Since it is not possible to provide a fitting solution to the comment during this editing meeting, it is proposed to create a Possible Problem of the comment and the additional problems discovered.</p>
<b>STATEMENT: USA—Fred Zemke—Presented BHX-168</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> <b>Part three of the paper were discussed and several points were considered for future work.</b>
<b>Amendments: Close this paper by creating a PP – The wording will be supplied by Fred Zemke</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as amended</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.39 Seq#060 (USA-STC-022) (BHX-088)**

<p><b>Seq#060 USA-STC-022</b> 1-Major Technical P02-11.40, &lt;user-defined type definition&gt;</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> SQL-99 allows the representation of reference values to be "user-defined", which means the user can, when inserting a row into a typed table, specify a value of a predefined type for the self-referencing column, which will be automatically cast by the system to a value of the corresponding reference type. To enable such casting , two cast functions are created implicitly when a structured type is created, one from the predefined type to reference type and the other from reference type to the predefined type.</p>
--

2000-07-27

However, such cast functions are generated only for the top-level type in a type hierarchy, thus making it impossible to create reference values of any of the subtypes in any given type hierarchy. This is clearly a bug and needs to be fixed.  
**Solution:** None provided with comment.

**BHX-088**  
Source: U.S.A.  
Status: SQL-99 TC and SQL200n Change Proposal  
Title: **Fixing bugs connected with the generation of cast functions for reference types**  
Authors: Krishna Kulkarni

**STATEMENT: US-Krishna Kulkarni -Presented BHX-088**

**Questions & Comments:**  
**UK—Hugh Darwen—In the Working draft, will this be included? Stephen--Yes**  
**UK—Hugh Darwen—Is there missing words in the 2.3.3? Krishna-there may be others of this nature in the document**

**Amendments: Krishna will provide a list of missing articles in an R1 version of BHX-088.**

**ACTION: Accepted as amended**

**VOTE: UNANIMOUS**

**8.40 Seq#061 (GBR-STC-021)**

**Seq#061 GBR-STC-021**  
2-Minor Technical P02-11.40, <user-defined type definition>  
**Comment:**  
If an attribute (of a structured type) can have a <collate clause>, why can't the representation of a distinct type?  
**Solution:** None provided with comment.

**STATEMENT: As written**

**Questions & Comments: None recorded.**

**Amendments: None.**

**ACTION: Resolved as a LO for the working draft.**

**VOTE: UNANIMOUS**

**8.41 Seq#065 (DEU-STC-004) (BHX-091)**

**Seq#065 DEU-STC-004**  
1-Major Technical P02-11.47, <drop method specification>  
**Comment:**  
Removing some method, say of name M, from a given type named T is a two-step process:  
1. One has to check whether there exists an implementation of M; if so, it needs to be dropped by an appropriate DROP METHOD statement.  
2. If it is made sure that an implementation of M does no longer exist, a statement ALTER TYPE T DROP ... RESTRICT can be attempted. Unfortunately, Subclause 11.47, "<drop method specification>", does not properly do the job for step 2. The reason is that the method to be dropped is identified by <specific routine designator>; however, after step 1 has been performed, there is no such <specific routine designator> anymore. Thus the subclause must be rewritten using a more appropriate concept.  
**Solution:** None provided with comment.

**BHX-091**  
Title: **Resolving DEU-STC-004**  
Author: Pat O'Connor, Krishna Kulkarni  
Source: U.S.A.  
Status: Technical Corrigendum  
Date: June 15, 2000

**STATEMENT: US-Krishna-Presented BHX-091**

2000-07-27

<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> <b>Netherlands—Stephen Cannan—Asked a clarifying question about schema</b>
<b>Amendments:</b> None
<b>ACTION:</b> Accepted as written
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

**8.42 Seq#067 (SWE-STC-020) (see comment) (BHX-172)**

<b>Seq#067 SWE-STC-020</b> 4-Minor Editorial <i>P02-11.49</i> , <SQL-invoked routine>
<b>Comment:</b> Correct parsing problems. <b>Solution:</b> Add Syntax Rule 23): An <SQL routine body> shall not generally contain a <schema definition>.
<b>BHX-172</b> Title: <b>Addressing DCOR #67 (SWE-STC-020)</b> Author: Fred Zemke, from research by Wolfgang Panny Source: U.S.A. Status: Change proposal Date: July 13, 2000 <b>Abstract</b> It is proposed to close DCOR comment #67 (SWE-STC-020) by adding a Possible Problem.

<b>STATEMENT:</b> USA—Fred Zemke—Presented BHX-172
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> None recorded.
<b>Amendments:</b> None.
<b>ACTION:</b> Accepted as written.
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

**8.43 Seq#070 (SWE-STC-022) (see comment)**

<b>Seq#070 SWE-STC-022</b> 4-Minor Editorial <i>P02-13.03</i> , <externally-invoked procedure>
<b>Comment:</b> Former deprecated feature not removed. <b>Solution:</b> In the Format, in the production for <host parameter declaration setup>, delete the text:   <host parameter declaration>... Delete NOTE 274 in Syntax Rule 3).

<b>STATEMENT:</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>
<b>Amendments:</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> Was already Done Editorially
<b>VOTE:</b>

**8.44 Seq#073 (GBR-STC-023) (see comment) See also 8.44 & 8.46**

<b>Seq#073 GBR-STC-023</b> 4-Minor Editorial <i>P02-14.03</i> , <fetch statement>
<b>Comment:</b> SR6)a)i), SR6)b)ii), GR7)a)i) and GR7)a)ii) all include the text, ". is the <SQL parameter name> of an SQL parameter of an SQL-invoked routine. ...", where the object in question is a <target specification>, the BNF for which does not permit it to be an <SQL parameter name>. In fact, the text is misleading, too, as an SQL parameter is by definition a parameter of an SQL-invoked routine (so the last four words are redundant). SR6)b)ii) similarly, has "... is a <host parameter name>", and a

2000-07-27

<p>&lt;target specification&gt; can't be one of those, either.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> In SR6)a)i), SR6)b)ii), GR7)a)i) and GR7)b)i) of Subclause 14.3, "&lt;fetch statement&gt;", replace "is the &lt;SQL parameter name&gt; of an SQL parameter of an SQL-invoked routine" with "is an &lt;SQL parameter reference&gt;". In SR6)b)iii), replace "is a &lt;host parameter name&gt; " with "is a &lt;host parameter reference&gt;". &lt;host parameter specification&gt;".</p>
--

<b>STATEMENT: UK—Hugh Darwen—Presented comment.</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> <b>USA—Fred Zemke researched and advised the group.</b> <b>US-Jim-Could not find</b> -<host parameter reference>". in the documents
<b>Amendments: See comment above.</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as amended</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.45 Seq#074 (GBR-STC-024) (BHX-143) See also 8.45, 8.70, & 8.72**

<p><b>Seq#074 GBR- STC- 024</b> 2- Minor Technical P02- 14.05, &lt;select statement: single row&gt;</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> &lt;select statement: single row&gt; appears to have no counterpart of SR6) a) of Subclause 14. 3, "&lt; fetch statement&gt;". It has instead SR2), requiring the number of targets to equal the number of columns in the result of the query. Is there is a good reason for this apparent lack of parallelism?</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment</p>
<p><b>BHX-143</b> <b>Title:</b> Resolving DCOR # 074, 148 and 150 <b>Author:</b> Stephen Cannan (The Netherlands) <b>Source:</b> NNI</p>
<b>STATEMENT: NL-Stephen-Presented BHX-143.</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments: None recorded.</b>
<b>Amendments: None.</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as written</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.46 Seq#075 (GBR-STC-025) (see comment) See also 8.44 & 8.46**

<p><b>Seq#075 GBR- STC- 025</b> 4- Minor Editorial P02- 14.05, &lt;select statement: single row&gt;</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> SR3) and GR4) both include the text, "... is the &lt;SQL parameter name&gt; of an SQL parameter of an SQL- invoked routine. ...", with reference to something that is a &lt;target specification&gt;, the BNF for which does not permit it to be an &lt;SQL parameter name&gt;. In fact, the text is misleading, too, as an SQL parameter is by definition a parameter of an SQL- invoked routine (so the last four words are redundant). SR4) and GR5) have "... is a &lt;host parameter name&gt;", and a &lt;target specification&gt; can't be one of those, either.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> In SR3) and GR4) of Subclause 14.5, "&lt; fetch statement&gt; &lt;select statement single row&gt;", replace "is the &lt;SQL parameter name&gt; of an SQL parameter of an SQL- invoked routine" with "is an &lt;SQL parameter reference&gt;". In SR4) and GR5), replace "is a &lt;host parameter name&gt; " with "is a &lt;host parameter reference&gt;". See comment</p>
<b>STATEMENT:</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>

2000-07-27

<b>Amendments:</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> See 8.44
<b>VOTE:</b>

8.47 Seq#076 (SWE-STC-025) (BHX-138) See also: 8.47 & 8.48

<p><b>Seq#076 SWE-STC-025</b>  4-Minor Editorial P02-16.01, &lt;start transaction statement&gt;</p> <p><b>Comment:</b>  If a &lt;set session characteristics statement&gt; is in effect, the implicit &lt;transaction mode&gt;s should be taken from the &lt;session characteristic list&gt;. The Syntax Rules must be rewritten.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment.</p> <p><b>BHX-138</b>  <b>Title:</b> Closing SWE-STC-025 and SWE-STC-026 (Seq# 76 &amp; 77)  <b>Author:</b> Stephen Cannan (The Netherlands)  <b>Source:</b> NNI</p>
--

<b>STATEMENT:</b> Netherlands—Stephen Cannan—Presented BHX-138 and stated that paper covers Seq#76 & Seq#77
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> None recorded.
<b>Amendments:</b> None.
<b>ACTION:</b> Accepted as written
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

8.48 Seq#077 (SWE-STC-026) (see comment) (BHX-138) See 8.47 & 8.48

<p><b>Seq#077 SWE-STC-026</b>  4-Minor Editorial P02-16.01, &lt;start transaction statement&gt;</p> <p><b>Comment:</b>  It should be possible to have only implicit &lt;transaction mode&gt;s.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b>  In the Format, replace the production for &lt;start transaction statement&gt; with the following:  &lt;start transaction statement&gt; ::=  START TRANSACTION [ &lt;transaction mode&gt; [ { &lt;comma&gt;  &lt;transaction mode&gt; }... ] ]  See comment</p>
--

<b>STATEMENT:</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>
<b>Amendments:</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> See 8.47
<b>VOTE:</b>

8.49 Seq#085 (SWE-STC-001) (BHX-146) See also:8.49, 8.51, & 8.58

<p><b>Seq#085 SWE- STC- 001</b>  1- Major Technical P02- 20.30, KEY_ COLUMN_USAGE view</p> <p><b>Comment:</b>  A problem with the KEY_ COLUMN_ USAGE view, when we tried to recreate a &lt;table definition&gt; statement from the Information Schema. Consider the following example (S1 and S2 have different &lt;schema authorization identifier&gt; s):  CREATE TABLE S1. T1 ( C1 INT CONSTRAINT X1  PRIMARY KEY );  GRANT REFERENCES ON S1. T1 TO S2;  CREATE TABLE S2. T2 ( C1 INT PRIMARY KEY,  C2 INT CONSTRAINT X2  REFERENCES S1. T1( C1));  When we now want to recreate table S2. T2, a lookup in the REFERENCES_ CONSTRAINTS view</p>
--



2000-07-27

tells us that the constraint S2. X2 references the unique constraint S1. X1, but we can not see it's contents in the KEY\_COLUMN\_USAGE view, although we have been granted REFERENCES privilege. We suggest that the KEY\_COLUMN\_USAGE view also show the keys for which a given user has a REFERENCE privilege. It seems resonable that one should be able to recreate all <SQL schema definition statement> s from the Information Schema.  
**Solution:** None provided with comment.

**BHX-146**  
**Title:** Resolving DCOR #085, 093 and 129  
**Author:** Stephen Cannan (The Netherlands)  
**Source:** NNI

**STATEMENT:** **Netherlands—Stephen Cannan—Presented BHX-146**  
**Questions & Comments:**  
**NL-Steven-Talked about the need for 2 PP's see amendment below:**  
**Amendments:** **None.**  
**ACTION:** **Accepted as written**  
**VOTE:** **UNANIMOUS**

**8.50 Seq#086 (SWE-STC-033) (see comment)**

**Seq#086 SWE- STC- 033**  
4- Minor Editorial P02- 20.31, *METHOD\_SPECIFICATION\_PARAMETERS* view  
**Comment:**  
Editorial - typographical error.  
**Solution:**  
Replace the line FROM ENABLED\_ ROLES ) ) with:  
FROM ENABLED\_ ROLES ) ) )

**STATEMENT:**  
**Questions & Comments:**  
**Amendments:**  
**ACTION:** **Has already been done Editorially**  
**VOTE:**

**8.51 Seq#093 (DEU-STC-005) (BHX-146) See also:8.49, 8.51, & 8.58**

**Seq#093 DEU- STC- 005**  
1- Major Technical P02- 21, *Definition Schema*  
**Comment:**  
The Definition and Information Schemata does not reflect dependencies that have an influence on the drop behavior of certain SQL objects. These dependencies include:  
1. Dependencies of SQL- invoked routines on SQL- invoked routines.  
2. Dependencies of views on SQL- invoked routines.  
3. Dependencies of constraints on SQL- invoked routines.  
4. Dependencies of triggers on SQL- invoked routines.  
5. Most likely some dependencies of views on user- defined types.  
6. Dependencies of assertions and constraints on user- defined types.  
7. Dependencies of triggers on user- defined types.  
8. Most likely some dependencies of SQL- invoked routines on user- defined types.  
**Solution:** None provided with comment.  
**BHX-146 See 8.49**

**STATEMENT:**  
**Questions & Comments:**  
**Amendments:**  
**ACTION:** **See 8.49**  
**VOTE:**

2000-07-27

8.52 Seq#098 (GBR-STC-027) (BHX-144)

Seq#098 GBR- STC- 027

2- Minor Technical P02- 21.08, CHARACTER\_SETS base table

**Comment:**

DR3) is:

3) The value of NUMBER\_OF\_CHARACTERS is a string consisting of a single space.

This cannot be, for the declared type of NUMBER\_OF\_CHARACTERS is INTEGER, as defined by the CARDINAL\_NUMBER domain. In case a solution is proposed that would involved changing the declared type of the column to something based on CHARACTER, we would suggest that "a string consisting of a single space" be replaced by "the string consisting of a single <space>".

We have done some research into how this error might have arisen and the following results might help the discussion. CWB- 051 proposed changes to this subclause and others as follows:

<< quote from CWB- 051r1, as amended by the meeting>>

**2.2.1.30. Subclause 19.3.27, "CHARACTER\_SETS base table"**

2.2.1.30.1. Replace Descriptions 2) (" The value of FORM\_OF\_USE..."), 3)

(" The value of NUMBER\_OF\_CHARACTERS..."), [and others not relevant to this comment] with:

2) The value of FORM\_OF\_USE is the **null value**.

3) The value of NUMBER\_OF\_CHARACTERS is the **null value**.

...

**2.2.1.31. Subclause 19.3.28, "COLLATIONS base table"**

2.2.1.31.2. Insert a new Description immediately following Description 2) (" The values of CHARACTER\_SET\_CATALOG..."):

3) The values of COLLATION\_TYPE, COLLATION\_DICTIONARY, and COLLATION\_DEFINITION are a **zero-length string**.

...

**2.2.1.32. Subclause 19.3.29, "TRANSLATIONS base table"**

2.2.1.32.1. Replace Description 4) with:

4) The value of TRANSLATION\_DEFINITION is a **zero-length string**.

<< end of quote from BHX- 051>>

The Editing Meeting accepted the proposal, after amending it:

<< quote from BBN- 027, "Minutes of the ISO 9075 FCD Editing Meeting", Item 8.22>>

DBL CWB- 051 was amended as follows:

a) Section 2.2.1.29, 30 and 31: change the new value for FORM\_OF\_USE, COLLATION\_TYPE, COLLATION\_DICTIONARY, COLLATION\_DEFINITION, and TRANSLATION\_DEFINITION from "the null value" to "**a zero length string**". << end of quote from BBN- 027>>

However, [Found: 99] (and [SchemataWD]) contains:

In Subclause 21.8 "CHARACTER\_SETS base table", Description 2) and 3):

2) The value of FORM\_OF\_USE is a string consisting of a **single space**.

3) The value of NUMBER\_OF\_CHARACTERS is a string

consisting of a **single space**. In Subclause 21.12 "COLLATIONS base table", Description 3)

3) The values of COLLATION\_TYPE,

COLLATION\_DICTIONARY, and COLLATION\_DEFINITION

are a string consisting of a **single space**. In Subclause 21.45 "TRANSLATIONS base table", Description 4)

4) The value of TRANSLATION\_DEFINITION is a string consisting of a **single space**.

Evidently the changes specified by CWB- 051, as amended according to the minutes of the CWB meeting (and as shown in CWB- 051R1), were incorrectly applied, though what the corrections should be (apart from removing the spurious entries from Annex B) is not clear. However, "a single space" is not SQL- speak — the only other place it occurs is in 21.35 "SQL\_FEATURES base table", Description 4) — <space> would be preferable. But why not 'the null value' which is used in more than twenty other places in DEFINITION\_SCHEMA (in most of which it is used to mean 'irrelevant' rather than 'unknown')? Indeed, in SQL\_IMPLEMENTATION\_INFO base table, *null* is used with the explicit meaning of *not applicable*, while *unknown* is represented by 0 (zero) or a zero-length string, as appropriate. What distinction are we trying to make in this case?

**Solution:** None provided with comment

2000-07-27

<p><b>BHX-144</b>  <b>Title:</b> Resolving DCOR #098  <b>Author:</b> Stephen Cannan (The Netherlands)  <b>Source:</b> NNI</p>
---

<p><b>STATEMENT:</b> <b>NL-Steven-Presented BHX-144</b></p>
<p><b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>  <b>[1] Netherlands—Stephen Cannan—Which one of the alternative should be chosen. In the WD these should be depreciated. Fred will do a PP so this action takes place.</b></p>
<p><b>Amendments:</b>  <b>Poll: Alternative 2: UK, CANADA, AU, NL, US, DE, JP, &amp; AUT -- YES</b></p>
<p><b>ACTION:</b> <b>Accepted as alternative #2</b></p>
<p><b>VOTE:</b> <b>UNANIMOUS</b></p>

**8.53 Seq#099 (GBR-STC-028) (see comment)**

<p>Seq#099 GBR-STC-028  2-Minor Technical P02-21.08, <i>CHARACTER_SETS</i> base table</p>
<p><b>Comment:</b>  DR5) and DR6) require the table to contain rows corresponding to SQL_TEXT and SQL_IDENTIFIER, but there is no rule requiring the table to contain a row corresponding to SQL_CHARACTER. We wonder if there has been some oversight here.</p>
<p><b>Solution:</b>  Insert the following new DR:  7) There is a row in this table for the character set INFORMATION_SCHEMA.SQL_CHARACTER.  In that row:  a) CHARACTER_SET_CATALOG, CHARACTER_SET_SCHEMA, and CHARACTER_SET_NAME are the name of the catalog, 'INFORMATION_SCHEMA', and 'SQL_IDENTIFIER', respectively.  b) DEFAULT_COLLATE_CATALOG, DEFAULT_COLLATE_SCHEMA, and DEFAULT_COLLATE_NAME are the name of the catalog, 'INFORMATION_SCHEMA', and 'SQL_CHARACTER', respectively.</p>

<p><b>STATEMENT:</b> <b>UK—Hugh Darwen—Presented solution</b></p>
<p><b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> <b>None recorded.</b></p>
<p><b>Amendments:</b> <b>None.</b></p>
<p><b>ACTION:</b> <b>Accepted as presented</b></p>
<p><b>VOTE:</b> <b>UNANIMOUS</b></p>

**8.54 Seq#124 (AUT-STC-002) (see comment)**

<p><b>Seq#124 AUT-STC-002</b>  3-Major Editorial P02-E Annex E <i>Incompatibilities with ISO/IEC 9075:1992 and ISO/IEC 9075-4:1996</i></p>
<p><b>Comment:</b>  The second item of Annex E "Incompatibilities with ISO/IEC 9075:1992 and ISO/IEC 9075-4:1996" of SQL:1999/Foundation reads: 2) In ISO/IEC 9075:1992, if one or more rows deleted or updated through some cursor <i>C1</i> are later updated or deleted through some other cursor <i>C2</i>, by a &lt;delete statement: searched&gt;, by an &lt;update statement: searched&gt;, or by some &lt;update rule&gt; or &lt;delete rule&gt; of some &lt;referential constraint definition&gt;, no exception condition is raised and no completion condition other than <i>successful completion</i> is raised. In ISO/IEC 9075:1999, a completion condition is raised: <i>warning – cursor operation conflict</i>. This entry is confusing because it seems that the situation in ISO/IEC 9075:1992 was exactly the same as it is in ISO/IEC 9075:1999. This can be checked by comparing all occurrences of <i>warning – cursor operation conflict</i> in SQL:1999/Foundation and SQL:1992. Here they are:  SQL:1999/Foundation SQL:1992  GR11) of 11.8 &lt;referential constraint definition&gt;...GR11) of SC 11.8</p>

2000-07-27

GR10) of 14.6 <delete statement: positioned>.....GR4) of SC 13.6  
GR10) of 14.7 <delete statement: searched>.....GR3) of SC 13.7  
GR8) of 14.9 <update statement: positioned>.....GR4) of SC 13.9  
GR7) of 14.10 <update statement: searched>.....GR3) of SC 13.10  
GR3)e) of 19.1 <get diagnostics statement>.....GR3)e) of SC 18.1

**Solution:**

Delete item 2) of Annex E of SQL:1999/Foundation.

**STATEMENT:** **AUT- Wolfgang Panny—Presented comment**

**Questions & Comments:** **None recorded.**

**Amendments:** **None.**

**ACTION:** **Rejected as not being analyzed correctly**

**VOTE:** **UNANIMOUS**

**8.55 Seq#126 (SWE-STC-066) (see comment) (BHX-155) See also: 8.20, 8.55, 8.68, & 8.69**

**Seq#126 SWE-STC-066**

4-Minor Editorial *P02-Annex E, Incompatibilities with ISO/IEC 9075:1992 and ISO/IEC 9075-4:1996*

**Comment:**

Editorial. Correct the reserved word list.

**Solution:**

In point 14) delete the texts:

- ABS
- ACTION
- AGGREGATE
- ALIAS
- CARDINALITY
- COMPLETION
- DESTROY
- DICTIONARY
- EVERY
- FACTOR
- HOST
- IGNORE
- INITIALIZE
- ITERATE
- LESS
- LIMIT
- MOD
- MODIFY
- NO
- OFF
- OPERATION
- OPERATOR
- OVERLAY
- PARAMETERS
- PREORDER
- RELATIVE
- REPLACE
- SENSITIVE
- SEQUENCE
- SESSION
- SPACE
- STRUCTURE
- SUBLIST
- SYMBOL
- TERM

2000-07-27

— TERMINATE — THE — TYPE — VARIABLE from the list. In point 14) add the texts: — ADMIN — ASYMMETRIC — CONSTRUCTOR — CURRENT_ROLE — DYNAMIC — FUNCTION — INOUT — LATERAL — LOCALTIME — LOCALTIMESTAMP — METHOD — OUT — RELEASE — SCOPE — STATEMENT — SYMMETRIC — UNNEST
--

<b>STATEMENT:</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>
<b>Amendments:</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> See 8.20
<b>VOTE:</b>

**8.56 Seq#127 (GBR-STC-002) (BHX-049R2)**

<p><b>Seq#127 GBR-STC-002</b>          1-Major Technical P02-No specific location</p> <p><b>Comment:</b>          Possible problems 751, 752 and 753, which are all related, need to be addressed with some urgency.</p> <p><b>Problem 751</b>          The specification of the effect of deleting a row from a table uses the SQL operator EXCEPT ALL. The semantics of EXCEPT ALL given in GR3)b)iii) of Subclause 7.13, "&lt;query expression&gt;", depend on the definition of the term duplicate, which in turn depends on the definition of distinct, which in turn depends on the concept of equality, which is not defined for all data types in SQL (as explained in WG3:SAF-033R1). In any case, EXCEPT ALL is possibly not appropriate, for consider the case where <i>T</i> consists of ROW('a') and ROW('a '). If cursor <i>C</i> is positioned on the second of those two rows, shouldn't DELETE WHERE CURRENT OF <i>C</i> delete precisely that row? The current specification would allow a conforming implementation to delete the first row instead. Note, however, that EXCEPT ALL does work fine for searched deletes; for example, DELETE FROM <i>T</i> WHERE <i>C</i> = 'a' correctly deletes both rows under the current specification. Similar problems arise with the specifications of the effects of replacing a row and inserting a row given in this Subclause.</p> <p><b>Problem 752</b>          There are many places in the SQL standard where hands are waved at the effect of some kind of assignment with phrasing such as "the value of <i>T</i> is set to the value of <i>S</i>". Consider, for example, UPDATE <i>T</i> SET <i>C</i> = 'a'. Suppose this example is included in a conformance test and the check that the implementation conforms is done with SELECT * FROM <i>T</i> WHERE <i>C</i> &lt;&gt; 'a'. An implementation that perversely assigned, say, 'a' to <i>C</i> in some row of <i>T</i> would pass the test! If precise rules were given instead of the handwaving, it would be clear to the developers of the conformance test that the proper check is SELECT * FROM <i>T</i> WHERE <i>C</i> = 'a' AND CHARACTER_LENGTH(<i>C</i>) = 4. Known types for which simple equals comparison is inadequate for testing assignment are</p>
--

2000-07-27

CHARACTER (because of trailing blanks), datetime types specified WITH TIMEZONE and structured types for which no CREATE ORDERING is given. Certain types based or sourced on any these need to be considered, too (e.g., array types, row types and distinct types). A possible solution has been mooted that would involve the definition of a third kind of "same-ness" of values. We already have three-valued equality and two-valued "distinctness" (like equality only nulls are treated as equal). Perhaps we should have indistinguishability too (without necessarily adding any concrete syntax for it, just so long as a conformance test for assignment can be specified).

**Problem 753**

The specification of the effect of invoking a mutator function rely on use of the term distinct which in turn relies on equality. Equality is not defined for certain types, and yet those types are permitted as the declared types of attributes. Moreover, the current specification would allow an attribute other than the one being "mutated" to change in value without breaking conformance in certain cases: an attribute having the value 'a' could be changed to 'a ', for example, as 'a' and 'a ' are not distinct values according to the definition of that term. A possible solution has been mooted that would involve the definition of a third kind of "same-ness" of values. We already have three-valued equality and two-valued "distinctness" (like equality only nulls are treated as equal). Perhaps we should have indistinguishability too (without necessarily adding any concrete syntax for it, just so long as a conformance test for mutator functions can be specified).

**Solution:**

"On Three Different Kinds of Sameness"

**BHX-049R2**

**Title:** On Three Different Kinds of Sameness

**Author:** J M Sykes (United Kingdom)

**Source:** UK Expert

**Status:** Resolution of UK DCor ballot comment and SQL:2002 change proposal

**Abstract:** This paper proposes to solve the problems described in [SAF-082] by (re)defining, and then using, the notion of *identity* (or *indistinguishability*) of values, so as to cover the two cases: identical values that cannot be equal because they cannot be compared, and equal values that are not necessarily identical.

**STATEMENT: UK-Mike-Presented BHX-49R2**

**Questions & Comments:**

[1] US-Fred-Concerned about "make it equal or both NULL"

**Amendments: XXX Need to check this STUFF SNAFU**

[1] In proposal part 3.1.3, Version 2, replace "Neither equal nor both null" with "Two null values are not distinct. A null value and a nonnull value are distinct."

[2] Change the word "Values" with "Fields" 3.1.3

[3] Amend: In proposal part 3.8, insert 2 new subrules preceding proposed GR2)a):

a.0) If V1 and V2 are both null, then V1 is identical to V2.

A.00) If V1 is null and V2 is not null or if V2 is null and V1 is not null, then V1 is not identical to V2.

Then, delete subrule 2)a)i1).

[4] See Steve's notes.

**ACTION: Accept as amended**

**VOTE:**

**US-NO**

**All others YES**

8.57 Seq#128 (GBR-STC-003)

**Seq#128 GBR-STC-003**

1-Major Technical P02-No specific location

2000-07-27

**Comment:**  
[BBN-051], in section 1.4.2 "What's wrong", item 5 says:  
The definition of SQL\_TEXT is unnecessarily cumbersome; its implementation-defined characteristic doesn't help application portability. It is more appropriate to select a specific character set — for which the present paper will select UCS/UTF-16 (a/k/a Unicode) — for this purpose. We agree. However, while UTF-16 was introduced, it appears to have equal standing with UTF-8, and no change was made to anything to do with SQL\_TEXT.  
**Solution:** None provided with comment.

**STATEMENT:** **As written.**  
**Questions & Comments:**  
**Netherlands—Stephen Cannan—This is added functionality and needs to be handled in the working draft as a Language Opportunity.**  
**Amendments:** **None.**  
**ACTION:** **Resolved as a LO for the working draft.**  
**VOTE:** **UNANIMOUS**

**8.58 Seq#129 (SWE-STC-002) (BHX-146) See also:8.49, 8.51, & 8.58**

**Seq#129 GBR-STC-003**  
1-Major Technical P02-No specific location  
**Comment:**  
[BBN-051], in section 1.4.2 "What's wrong", item 5 says:  
The definition of SQL\_TEXT is unnecessarily cumbersome; its implementation-defined characteristic doesn't help application portability. It is more appropriate to select a specific character set — for which the present paper will select UCS/UTF-16 (a/k/a Unicode) — for this purpose. We agree. However, while UTF-16 was introduced, it appears to have equal standing with UTF-8, and no change was made to anything to do with SQL\_TEXT.  
**Solution:** None provided with comment.

**STATEMENT:**  
**Questions & Comments:**  
**Amendments:**  
**ACTION:** **See 4.49**  
**VOTE:**

**8.59 Seq#130 (USA-STC-027) (BHX-038)**

**Seq#130 USA-STC-027**  
2-Minor Technical P02-No specific location  
**Comment:**  
Various additions to the TC were discovered while cleaning out some SQL3 Possible Problems.  
**Solution:**  
See "Addressed by"  
WG3:BHX-038  
**BHX-038**  
Title: **Deleting some Possible Problems**  
Author: Fred Zemke  
Source: U.S.A.  
Status: TC and WD Change proposal  
Date: February 24, 2000  
**Abstract**  
I propose resolutions for over half of the [Foundation WD] Possible Problems under the heading "Minor Problems and Wordsmithing Candidates".

**STATEMENT:** **USA—Fred Zemke—Presented the TC portion of this paper. Paper also includes WG agenda material.**

2000-07-27

<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> None recorded.
<b>Amendments:</b> None.
<b>ACTION:</b> Accepted the TC portion of the paper as written
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

8.60 Seq#131 (USA-STC-029) (BHX-039)

<p><b>Seq#131 USA-STC-029</b> 2-Minor Technical P03-05.13, <i>Description of CLI descriptor areas</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Syntax Rule 5) c) xiv), "TYPE indicates ARRAY or ARRAY CARDINALITY is a valid value for the cardinality of an array, there is LOCATOR, the value of exactly one immediately subordinate descriptor area of IDA, and that item descriptor area is valid." appears to have been mangled since the phrase "there is LOCATOR" is not meaningful. <b>Solution:</b> See WG3:BHX-039.</p> <p><b>BHX-039</b> <b>Title:</b> Misc fixes for SQL/CLI <b>Author:</b> Paul Cotton <b>Status:</b> SQL/CLI, DCOR and SQL/MED change proposal <b>Origin:</b>USA</p>
--

<b>STATEMENT:</b> USA-Krishna Kulkarni-Presented TC portion of this paper
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> None recorded
<b>Amendments:</b> None.
<b>ACTION:</b> Accepted the TC portion of BHX-039
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

8.61 Seq#132 (USA-STC-028) (BHX-153)

<p><b>Seq#132 USA- STC- 028</b> 4- Minor Editorial P03- 0A. 02, <i>COBOL Library item SQLCLI</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The replacement in rationale 2 (" Editorial – consistency with Annex A. 1") seems to be the same as what it is replacing, i. e., there does not seem to be any real change proposed. <b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment</p> <p><b>BHX-153</b> <b>Title:</b> Addressing DCOR #132 (USA-STC-028) <b>Author:</b> Fred Zemke <b>Source:</b> U.S.A. <b>Status:</b> Change proposal <b>Date:</b> July 10, 2000 <b>Abstract</b> This paper addresses DCOR comment #132 (USA-STC-028)</p>
--

<b>STATEMENT:</b> USA--Fred Zemke—Presented BHX-153
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> None recorded.
<b>Amendments:</b> None.
<b>ACTION:</b> Accepted as written
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

8.62 Seq#134 (GBR-STC-032) (see comment)

<p><b>Seq#134 GBR-STC-032</b> 2-Minor Technical P04-06.02, <i>&lt;identifier chain&gt;</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> SR2) includes the sentence, "Let the phrase <i>possible scope tags</i> denote those exposed &lt;table name&gt;s,</p>
--



2000-07-27

<correlation name>s, and <routine name>s." Unlike the text that precedes it, this fails to take query names into account.  
**Solution:**  
In the offending sentence, change "<table name>s" to "<table or query name>s".

**STATEMENT:** UK—Hugh Darwen—Stands as written.  
**Questions & Comments:** None recorded.  
**Amendments:** None.  
**ACTION:** Resolved as proposed.  
**VOTE:**

8.63 Seq#135 (GBR-STC-033) (see comment)

**Seq#135 GBR-STC-033**  
2-Minor Technical P04-06.02, <identifier chain>  
**Comment:**  
SR2) includes the sentence, "Let the phrase *possible scope tags* denote those exposed <table name>s, <correlation name>s, and <routine name>s.", being an exact copy of the corresponding sentence in Part 2. Thus, PSM does not change the definition of *possible scope tags*. Earlier text in the same SR signals a clear intent to include <beginning label>s in the list of things constituting the possible scope tags.  
**Solution:**  
In the offending sentence, change "and <routine name>s" to ", <routine name>s and <beginning label>s".

**STATEMENT:** UK—Hugh Darwen—Presented comment.  
**Questions & Comments:** USA—Fred Zemke—Concurred  
**Amendments:** None.  
**ACTION:** Accepted as proposed  
**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

8.64 Seq#136 (GBR-STC-034) (see comment)

**Seq#136 GBR- STC- 034**  
2- Minor Technical P04- 06.02, <identifier chain>  
**Comment:**  
SR3) starts, "If the innermost possible qualifier is a <beginning label>", which is inconsistent with the SR in Part 2 that it is augmenting.  
**Solution:**  
In the offending sentence, change "qualifier" to "scope tag".

**STATEMENT:** UK—Hugh Darwen—Presented comment.  
**Questions & Comments:** None recorded.  
**Amendments:** None.  
**ACTION:** Accepted as proposed  
**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

8.65 Seq#138 (GBR-STC-035) (see comment) XXX

**Seq#138 GBR-STC-035**  
2-Minor Technical P04-12.02, <fetch statement>  
**Comment:**  
SR2), SR3), GR1) and GR2) all include the text, "... is the <SQL parameter name> of an SQL parameter of an SQL-invoked routine. ...", with reference to something that is a <target specification>, the BNF for which does not permit it to be an <SQL parameter name>. In fact, the text is misleading, too, as an SQL parameter is by definition a parameter of an SQL-invoked routine (so the last four words are redundant).  
**Solution:**

2000-07-27

In SR2), SR3), GR1) and GR2) of Subclause 12.2, "<fetch statement>", replace "is the <SQL parameter name> of an SQL parameter of an SQL-invoked routine" with "If *TS* is an <SQL parameter reference>".

<b>STATEMENT:</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> <b>USA—Fred Zemke--Concurs.</b>
<b>Amendments:</b> See Stevens Document XXX
<b>ACTION:</b> Accepted with amendment-
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

**8.66 Seq#139 (GBR-STC-036) (see comment)**

**Seq#139 GBR- STC- 036**  
2- Minor Technical P04- 12.04, <select statement: singlerow>

**Comment:**  
SR1) and GR1) both refer to the possibility that a <target specification> might be an <SQL variable name>, which the BNF for <target specification> does not permit.

**Solution**  
In SR1) and GR1), replace "< SQL variable name> with "< SQL variable reference>" .

<b>STATEMENT:</b> UK-As written.
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> <b>USA-Krishna Kulkarni-Concurs</b>
<b>Amendments:</b> None.
<b>ACTION:</b> Accepted as proposed
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

**8.67 Seq#140 (AUT-STC-003) (BHX-137) See 8.67 & 8.76 XXX**

**Seq#140 AUT-STC-003**  
3-Major Editorial P04-15.01 <embedded SQL host program>

**Comment:**  
In SR 4) of SC 15.1, "<embedded SQL host program>", of SQL:1999/PSM there is an occurrence of "<exception name>" (there are three other occurrences in SC 16.1, "<embedded SQL host program>", of SQL:1999/Bindings; no other occurrences in parts 1-5 of the SQL:1999 documents). There seems to be no definition for the term "exception name" and there seems to be no BNF for <exception name>. Perhaps "<condition>" or "<SQL condition>" (or a related term) is meant instead.

**Solution:** None supplied with comment.

**BHX-137**  
**Title:** Resolving DCOR #140 & 155  
**Author:** Stephen Cannan (The Netherlands)  
**Source:** NNI

<b>STATEMENT:</b> Netherlands—Stephen Cannan—Presented BHX 137
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> None recorded.
<b>Amendments:</b> None.
<b>ACTION:</b> Accept as written
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

**8.68 Seq#144 (SWE-STC-072) (see comment) (BHX-155) See also: 8.20, 8.55, 8.68, & 8.69**

**Seq#144 SWE- STC- 072**  
4- Minor Editorial P05- 05.01, <token> and <separator>

**Comment:**  
Editorial. Missing non- reserved words.

2000-07-27

<p><b>Solution</b></p> <p>In the Format, in the production for &lt;non- reserved word&gt;, add the texts:</p> <pre> SCOPE_ CATALOG SCOPE_ NAME SCOPE_ SCHEMA USER_ DEFINED_ TYPE_ CATALOG USER_ DEFINED_ TYPE_ NAME USER_ DEFINED_ TYPE_ SCHEMA </pre> <p>in the correct alphabetical order.</p> <p><b>BHX-155</b> <b>See 8.20</b></p>
--

<b>STATEMENT:</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>
<b>Amendments:</b>
<b>ACTION: See 8.20</b>
<b>VOTE:</b>

**8.69** Seq#145 (SWE-STC-073) (see comment) (BHX-155) **See also: 8.20, 8.55, 8.68, & 8.69**

<p>Seq#145 SWE- STC- 073 4- Minor Editorial P05- 05.01, &lt;token&gt; and &lt;separator&gt;</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Editorial. Misplaced non- reserved word</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> In the Format, in the production for &lt;non- reserved word&gt;, add the text:   NESTING in the correct alphabetical order. In the Format, in the production for &lt;reserved word&gt;, delete the text:   NESTING</p> <p><b>BHX-155</b> <b>See 8.20</b></p>
---

<b>STATEMENT:</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>
<b>Amendments:</b>
<b>ACTION: See 8.20</b>
<b>VOTE:</b>

**8.70** Seq#148 (GBR-STC-037) (BHX-143) **See also 8.45, 8.70, & 8.72**

<p>Seq#148 GBR- STC- 037 2- Minor Technical P05- 12, Data manipulation</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> There is no subclause corresponding to Subclause 14.3, "&lt; fetch statement&gt;" in Part 2. This means that it is not possible to FETCH anything into a host variable.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment.</p> <p><b>BHX-143</b> <b>See 8.45</b></p>
---

<b>STATEMENT:</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>
<b>Amendments:</b>
<b>ACTION: See 8.45</b>
<b>VOTE:</b>

**8.71** Seq#149 (GBR-STC-038) (see comment)

Seq#149 GBR-STC-038
---------------------

2000-07-27

2-Minor Technical P05-12.01, <select statement: single row>

**Comment:**

SR1), GR1) and GR2) all refer to the possibility that a <target specification> might be an <embedded variable name>, which the BNF for <target specification> does not permit.

**Solution:**

In SR1), GR1 and GR2), replace "<embedded variable name>" with "<embedded variable specification>".

**STATEMENT:** As written.

**Questions & Comments:** None recorded.

**Amendments:** None.

**ACTION:** Accepted as proposed

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

8.72 Seq#150 (GBR-STC-039) (BHX-143) See also 8.45, 8.70, & 8.72

Seq#150 GBR- STC- 039

4- Minor Editorial P05- 12.01, <select statement: single row>

**Comment:**

GR1) mysteriously starts with "If *the* [our emphasis] target specification *TS* is an <embedded variable name>, ...", implying incorrectly that there is necessarily only one target in a singleton SELECT .

**Solution:**

None provided with comment

**BHX-143**

See 8.45

**STATEMENT:**

**Questions & Comments:**

**Amendments:**

**ACTION:** See 8.45

**VOTE:**

8.73 Seq#151 (GBR-STC-040)

Seq#151

**STATEMENT:** NL-Steven-Presented comment's current status

**Questions & Comments:** None captured.

**Amendments:** None.

**ACTION:** Resolved with no action

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

8.74 Seq#152 (GBR-STC-041) (BHX-166) See also 8.74 & 8.75

Seq#152 GBR- STC- 041

2- Minor Technical P05- 16.01, <embedded SQL host program>

**Comment:**

SR22) g) i) 5) is as follows:

5) Otherwise, *PT* is the SQL data type that corresponds to the host language data type of *EVN* as specified in Subclause 13.6, "Data type correspondences", in ISO/ IEC 9075- 2.

This appears to be ambiguous. Consider the C data type "pointer to long". Table 19 of Subclause 13.6, "Data type correspondences", in SQL: 1999 Part 2 (Foundation) shows two distinct SQL data types that correspond to "pointer to long", namely, BOOLEAN and INTEGER. Therefore *PT* in the cited subrule can be either BOOLEAN or INTEGER. It clearly cannot be both, so which is it? There are many other examples of such ambiguity in Subclause 13.6.

**Solution:** None provided with comment

**BHX-166**

2000-07-27

<b>Subject:</b> TC Change Proposal
<b>Source:</b> Germany
<b>Title:</b> Addressing GBR-STC-041 and GBR-STC-043
<b>Author:</b> Friedemann Schwenkreis

<b>STATEMENT:</b> DEU-- Friedemann Schwenkreis—Presented BHX-166
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> None recorded.
<b>Amendments:</b> None.
<b>ACTION:</b> Accept as written
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

8.75 Seq#154 (GBR-STC-043)

<b>STATEMENT:</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>
<b>Amendments:</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> See 8.74
<b>VOTE:</b>

8.76 Seq#155 (AUT-STC-004)

<b>Seq#155 AUT- STC- 004</b>
3- Major Editorial P05- 16.01 <embedded SQL host program>
<b>Comment:</b> In SR 15) and 16) of SC 16.1, "< embedded SQL host program>", of SQL: 1999/ Bindings there are (3 altogether) occurrences of "< exception name>" (there is another occurrence in SC 15.1, "< embedded SQL host program>", of SQL: 1999/ PSM; no other occurrences in parts 1- 5 of the SQL: 1999 documents). There seems to be no definition for the term "exception name" and there seems to be no BNF for <exception name>. Perhaps "< condition>" or "< SQL condition>" (or a related term) is meant instead.
<b>Solution:</b> None supplied with comment.

<b>STATEMENT:</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>
<b>Amendments:</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> See 8.67
<b>VOTE:</b>

8.77 Seq#156 (AUT-STC-005) (see comment)

<b>Seq#156 AUT-STC-005</b>
3-Major Editorial P05-16.01 <embedded SQL host program>
<b>Comment:</b> In the BNF production for <statement or declaration> in SC16.1, "<embedded SQL host program>" of SQL:1999/Bindings the two last alternatives on the right-hand side are: <SQL-invoked routine> and <SQL procedure statement>. This seems to be redundant, because one of the many alternatives for <SQL procedure statement> in fact is <SQL-invoked routine>. Hence the alternative <SQL-invoked routine> could be ommitted.
<b>Solution:</b> In the Format of SC16.1 delete the line   <SQL-invoked routine> on the right hand side of the BNF production for <statement or declaration>.

<b>STATEMENT:</b> As written
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> None recorded.
<b>Amendments:</b> None.
<b>ACTION:</b> Accepted as proposed

2000-07-27

**VOTE: UNANIMOUS**

**8.78 Seq#157 (AUT-STC-006) (BHX-142)**

**Seq#157 AUT-STC-006**

3-Major Editorial P05-16.01 <embedded SQL host program>

**Comment:**

GR2) of SC16.1, "<embedded SQL host program>" in SQL:1999/Bindings reads:

"If the cursor mode of the current SQL-transaction is *cascade off*, ..." Is a cursor mode of '*cascade off*' defined at all?

**Solution:** None supplied with comment.

**BHX-142**

**Title:** Resolving DCOR #157

**Author:** Stephen Cannan (The Netherlands)

**Source:** NNI

**STATEMENT: Netherlands—Stephen Cannan—Presented BHX-142**

**Questions & Comments: None recorded.**

**Amendments: None.**

**ACTION: Accepted as written**

**VOTE: UNANIMOUS**

**8.79 Seq#168 (USA-STC-039) See BHX-038, BHX-058, BHX-090, & BHX-123**

**Seq#168 USA-STC-039**

1-Major STC-No specific

**Comment:**

The Possible Problems in the WDs should be examined to see if they contain any Technical *location* problems that are true of SQL:1999. Any such problems should be fixed in the TC.

**Solution:** None provided with comment

**STATEMENT:**

**Questions & Comments: None recorded.**

**Amendments: None.**

**ACTION: Accepted with solutions from: BHX-038, BHX-058, BHX-090, & BHX-123**

**VOTE: UNANIMOUS**

**8.80 Seq#021a DEU-STC-001 See also: 8.1, 8.13, 8.26, & 8.80**

**Seq#021a DEU- STC- 001**

3- Editorial P02- 04.32, SQL-transactions

**Comment:**

The following text

Closing the cursor causes an effective check of all table constraints and assertions, the effective execution of all referential actions, and the reevaluation of all matching rows and unique matching rows. might have been in place in this Subclause when there was the concept of CASCADE ON/ OFF. Without that concept, this text needs to be moved to Subclause 4.29, "Cursors". In addition, it is not clear whether that text is sufficiently reflected in Subclause 14.4, "< close statement>".

**Solution:** None provided with comment.

**STATEMENT:**

**Questions & Comments:**

**Amendments:**

**ACTION: See 8.1**

**VOTE:**

2000-07-27

**8.81 Seq#009a WG3-STC-001**

<p><b>Seq#009a WG3- STC- 001</b> 4- Minor Editorial <i>P02- 03.01.05, Definitions provided in Part 2</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Missing character in the definition of &lt;white space&gt;</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Under “vv) white space:” add the following definition: — U+ 202F, Narrow No- Break Space</p>
---

<b>STATEMENT:</b> <b>As written</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> <b>None recorded.</b>
<b>Amendments:</b> <b>None.</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> <b>Accepted as Written</b>
<b>VOTE:</b> <b>UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.82 Seq#000a WG3-STC-002 (BHX-140)**

<p><b>Seq#000a WG3- STC- 002</b> 3- Major Editorial <i>P01- 06.02.05 Relationships of incremental parts to ISO/ IEC 9075-2, Foundation</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Framework should allow itself to be modified by incremental parts</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment.</p> <p><b>BHX-140</b> <b>Title:</b> Resolving DCOR #000a (WG3-STC-002) <b>Author:</b> Stephen Cannan (The Netherlands) <b>Source:</b> NNI</p>
---

<b>STATEMENT:</b> <b>Netherlands—Stephen Cannan—Presented BHX-140</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> <b>None recorded.</b> <b>[1] US-Jim Melton-Part 5 Section 3.4 Modifies the Object Identifier and is an example as presented in the paper.</b>
<b>Amendments:</b> <b>Include Part 10 as well.</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> <b>Accepted as amended.</b>
<b>VOTE:</b> <b>UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.83 Seq#130a WG3-STC-003 (BHX-141R1)**

<p><b>Seq#130a WG3- STC- 003</b> 2- Major Editorial <i>P02- No specific location</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> “schema descriptor” is used, 3 times (11. 1 &lt;schema definition&gt;, 12. 6 &lt;revoke statement&gt;* 2), not defined. But 4.20 SQL- schema says a schema is a descriptor. Perhaps should say that schema is described by a schema descriptor, etc.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment.</p> <p><b>BHX-141</b> <b>Title:</b> Resolving DCOR #130a <b>Author:</b> Stephen Cannan (The Netherlands) <b>Source:</b> NNI</p>
--

<b>STATEMENT:</b> <b>Netherlands—Stephen Cannan—Presents BHX-141R1</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> <b>[1] USA—Fred Zemke—There is a descriptor that needs to be removed.</b> <b>[2] UK—Hugh Darwin—Replace e)</b>
<b>Amendments:</b> <b>[1] There is a descriptor that needs to be removed.</b>

2000-07-27

[2] R1 took into account the previous amendment. [3] Replace e) with: The descriptor created by every <schema element> of the <schema definition>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as amended</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.84 Seq#130b (WG3-STC-004) (BHX-141R1)**

<b>Seq#130b WG3- STC- 004</b> 2- Minor P03- 05.01, Technical routine>
<b>Comment:</b> <CLI There is no syntax rule which prohibits a <separator> from occurring between <CLI name prefix> and <CLI generic name>
<b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment.
<b>BHX-141R1</b> <b>Title:</b> Resolving DCOR #130a <b>Author:</b> Stephen Cannan (The Netherlands) <b>Source:</b> NNI

<b>STATEMENT: USA—Krishna Kulkarni—Presented BHX-121</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>
<b>Amendments: XXX</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as amended</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

**8.85 Seq#132a (WG3-STC-005) (BHX-170)**

<b>Seq#132a WG3- STC- 005</b> 4- Minor Editorial P03- No specific location
<b>Comment:</b> The term “data source” is used but never defined.
<b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment.
<b>BHX-170</b> <b>Subject:</b> TC Change Proposal <b>Source:</b> Germany <b>Title:</b> Resolving DCOR #132a (WG3-STC-005) <b>Author:</b> Friedemann Schwenkreis

<b>STATEMENT: DEU—Friedemann Schwenkreis—Presented BHX-170</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments: None recorded.</b>
<b>Amendments: None.</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as written</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

## 9 Resolution of Catch-All Ballot Comments

**9.1 Seq#169 (USA-STC-038) See also: 9.1 & 9.2**

<b>Seq#169 USA-STC-038</b> 1-Major Technical STC-No specific location
<b>Comment:</b> All possible problems, editor’s notes, and problems that are discovered during the editing meeting should be resolved.
<b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment

<b>STATEMENT:</b>
-------------------



2000-07-27

<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>
<b>Amendments:</b>
<b>ACTION: CLOSE WITH NO FURTHER ACTION</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

**9.2 Seq#170 (CAN-STC-001) See also: 9.1 & 9.2**

<b>Seq#170 CAN-STC-001</b> 2-Minor Technical <i>STC-No specific location</i>
<b>Comment:</b> All Possible Problems, Editor's Notes and problems discovered during the editing process must be resolved.
<b>Solution:</b> None provided with comment.

<b>STATEMENT:</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>
<b>Amendments:</b>
<b>ACTION: See 9.1</b>
<b>VOTE:</b>

**9.3 Correcting the OLAP Package (BHX-067)**

<b>BHX-067</b> Title: <b>Correcting the OLAP Package</b> Author: Fred Zemke, Krishna Kulkarni, Chuck Campbell, Andy Witkowski, Bob Lyle, Rick Cole Source: U.S.A. Status: Change proposal for OLAP FPDAM, TC and Framework WD Date: April 7, 2000 <b>Abstract</b> This paper proposes to replace the current definition of the OLAP package, which was never reviewed by experts in the field, with one that is more relevant to the industry today.
---

<b>STATEMENT: As written</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments: None</b>
<b>Amendments:</b>
<b>ACTION: Accept the TC part of the paper.</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

**9.4 Fixing miscellaneous bugs connected with locators and savepoints (BHX-089)**

<b>BHX-089</b> Source: U.S.A. Status: SQL-99 TC and SQL200n Change Proposal Title: Fixing miscellaneous bugs connected with locators and savepoints Authors: Krishna Kulkarni
---

<b>STATEMENT: US-Krishna-Presented BHX-089</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments: None recorded.</b>
<b>Amendments: None.</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as written</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

**9.5 Handling of Returned Results Sets for Scrollable Cursors (BHX-092)**

<b>BHX-092</b> <b>Handling of Returned Results Sets for Scrollable Cursors</b> Author: Pat O'Connor Source: U.S.A.
---

2000-07-27

Status: Technical Corrigendum Date: June 15, 2000
--

<b>STATEMENT: US-Krishna-Presented BHX-092</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments: None recorded.</b>
<b>Amendments: None.</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as written</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

#### 9.6 Foreign tables and privileges (BHX-095)

<b>BHX-095</b> <b>Handling of Returned Results Sets for Scrollable Cursors</b> Author: Pat O'Connor Source: U.S.A. Status: Technical Corrigendum Date: June 15, 2000
---

<b>STATEMENT: US-Krishna-Presented BHX-95</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments: None recorded.</b>
<b>Amendments: None.</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as written</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

#### 9.7 Deleting more PPs (BHX-090)

<b>BHX-095</b> Title: <b>Foreign tables and privileges</b> Author: Jan-Eike Michels Source: U.S.A. Status: SQL/MED change proposal SQL:1999 TC change proposal SQL:200n change proposal Date: June 15, 2000 <b>Abstract</b> This paper proposes to treat a foreign table as a new kind of table and introduces an improved privilege model for foreign tables. In passing two minor problems in Foundation were discovered and solved.
---

<b>STATEMENT: As written.</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments: None recorded.</b>
<b>Amendments: None.</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as Editorial</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

#### 9.8 Direct containment in OLAP (BHX-094R2)

<b>BHX-094R1</b> Title: <b>Direct containment in OLAP</b> Author: Fred Zemke Source: U.S.A. Status: Change proposal for [OLAP FPDAM], [Foundation WD], [PSM WD] and [SQL:1999 TC] Date: June 20, 2000 <b>Abstract</b> It is proposed that the definition of direct containment for <ordered set function> should only apply to the sort operands in the WITHIN GROUP clause. The paper also raises as a discussion topic whether it is desirable to retain certain instances of direct containment.
--

<b>STATEMENT: US--Fred Zemke--Presented BHX-094R1 &amp; BHX-094R2</b>
---

2000-07-27

<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> [1] USA—Chuck Campbell—An R2 was created to cover items that arose in other agenda items. This also covers section 10.2 [2] UK—Hugh Darwen—Concerned with what is in the BASE Document. Fred Zemke said that a aggregate can not be nested in multiple WHERE clauses. [3] USA—Jim Melton—This is a very old restriction and could cause problems if it is lifted.
<b>Amendments: [1] BHX-094R1:</b> [1] Withdraw section 10.2 for the TC for the time being.  <b>[2] BHX094R2:</b> [1] In Section 7.10 Replace <b>specified</b> with <b>Immediately contained</b> in the WD and in section 8.10 do the same for the TC.
<b>ACTION:</b> [1] Accepted as amended R1 [2] Accepted as amended R2 including section 10.
<b>VOTE:</b> [1] UNANIMOUS for R1 [2] UNANIMOUS for R2

#### 9.9 Fix Cursor Bug in PSM (BHX 118)

<b>BHX 118</b> Title: Fix cursor bug in PSM Author: Richard Swagerman Origin: Canada
---

<b>STATEMENT: USA—Krishna Kulkarni—Presented BHX-118</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments: None recorded.</b>
<b>Amendments: Need to enter a PP to capture this problem.</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as written</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

#### 9.10 TC Fixing length in function definitions (BHX-127)

<b>BHX-127</b> <b>Status:</b> Change proposal for change to multiple function definitions <b>Author:</b> Jim Murray ( Australia ) <b>Abstract:</b> It is proposed that the definition of functions having one or more character type parameters be altered to correct a problem in how character length specifications are derived.
--

<b>STATEMENT: AUS-Jim Murray-Presented BHX-127</b>
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> [1] US-Krishna Kulkarni-Is there a check being made within the routine? Jim Melton & Jim Murray said that this is inconsistent and needed fixing. [2] Netherlands-Stephen Cannan-One is hard coded as 128, is this correct? [3] CANADA-Mark Ashworth—Has a real problem with the paper. What buffer length contains? Defined as a variable length field. Jim Melton attempted to clarify the point. Rule 9 (e). Mark Ashworth was convinced that this was now ok.
<b>Amendments: None.</b>
<b>ACTION: Accepted as written</b>
<b>VOTE: UNANIMOUS</b>

## 10 National Body Closing Comments

### 10.1 Australia

<b>Closing Comments:</b> Australia is also pleased that all the comments were resolved to all the national bodies' satisfaction. We thank Hugh for time and effort he has put into social and non-social
---

2000-07-27

arrangements and wish him to pass on the thanks to Gill and to Hugh's wife.

Thanks to the convenor, editor, secretary and all the delegates for making this a very successful meeting.

10.2 Belgium

Not Present

10.3 Brazil

Not Present

10.4 Canada

Closing Comments:

No closing statement.

10.5 China

Not Present

10.6 Czech Republic

Not Present

10.7 Denmark

Not Present

10.8 Finland

Not Present

10.9 France

Not Present

10.10 Germany

Closing Comments:

No closing statement.

10.11 Italy

Not Present

10.12 Japan

Closing Comments:

Japan Closing Comment:

Japan is pleased that all the comments are resolved successfully. Also Japan is going to continue to check new draft.

10.13 Netherlands

Closing Comments:

The Netherlands is please that all comments have been resolved. We particularly pleased that the excellent co-operation spirit of co-operation which is now traditional within this group persists. We believe that this is essential to the success of the group. We would like to thank IBM for the facilities and Hugh Darwen and Gill Dawson for the arrangements. We would like to thank Hugh and Lindsey for their hospitality on Friday evening and for arranging both outdoor and indoor sporting facilities. We will be supporting progression of this document.

10.14 Norway

Not Present

2000-07-27

#### 10.15 Republic of Korea

Not Present

#### 10.16 United Kingdom

##### Closing Comments:

UK Closing comments for DCOR editing meeting

In our opening comments we confirmed that the document accompanying our ballot response is mainly a compendium of problems in SQL:1999 rather than problems with the Corrigendum we wish to publish. We clarified that, except where specifically stated, we did not require these problems to be addressed by changes to the DCOR document. We are therefore pleased that a significant number of these problems have aroused sufficient concern and interest in other delegates to give rise to solutions to problems we had been unable to solve ourselves, for lack of resource or expertise.

We are disappointed that our proposed removal of a certain restriction on the use of outer references in query expressions was found to be unacceptable at this time. We still have significant concerns about this restriction, so we hope to revisit this issue at our next meeting.

We welcome the contribution of useful comments from Sweden, a national body that has not been actively participating in WG3 for a number of years as far as we recall. We obviously hope our attempts to address these comments will meet with Swedish approval. We would especially welcome Swedish participation in our forthcoming meeting in Helsinki, Finland.

The size of the TC we are about to publish will perhaps be an embarrassment to this group of standardisers. But we can console ourselves with the thought that it is attempts to *implement* a specification that are most likely to reveal errors in that specification. Ours is a standard being implemented.

#### 10.17 United States

##### Closing Comments:

USA is quite pleased that DCOR Editing meeting succeeded in resolving all the DCOR ballot comments to the satisfaction of each of the national bodies. We believe our national body will be willing to endorse the actions taken at this meeting and change our vote to "Yes". USA looks forward to the early publication of SQL TC4. USA is grateful to all the delegates for working very hard to address the comments. USA thanks the Convenor, Stephen Cannan for chairing the editing meeting and making sure that the meeting was run smoothly and productively. We also thank Hugh Darwen for the excellent meeting arrangements.

#### 10.18 Austria

##### Closing Comments:

No closing statement.

#### 10.19 Russian Federation

Not Present

#### 10.20 Sweden

##### Closing Comments:

Sweden did not attend the editing meeting.

## 11 Recommendations

### 11.1 Preparation of Revised Texts (SD-005)

SD-005

2000-07-27

<b>STATEMENT:</b> Netherlands—Stephen Cannan—It will take at least three weeks to accomplish the revision. Look for it on or about the 13 <sup>th</sup> of August and need to respond by the 15 <sup>th</sup> of September.
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b>
<b>Amendments:</b>
<b>ACTION:</b>
<b>VOTE:</b>

### 11.2 Disposition of Comments Report

<b>STATEMENT:</b> The output of this meeting are:  [1] Consolidated [2] Minutes [3] Covering letter
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> None recorded.
<b>Amendments:</b> None.
<b>ACTION:</b> Moved by USA and Seconded by UK
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

### 11.3 Recommendation Regarding Progression

<b>STATEMENT:</b> The Editing Meeting held in Warwick, England, between the 3rd and the 13th July 2000 recommend that the Technical Corrigendum document be transmitted to ITTF in Geneva for publication as a COR as soon as the revised text is available.
<b>Questions &amp; Comments:</b> None recorded.
<b>Amendments:</b> None.
<b>ACTION:</b> Moved UK and Seconded Japan
<b>VOTE:</b> UNANIMOUS

## 12 Action Items

National bodied need to review the sneak peek documents and make their comments and have them to Jim Melton the Editor by the end of business on the 27<sup>th</sup> of August.

## 13 Adjourn



*FINAL AGENDA*

**1 INTRODUCTION OF PARTICIPANTS**

**2 DISTRIBUTION OF DOCUMENTS**

**3 SELECTION OF SECRETARY AND RESOLUTION RECORDER**

**4 APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**5 ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

5.1 Calling notice for DCOR Editing Meeting (SC32 N00434) (BHX-020)

5.2 ISO 9075 TC#4 DCOR text (SC32 N00431) (BHX-017)

5.3 Results of SC32 Ballot on FCD 9075 Cor1 (SC32 N00484, BHX-032)

5.4 DCOR 9075 Consolidated Ballot Comments (BHX-029R3)

5.5 Convenor's Definition of Consensus

**6 NATIONAL BODY OPENING COMMENTS**

6.1 Australia (BHX-048)

6.2 Belgium

6.3 Brazil

6.4 Canada (BHX-070)

6.5 China

6.6 Czech Republic

6.7 Denmark

6.8 Finland

6.9 France

6.10 Germany

6.11 Italy

6.12 Japan

6.13 Netherlands



2000-07-27

- 6.14 Norway
- 6.15 Republic of Korea
- 6.16 United Kingdom (BHX-053)
- 6.17 United States (BHX-060)
- 6.18 Austria (BHX-076)
- 6.19 Russian Federation
- 6.20 Sweden (BHX-077)

## 7 BALLOT COMMENTS ALREADY PROCESSED BY THE EDITOR

- 7.1 Seq#001 (USA-STC-001) (see comment)
- 7.2 Seq#003 (SWE-STC-038) (see comment)
- 7.3 Seq#011 (USA-STC-003) (see comment)
- 7.4 Seq#014 (GBR-STC-010) (see comment)
- 7.5 Seq#020 (USA-STC-007) (see comment)
- 7.6 Seq#026 (SWE-STC-007) (see comment)
- 7.7 Seq#027 (SWE-STC-008) (see comment)
- 7.8 Seq#029 (SWE-STC-010) (see comment)
- 7.9 Seq#031 (SWE-STC-012) (see comment)
- 7.10 Seq#032 (SWE-STC-013) (see comment)
- 7.11 Seq#033 (SWE-STC-014) (see comment)
- 7.12 Seq#036 (USA-STC-010) (see comment)
- 7.13 Seq#046 (USA-STC-015) (see comment)
- 7.14 Seq#047 (USA-STC-021) (see comment)
- 7.15 Seq#048 (USA-STC-016) (see comment)
- 7.16 Seq#049 (USA-STC-017) (see comment)
- 7.17 Seq#050 (USA-STC-018) (see comment)
- 7.18 Seq#051 (USA-STC-019) (see comment)
- 7.19 Seq#052 (USA-STC-020) (see comment)
- 7.20 Seq#055 (SWE-STC-017) (see comment)

2000-07-27

- 7.21 Seq#059 (SWE-STC-019) (see comment)
- 7.22 Seq#062 (USA-STC-023) (see comment)
- 7.23 Seq#063 (USA-STC-024) (see comment)
- 7.24 Seq#064 (GBR-STC-022) (see comment)
- 7.25 Seq#066 (USA-STC-025) (see comment)
- 7.26 Seq#068 (SWE-STC-021) (see comment)
- 7.27 Seq#069 (AUT-STC-001) (see comment)
- 7.28 Seq#071 (SWE-STC-023) (see comment)
- 7.29 Seq#072 (SWE-STC-024) (see comment) (BHX-100)
- 7.30 Seq#078 (USA-STC-026) (see comment)
- 7.31 Seq#079 (SWE-STC-027) (see comment)
- 7.32 Seq#080 (SWE-STC-028) (see comment)
- 7.33 Seq#081 (SWE-STC-029) (see comment)
- 7.34 Seq#082 (SWE-STC-030) (see comment)
- 7.35 Seq#083 (SWE-STC-031) (see comment)
- 7.36 Seq#084 (SWE-STC-032) (see comment)
- 7.37 Seq#087 (SWE-STC-034) (see comment)
- 7.38 Seq#088 (SWE-STC-035) (see comment)
- 7.39 Seq#089 (SWE-STC-036) (see comment)
- 7.40 Seq#090 (SWE-STC-037) (see comment)
- 7.41 Seq#091 (SWE-STC-039) (see comment)
- 7.42 Seq#092 (SWE-STC-040) (see comment)
- 7.43 Seq#094 (SWE-STC-041) (see comment)
- 7.44 Seq#095 (SWE-STC-042) (see comment)
- 7.45 Seq#096 (SWE-STC-043) (see comment)
- 7.46 Seq#097 (SWE-STC-044) (see comment)
- 7.47 Seq#100 (GBR-STC-026) Rejected
- 7.48 Seq#101 (GBR-STC-029) (see comment)

2000-07-27

- 7.49 Seq#102 (SWE-STC-045) (see comment)
- 7.50 Seq#103 (SWE-STC-046) (see comment)
- 7.51 Seq#104 (SWE-STC-047) (see comment)
- 7.52 Seq#105 (SWE-STC-048) (see comment)
- 7.53 Seq#106 (SWE-STC-049) (see comment)
- 7.54 Seq#107 (SWE-STC-050) (see comment)
- 7.55 Seq#108 (SWE-STC-054) (see comment)
- 7.56 Seq#109 (SWE-STC-055) (see comment)
- 7.57 Seq#110 (SWE-STC-056) (see comment)
- 7.58 Seq#111 (SWE-STC-057) (see comment)
- 7.59 Seq#112 (SWE-STC-051) (see comment)
- 7.60 Seq#113 (SWE-STC-052) (see comment)
- 7.61 Seq#114 (SWE-STC-053) (see comment)
- 7.62 Seq#115 (SWE-STC-058) (see comment)
- 7.63 Seq#116 (SWE-STC-059) (see comment)
- 7.64 Seq#117 (SWE-STC-060) (see comment)
- 7.65 Seq#118 (SWE-STC-061) (see comment)
- 7.66 Seq#119 (SWE-STC-062) (see comment)
- 7.67 Seq#120 (SWE-STC-063) (see comment)
- 7.68 Seq#121 (SWE-STC-064) (see comment)
- 7.69 Seq#122 (GBR-STC-030) (see comment)
- 7.70 Seq#123 (GBR-STC-031) (see comment)
- 7.71 Seq#125 (SWE-STC-065) (see comment)
- 7.72 Seq#133 (SWE-STC-067) (see comment)
- 7.73 Seq#137 (SWE-STC-068) (see comment)
- 7.74 Seq#141 (SWE-STC-069) (see comment)
- 7.75 Seq#142 (SWE-STC-070) (see comment)
- 7.76 Seq#143 (SWE-STC-071) (see comment)

2000-07-27

- 7.77 Seq#146 (SWE-STC-074) (see comment)
- 7.78 Seq#147 (SWE-STC-075) (see comment)
- 7.79 Seq#153 (GBR-STC-042) (see comment)
- 7.80 Seq#158 (USA-STC-030) (see comment)
- 7.81 Seq#159 (USA-STC-031) (see comment)
- 7.82 Seq#160 (USA-STC-032) (see comment)
- 7.83 Seq#161 (USA-STC-033) (see comment)
- 7.84 Seq#162 (USA-STC-034) (see comment)
- 7.85 Seq#163 (USA-STC-035) (see comment)
- 7.86 Seq#164 (USA-STC-036) (see comment)
- 7.87 Seq#165 (USA-STC-037) (see comment)
- 7.88 Seq#166 (SWE-STC-076) (see comment)
- 7.89 Seq#167 (SWE-STC-077) (see comment)

## 8 RESOLUTION OF BALLOT COMMENTS

- 8.1 Seq#002 (GBR-STC-001) **See also: 8.1, 8.13, 8.26, & 8.80**
- 8.2 Seq#004 (GBR-STC-004) (see comment)
- 8.3 Seq#005 (GBR-STC-005) (see comment)
- 8.4 Seq#006 (GBR-STC-006) (BHX-152R1) **See also 8.4 & 8.5**
- 8.5 Seq#007 (GBR-STC-007) (BHX-152R1) **See also 8.4 & 8.5**
- 8.6 Seq#008 (USA-STC-002) (BHX-035) (BHX-049R2) (BHX-093) (BHX-116)
- 8.7 Seq#009 (SWE-STC-003) (see comment)
- 8.8 Seq#010 (USA-STC-004) (BHX-062R1)
- 8.9 Seq#012 (GBR-STC-008) (BHX-149) **See also 8.9 & 8.34**
- 8.10 Seq#013 (GBR-STC-009) (see comment)
- 8.11 Seq#015 (USA-STC-005) (see comment)
- 8.12 Seq#016 (USA-STC-006) (see comment)
- 8.13 Seq#017 (GBR-STC-012) **See also: 8.1, 8.13, 8.26, & 8.80**
- 8.14 Seq#018 (GBR-STC-011) (BHX-132)

2000-07-27

- 8.15 Seq#019 (GBR-STC-013) (see comment)
- 8.16 Seq#021 (USA-STC-008) (BHX-163)
- 8.17 Seq#022 (USA-STC-009) (BHX-036)
- 8.18 Seq#023 (SWE-STC-004) (see comment)
- 8.19 Seq#024 (SWE-STC-005) (see comment)
- 8.20 Seq#025 (SWE-STC-006) (see comment) (BHX-155) **See also: 8.20, 8.55, 8.68, & 8.69**
- 8.21 **Seq#028 (SWE-STC-009) (see comment) XXX**
- 8.22 Seq#030 (SWE-STC-011) (see comment)
- 8.23 Seq#034 (SWE-STC-015) (see comment)
- 8.24 Seq#035 (GBR-STC-014) (see comment)
- 8.25 Seq#037 (GBR-STC-015) (see comment)
- 8.26 Seq#038 (GBR-STC-016) **See also: 8.1, 8.13, 8.26, & 8.80**
- 8.27 Seq#039 (GBR-STC-017) (see comment)
- 8.28 Seq#040 (USA-STC-011) (BHX-131)
- 8.29 Seq#041 (USA-STC-012) (BHX-037)
- 8.30 Seq#042 (USA-STC-013) (BHX-061)
- 8.31 Seq#043 (GBR-STC-018) (see comment)
- 8.32 Seq#044 (SWE-STC-016) (see comment)
- 8.33 Seq#045 (USA-STC-014) (BHX-087)
- 8.34 Seq#053 (GBR-STC-019) (BHX-149) **See also 8.9 & 8.34**
- 8.35 Seq#054 (DEU-STC-002) (BHX-164)
- 8.36 Seq#056 (SWE-STC-018) (see comment)
- 8.37 Seq#057 (GBR-STC-020) (see comment)
- 8.38 Seq#058 (DEU-STC-003) (BHX-168)
- 8.39 Seq#060 (USA-STC-022) (BHX-088)
- 8.40 Seq#061 (GBR-STC-021)
- 8.41 Seq#065 (DEU-STC-004) (BHX-091)
- 8.42 Seq#067 (SWE-STC-020) (see comment) (BHX-172)

2000-07-27

- 8.43 Seq#070 (SWE-STC-022) (see comment)
- 8.44 Seq#073 (GBR-STC-023) (see comment) See also 8.44 & 8.46
- 8.45 Seq#074 (GBR-STC-024) (BHX-143) See also 8.45, 8.70, & 8.72
- 8.46 Seq#075 (GBR-STC-025) (see comment) See also 8.44 & 8.46
- 8.47 Seq#076 (SWE-STC-025) (BHX-138) See also: 8.47 & 8.48
- 8.48 Seq#077 (SWE-STC-026) (see comment) (BHX-138) See 8.47 & 8.48
- 8.49 Seq#085 (SWE-STC-001) (BHX-146) See also:8.49, 8.51, & 8.58
- 8.50 Seq#086 (SWE-STC-033) (see comment)
- 8.51 Seq#093 (DEU-STC-005) (BHX-146) See also:8.49, 8.51, & 8.58
- 8.52 Seq#098 (GBR-STC-027) (BHX-144)
- 8.53 Seq#099 (GBR-STC-028) (see comment)
- 8.54 Seq#124 (AUT-STC-002) (see comment)
- 8.55 Seq#126 (SWE-STC-066) (see comment) (BHX-155) See also: 8.20, 8.55, 8.68, & 8.69
- 8.56 Seq#127 (GBR-STC-002) (BHX-049R2)
- 8.57 Seq#128 (GBR-STC-003)
- 8.58 Seq#129 (SWE-STC-002) (BHX-146) See also:8.49, 8.51, & 8.58
- 8.59 Seq#130 (USA-STC-027) (BHX-038)
- 8.60 Seq#131 (USA-STC-029) (BHX-039)
- 8.61 Seq#132 (USA-STC-028) (BHX-153)
- 8.62 Seq#134 (GBR-STC-032) (see comment)
- 8.63 Seq#135 (GBR-STC-033) (see comment)
- 8.64 Seq#136 (GBR-STC-034) (see comment)
- 8.65 Seq#138 (GBR-STC-035) (see comment) XXX
- 8.66 Seq#139 (GBR-STC-036) (see comment)
- 8.67 Seq#140 (AUT-STC-003) (BHX-137) See 8.67 & 8.76 XXX
- 8.68 Seq#144 (SWE-STC-072) (see comment) (BHX-155) See also: 8.20, 8.55, 8.68, & 8.69
- 8.69 Seq#145 (SWE-STC-073) (see comment) (BHX-155) See also: 8.20, 8.55, 8.68, & 8.69
- 8.70 Seq#148 (GBR-STC-037) (BHX-143) See also 8.45, 8.70, & 8.72

2000-07-27

- 8.71 Seq#149 (GBR-STC-038) (see comment)
- 8.72 Seq#150 (GBR-STC-039) (BHX-143) See also 8.45, 8.70, & 8.72
- 8.73 Seq#151 (GBR-STC-040)
- 8.74 Seq#152 (GBR-STC-041) (BHX-166) See also 8.74 & 8.75
- 8.75 Seq#154 (GBR-STC-043)
- 8.76 Seq#155 (AUT-STC-004)
- 8.77 Seq#156 (AUT-STC-005) (see comment)
- 8.78 Seq#157 (AUT-STC-006) (BHX-142)
- 8.79 Seq#168 (USA-STC-039) See BHX-038, BHX-058, BHX-090, & BHX-123
- 8.80 Seq#021a DEU-STC-001 See also: 8.1, 8.13, 8.26, & 8.80
- 8.81 Seq#009a WG3-STC-001
- 8.82 Seq#000a WG3-STC-002 (BHX-140)
- 8.83 Seq#130a WG3-STC-003 (BHX-141R1)
- 8.84 Seq#130b (WG3-STC-004) (BHX-141R1)
- 8.85 Seq#132a (WG3-STC-005) (BHX-170)

## 9 RESOLUTION OF CATCH-ALL BALLOT COMMENTS

- 9.1 Seq#169 (USA-STC-038) See also: 9.1 & 9.2
- 9.2 Seq#170 (CAN-STC-001) See also: 9.1 & 9.2
- 9.3 Correcting the OLAP Package (BHX-067)
- 9.4 Fixing miscellaneous bugs connected with locators and savepoints (BHX-089)
- 9.5 Handling of Returned Results Sets for Scrollable Cursors (BHX-092)
- 9.6 Foreign tables and privileges (BHX-095)
- 9.7 Deleting more PPs (BHX-090)
- 9.8 Direct containment in OLAP (BHX-094R2)
- 9.9 Fix Cursor Bug in PSM (BHX 118)
- 9.10 TC Fixing length in function definitions (BHX-127)

## 10 NATIONAL BODY CLOSING COMMENTS

- 10.1 Australia

2000-07-27

- 10.2 Belgium
- 10.3 Brazil
- 10.4 Canada
- 10.5 China
- 10.6 Czech Republic
- 10.7 Denmark
- 10.8 Finland
- 10.9 France
- 10.10 Germany
- 10.11 Italy
- 10.12 Japan
- 10.13 Netherlands
- 10.14 Norway
- 10.15 Republic of Korea
- 10.16 United Kingdom
- 10.17 United States
- 10.18 Austria
- 10.19 Russian Federation
- 10.20 Sweden

## **11 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 11.1 Preparation of Revised Texts (SD-005)
- 11.2 Disposition of Comments Report
- 11.3 Recommendation Regarding Progression

## **12 ACTION ITEMS**

## **13 ADJOURN**



ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N00499  
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32/WG3 HEL-011

2000-07-27

**DOCUMENT REGISTER**

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG3  
DOCUMENT REGISTER  
3rd July – 14th July 2000  
Warwick, England

**Prefix: WG3 BHX**

No.	Source	Title	Agenda	Avail.?
001	Cotton	Minutes from Santa Fe WG Meeting	WG5.1	Y
002R1	Cannan	Technical Corrigendum #5 WD	WG9.1	Y
003	Melton	ISO 9075-1 SQL/Framework WD	WG6.13	Y
004	Melton	ISO 9075-2 SQL/Foundation WD	WG6.14	Y
005	Melton	ISO 9075-3 SQL/CLI WD	WG6.15	Y
006	Melton	ISO 9075-4 SQL/PSM WD	WG6.16	Y
007	Melton	ISO 9075-7 SQL/Temporal WD	WG6.17	Y
008	Melton	ISO 9075-9 SQL/MED WD	WG6.18	Y
009	Melton	ISO 9075-10 SQL/OLB WD	WG6.19	Y
010	Melton	ISO 9075-11 SQL/Schemata WD	WG6.20	Y
011	Cotton	Minutes of ISO 9075-10 SQL/OLB FCD Final Continuation Editing Meeting, Santa Fe, (SC32 N00428)	WG6.22	Y
012	Melton	ISO 9075-10 SQL/OLB FCD Final Disposition of Comments (SC32 N00429)	WG6.23	Y
013	Melton	ISO 9075-9 SQL/OLB FDIS text (SC32 N00475)	WG6.24	Y
014	Cannan	Convenor's recommendation on SQL/OLB progression to the SC32 secretariat (SC32 N00430)	WG6.25	Y
015	Melton	ISO 9075-9 SQL/MED FCD text (SC32 N0368)	EM5.2	Y
016	Melton	ISO 9075 SQL/OLAP FPDAM Text (SC32 N0379)	EO5.2	Y
017	Cannan	ISO 9075 TC#4 DCOR text (SC32 N0431)	EC5.2	Y
018	Cannan	Calling Notice for SQL/MED FCD Editing Meeting (SC32 N0432)	EM5.1	Y
019	Cannan	Calling Notice for SQL/OLAP FPDAM Editing Meeting (SC32 N0433)	EO5.1	Y
020	Cannan	Calling Notice for DCOR Editing Meeting (SC32 N0434)	EC5.1	Y
021R1	W3C	W3C XML Schema Part 1 – Structures	WG8.1	Y
022R1	W3C	W3C XML Schema Part 2 – Datatypes	WG8.2	Y
023	W3C	W3C XML Query Requirements	WG8.4	Y
024	Cotton	Revised classification of SQL- statements in ISO/ IEC 9075: 1999	WG11.1	Y
025	Cannan	Calling Notice for Working Group Meeting (WG3 N0035)	WG6.1	Y
026	Melton	ISO 9075-12 SQL/Replication WD	WG6.21	Y
027R2	Melton	Consolidated Ballot Comments (SQL/MED)	EM5.4	Y
028	Melton	Consolidated Ballot Comments (SQL/OLAP)	EO5.4	Y
029R2	Melton	Consolidated Ballot Comments (SQL/TC4)	EC5.4	Y
030	SC32	Results of SC32 Ballot on FCD 9075-9 (SC32 N0478)	EM5.3	Y
031	SC32	Results of SC32 Ballot on FCD 9075 Amd1 (SC32 N0479)	EC5.3	Y
032	SC32	Results of SC32 Ballot on FCD 9075 Cor1 (SC32 N0484)	EO5.3	Y
033R1	Darwen	Warwick Meeting Arrangements	WG6.2	Y
034	USA	Enhancing <finality> for structured types (H2-2000-009)	WG11.3	Y
035	USA	A TC of distinction if not renown (H2-2000-011R1)	ET8.6	Y
036	USA	TC for equivalent identifiers ( H2-2000-012R1)	ET8.17	Y
037	USA	TC for <table reference> ( H2-2000-013R1)	ET8.29	Y
038	USA	Deleting some possible problems (H2-2000-018R2)	ET8.59, ET8.79	Y
039	USA	Miscellaneous fixes for SQL/CLI (H2-2000-036R1)	ET8.60 EM8.104	Y
040	USA	Changing ?what if? to ?hypothetical? ( H2-1999-482R1)	EO8.7	Y
041	USA	Data type of PERCENTILE_CONT (H2-1999-483R1)	EO8.19	Y
042	USA	Permitting completely unordered ROW_NUMBER (H2-1999-484R1)	EO8.23	Y
043	USA	WIDTH_BUCKET for out-of-bound values (H2-1999-485R1)	EO8.13	Y
044	USA	OLAP functions and GROUP BY extensions (H2-1999-492R1)	EO8.29	Y

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N00499  
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32/WG3 HEL-011

2000-07-27

No.	Source	Title	Agenda	Avail.?
045	USA	Completing the merge of RTM-054r2 and RTM-109r1 (H2-2000-014)	EO8.8	Y
046	USA	Percentiles and nulls (H2-2000-015)	EO8.20	Y
047R1	Cotton	XML Schema Part 0: Primer	WG8.3	Y
048	AUS	Ballot Comments on SQL/MED	EM6.1	Y
049R2	Sykes	On Three Different Kinds of Sameness	ET8.6, ET8.56	Y
050	Darwen	Clarifying When Access Tokens Are Generated	EM8.73	Y
051	UK	UK SQL/MED FCD Ballot Comments	EM6.16	Y
052	UK	UK SQL/OLAP FPDAM Ballot Comments	EO6.16	Y
053	UK	UK DCOR Ballot Comments	ET6.16	Y
054	USA	A new standing document (H2-2000-182)	WG6.12	Y
055	USA	Remove restrictions on REFs in attributes (H2-2000-192)	WG11.4	Y
056	USA	ALTER TRANSFORM (H2-2000-193)	WG11.5	Y
057	USA	Extensions for <table definition> (H2-2000-194)	WG11.6	Y
058	USA	Bye bye, PP! (H2-2000-209)	WG11.7, ET8.79	Y
059	USA	SQLJ Parts 1 and 2 - Progression possibilities (H2-2000-232)	WG19.1	Y
060	USA	USA SQL-99/TC 1 DCOR Ballot Comments (H2-2000-207)	ET6.17	Y
061	USA	Another TC for <group by clause> (H2-2000-181)	ET8.30	Y
062R1	USA	Uniform Syntax and Conformance Rules for comparisons (H2-2000-187)	ET8.7 EO8.32	Y
063	USA	USA OLAP FPDAM Ballot Comments (H2-2000-163--Melton)	EO6.17	Y
064	USA	Filtering for aggregates (H2-2000-188)	EO8.30	Y
065	USA	Allowing percentiles as reporting functions (H2-2000-189)	EO8.21	Y
066	USA	Corrections for window ordering (H2-2000-190)	EO8.10	Y
067	USA	Correcting the OLAP Package (H2-2000-191)	EO8.37 ET9.3	Y
068	USA	USA MED FCD Ballot Comments (H2-2000-162)	EM6.17	Y
069	CAN	SQL/OLAP FPDAM comments	EO6.4	Y
070	CAN	SQL:1999 TC#1 DCOR comments	ET6.4	Y
071	CAN	SQL/MED FCD comments	EM6.4	Y
072	NLD	SQL/OLAP FPDAM comments	EO6.13	Y
073	NLD	SQL/MED FCD comments	EM6.13	Y
074	JPN	SQL/OLAP FPDAM comments	EO6.12	Y
075	JPN	SQL/MED FCD comments	EM6.12	Y
076	AUT	Austrian DCOR Comments (SC32 N00485)	ET6.18	Y
077	SWE	Swedish Ballot Comments	ET6.20	Y
078	Deutsch	H2-2000-254: H2 Proposal to SC 32/WG 3 for Co-located Meeting in Helsinki, 2-6 October 2000	WG6.26	Y
079	Cannan	Co-located Meetings	WG6.26	Y
080	Sykes	A Review of Some Possible Problems with SQL character features - WG3 discussion	WG11.8	Y
081	Darwen	UK SQL/MED FCD Typos Reported to The Editor	EM9.5	Y
082	Darwen	Datalink Constraints on COLUMNS Base Table	EM8.166	Y
083	Darwen	Revisions to Some Solutions in UK Ballot Comments	EM8.4	Y
084	Darwen	Wrapper Routines: Terminology Clean-Up	EM8.6, EM8.52	Y
085	USA	Enhancing <dynamic parameter specification>s for <routine invocation>s (H2-2000-272)	WG11.9	Y
086	USA	Add SPECIFIC METHOD to CREATE METHOD (H2-2000-275)	WG11.10	Y
087	USA	Correcting a small bug in <Similar Predicate> (H2-2000-236)	ET8.33	Y
088	USA	Fixing bugs with the generation of cast functions for reference types (H2-2000-255)	ET8.39	Y
089	USA	Fixing miscellaneous bugs connected with locators and savepoints (H2-2000-256)	ET9.4	Y
090	USA	Deleting more PPs (H2-2000-271)	ET9.7, ET8.79	Y
091	USA	Resolving DEU-STC-004 (H2-2000-273)	ET8.41	Y
092	USA	Handling of Returned Results Sets for Scrollable Cursors (H2-2000-274r1)	ET9.5	Y
093	USA	Response to BHX-049r1 (Discussion Paper) (H2-2000-305)	ET8.6, ET8.56	Y

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N00499  
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32/WG3 HEL-011

2000-07-27

No.	Source	Title	Agenda	Avail.?
094R2	USA	Direct containment in OLAP (H2-2000-277)	ET9.8 EO8.2, EO8.26	Y
095	USA	Foreign tables and privileges (H2-2000-259)	ET9.6 EM8.5	Y
096	USA	Exceptions Raised by <natural logarithm>, <power function>, and <width bucket function> (H2-2000-248)	EO8.16	Y
097	USA	Supplying the to-be-supplied in OLAP (H2-2000-267)	EO8.1	Y
098	USA	Minor improvements to OLAP Concepts (H2-2000-268)	EO8.3	Y
099	USA	Nulls with FLOOR and CEILING (H2-2000-269)	EO8.14	Y
100	USA	Addressing NLD-PA1-009 (OLAP PP#1) (H2-2000-270 )	ET7.29 EO8.31	Y
101	USA	Cleanup of foreign server and foreign-data wrapper related issues (H2-2000-258)	EM8.16, EM8.101	Y
102R1	USA	Cleanup of "Sequence of actions..." table (H2-2000-260)	EM8.46, EM8.47 EM8.160, EM8.161,	Y
103	USA	Simplifying datalink structure (H2-2000-261)	EM8.28, EM8.30	Y
104	USA	Resolving USA-P09-024 and USA-P09-025 (H2-2000-262)	EM8.35, EM8.74, EM8.75	Y
105R1	USA	Integrity Fix for Drop Column Definition with Datalink Control (H2-2000-263r1)	EM8.82	Y
106	USA	<cast specification> Table To Include Row and Collection Types (H2-2000-264)	EM8.68	Y
107	USA	Close comment USA-P09-009 (H2-2000-302)	EM8.36, EM8.79	Y
108R1	USA	Cleanup of generic options (H2-2000-308)	EM8.78, EM8.83	Y
109R1	USA	Cleanup of user mappings (H2-2000-309)	EM8.91	Y
110	USA	Importing Foreign Schemas for SQL/MED (H2-2000-310)	EM8.131, EM8.136	Y
111	Darwen	Handling a Nonexistent Datalink Referent	EM8.29	Y
112	JPN	User mapping for public(Resolving JPN-P09-002)	EM8.91	Y
113	JPN	Resolving JPN-P09-005	EM8.128	Y
114	JPN	Resolving JPN-P09-003	EM8.78	Y
115	JPN	Limit clause(Resolving JPN-A01-001)	EO8.33	Y
116	Sykes	Response to BHX-093, and other possible problems with BHX-049r1	ET8.6, ET8.56	Y
117	Sykes	Further discussion of issues raised in BHX-080 - discussion	WG11.8	Y
118	CAN	Fix cursor bug in PSM	ET9.9	Y
119	Darwen	Clarification of Foereign Server Sessions	EM8.4, EM8.41	Y
120	Schwenkreis	Resolving DEU-P09-008	EM8.111	Y
121	USA	Language binding changes for the wrapper interface	EM8.43, EM8.114, EM8.121, EM8.122, EM8.185, EM8.196, EM8.197, EM8.202, EM8.203 ET8.84	Y
122	USA	year-month ranges on OLAP	EO9.6	Y
123	USA	Deleting still more PP's	WG11.11, ET8.79, EM8.87, EM8.90	Y
124	USA	Resolving GBR-P09-019	EM8.33	Y
125	USA	Resolving minor comments related to URLs	EM8.32, EM8.56, EM8.57, EM8.65	Y

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N00499  
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32/WG3 HEL-011

2000-07-27

No.	Source	Title	Agenda	Avail.?
126	AUS	MED Fixing length in function definitions	EM8.215, EM9.6	Y
127	AUS	TC Fixing length in function definitions	ET9.10	Y
128	Cannan	Solving MED Seq#204 etc.	EM8.162	Y
129	Zemke	Addressing OLAP #038	EO8.27	Y
130	Zemke	Addressing OLAP #018 & #039	EO8.9, EO8.28	Y
131	Zemke	Addressing DCOR #040	ET8.28	Y
132	Zemke	Closing DCOR #018	ET8.14	Y
133	Zemke	OLAP Comments to close with no action	EO8.17, EO8.25, EO8.33, EO8.35, EO8.36	Y
134	Melton	Resolving Comments Related to GetOptions and RetrieveStatistics	EM8.133, EM8.134, EM8.135, EM8.158 EM8.205,	Y
135	Schwenkreis	Addressing AUS-STC-007	EM8.208	Y
136R1	Darwen	Splitting Clause 22 MED#146	EM8.109, EM8.214	Y
137	Cannan	Resolving DCOR #140 and 155	ET8.67, EM8.76	Y
138	Cannan	Closing SWE-STC-025 and SWE-STC-026 (Seq# 76 and 77)	ET8.47, ET8.48	Y
139	Ashworth	Addressing SQL/MED #46 CAN-P09-007	EM8.38	Y
140	Cannan	Resolving DCOR #000a	ET8.82	Y
141R1	Cannan	Resolving DCOR #130a	ET8.83	Y
142	Cannan	Resolving DCOR #157	ET8.78	Y
143	Cannan	Resolving DCOR #074, 148, 150	ET8.45, ET8.70, ET8.72	Y
144	Cannan	Resolving DCOR #098	ET8.52	Y
145	Murray	Resolving Comment SQL/MED 155a	EM8.211	Y
146	Cannan	Resolving DCOR #085, 093, 129	ET8.49, ET8.51, ET8.58	Y
147	USA	Resolving USA-P09-068 & JPN-P09-004	EM8.45, EM8.195	Y
148	USA	Cleanup of data retrieval in SQL/MED	EM8.50, EM8.51, EM8.53, EM8.186, EM8.189, EM8.190, EM8.191, EM8.209	Y
149	Sykes	Addressing DCOR ballot comments SEQ#012 and SEQ#053	ET8.9, ET8.34	Y
150R1	USA	SQL/MED Conformance Statement	EM8.86, EM8.172, EM8.173, EM8.174	Y
151	Darwen	MED Definitions #8, #9	EM8.7, EM8.8	Y
152R1	Murray	Resolving DCOR comment #6	ET8.4	Y
153	Zemke	Resolving DCOR #132	ET8.61	Y
154	Zemke	Resolving DCOR #150	ET8.72	Y
155	Zemke	Resolving DCOR keyword comments (#25, #126, #144, #145)	ET8.20, ET8.55, ET8.68, ET8.69	Y

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N00499  
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32/WG3 HEL-011

2000-07-27

No.	Source	Title	Agenda	Avail.?
156R1	Melton	Resolving comments related to XML usage	EM8.21, EM8.22, EM8.23, EM8.24, EM8.25, EM8.26, EM8.27, EM8.130, EM8.132, EM8.157, EM8.180, EM8.194, EM8.210	Y
157	Darwen	Segregating Access Token and File Reference	EM8.32, EM8.56, EM8.57, EM8.65	Y
158	Cannan	Resolving MED #249	EM8.198	Y
159	USA	Resolving CAN-P09-005 (Seq#013)	EM8.11	Y
160	Schwenkreis	URL issues	EM7.47, EM8.76	Y
161	Uleman	Clarifying SQL-Aware foreign server	EM8.10	Y
162R1	Ashworth	Addressing MED #101 (USA-P09-027)	EM8.77	Y
163	Murray	Addressing DCOR #021	ET8.16	Y
164	Schwenkreis	Resolving DCOR # 054	ET8.35	Y
165	Piprani	Resolving MED #250	EM8.199	Y
166	Schwenkreis	Resolving GBR-STC-041 ...	ET8.74, ET8.75	Y
167	USA	Resolving MED #241	EM8.193	Y
168	Zemke	DCOR #058	ET8.38	Y
169	Schwenkreis	Addressing WG3-P09-002	EM8.216	Y
170	Schwenkreis	Resolving DCOR#132a	ET8.85	Y
171	Ashworth	Resolving MED#222	EM8.178	Y
172	Zemke	Addressing DCOR# 067	ET8.42	Y