

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 0730

Date: 2001-11-07

REPLACES: --

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

DOCUMENT TYPE	Meeting Report
TITLE	Minutes of the Continuation Editing Meeting (electronic), 2nd July – 24th August 2001 on: ISO/IEC CD 9075/1 — SQL/Framework; ISO/IEC CD 9075/2 — SQL/Foundation; ISO/IEC CD 9075/3 — SQL/CLI; ISO/IEC CD 9075/4 — SQL/PSM; ISO/IEC CD 9075/9 — SQL/MED; ISO/IEC CD 9075/10 — SQL/OLB; ISO/IEC CD 9075/11 — SQL/Schemata
SOURCE	Stephen Cannan & Baba Piprani
PROJECT NUMBER	1.32.03.05.01.00
STATUS	Output document from Ballot Resolution Meeting
REFERENCES	
ACTION ID.	FYI
REQUESTED ACTION	
DUE DATE	
Number of Pages	25
LANGUAGE USED	English
DISTRIBUTION	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: +1 703 236-1422; Facsimile; +1 703 527-5640; E-mail: 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

ISO

International Organization for Standardization

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32
Data Management and Services
WG3 Database Languages

Secretariat: USA (ANSI)

Title: Minutes of the Continuation Editing Meeting (electronic), 2nd July – 24th August 2001 on:

ISO/IEC CD 9075/1 — SQL/Framework
ISO/IEC CD 9075/2 — SQL/Foundation
ISO/IEC CD 9075/3 — SQL/CLI
ISO/IEC CD 9075/4 — SQL/PSM
ISO/IEC CD 9075/9 — SQL/MED
ISO/IEC CD 9075/10 — SQL/OLB
ISO/IEC CD 9075/11 — SQL/Schemata

Author: Stephen Cannan & Baba Piprani

Status: Output document from Ballot Resolution Meeting

1. Introduction Of Participants

Mark Ashworth	(Canada)
Stephen Cannan	(Netherlands) (Convenor)
Hugh Darwen	(UK)
Takashi Kotera	(Japan)
Jutta Kreyss	(Germany)
Krishna Kulkarni	(USA)
Jim Melton	(USA) (Editor)
Jan-Eike Michels	(USA)
Åke Persson	(Sweden)
Baba Piprani	(Canada)
Peter Pistor	(Germany)
Takaaki Shiratori	(Japan)
Mike Sykes	(UK)
Masashi Tsuchida	(Japan)
Keith W. Hare	(USA)
Fred Zemke	(USA)

2. Distribution Of Documents

E3B-019 "Resolving SEQ#142 (DEU-P02-007) Fred Zemke 2001-08-01 13:30
E3B-020: "Keeping REVOKE of the HIERARCHY option" Fred Zemke 2001-08-01 13:32
E3B-021: "continued work on mutliargument aggregates" Fred Zemke 2001-08-06 21:15
E3B-023:"An addition of general rules about transition table" Takashi Kotera 2001-08-09 21:46
E3B-024 "Follow-up to E3B-015" Fred Zemke 2001-08-13 21:57
E3B-025 "CASTing ROW types" Jan-Eike Michels 2001-08-15 13:43
E3B-026 "TABLE Functions" Jan-Eike Michels 2001-08-15 13:45
E3B-027 "Enhancing the foreign-data wrapper interface" Jan-Eike Michels 2001-08-15 13:46

3. Selection Of Secretary And Resolution Recorder

Proposal for Resolution Recorder: Krishna Kulkarni Stephen Cannan 2001-07-01 07:25
Proposal for Secretary: Baba Piprani Stephen Cannan 2001-07-01 07:21
Accepted.

4. Approval Of Agenda

Stephen Cannan
Posted on 2001-07-01 09:51
The agenda consists implicitly of the items in the forum.

Jan-Eike Michels
Posted on 2001-07-05 18:40
Sorry if this is not the correct forum to post this question, but I'm wondering why there is no agenda entry for SEQ# 300.

Replies:

17.1. No Catch-alls included in the agenda Stephen Cannan 2001-07-09 03:02
Since we have yet another editing meeting scheduled for Victoria in October, I deliberately left all the catch-all type comments of the agenda, since these can only be dealt with at the last minute there seemed no point in including these comments.
The excluded comments are:

017, 018, 019, 020, 290, 291, 292, 300, 426, 427, 428, 430, 459, 460, 461, 462, 515, 516, 517, 526, 561, 562, 563, 565, 568, 608, 609, 610, 611

5. Administrative Matters

- 5.1 Minutes from CD Editing Meeting, Perth, Australia (E3B-001)**
- 5.2 Calling notice for Continuation CD Editing Meeting (SC32 N00645, E3B-002)**
- 5.3 ISO 9075-1 SQL/Framework CD Interim Text (E3B-003)**
- 5.4 ISO 9075-2 SQL/Foundation CD Interim Text (E3B-004)**
- 5.5 ISO 9075-3 SQL/CLI CD Interim Text (E3B-005)**
- 5.6 ISO 9075-4 SQL/PSM CD Interim Text (E3B-006)**
- 5.7 ISO 9075-9 SQL/MED CD Interim Text (E3B-007)**
- 5.8 ISO 9075-10 SQL/OLB CD Interim Text (E3B-008)**
- 5.9 ISO 9075-11 SQL/Schemata Interim CD Text (E3B-009)**
- 5.10 CD 9075 Consolidated Ballot Comments (E3B-010)**
- 5.11 Outstanding Ballot Comments (E3B-011)**
- 5.12 Convenor's rules of engagement (E3B-012)**
- 5.13 Convenor's Definition of Consensus**

1. Usual statement

Stephen Cannan

Posted on 2001-07-01 09:59

The convenor announced that his definition of consensus would be:

- Where the item corrected an error, a simple majority of Nation Bodies voting on the issue
- Where the item added or removed functionality, a clear majority of two National Bodies, but if not all present voted, then he would use his judgement.

6. National Body Opening Comments

- 6.1 Australia**
- 6.2 Belgium**
- 6.3 Brazil**
- 6.4 Canada**
- 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**

1. Japanese national body opening comments

Takaaki Shiratori

Posted on 2001-07-05 04:28

Japan thinks it is very efficient to have this E3B electric meeting at this time period toward the resolution of remaining CD ballot comments as many as possible before YYJ meeting. There are still many challenging features, such as Data warehousing, XML-related, EJB Query, and materialized view topics. We expect all of major comments are addressed during this meeting period and we would like to contribute those resolutions as much as possible.

By taking this opportunity, we want to thank Baba Piprani and Canadian national body for offering this wonderful e-meeting facility.

Keywords: Japan, Japanese, National Body, Opening Comments

- 6.13 Netherlands**
- 6.14 Norway**
- 6.15 Republic of Korea**
- 6.16 United Kingdom**
- 6.17 United States**
- 6.18 Austria**
- 6.19 Russian Federation**
- 6.20 Sweden**

7. SQL/Framework Topics

- 7.1 Seq#012 (USA-P01-001)**
- 7.2 Seq#015a (WG3-P01-022)**
- 7.3 Seq#016a (WG3-P01-005) (E3B-018)**

1. E3B-018 Resolving some FCD only comments

Stephen Cannan

Posted on 2001-07-01 06:44

The comments identified by this paper must be deferred until the FCD editing meeting.

Replies: 1.1. Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-07-28 05:07

Will National Bodies please record their vote as a direct response to this discussion topic

1.1.1. The Netherlands - Yes (Support) Stephen Cannan 2001-07-28 05:07

1.1.2. Canada, Yes Baba Piprani 2001-08-03 11:46

1.1.3. UK votes yes Mike Sykes 2001-08-05 06:31

1.2. Germany - Yes (Support) Peter Pistor 2001-08-03 11:13

1.3. US votes YES Krishna Kulkarni 2001-08-03 20:44

1.1.4. Result of Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-08-13 14:24

The vote was For: 6 Against: 0 Abstain 0

Note: Japan voted yes by email due to problems accessing the forum.

I therefore declare the comments:

Seq#016a (WG3-P01-005)

Seq#421a (WG3-P03-001)

Seq#424a (WG3-P03-002)

Seq#433a (WG3-P04-001)

Seq#492a (WG3-P09-001)

Seq#546a (WG3-P10-001)

Seq#558a (WG3-P10-002)

Seq#598f (WG3-P11-001)

resolved.

8. SQL/Foundation Topics

- 8.1 Seq#024c (WG3-P02-003)
- 8.2 Seq#027a (WG3-P02-026)
- 8.3 Seq#029aa (WG3-P02-027)
- 8.4 Seq#029e (WG3-P02-028)
- 8.5 Seq#029f (WG3-P02-029)
- 8.6 Seq#029g (WG3-P02-030)
- 8.7 Seq#031 (NLD-P02-003)
- 8.8 Seq#035 (USA-P02-005) (E3B-016R1) (partial)

[Jan-Eike Michels](#) Posted on 2001-07-05 19:00

This proposal is not addressing SEQ# 35 in the sense that a new collection type is introduced. This was done by [PER-098]. What the current proposal tries to achieve is rather to extend the functionality of MULTISets to what was at one point already in the working draft for SQL3. [YOW-056] introduced the functionality that allowed a collection of a ROW type to be treated in a table reference as a table with as many columns as the ROW type has fields (using UNNEST). Collection types (except for ARRAYS) were removed from SQL3 and so was the described functionality. It is still possible to treat a collection (ARRAYs or MULTISets as re-introduced by [PER-098]) as a table reference using UNNEST. However, if the element type of the collection is a ROW type, then the resulting table has only one column (of type ROW) instead of as many columns as there are fields in the ROW type (with the data type of a column being the data type of the corresponding field).

We believe that the UNNEST of a multiset of rows should yield a table with the same degree as the degree of the ROW type of the MULTISet with the column names and data types equaling the field names and data types. Please see the paper for an example.

While implementing the changes necessary for the above described fix, we noticed that Syntax Rule 1)d) of 7.6, <table referecne>, in [Foundation CD] is slightly different from what was originally proposed in [BBN-108]. The difference is only the location of the right parentheses. It turns out that the easy fix to place the parentheses where they originally belonged is not sufficient, since then Syntax Rule 1)e) is broken because ELDT is then not a <lateral derived table> but a <table primary> and CDT (being a <collection derived table>) cannot be equivalent to a <table primary>.

The proposed solution is to put the right parentheses where they were originally proposed to be and change Syntax Rule 1)e) from:

"CDT is equivalent to the <lateral derived table> ELDT."

to:

"TR is equivalent to the <table primary> ELDT."

(TR being the <table reference> in question).

Both fixes are also proposed for the [TC].

1.1. [Vote Stephen Cannan](#) 2001-07-28 04:57

1.1.1. [The Netherlands - Yes \(Support\) Stephen Cannan](#) 2001-07-28 04:58

1.1.2. [Germany: I understand that the vote will be deferred to the second call of votes Peter Pistor](#) 2001-08-03 11:23

1.1.3. Canada - E3B-016, Yes [Baba Piprani](#) 2001-08-03 11:40

1.1.4. [Result of Vote Stephen Cannan](#) 2001-08-13 13:57

The USA asked that due to the submission of an R1 the current vote be discounted and that the revised paper be included in the second call for votes.

This is an very sensible suggestion and I will act upon it.

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 N00730
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 WG3 YYJ-014R2
Date: 2001-10-15

1.2. [Editorial comment from Peter Pistor](#) [Peter Pistor](#) 2001-08-01 13:05
In 3.1, point 1, first para, last sentence ("Let ET ...").

between "of" and "CVE", the following text should be injected: "the declared type of".

In the same section 3.1, point 1, SR1)a)i) should start as follows:

"If the declared type of CVE ...".

1.2.1. [Agree with your observation](#) [Jan-Eike Michels](#) 2001-08-01 16:22
Peter,

Thanks for spotting this. I agree that what you are suggesting is the right thing to do. What worries me though is that there are already several occurrences (I didn't count all of them ;-)) of "Let 'some_thing' be the element type of 'some_other_thing'." present in Foundation today. I guess someone should submit an FCD ballot comment (when it's time for this) to correct all of those occurrences as necessary.

1.3. [Another possible problem](#) [Peter Pistor](#) 2001-08-02 12:43
Jens Luffer (Univ. of Jena) made me aware of a possible Problem in section 3.1 point 1, in the proposed SR1)e)i)1) ("If ET is a row type ..."). We both believe that the SQL fragment

LATERAL ...

is not well-formed, since the select list after "RECQP SELECT" has to have NDET + 1 Elements, but PDCLP has only NDET elements.

(Note: In the existing version, PDCLP was either the zero string, or it had one element (no ordinality) or 2 (with ordinality).)

1.3.1. [Agree again.](#) [Jan-Eike Michels](#) 2001-08-02 14:25
Another good catch, Peter. Thanks.

The problem arises because in my proposal I'm deleting SR 1)b)i)1) and do not compensate for it.

A fix would be to rewrite SR1)d).

I could produce an r1 version by the end of today (my time). However, I think this would not leave enough time for the other national bodies to review the paper to cast a vote within this voting period. So I will ask Krishna as our IR to ask Stephen to defer voting on e3b016 to the second voting period of this E3B meeting.

1.3.1.1. [new version posted](#) [Jan-Eike Michels](#) 2001-08-02 16:44
As announced earlier, I have posted an R1 version of the paper (that fixes both of the problems pointed out by Peter) to the sqlstandards.org server.

1.3.2. [Agree to r1](#) [Peter Pistor](#) 2001-08-03 11:26
I have checked the proposed changes; they look perfect.

1.4. [Action deferred on this?](#) [Krishna Kulkarni](#) 2001-08-03 20:52

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 N00730
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 WG3 YYJ-014R2

Date: 2001-10-15

I was told by the author of this paper that he has prepared and posted a revised version addressing the concerns expressed by the UK and Germany. In order to give the concerned national bodies time to ensure that the revised version addresses their concerns, I had requested the Convenor yesterday to defer action on this paper to the second call for votes of E3B meeting. However, I see that Germany has since posted a note agreeing to the changes made by the author in version R1. Does Germany still want the action deferred to the second call for voting? Also, could UK please indicate whether they are OK with the changes made in R1? Thanks.

1.4.1. [Did the UK really have any comments regarding this paper?](#) [Jan-Eike Michels](#) 2001-08-04 00:58

Krishna,

You mentioned that the UK had concerns regarding this paper (E3B-016). I have not seen any from the UK (at least not in this thread). There were some comments on E3B-014 from the UK, which I agreed with. Could you please clarify? Thanks.

1.4.2. [No, I misunderstood](#) [Krishna Kulkarni](#) 2001-08-06 20:19

You're right - UK commented on E3B-014 and not on this.

1.5. [Second Vote](#) [Stephen Cannan](#) 2001-08-20 09:00

Will National Bodies please record their vote as a direct response to this discussion topic

1.5.1. [The Netherlands - Yes](#) [Stephen Cannan](#) 2001-08-20 13:40

1.5.2. [Germany- Yes \(Support of paper\)](#) [Peter Pistor](#) 2001-08-21 14:52

1.5.3. [USA votes YES.](#) [Krishna Kulkarni](#) 2001-08-23 01:47

1.5.4. [Japan - Yes](#) [Takaaki Shiratori](#) 2001-08-24 10:34

1.5.5. [UK votes "yes"](#) [Hugh Darwen](#) 2001-08-24 11:33

Sorry, I just voted "yes" on the obsolete first vote by mistake.

1.5.6. [Result of second vote](#) [Stephen Cannan](#) 2001-08-24 14:27

For: 5 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

I hereby declare the paper accepted and that it be added to the addressed by column of comment SEQ# 35, USA-P02-005

1.6. [Agreement](#) [Hugh Darwen](#) 2001-08-24 06:56

I agree that this paper is effectively reinstating what we once had in "SQL3" collection type support. Simultaneous "unwrapping" (of rows) and "ungrouping" (of collections) is always the term "unnest" meant in the early days of research into "NFNF" relations.

8.9 Seq#037 (NLD-P02-004)

8.10 Seq#046 (NLD-P02-006)

8.11 Seq#050 (NLD-P02-009)

8.12 Seq#051 (USA-P02-014)

8.13 Seq#052 (USA-P02-015)

8.14 Seq#063 (NLD-P02-013)

8.15 Seq#065 (NLD-P02-012)

8.16 Seq#070 (USA-P02-020)

8.17 Seq#075 (NLD-P02-018)

8.18 Seq#086 (USA-P02-024) (E3B-015)

1. Vote (on E3B-015)

Stephen Cannan

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 N00730
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 WG3 YYJ-014R2
Date: 2001-10-15

Posted on 2001-07-28 05:05

Will National Bodies please record their vote as a direct response to this discussion topic

Replies:

1.1. The Netherlands - Yes (Support) Stephen Cannan 2001-07-28 05:06

1.2. Germany - Yes(Support) Peter Pistor 2001-08-03 11:11

1.5. Canada - E3B-015, Yes Baba Piprani 2001-08-03 11:33

1.6. US votes YES. Krishna Kulkarni 2001-08-03 20:53

1.7. Result of Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-08-13 15:30

The result was For: 5 Against: 0 Abstain: 0

Note Japan voted yes by email due to problems accessing the forum.

I hereby declare the paper accepted and comment

Seq#86, USA-P02-024

resolved

8.19 Seq#087 (USA-P02-025)

8.20 Seq#088 (USA-P02-026)

8.21 Seq#088a (WG3-P02-031)

8.22 Seq#95b (WG3-P02-032)

8.23 Seq#101a (WG3-P02-033)

8.24 Seq#101b (WG3-P02-034) (E3B-025)

1. Presentation of E3B-025

Jan-Eike Michels

Posted on 2001-08-15 14:50

This paper proposes to allow casts between row types as long as both row types have the same number of fields and corresponding fields are castable.

Replies: 1.1. Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-08-20 09:11

Will National Bodies please record their vote as a direct response to this discussion topic.

I am aware that little time has been available to discuss this item. Any National Body may request that the vote be deferred until October.

1.1.1. Germany - Yes (Support of paper) Peter Pistor 2001-08-21 14:32

1.1.2. USA votes YES. Krishna Kulkarni 2001-08-23 02:24

1.1.3. UK votes "yes" Hugh Darwen 2001-08-24 11:38

1.1.4. Japan votes Yes. Takaaki Shiratori 2001-08-24 12:28

1.1.5. Result of Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-08-24 14:29

For: 4 Against: 0 Abstain: 3

I hereby declare the paper accepted and comment

SEQ# 101b, WG3-P02-034

resolved

8.25 Seq#104a (WG3-P02-035)

8.26 Seq#104b (WG3-P02-036)

8.27 Seq#112 (NLD-P02-029)

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 N00730
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 WG3 YYJ-014R2
Date: 2001-10-15

8.28 Seq#113 (USA-P02-037) (E3B-026)

1. Presentation of E3B-026

Jan-Eike Michels

Posted on 2001-08-15 14:52

It is proposed to introduce the concept of "table functions" into SQL:200n. It is shown that this concept fits neatly into the existing specifications of SQL-invoked functions. The proposed approach is based on SQL-invoked functions whose return type is a multiset type whose element type is a row type. With this approach, the amount of changes and extensions to the current version of SQL:200n could be kept minimal.

Please see the paper for examples and the exact changes that are proposed.

Replies: 1.1. Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-08-20 09:12

Will National Bodies please record their vote as a direct response to this discussion topic.

I am aware that little time has been available to discuss this item. Any National Body may request that the vote be deferred until October.

1.1.1. Germany - Yes (Support of paper) Peter Pistor 2001-08-21 14:36

1.1.2. USA votes YES. Krishna Kulkarni 2001-08-23 02:26

1.1.3. UK votes "yes" Hugh Darwen 2001-08-24 11:39

1.1.4. Japan votes Yes. Takaaki Shiratori 2001-08-24 12:30

1.1.5. Result of Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-08-24 14:30

For: 4 Against: 0 Abstain: 3

I hereby declare the paper accepted and comment

SEQ# 113, USA-P02-037

resolved

8.29 Seq#114 (USA-P02-038)

8.30 Seq#115 (USA-P02-039)

8.31 Seq#117a (WG3-P02-037) (E3B-024)

1. Vote

Stephen Cannan

Posted on 2001-08-20 09:10

Will National Bodies please record their vote as a direct response to this discussion topic.

I am aware that little time has been available to discuss this item. Any National Body may request that the vote be deferred until October.

Replies:

1.1. The Netherlands - Yes Stephen Cannan 2001-08-20 13:42

1.2. Germany - Yes (Support of paper) Peter Pistor 2001-08-21 14:34

1.3. USA votes YES. Krishna Kulkarni 2001-08-23 02:17

1.4. UK votes "yes" Hugh Darwen 2001-08-24 11:37

1.5. Japan votes YES. Takaaki Shiratori 2001-08-24 12:37

1.6. Result of Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-08-24 14:32

For: 5 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 N00730
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 WG3 YYJ-014R2
Date: 2001-10-15

I hereby declare the paper accepted and comment
SEQ# 117a, WG3-P02-037
SEQ# 168a, WG3-P02-042
resolved

8.32 Seq#120 (USA-P02-041) (E3B-021)

1. Vote

Stephen Cannan

Posted on 2001-08-20 09:06

Will National Bodies please record their vote as a direct response to this discussion topic.

I am aware that little time has been available to discuss this item. Any National Body may request that the vote be deferred until October.

Replies: 1.1. Germany - Yes (Support of paper) Peter Pistor 2001-08-21 14:38

1.2. USA votes YES. Krishna Kulkarni 2001-08-23 02:11

1.3. UK votes "yes" Hugh Darwen 2001-08-24 11:23

1.4. Japan votes YES. Takaaki Shiratori 2001-08-24 12:39

1.5. Result of Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-08-24 14:35

For: 4 Against: 0 Abstain: 3

I hereby declare the paper accepted and comment

Seq# 120, USA-P02-041

resolved

8.33 Seq#120a (WG3-P02-038)

8.34 Seq#129 (USA-P02-043)

8.35 Seq#132 (USA-P02-045)

8.36 Seq#135 (USA-P02-046)

8.37 Seq#139a (WG3-P02-039)

8.38 Seq#142 (DEU-P02-007) (E3B-019)

2. US concerns with possible incompatibility in E3B-019

Fred Zemke

Posted on 2001-08-23 13:55

As Krishna noted in a previous topic under this agenda, the US national body reviewed E3B-019 at our last meeting. We did not reach a definitive conclusion regarding this paper. Our concern is with the last paragraph in section 1.2 on page 2, which points out that under the existing rules, a possible interpretation is that certain strings (which I don't know how to produce on this keyboard) would test True under the LIKE predicate, whereas under the new rules these same strings would definitely test False. The situation that Germany points to has nagged at me personally for many years, and I grant that the proposed solution does resolve an uncertainty of interpretation. However, the US national body was unable to reach a conclusion about the last sentence in the cited paragraph, which says "We doubt whether such comparisons are intended". Consequently the US would like more time to consider this issue.

In addition, the US believes that the paper is currently incomplete. If in fact the claim that such comparisons were never intended is correct, then the paper should also propose a TC. On the other hand, the US may decide that the claim is false, and still support the paper, in which case an entry in the incompatibilities annex would be required.

1. Vote

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 N00730
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 WG3 YYJ-014R2
Date: 2001-10-15

Stephen Cannan

Posted on 2001-08-20 09:04

Will National Bodies please record their vote as a direct response to this discussion topic.

I am aware that little time has been available to discuss this item. Any National Body may request that the vote be deferred until October.

Replies:

1.1. Germany - Yes (Support of paper) Peter Pistor 2001-08-21 14:40

1.2. USA requests deferring action on this paper till Victoria Krishna Kulkarni 2001-08-23 02:02
The US national body considered this paper at its recent meeting and it was decided to request for deferring action on this paper till Victoria. Specific questions/issues with the paper will follow soon.

1.3. Japan kindly request that the vote be deferred until October. Takaaki Shiratori 2001-08-24 13:44

Japan National Body want to spend more time to check consistency of this paper with relative portions in the CD of 9075. Specific questions or possibly issues will be prepared before Victoria meeting if those are found.

1.4. Result of Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-08-24 14:40

Due to multiple National Body requests final action on this paper is deferred till the October meeting.

8.39 Seq#153 (USA-P02-055)

8.40 Seq#154 (USA-P02-056) (E3B-014R1)

1. Presentation of E3B-014

Jan-Eike Michels

Posted on 2001-07-05 18:46

Modified by Jan-Eike Michels on 2001-07-05 18:47

The comment points out that each of collection type and reference type do not have a type designator.

The solution proposed in this paper is to add a type designator to the type descriptor of collection types and reference types.

The type designator for a collection type with an element type ET, whose type designator is ETD, looks like this (where CT stands for either ARRAY or MULTISSET): ETD CT

The type designator for a reference type with a referenced type of RT, whose name is TN, like this:

REF(TN)

The fix for ARRAYs and reference types is also proposed for the [TC].

Replies: 1.1. Editorial comments from UK Hugh Darwen 2001-07-20 13:22

[We hope we are doing the right thing, posting these comments as a "reply" to the presentation. We remark that it wasn't all that straightforward, finding the right place on the agenda. We had to look to see which comments the paper was addressing and then go to the agenda item for #154 (lucky there was only one comment to consider!)]

We approve of E3B-014 in principle but have some editorial suggestions that we offer as friendly amendments. Some of the suggestions affect existing text cited in E3B-014 but not modified by it. Perhaps these suggestions can be conveniently handled by making them into amendments to E3B-014.

1. Section 3.1, Point 2. The proposed new bulleted paragraph doesn't say which type designator is included in the descriptor. We suggest "The type designator of *RT*".

2. Section 3.1, Point 2. If amendment 1 is accepted, then the following changes are needed to the existing text in the CD: "A reference type descriptor includes" to be replaced by "The reference type descriptor for *RT* includes"; and "scope of the reference type" to be replaced by "scope of *RT*".

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 N00730
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 WG3 YYJ-014R2
Date: 2001-10-15

3. Section 3.1, Point 2. With the arrival of the type designator in the descriptor, the name of the referenced type is redundant and should be deleted, along with the text in GR21) of Subclause 6.1, "<data type>", that specifies an assignment to this field.

4. Section 3.1, Point 2. We note in passing that the entry for the "length of the referenced type" is not backed up by any assignment at all, nor is the concept of a UDT having a length mentioned anywhere in Subclause 11.40, "<user-defined type definition>". We suggest to delete this entry.

5. Section 3.2, Point 1. There are problems in the following cited existing text: "A collection type descriptor describes a <collection type>. The collection type descriptor for <collection type> CT includes:". Angle-brackets are inappropriate in both appearances of "<collection type>", but the second appearance can be safely deleted because CT is already defined to be a collection type.

6. Section 3.2, Point 1. "The type designator" should be replaced by "The type designator of <italics>CT</italics>".

7. Section 3.2, Point 1. In the third entry, "The kind of the collection" is not quite right and should be replaced by, for example, "the kind of collection of <italics>CT</italics>" ("kind of collection" is a defined term, and it applies to a collection type, not to a collection per se).

8. Section 3.2, Point 1. In the fourth entry, replace "The collection type" by "<italics>CT</italics>".

9. Section 3.3, Point 1. Angle brackets are needed, this time, around "collection type".

10. Section 3.3, Point 1. "(ARRAY or MULTISSET)" should be moved to between "collection" and "specified", so that it qualifies what it is meant to qualify.

11. Section 4.1, Point 2. If any of our suggested amendments to Section 3.1 are accepted, knock-on effects here need to be considered.

12. Section 4.2, Point 2. If any of our suggested amendments to Section 3.2 are accepted, knock-on effects here need to be considered. Note that "type of the collection CT" is not correct, as CT is a collection type, not a collection. Without the availability of the new "kind of collection" construct, it's difficult to know what to do about this. We mildly suggest, "An indication that CT is an array type".

13. Section 4.3, Point 1, "the descriptor of the element type". The use of the definite article here suggests that there is exactly one descriptor in existence of that element type, whereas copies of that descriptor must exist inside every array type descriptor that has the element type in question. We suggest to replace "the" by "a" and "of" by "for".

14. Section 4.3, Point 2, "RDT, the". Replace the comma by "and".

That's all.

1.1.1. Personally agree with your comments Jan-Eike Michels 2001-07-26 16:37
Hugh,

Thanks for your careful examination of my paper. I personally agree with the comments you made wrt. to the proposed changes introduced in my paper, namely comments:

1., 6., 9., 10., 11., 13., and 14.

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 N00730
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 WG3 YYJ-014R2
Date: 2001-10-15

I also agree with the comments you made wrt. the existing text in [Foundation CD] not touched by my paper, namely comments:
2., 3., 4., 5., 7., 8., and 12.

Now, how do we proceed from here?

Since I personally agree with the changes, I would be willing to produce an R1 version of my paper with the changes you have suggested regarding my proposal. But I'll wait with the R1 version until I get some feedback from others.

I would also be willing to incorporate the changes you have suggested regarding the existing text in [Foundation CD] under the condition that other experts (from your, my and other national bodies) agree with your findings.

Suggestions on how to proceed are welcome.

1.1.1.1. No alternative to an r1 envisaged Hugh Darwen 2001-08-23 10:04

Jan-Eike,

At a face to face meeting we might agree on all these changes orally and have them recorded in the minutes as friendly amendments. If there is a procedure here for doing that, fine, but if there isn't, then I'm afraid I see no alternative to the production of an r1.

Hugh

1.2. Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-07-28 04:55

Will National Bodies please record their vote as a direct response to this discussion topic

1.2.1. The Netherlands - Yes (Support) Stephen Cannan 2001-07-28 04:56

1.2.2. Germany - Yes (Support) Peter Pistor 2001-08-03 11:19

1.2.3. UK vote will be slightly delayed Mike Sykes 2001-08-05 06:16

Hugh is on vacation for the next week, but I imagine he may wish to see the promised revision of the paper before voting.

1.2.4. Result of Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-08-13 14:37

The result was For: 5 Against: 0 Abstain: 1 (UK due to holidays).

I am glad to see the WG3 tradition in physical meetings of introducing amendments in the middle of a vote has not been stifled by this electronic way of working.

I am going to assume that all the amendments were indeed editorial and that the paper has passed and the comment

SEQ# 154, USA-P02-056

has been resolved.

I hereby ask Jan-Eike to produce an R1 incorporating all the amendments and post it as quickly as possible. If any National Body wishes to reopen the agenda item after having seen the R1 I will of course do so.

1.2.4.1. R1 posted Jan-Eike Michels 2001-08-15 16:45

FYI, I have posted an R1 version with the amendments proposed by Hugh and Peter. Thx.

1.3. Comment from Peter Pistor (Germany) Peter Pistor 2001-07-30 12:12

Please check section 3.3, point 2, of paper e3b-014, which refers to GR21).

I believe that one cannot speak of "designator REF(RDT) since RDT has been introduced as <reference type>, i.e. a syntactic entity. My suggestion for rewording of the second sentence:

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 N00730
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 WG3 YYJ-014R2
Date: 2001-10-15

Let RDTN be the name of the <referenced type> RDT. The includes RDTN and the type designator REF(RDTN).

1.3.1. Agree with Peter Jan-Eike Michels 2001-07-30 12:38
Another oversight in my paper. I agree with Peter's findings and solution.

1.4. Canada E3B-014 , Yes Baba Piprani 2001-08-03 11:31

1.5. US votes YES. Krishna Kulkarni 2001-08-03 20:54

8.41 Seq#159a (WG4-P02-001)

8.42 Seq#159b (WG3-P02-040)

8.43 Seq#161 (USA-P02-060)

8.44 Seq#161a (WG3-P02-041)

8.45 Seq#168a (WG3-P02-042) (E3B-024)

See Agenda Item 8.31

8.46 Seq#171 (USA-P02-065)

8.47 Seq#174 (USA-P02-067)

8.48 Seq#177a (WG3-P02-043)

8.49 Seq#181 (USA-P02-070)

8.50 Seq#181a (WG3-P02-044)

8.51 Seq#182a (WG3-P02-045)

8.52 Seq#188 (USA-P02-073)

8.53 Seq#190a (WG3-P02-046)

8.54 Seq#191a (WG3-P02-047)

8.55 Seq#192 (GBR-P02-325)

1. Comment already resolved

Stephen Cannan

Posted on 2001-07-09 15:32

This comment is already marked as resolved in E3B-010 and E3B-011.

It should not, therefore, have been included in E3B-011 and thus should not have appeared as this agenda item.

8.56 Seq#192a (WG3-P02-048)

8.57 Seq#195 (NLD-P02-045)

8.58 Seq#204 (USA-P02-079)

8.59 Seq#207a (WG3-P02-049)

8.60 Seq#217 (NLD-P02-052)

8.61 Seq#218 (USA-P02-086) (E3B-020)

1. Vote

Stephen Cannan

Posted on 2001-08-20 09:05

Will National Bodies please record their vote as a direct response to this discussion topic.

I am aware that little time has been available to discuss this item. Any National Body may request that the vote be deferred until October.

Replies:

1.1. The Netherlands - Yes Stephen Cannan 2001-08-20 13:41

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 N00730
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 WG3 YYJ-014R2
Date: 2001-10-15

1.2. Germany - Yes (Support of paper) Peter Pistor 2001-08-21 14:41

1.3. USA votes YES. Krishna Kulkarni 2001-08-23 02:08

1.4. UK votes "yes" Hugh Darwen 2001-08-24 11:35

1.5. Japan votes YES. Takaaki Shiratori 2001-08-24 12:40

1.6. Result of Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-08-24 14:36

For: 4 Against: 0 Abstain: 3

I hereby declare the paper accepted and comment

Seq# 218, USA-P02-086

resolved

8.62 Seq#221a (WG3-P02-050)

8.63 Seq#229a (WG3-P02-051)

8.64 Seq#229b (WG3-P02-055)

8.65 Seq#231 (USA-P02-094)

8.66 Seq#233 (NLD-P02-054)

8.67 Seq#233a (WG3-P02-052)

8.68 Seq#244 (NLD-P02-056)

8.69 Seq#255 (JPN-P02-001) (E3B-023)

Paper withdrawn.

8.70 Seq#256 (USA-P02-101)

8.71 Seq#259 (GBR-P02-430)

8.72 Seq#265 (NLD-P02-066)

8.73 Seq#267 (USA-P02-105)

8.74 Seq#269 (NLD-P02-068)

8.75 Seq#274 (NLD-P02-070)

8.76 Seq#275 (NLD-P02-071)

8.77 Seq#276 (NLD-P02-072)

8.78 Seq#277 (NLD-P02-073)

8.79 Seq#278 (NLD-P02-074)

8.80 Seq#279 (NLD-P02-075)

8.81 Seq#280 (NLD-P02-076)

8.82 Seq#281 (USA-P02-107)

8.83 Seq#284 (USA-P02-108)

8.84 Seq#286 (USA-P02-110)

8.85 Seq#289 (CAN-P02-001)

8.86 Seq#294 (NLD-P02-164)

8.87 Seq#296 (NLD-P02-180)

8.88 Seq#301 (USA-P02-113)

8.89 Seq#302 (USA-P02-114)

8.90 Seq#303 (USA-P02-115)

8.91 Seq#304 (USA-P02-116)

8.92 Seq#305 (USA-P02-117)

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 N00730
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 WG3 YYJ-014R2
Date: 2001-10-15

- 8.93 Seq#305a (WG3-P02-053)
- 8.94 Seq#393 (NLD-P02-163)
- 8.95 Seq#401 (NLD-P02-173)
- 8.96 Seq#402 (NLD-P02-174)
- 8.97 Seq#403 (NLD-P02-175)
- 8.98 Seq#412 (NLD-P02-186)
- 8.99 Seq#413 (NLD-P02-187)
- 8.100 Seq#414 (NLD-P02-188)
- 8.101 Seq#415 (NLD-P02-189)
- 8.102 Seq#416 (NLD-P02-190)
- 8.103 Seq#417 (NLD-P02-191)
- 8.104 Seq#418 (NLD-P02-192)
- 8.105 Seq#419 (NLD-P02-194)
- 8.106 Seq#420ff (WG3-P02-054)
- 8.107 Seq#420e (WG3-P02-021) (E3B-022)

1. Presentation of E3B-022

Stephen Cannan

Posted on 2001-08-13 15:44

(Jim can modify this if he wishes)

Replies:

1.1. Mike Sykes's comment Stephen Cannan 2001-08-13 15:45
I am very much in favour of what e3b022 is setting out to do.

However, I have an editorial suggestion and a question that may be easily answered.

Editorial:

I note that Jim has used both UCS and Unicode to refer to what I understand to be the same thing. Since FoundCD1r1 uses the term 'UCS' extensively, and 'Unicode' only when referring in Unicode terms (e.g. 'Unicode General Category') and references to Unicode publications; elsewhere, 'UCS' is preferred. It would be more consistent to use 'UCS' rather than 'Unicode' in such places as Feature names and BNF non-terminals.

A question

In the discussion of the possible notation, C, Java and XML are all mentioned as offering possible precedents -- yet ISO/IEC 10646-1 Subclause 6.5 "Identifiers for characters" is not. Is there a reason for this? Admittedly, the only version I have (ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2 N 2005) refers to the no longer necessary eight hex digit form, but doubtless this is under review for a six digit form. Is it not desirable to avoid unnecessary proliferation of ways of doing the same thing? I find the 'Note to reviewers' in section 1 of e3b022 ironic, to say the least!

Regarding the question asked in the Note to reviewers on p10, there should be at most one new feature, unless implementors have good reason, and users are judged willing to accept one of these extensions without the other. My own opinion is that both should be bundled in with Feature T061, 'UCS support', unless a convincing case can be made why they should not be.

1.1.1. Editorial comment accepted, other questioned Jim Melton 2001-08-19 18:40
JM: Mike Sykes wrote:

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 N00730
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 WG3 YYJ-014R2
Date: 2001-10-15

Editorial:

I note that Jim has used both UCS and Unicode to refer to what I understand to be the same thing. Since FoundCD1r1 uses the term 'UCS' extensively, and 'Unicode' only when referring in Unicode terms (e.g. 'Unicode General Category') and references to Unicode publications; elsewhere, 'UCS' is preferred. It would be more consistent to use 'UCS' rather than 'Unicode' in such places as Feature names and BNF non-terminals.

JM: I agree with Mike that consistency is desirable and will endeavor to change appropriate instances of "Unicode" to "UCS" as he suggested.

A question

In the discussion of the possible notation, C, Java and XML are all mentioned as offering possible precedents -- yet ISO/IEC 10646-1 Subclause 6.5 "Identifiers for characters" is not. Is there a reason for this? Admittedly, the only version I have (ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2 N 2005) refers to the no longer necessary eight hex digit form, but doubtless this is under review for a six digit form. Is it not desirable to avoid unnecessary proliferation of ways of doing the same thing? I find the 'Note to reviewers' in section 1 of e3b022 ironic, to say the least!

JM: It was exceedingly difficult to find a solution that was acceptable to the implementors of several DBMSs (and it's true that not all vendors were 100% satisfied with the compromise in the paper!). I am, of course, interested in minimizing the number of conventions (and I recognize the irony to which Mike referred). I regret to say that I do not have a copy of the recent 10646-1 edition, though.

Regarding the question asked in the Note to reviewers on p10, there should be at most one new feature, unless implementors have good reason, and users are judged willing to accept one of these xtensions without the other. My own opinion is that both should be bundled in with Feature T061, "UCS support", unless a convincing case can be made why they should not be.

JM: While I am sympathetic to the notion that Mike raised, at least two vendors have notified me that their engines can easily support UCS characters in literals, but much less easily in schema object names (e.g., table or column names) and that they very strongly prefer having two separate features.

JM: Thanks for the comments!

JM: Jim

1.2. Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-08-20 09:09

Will National Bodies please record their vote as a direct response to this discussion topic. I am aware that little time has been available to discuss this item. Any National Body may request that the vote be deferred until October.

1.2.1. Germany - Yes (Support of paper) Peter Pistor 2001-08-21 14:42

1.2.2. Sweden kindly request that the vote be deferred until October Åke Persson 2001-08-22 01:36
As a <delimited identifier part> can be a <reverse solidus> (see SR 6), I believe we must redefine <Unicode identifier part> as follows:

```
<Unicode identifier part> ::=
  <nondoublequote and nonescape character>
  | <doublequote symbol>
  | <Unicode escape value>
```

New SR:

A <nondoublequote and nonescape character> is any character of the source language character set other than a <double quote> or a <reverse solidus>.

A similar change is needed for <Unicode representation>:

```
<Unicode representation> ::=
  <nonquote and nonescape character>
  | <quote symbol>
  | <Unicode escape value>
```

New SR:

A <nonquote and nonescape character> is one of:

- a) Any character of the source language character set other than a <quote> or a <reverse solidus>.
- b) Any character other than a <quote> or a <reverse solidus> in the character repertoire identified by the <character set specification> or implied by "N".

1.2.3. USA votes YES. Krishna Kulkarni 2001-08-23 02:12

1.2.4. UK request deferment Hugh Darwen 2001-08-24 11:26

1.2.5. Japan kindly request that the vote be deferred until Victoria. Takaaki Shiratori 2001-08-24 12:26

The use of <reverse solidus> in syntactic meaning like Unicode escape sequences may bother SQL users and SQL document writers in far east Asian countries. Its code point has different glyph image (not always reverse solidus) on currently the most popular platforms and file systems.

1.2.6. Result of Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-08-24 14:41

Due to multiple National Body requests final action on this paper is deferred till the October meeting.

9. SQL/CLI Topics

9.1 Seq#421a (WG3-P03-001) (E3B-018)
See Agenda Item 7.3

9.2 Seq#424a (WG3-P03-002) (E3B-018)
See Agenda Item 7.3

10. SQL/PSM Topics

10.1 Seq#433a (WG3-P04-001) (E3B-018)
See Agenda Item 7.3

10.2 Seq#437 (USA-P04-004)

10.3 Seq#442 (USA-P04-005)

10.4 Seq#444a (WG3-P04-002)

10.5 Seq#486 (NLD-P04-006)

11. SQL/MED Topics

11.1 Seq#492a (WG3-P09-001) (E3B-018)
See Agenda Item 7.3

11.2 Seq#518 (USA-P09-011) (E3B-027)

11.02 Seq#518 (USA-P09-011)

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 N00730
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 WG3 YYJ-014R2
Date: 2001-10-15

1. Presentation of E3B-027 (Please use this thread for all discussions related to the paper.)

Jan-Eike Michels

Posted on 2001-08-15 14:56

Modified by Jan-Eike Michels on 2001-08-15 15:04

By addressing five SQL/MED CD ballot comments, we propose significant enhancements to the foreign-data wrapper interface to allow more complex <query specification>s than "SELECT * FROM ftn" to be transmitted between the SQL-server and a foreign-data wrapper.

Please see the paper for a detailed discussion, the rationale and the proposed changes.

Replies:

1.1. Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-08-20 09:12

Will National Bodies please record their vote as a direct response to this discussion topic.

I am aware that little time has been available to discuss this item. Any National Body may request that the vote be deferred until October.

1.1.1. Germany - Yes (Support of paper) Peter Pistor 2001-08-21 14:43

1.1.2. USA votes YES. Krishna Kulkarni 2001-08-23 02:28

1.1.3. UK votes "yes" Hugh Darwen 2001-08-24 11:28

1.1.4. Japan votes YES. Takaaki Shiratori 2001-08-24 12:31

1.1.5. Result of vote Stephen Cannan 2001-08-24 14:38

For: 4 Against: 0 Abstain: 3

I hereby declare the paper accepted and comments

Seq# 518, USA-P09-011

Seq# 519, USA-P09-012

Seq# 521, USA-P09-014

Seq# 522, USA-P09-015

resolved and the paper added to the addressed by column of comment

Seq# 520, USA-P09-013

11.3 Seq#519 (USA-P09-012) (E3B-027)

See Agenda Item 11.2

11.4 Seq#520 (USA-P09-013) (E3B-027) (partial)

See Agenda Item 11.2

11.5 Seq#521 (USA-P09-014) (E3B-027)

See Agenda Item 11.2

11.6 Seq#522 (USA-P09-015) (E3B-027)

See Agenda Item 11.2

11.7 Seq#523 (USA-P09-016)

11.8 Seq#524 (USA-P09-017)

11.9 Seq#525 (USA-P09-018)

12. SQL/OLB Topics

12.1 Seq#546a (WG3-P10-001) (E3B-018)

See Agenda Item 7.3

12.2 Seq#559 (NLD-P10-011)

12.3 Seq#566 (NLD-P10-019)

12.4 Seq#567 (NLD-P10-020)

13. SQL/Schemata Topics

13.1 Seq#582a (WG3-P11-001) (E3B-018)

See Agenda Item 7.3

13.2 Seq#583 (USA-P11-002)

13.3 Seq#588 (USA-P11-003)

13.4 Seq#590 (NLD-P11-004)

13.5 Seq#598a (WG3-P11-002)

13.6 Seq#598b (WG3-P11-003)

13.7 Seq#598c (WG3-P11-004)

13.8 Seq#598d (WG3-P11-005)

13.9 Seq#598e (WG3-P11-006)

13.10 Seq#598f (WG3-P11-007) (E3B-018)

See Agenda Item 7.3

13.11 Seq#599 (USA-P11-005) (E3B-013R1)

(E3B-017)

13.11 Seq#599 (USA-P11-005)

1. Presentation of E3B013

Stephen Cannan

Posted on 2001-06-05 14:40

The comment is ill conceived.

The table contains all the necessary information and modifying the table type would merely introduce redundancy.

Replies:

1.1. Comment may be addressing Types of Tables see P2 4.16.1 Baba Piprani 2001-06-06 17:36
If we look at Foundation clause 4.16.1, Types of Tables, then perhaps the comment is applicable. The information schema currently does not portray this information. If this is not so, then Netherlands comments are ok.

1.1.1. 4.16.1 is wrong subclause to be looking at Stephen Cannan 2001-06-11 05:17

Baba,

I think the comment is referring to the fact that a table can be based on a UDT. This information is captured in USER_DEFINED_NAME etc.

1.1.1.1. Please see E3B-017 for a different solution to this comment. Jan-Eike Michels 2001-07-05 19:19

Stephen,

You are right when you say that the information can be derived from three other columns (USER_DEFINED_TYPE...). However, I think this is not very user-friendly and the information should be made available to the user in a more direct way. A way to do this is described in E3B-017. Please see the thread on that paper for more details.

Additionally, I'd like to point out Subclause 4.15, "Tables", that says "... Every Table descriptor includes:... An indication of whether the base table is a referenceable table or not, ...", Subclause 4.15.2, "Referenceable tables,...", that says "A typed table is called a referenceable table.", and GR 5)c)i) of

Subclause 11.3, <table definition>, that says "An indication that the table is a referenceable table.". Yet, this information is not directly visible in the information schema.
Thus, the solution provided in E3B-017 does not only add to a more user-friendly standard but resolves a discrepancy between the table descriptor and the information schema.

1.1.1.1.1. Need not modify base table, only view Stephen Cannan 2001-07-09 03:07
I strongly oppose modifying the base table with redundant information, however I am much more sympathetic to Mike's suggestion to only modify the view.

1.1.1.1.1.1. Please see my posting in the other discussion thread. Jan-Eike Michels 2001-07-09 13:49
Please see my posting in the other discussion thread.

2. Presentation of E3B-017

Jan-Eike Michels
Posted on 2001-07-05 19:07
Modified by Jan-Eike Michels on 2001-07-05 19:09

[Foundation CD] defines a "typed table" as a table whose row type is derived from a structured type. Only a base table or a view can be a typed table. (see also Subclause 4.15.2, Referenceable tables, subtables, and supertables).

The information whether a table is a typed table is not directly visible in the information schema. It can only be inferred from other information. That is, if the values of the user_defined_type_catalog, user_defined_type_schema, and user_defined_type_name columns of the TABLES base table are not each the null value, then the row type of the table in question is derived from a structured type and, according to the definition of "typed table" given above, the table in question is a typed table. To infer this information in such a cumbersome way, when it could be done more easily is not very user friendly.

To do it more easily, the comment suggests to add an additional value to the TABLE_TYPE column of the TABLES base table so that the user can query this information directly. However, this change would introduce an incompatibility to SQL99 and therefore we propose a different solution.

Thus, the solution we propose is to add a new column to the TABLES base table, named "IS_TYPED" and a check constraint that enforces the relationship between the new column and the existing three columns user_defined_type_catalog, user_defined_type_schema, and user_defined_type_name. If the value of IS_TYPED is YES, then the values of other three columns should not be NULL. If the value of IS_TYPED is NO, then the values of the other three columns must be NULL.

Replies:

2.1. We don't need to modify the base table, only the view Mike Sykes 2001-07-08 06:35
If we really want to be more user-friendly, it would be sufficient to add a column to TABLES view, whose value is the result of a <case expression>.

2.1.1. Perhaps we do Jan-Eike Michels 2001-07-09 13:48
Mike, Stephen,
I'm glad that we agree on adding a column to the information schema TABLES view for user-friendliness.

Let me try to explain why I think we should also add the column to the TABLES base table of the definition schema. (Disclaimer: I'm not an expert in the information/definition schemas, so please correct me if I'm wrong.)

A (base) table descriptor includes (among others) an indication whether the table is referenceable (i.e., typed) and the user-defined type name (if it was specified).

According to the function description of Subclause 6.46, TABLES base table, in Schemata (E3B-010), "The TABLES table ... effectively contains a representation of the table descriptors".

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 N00730
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 WG3 YYJ-014R2
Date: 2001-10-15

I can see the user-defined type name from the table descriptor in the TABLES table but I cannot see the information about the indication whether it's typed or not. So the function description is not correct. And adding the column would fix this.

Now, Stephen is arguing that adding the additional column to the TABLES base table would be redundant, but then one could argue that the table descriptor also contains redundant information. Note, I'm not arguing to modify the descriptor. I just would like to see the descriptor in sync with the definition schema.

As I understand it, the definition schema is kind of hypothetical in any case so I'm wondering why adding an additional column would cost much.

2.1.1.1. Withdrawal Stephen Cannan 2001-07-09 15:27

I see what Jan-Eike is getting at.

I agree wholeheartedly that the DS tables are supposed to reflect the descriptors.

I am now not convinced that the descriptors have always been properly thought out.

I am pleased, however, to note that Jan-Eike has fixed a couple of other problems in the TABLES base table w.r.t. the table descriptor definition, although this is not mentioned in the discussion.

In the light of the above, I am withdrawing my proposal and will support E3B-017 which, even if it does not create an ideal situation, at least considerably improves the consistency of what we have.

2.1.1.2. Withdrawal of previous comment Mike Sykes 2001-07-25 13:38

I accept the point that, ideally, we should keep the Definition Schema in sync with the descriptors.

It is perhaps ironic that I'm currently considering how to keep the descriptors in sync with the Def Schema - viz making changes to treat collation as part of data type - but that's another story!

2.2. Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-07-28 05:02

Will National Bodies please record their vote as a direct response to this discussion topic

2.2.1. The Netherlands - Yes (Support) Stephen Cannan 2001-07-28 05:03

2.2.2. Canada E3B-017, Yes (in spite of the discussion threat from Jan-Eike Michels) Baba Piprani
2001-08-03 11:42

2.2.3. UK votes yes Mike Sykes 2001-08-05 06:27

Though not explicitly empowered, I have no compunction in stating that the UK supports this proposal.

2.3. Germany - Yes (Support) Peter Pistor 2001-08-03 11:05

2.4. US votes YES on E3B-017. Krishna Kulkarni 2001-08-03 20:54

2.2.4. Result of Vote Stephen Cannan 2001-08-13 15:33

For: 6 Against: 0 Abstain: 0

Note Japan voted yes by email due to problems accessing the forum.

I hereby declare the paper accepted and comment

SEQ# 599, USA-P11-005

resolved

13.12 Seq#600 (USA-P11-006)

14. National Body Closing Comments

14.1 Australia

14.2 Belgium

- 14.3 Brazil
- 14.4 Canada
- 14.5 China
- 14.6 Czech Republic
- 14.7 Denmark
- 14.8 Finland
- 14.9 France
- 14.10 Germany
- 14.11 Italy
- 14.12 Japan
- 14.13 Netherlands
- 14.14 Norway
- 14.15 Republic of Korea
- 14.16 United Kingdom
- 14.17 United States
- 14.18 Austria
- 14.19 Russian Federation
- 14.20 Sweden

15. Recommendations

15.1 Preparation of Revised Texts (SD-005)

15.01 Preparation of Revised Texts (SD-005)

1. Tentative dates for revised text publication

Jim Melton

Posted on 2001-07-04 13:14

Modified by Jim Melton on 2001-07-04 13:35

It is my intent to publish revised text for each document being considered at this E3B round of the Editing Meeting no later than Sunday, 2001-09-09 (9 September). This date is consistent with the date suggested at the end of the PER (Perth) round and allows a meaningful amount of time (about 5 weeks) to prepare additional proposals for the YYJ (Victoria) round.

As always, that date represents the plan, but is subject to possible slippage due to unusually difficult editing, heavy conflicts, etc.

Furthermore, this proposed date is subject to there being an appropriate recommendation arising from this E3B round of this Editing Meeting.

15.2 Disposition of Comments Report

16. Action Items

17. Adjourn

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 N00730
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 WG3 YYJ-014R2
Date: 2001-10-15

DOCUMENT REGISTER

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG3
DOCUMENT REGISTER
2nd July – 24th August 2001
Cyberspace

Prefix: WG3 E3B

No.	Source	Title	Agenda	Avail.?
001	Brown	Minutes from CD Editing Meeting, Perth, Australia	5.1	Y
002	Cannan	Calling notice for Continuation CD Editing Meeting (SC32 N00645)	5.2	Y
003p	Melton	ISO 9075-1 SQL/Framework CD (interim text)	5.3	Y
004p	Melton	ISO 9075-2 SQL/Foundation CD (interim text)	5.4	Y
005p	Melton	ISO 9075-3 SQL/CLI CD (interim text)	5.5	Y
006p	Melton	ISO 9075-4 SQL/PSM CD (interim text)	5.6	Y
007p	Melton	ISO 9075-9 SQL/MED CD (interim text)	5.7	Y
008p	Melton	ISO 9075-10 SQL/OLB CD (interim text)	5.8	Y
009p	Melton	ISO 9075-11 SQL/Schemata CD (interim text)	5.9	Y
010	Melton	CD 9075 Consolidated Ballot Comments	5.10	Y
011	Melton	CD 9075 Outstanding Ballot Comments	5.11	Y
012	Cannan	Convenor's Rules of Engagement	5.12	Y
013R1	Cannan	Rejecting change to TABLE_TYPE column in the TABLES base table	13.11	Y
014R1	USA	Supplying missing type designators (H2-2001-297)	8.40	Y
015	USA	No more <row value expression>s in <set clause> (H2-2001-298)	8.18	Y
016R1	USA	Fixing UNNEST for collections of rows (H2-2001-300)	8.8	Y
017	USA	Displaying Typed Tables in the Information Schema (H2-2001-301)	13.11	Y
018	Cannan	Resolving some FCD only comments	7.3, 9.1, 9.2, 10.1, 11.1, 12.1, 13.10	Y
019	Pistor	Resolving SEQ# 142 (DEU-P02-007)	8.38	Y
020	Zemke	Keeping REVOKE of the HIERARCHY option	8.61	Y
021	Zemke	Continued work on multiargument aggregates	8.32	Y
022	Melton	Unicode Escape Sequences for SQL	8.107	Y
023	Kotera	An addition of general rules about transition table	8.69 withdrawn	Y
024	Zemke	Follow-up to E3B-015	8.31, 8.45	Y
025	Michels	CASTing ROW types	8.24	Y
026	Michels	TABLE Functions	8.28	Y
027	Michels et al	Enhancing the foreign-data wrapper interface	11.2, 11.3, 11.4, 11.5, 11.6	Y
028				
029				
030				