

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 2044

Date: 2010-06-06

REPLACES: —

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32

Data Management and Interchange

Secretariat: United States of America (ANSI)
Administered by Farance Inc. on behalf of ANSI

DOCUMENT TYPE	Summary of Voting/Table of Replies
TITLE	Summary of Voting on 32N1965 FCD 9075-4 Information technology - Database languages - SQL - Part 4: Persistent Stored Modules (SQL/PSM)
SOURCE	SC32 Secretariat
PROJECT NUMBER	1.32.03.07.04.00
STATUS	WG3 is requested to resolve the comments. The document failed to obtain substantial support.
REFERENCES	
ACTION ID.	ACT
REQUESTED ACTION	
DUE DATE	
Number of Pages	9
LANGUAGE USED	English
DISTRIBUTION	P & L Members SC Chair WG Conveners and Secretaries

Dr. Timothy Schoechle, Secretary, ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32
Farance Inc *, 3066 Sixth Street, Boulder, CO, United States of America
Telephone: +1 303-443-5490; E-mail: Timothy@Schoechle.org
available from the JTC 1/SC 32 WebSite <http://www.jtc1sc32.org/>
*Farance Inc. administers the ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 Secretariat on behalf of ANSI

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N2044

Summary of Voting on Document SC 32 N 1965

Title: FCD 9075-4 Information technology - Database languages - SQL - Part 4:
Persistent Stored Modules (SQL/PSM)

Project: 1.32.03.07.04.00

“P” Member	Approval	Approval with Comments	Disapproval with Comments	Abstention with Comments
Canada	1			
China	1			
Czech Republic	1			
Egypt				
Finland				1
Germany		1		
India				
Japan			1	
Korea, Republic of	1			
Sweden				
Russian Federation				
Portugal				
United Kingdom				
United States			1	
Total “P”	4	1	2	1
“O” Member				
Austria				
Belgium				
France				
Ghana				
Hungary				
Indonesia				
Italy				
Kazakhstan				
Netherlands, The				
Norway				
Romania				
Switzerland				
Total “O”				

Dr. Timothy Schoechle, Secretary, ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32
Farance Inc *, 3066 Sixth Street, Boulder, CO, United States of America
Telephone: +1 303-443-5490; E-mail: Timothy@Schoechle.org
available from the JTC 1/SC 32 WebSite <http://www.jtc1sc32.org/>
*Farance Inc. administers the ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 Secretariat on behalf of ANSI

COMMENTS:

Finland

ABSTAIN. No information available.

Germany

YES. See comments below:

Japan

NO. See comments below:

United States

NO. See comments below:

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2010-06-04

Document: ISO/IEC FCD 9075-4 32N1965

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
DE 1			Major Techni- cal	All possible problems and problems that are discovered during the editing process must be satisfactorily resolved.	None provided with comment.	
DE 2	18.3		Minor Editori- al	In the last part of the where clause is the correlation name in the subquery misspelled. It is currently ICSN but it should be ISCN.	See comment.	
DE 3	18.3		Minor Editori- al	In the grant statement is the first line missing.	Add the line "GRANT SELECT ON TABLE MODULE_TABLE_USAGE" before the last line.	
DE 4	18.4		Minor Editori- al	The last column in the select list of the view is called MODULE_CREATED, In the base table MODULES the column is named CREATED. In the View it needs also to be called CREATED.	See comment.	
DE 5	18.8		Minor Editori- al	The line "FROM MODULE_COL_USAGE" is missing at the end of the view definition.	See comment.	
DE 6	19.2		Minor Editori- al	In the constraint MODULE_PRIVILEGE_GRANTOR_CHECK the first closing bracket ")" needs to be removed.	See comment.	

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
SQL/PSM						
	JPN-P04-001		1-Major Technical	P04-14.13, <for statement>	<p>A pair of BEGIN and END is not closed in <loop statement> in COMMON_CODE of the equivalent code to <for statement>, which reads:</p> <pre> DECLARE CN CS CURSOR FOR FCS DECLARE V1 DT1; DECLARE V2 DT2; . . . DECLARE Vn DTn; DECLARE AT_END BOOLEAN DEFAULT FALSE; DECLARE NOT_FOUND CONDITION FOR SQLSTATE '02000'; BEGIN NOT ATOMIC BL:LOOP DECLARE CONTINUE HANDLER FOR NOT_FOUND SET AT_END = TRUE; FETCH CN INTO V1, V2, ..., Vn; END; IF AT_END THEN LEAVE BL; END IF; SLL END LOOP BL; CLOSE CN; END; </pre> <p>While “BL:LOOP” is inside of the compound statement which begins at “BEGIN NOT ATOMIC” and ends at corresponding “END”, “END LOOP BL” is outside of that.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Solution</p> <p>None provided with comment.</p>	
	JPN-P04-002		1-Major Technical	P04-14.13, <for statement>	<p>COMMON_CODE of the equivalent code to <for statement> has no exception handler for exception conditions occurred in that and the author of SQL routine that contains <for statement> does not aware COMMON_CODE. This causes some problem. For example, suppose the handler with handler type CONTINUE is declared in the compound statement that contains <for statement>. If in the execution of COMMON_CODE, <open statement> fails and subsequent <fetch statement> results in an error, <loop statement> never terminates, because the execution of <fetch statement> does not reach a completion condition with no</p>	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
					data. Solution None provided with comment.	

USA Comments on FCD 9075-4 (SQL/PSM) - 2010

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
SQL/PSM						
	P04-USA-010		2-Minor Technical	<i>P02-09.24, <SQL-invoked routine></i>	<p>Foundation 11.59 <SQL-invoked routine> SR 19)h) says "An <SQL routine body> shall not immediately contain an <SQL procedure statement> that simply contains a <table reference> that identifies a declared local temporary table.". Note that this rule is not modified in PSM. This means that an SQL routine R defined in an SQL-server module M cannot reference a declared local temporary table T that is defined in the same SQL-server module M. But in that case it seems that SQL-server module declared local temporary tables are completely useless.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Solution</p> <p>None provided with comment.</p>	
	P04-USA-020		1-Major Technical	<i>P04-14.13, <for statement></i>	<p>The cursor is never opened or closed. (Closing the cursor will matter if the loop is ever re-executed.)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Solution</p> <p>None provided with comment.</p>	
	P04-USA-030		1-Major Technical	<i>P04-17.03, <resignal statement></i>	<p>The treatment of condition areas in the GRs is unclear. Much of the lack of clarity stems from GR 5)b), which says</p> <p>"All occupied condition areas in DA are stacked such that the i-th condition area is placed at the position of the i+1-st condition area in DA."</p> <p>Specific questions about condition areas in the GRs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> GR 3) defines CA as the "first condition area". After applying GR 5)b), does CA now reference the second condition area because the former first condition area has been "placed" at the second condition area? If the word "copied" were used instead of "placed", it would be clear that CA still references the first condition area. What is the effect of GR 5)b) on the contents of the (new) first condition area? Note that Foundation FCD 4.30 "Diagnostics area" second paragraph says <p>"Pushing a diagnostics area stack effectively creates a new first diagnostics area, incrementing the ordinal position of every existing diagnostics area in the stack by 1 (one). The content of the new first diagnostics area is initially a copy of the content of the old (now second) one."</p> <p>Strictly speaking, this paragraph only talks about stack discipline for diagnostics</p>	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
					<p>areas, not condition areas. Nevertheless, it creates the expectation that stacks are maintained by replicating the first cell. Is this what is desired for condition areas?</p> <p>3. Note that GR 5)d) proceeds to set certain fields of the condition area. 5)d) lead paragraph mistakenly believes that CONDITION_IDENTIFIER is part of the statement area when in fact it is part of the condition area. Presumably this paragraph intends to set the CONDITION_IDENTIFIER of the first condition area. Subrules i), ii) and iii) are concerned with setting RETURNED_SQLSTATE. Does this mean that all other condition area items in the first condition area retain their values that were replicated into the second condition area?</p> <p>4. Also note that if both <set signal information> and <signal value> are specified, then GR 4) will change conditions in the first CA before GR 5) does 'stacking', so that, no matter what stacking means, the first and second CA will not contain 'new' and 'old' information respectively (which apparently was the intent). It's as if GR 4) and GR 5) are in reverse order.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Solution</p> <p>None provided with comment.</p>	
	P04-USA-040		2-Minor Technical	P04-17.03, <resignal statement>	<p>GR 5)b) says</p> <p>a) If the maximum number of condition areas for diagnostics areas is exceeded, then the statement information item MORE in SA is set to 'Y' and the last condition area in DA is made vacant.</p> <p>How can the maximum number of condition areas be exceeded? No attempt has been made to add another condition area yet; that occurs in 5)c).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Solution</p> <p>Replace “exceeded” by “has been reached”.</p>	See comment
	P04-USA-050		2-Minor Technical	P04-17.03, <resignal statement>	<p>General Rule 5)d) says</p> <p>d) The statement information items COMMAND_FUNCTION, DYNAMIC_FUNCTION, and CONDITION_IDENTIFIER in SA are set to 'RESIGNAL', a zero-length string, and CN, respectively.</p> <p>This is impossible. CONDITION_IDENTIFIER is in CA not SA. The probable intended words are</p> <p>"d) The statement information item COMMAND_FUNCTION in SA is set to 'RESIGNAL'. The statement information item DYNAMIC_FUNCTION in SA</p>	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
					is set to a zero-length string. The condition information item CONDITION_IDENTIFIER in the first CA is set to CN." Solution None provided with comment.	
	P04-USA-060		1-Major Technical	<i>P04-No specific location</i>	All Possible Problems and Editor's Notes must be satisfactorily resolved and all problems discovered during the course of the ballot resolution process must be satisfactorily resolved. Solution None provided with comment.	

Discussion

The columns in the document have the following meanings:

- **SEQ #** — A sequence number indicating the total number of comments
- **Cmnt ID** — The comment identifier assigned by the organization submitting the comment
- **See Also** — Pointers to (comment identifiers of) other comments that appear to be closely related
- **Severity** — The severity of the problem as stated by the organization submitting the comment
- **Reference** — The location in the balloted document that the organization identified as most pertaining to the comment
- **Description** — The description provided by the organization with the comment; this includes any solution provided by the organization
- **Addressed By** — “See Comment” if a solution was provided by the organization; a paper number if a known proposal addresses the comment; blank otherwise.

=====
End of paper
=====