PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

BSI Standards Publication

Information technology — Programming languages, their environments and system software interfaces — Guidelines for language bindings

bsi.

...making excellence a habit.™

Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

National foreword

This Published Document is the UK implementation of ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016. It supersedes BS ISO/IEC TR 10182:1993 which is withdrawn.

The UK participation in its preparation was entrusted to Technical Committee IST/5, Programming languages, their environments and system software interfaces.

A list of organizations represented on this committee can be obtained on request to its secretary.

This publication does not purport to include all the necessary provisions of a contract. Users are responsible for its correct application.

© The British Standards Institution 2016. Published by BSI Standards Limited 2016

ISBN 978 0 580 88135 0

ICS 35.060

Compliance with a British Standard cannot confer immunity from legal obligations.

This Published Document was published under the authority of the Standards Policy and Strategy Committee on 31 March 2016.

Amendments issued since publication

Date	Text affected

Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

TECHNICAL REPORT

ISO/IEC TR 10182

First edition
2016-03-15

Information technology — Programming languages, their environments and system software interfaces — Guidelines for language bindings

Technologies de l'information — Langages de programmation, leurs environnements et interfaces logicielles des systèmes — Techniques d'interface pour les normes de langages de programmation

Reference number
ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016(E)

Documents
Document Sharing Hub

© ISO/IEC 2016

Full document details: PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

COPYRIGHT PROTECTED DOCUMENT

© ISO/IEC 2016, Published in Switzerland

All rights reserved. Unless otherwise specified, no part of this publication may be reproduced or utilized otherwise in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, or posting on the internet or an intranet, without prior written permission. Permission can be requested from either ISO at the address below or ISO's member body in the country of the requester.

ISO copyright office
Ch. de Blandonnet 8 • CP 401
CH-1214 Vernier, Geneva, Switzerland
Tel. +41 22 749 01 11
Fax +41 22 749 09 47
copyright@iso.org
www.iso.org

© ISO/IEC 2016 – All rights reserved

Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

Contents

Page

Foreword ..... **iv**

Introduction ..... **v**

1 Scope **1**

2 Terms and definitions **1**
- 2.1 Terms 1
- 2.2 Abbreviated terms 3

3 Overview of functional binding methods **3**
- 3.1 Introduction to Methods 3
- 3.2 System Facility Standard Procedural Interface (Method 1) 4
- 3.3 User-Defined Procedural Interfaces (Method 2) 5
- 3.4 Programming Language Extensions with Native Syntax (Method 3) 5
- 3.5 Programming Languages with Embedded Alien Syntax (Method 4) 6
- 3.6 Binding Pre-Existing Language Elements (Method 5) 6
- 3.7 Conclusions 6

4 Guidelines **7**
- 4.1 Organizational Guidelines for Preparation of Language Bindings 7
- 4.2 General Technical Guidelines 9
- 4.3 Recommendations for Functional Specifications 9
- 4.4 Method-Dependent Guidelines for Language Bindings 10
  - 4.4.1 Introduction to Method-Dependent Guidelines 10
  - 4.4.2 Guidelines for Standard Procedural Interfaces 10
  - 4.4.3 Guidelines for User Defined Procedural Interfaces 17
  - 4.4.4 Guidelines for Programming Language Extensions with Native Syntax 18
  - 4.4.5 Uses of Programming Languages with Embedded Alien Syntax 18

5 Future directions **18**

Annex A (informative) **Graphic Binding Examples** **20**

Annex B (informative) **GKS Bindings Generic Issues** **27**

Bibliography **40**

© ISO/IEC 2016 – All rights reserved

Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

Foreword

ISO (the International Organization for Standardization) and IEC (the International Electrotechnical Commission) form the specialized system for worldwide standardization. National bodies that are members of ISO or IEC participate in the development of International Standards through technical committees established by the respective organization to deal with particular fields of technical activity. ISO and IEC technical committees collaborate in fields of mutual interest. Other international organizations, governmental and non-governmental, in liaison with ISO and IEC, also take part in the work. In the field of information technology, ISO and IEC have established a joint technical committee, ISO/IEC JTC 1.

The procedures used to develop this document and those intended for its further maintenance are described in the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1. In particular the different approval criteria needed for the different types of document should be noted. This document was drafted in accordance with the editorial rules of the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2 (see www.iso.org/directives).

Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. ISO and IEC shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights. Details of any patent rights identified during the development of the document will be in the Introduction and/or on the ISO list of patent declarations received (see www.iso.org/patents).

Any trade name used in this document is information given for the convenience of users and does not constitute an endorsement.

For an explanation on the meaning of ISO specific terms and expressions related to conformity assessment, as well as information about ISO's adherence to the WTO principles in the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT), see the following URL: Foreword — Supplementary information.

The committee responsible for this Technical Report is ISO/IEC JTC 1, *Information technology,* Sub-Committee SC 22, *Programming languages, their environments and system software interfaces.*

This first edition of ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016 cancels and replaces the first edition of ISO/IEC TR 10182:1993, of which it constitutes a minor revision with the following changes:

— the references section has been deleted;

— minor editorial errors have been corrected.

© ISO/IEC 2016 – All rights reserved
Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

Introduction

This Technical Report is a compilation of the experience and knowledge gained by the members of ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22/WG11 (Techniques for Bindings) from the generation of programmers' interfaces to FUNCTIONAL INTERFACE STANDARDS. Although current experience was derived from the fields of computer graphics and database management, the problems discussed are thought to be generally applicable for mappings of other functional interface standards to programming languages. This Technical Report is intended

a) to identify the problems and conflicts which shall be resolved;

b) to suggest guidelines for future use;

c) to provide scope and direction to required additional work, such as common procedural calling mechanisms and data types; and

d) as a historical record of past experiences and decisions.

This Technical Report is incomplete; the authors have concentrated on those areas where experience and expertise was readily available. The ideas and issues brought forward here emerged from more than 10 years of work, and are represented in International Standards.

Clause 3 of this Technical Report contains the results of a survey of current methods used for language binding development. Characteristics of each method are given, followed by reasons for the selection of the method.

Application of the methods has suggested some guidelines that are presented in Clause 4. Clauses 3 and 4 contain documentation of the current state of language binding efforts; Clause 5 addresses future directions for language bindings.

Circulation of this Technical Report is necessary at this stage, as input and discussion from representatives of ISO/IEC JTC1/SC21 (functional specification standards developers), ISO/IEC JTC1/SC24 (computer graphics standards developers), and ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22 (language standards developers) is urgently sought. The Technical Report in its current form may be useful for those about to embark on language binding developments.

© ISO/IEC 2016 – All rights reserved

Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

Information technology — Programming languages, their environments and system software interfaces — Guidelines for language bindings

1 Scope

This Technical Report is based on experience gained in the standardization of two major areas in information processing. One area covers programming languages. The other area is composed of the services necessary to an application program to achieve its goal. The services are divided into coherent groups, each referred to as a SYSTEM FACILITY, that are accessed through a FUNCTIONAL INTERFACE. The specification of a system facility, referred to as a FUNCTIONAL SPECIFICATION, defines a collection of SYSTEM FUNCTIONS, each of which carries out some well-defined service.

Since in principle there is no reason why a particular system facility should not be used by a program, regardless of the language in which it is written, it is the practice of system facility specifiers to define an 'abstract' functional interface that is language independent. In this way, the concepts in a particular system facility may be refined by experts in that area without regard for language peculiarities. An internally coherent view of a particular system facility is defined, relating the system functions to each other in a consistent way and relating the system functions to other layers within the system facility, including protocols for communication with other objects in the total system.

However, if these two areas are standardized independently, it is not possible to guarantee that programs from one operating environment can be moved to another, even if the programs are written in a standard programming language and use only standard system facilities. A language binding of a system facility to a programming language provides language syntax that maps the system facility's functional interface. This allows a program written in the language to access the system functions constituting the system facility in a standard way. The purpose of a language binding is to achieve portability of a program that uses particular facilities in a particular language. Examples of system facilities that have had language bindings developed for them are GKS, NDL, and SQL (see Bibliography). It is anticipated that further language binding development will be required. Some system facilities currently being standardized have no language bindings and additional system facilities will be standardized. There is a possibility of n × m language bindings, where n is the number of languages and m the number of system facilities.

The scope of this Technical Report is to classify language binding methods, reporting on particular instances in detail, and to produce suggested guidelines for future language binding standards.

Note that the language bindings and the abstract facility interfaces shall have a compatible run time representation, but the abstract facility does not necessarily have to be written in the host language. For example, if the application program is using a Pascal language binding and the corresponding facility is written in FORTRAN, there shall be a compatible run time representation in that operating environment. How this compatibility is achieved is outside the scope of these guidelines. This is generally a property of the operating environment defined by the implementor, and is reviewed briefly in this Technical Report.

2 Terms and definitions

2.1 Terms

ABSTRACT SERVICE INTERFACE: An interface having an abstract definition that defines the format and the semantics of the function invoked independently of the concrete syntax (actual representation) of the values and the invocation mechanism.

© ISO/IEC 2016 – All rights reserved

Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

ALIEN SYNTAX: Syntax of a language other than the host language.

EMBEDDED ALIEN SYNTAX: Statements in a special language for access to a system facility, included in a source program written in a standard programming language.

EXTERNAL IDENTIFIER: An identifier that is visible outside of a program.

FUNCTIONAL INTERFACE: The abstract definition of the interface to a system facility by which system functions are provided.

FUNCTIONAL SPECIFICATION: The specification of a system facility. In the context of this Technical Report, the functional specification is normally a potential or actual standard. For each system function the specification defines the parameters for invocation and their effects.

HOST LANGUAGE: The programming language for which a standard language binding is produced; the language in which a program is written.

IDENTIFIER: Name of an object in an application program that uses a system facility.

IMPLEMENTATION-DEFINED: Possibly differing between different processors for the same language, but required by the language standard to be defined and documented by the implementor.

IMPLEMENTATION-DEPENDENT: Possibly differing between different processors for the same language, and not necessarily defined for any particular processor.

IMPLEMENTOR: The individual or organization that realizes a system facility through software, providing access to the system functions by means of the standard language bindings.

LANGUAGE BINDING OF *f* TO *l* or *l* LANGUAGE BINDING OF *f*: A specification of the standard interface to facility *f* for programs written in language *l.*

LANGUAGE COMMITTEE: The ISO technical Subcommittee or Working Group responsible for the definition of a programming language standard.

PROCEDURAL BINDING (system facility standard procedural interface): The definition of the interface to a system facility available to users of a standard programming language through procedure calls.

PROCEDURAL INTERFACE DEFINITION LANGUAGE: A language for defining specific procedures for interfacing to a system facility as used, for example, in ISO 8907:1987, Database Language NDL.

PROCEDURE: A general term used in this Technical Report to cover a programming language concept which has different names in different programming languages — subroutine and function in FORTRAN, procedure and function in Pascal, etc. A procedure is a programming language dependent method for accessing one or more system functions from a program. A procedure has a name and a set of formal parameters with defined data types. Invoking a procedure transfers control to that procedure.

PROCESSOR: A system or mechanism that accepts a program as input, prepares it for execution, and executes the process so defined with data to produce results.

PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE EXTENSIONS WITH NATIVE SYNTAX or native syntax binding: The functionality of the system facilities is incorporated into the host programming language so that the system functions appear as natural parts of the language. The compiler processes the language extensions and generates the appropriate calls to the system facility functions.

SYSTEM FACILITY: A coherent collection of services to be made available in some way to an application program. The system facility may be defined as a set of discrete system functions with an abstract service interface.

SYSTEM FACILITY COMMITTEE: The ISO technical subcommittee or Working Group responsible for the development of the functional specification of a system facility.

© ISO/IEC 2016 – All rights reserved
Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

SYSTEM FUNCTION: An individual component of a system facility, which normally has an identifying title and possibly some parameters. A system function's actions are defined by its relationships to other system functions in the same system facility.

2.2 Abbreviated terms

CGI: Computer Graphics Interface standard (ISO DP) — a functional specification of the computer graphics programming system facility.

GKS: Graphical Kernel System standard (ISO/IEC 7942-1) — a functional specification of the computer graphics programming system facility.

MDL: Module Definition Language — a language for the specification of an interface to a generic system facility. The MDL is used to generate a module to support the specific system facility access needs of an application program.

NDL: Network Database Language — may be used to define the structure of a database using the network model of data. NDL is defined in ISO 8907:1987 (see Bibliography). The standard also includes the data manipulation functions and their language bindings.

PHIGS: Programmers Hierarchical Interactive Graphics System standard [ISO/IEC 9593 (all parts)], – a functional specification of the 3-D computer graphics programming system facility.

SQL: Structured Query Language — defines the structure of a database using the relational model of data. Database Language SQL is defined in ISO/IEC 9075-1, ISO/IEC 9075-2, ISO/IEC 9075-3, ISO/IEC 9075-4 and ISO/IEC 9075-11 (see Bibliography). The standard also includes the data manipulation functions and their language bindings.

3 Overview of functional binding methods

3.1 Introduction to Methods

This section discusses the binding development problem in general by documenting a number of different approaches to bindings. Each approach has its own characteristics from the points of view of the user, the implementor, and the specifiers of standards.

The first task in specifying a binding of a system facility is to determine the usability, stability, and implementation goals of both the binding and the system facility, and to use these to help select the best method.

The functional binding methods are:

— Method 1. Provide a completely defined procedural interface (the System Facility Standard Procedural Interface).

— Method 2. Provide a procedural interface definition language (User-Defined Procedural Interface).

— Method 3. Provide extensions to the programming language, using native syntax.

— Method 4. Allow alien syntax to be embedded in the programming language.

— Method 5. Binding pre-existing language elements.

Before addressing the individual methods, a discussion of a general issue that affects programming language implementations is indicated. This issue is whether to increase the capability of a given compiler to encompass the system facility, or to provide a pre-processor. Though this is of no direct concern to language binding developers, they may wish to consider the feasibility of each option when choosing a method.

© ISO/IEC 2016 – All rights reserved

Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

A pre-processor is necessary for Method 4 above, and optional for Method 3. Method 1 does not require a pre-processor but it may be useful to provide a utility that checks the syntax of all the procedure calls. The function of a pre-processor is to scan a program source text, to identify alien syntax or syntax associated with a given facility, and to replace this text by host language constructs (for example, calls to system functions) that can be compiled by the standard compiler.

The advantages of a pre-processor are:

— A pre-processor can often carry out semantic checking not provided by the language compilers.

— A pre-processor can be independent of the particular language compiler.

— A pre-processor approach avoids problems that result from tampering with an existing language standard or with certified compilers.

— If the system facility is enhanced, it is easier to modify a pre-processor than a full compiler.

The disadvantages are:

— A pre-processor requires an extra pass through the source.

— There may be a problem with multiple pre-processors for different system facilities existing in the same environment.

— A pre-processor may produce code unfamiliar to the programmer and make debugging more difficult — for example, it may change statement numbers.

— Depending on the language extensions, it may be necessary to analyse the syntax of most of the language to detect the code to be replaced.

In the following sections, each functional binding method is discussed, circumstances that suggest a method be used or avoided are given, and relevant advantages and disadvantages are defined.

There is often more than one way to implement a given method. In addition, it may be necessary to implement more than one method for any given facility.

3.2 System Facility Standard Procedural Interface (Method 1)

With functional binding Method 1, the system facility is designed to support a fixed number of procedures. Each procedure has formal parameters of defined data types and each procedure invocation passes actual parameter values which match the data types.

Method 1 is appropriate when the syntax of the interface provided for each system function is fairly simple and can be fully defined by a few parameters. The method can become unwieldy when the functions that can be invoked use a large number of data types whose structure may be unknown until the time of invocation, and require parameters or data types that are unknown in structure until the time of invocation.

It is often useful to define subsets of the facility to suit different modes of use. For example, where the functions are largely independent and a program only requires a few of them, it may be possible to reduce the size of the run-time system by omitting portions of the system facility. These subsets are reflected by levels of conformance to the functional interface standard.

Use of Method 1 requires that the procedural interface be redefined for each programming language, in terms of the syntax and data types of that language. Thus, separate language binding standards to the same functional interface standard are created.

Method 1 has been used by GKS and other graphics draft standards, where the syntax of the parameters is fairly simple.

It should be noted that, if languages used a common procedure calling mechanism and equivalent sets of data types (ISO/IEC JTC1 has assigned work items on these topics to SC22/WG 11), then it would be

© ISO/IEC 2016 – All rights reserved
Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

possible to derive system facility standard procedural interfaces from the abstract definitions. It would also be possible to derive system facility standard procedural interfaces from abstract definitions under other conditions, particularly for languages of sufficient abstraction (like Pascal and Ada).

3.3 User-Defined Procedural Interfaces (Method 2)

With functional binding Method 2, the run-time procedural interface is defined by the user, and the system functions invoked by the procedures are defined in a language appropriate to the system facility.

This method is appropriate when the interfaces to the system functions provided by the system facility are too complex to be defined by a few parameters, and when they cannot be easily contained in an exhaustive list.

Method 2 allows the binding document to be easily adapted to different programming languages, since the binding only deals with data types. The naming of procedures and parameters is done by the user and not the binding specifiers. The procedural interface definitions are compiled and the resulting object module shall be linked both to the application program and to the system facility.

Advantages of Method 2 are:

— It may provide early diagnosis of errors.

— It is processed once and may allow specific optimization (for example, optimization of query searches) leading to run-time economies.

— Modules may be shared among application programs, since they exist independently.

— The task of creating modules may be specialized and managed outside of the user's program.

Disadvantages of Method 2 are:

— The definition of modules is an extra design step and risks poor usability when the programmer has to define his own modules.

— The procedural interface definition language is another language to learn unless the procedural interface language is part of the host language already.

— There is generally an administrative overhead for managing modules to ensure that they get recompiled and relinked when necessary.

— Porting an application involves porting the program and all the referenced procedural interface definition language modules.

— An additional compiler has to be provided for the procedural interface language unless the procedural interface language is part of the host language already.

Database facilities use this method, where a Procedural Interface Definition Language (in the database standards this is referred to as a Module Definition Language), containing both declarations and procedural statements, is provided. A module may declare the data to be accessed as a view of the database (as it may reference a predefined view) and it defines both the form and the execution of database procedures.

3.4 Programming Language Extensions with Native Syntax (Method 3)

With functional binding Method 3, the functionality of the system facilities is incorporated into the host programming language so that the system functions appear as natural parts of the language. The compiler processes the language extensions and generates the appropriate calls to the system facility functions.

This method is viable only when the system facility is stable and when the application requirements are well understood, since the cost of changes to programming language standards is high.

Documents
Document Sharing Hub

© ISO/IEC 2016 – All rights reserved

Full document details: PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

The main advantage is usability. The users of the language have little extra to learn except the new facilities. It also allows the language developers, when defining new versions of the language, to choose a conforming subset of the facilities or to change the appearance of existing language facilities if they believe this is helpful to their users. Another advantage is that new data types appropriate to the system facility can be constructed.

The disadvantages are that Method 3 ties a compiler to a particular system facility definition. It also ties the language specification to that of the system facility, making it highly desirable to process the standardization of both specifications together if enhancements are needed. It may also be more difficult to use this method in a mixed-language environment, since the same facilities may have confusingly different appearances in different host languages.

Method 3 has been tried with the COBOL and FORTRAN database facilities (Codasyl and ANSI) and with the graphics chapter for Basic.

3.5 Programming Languages with Embedded Alien Syntax (Method 4)

With functional binding Method 4, the system facilities are considered to be 'driven' by statements written in a 'system facility language' rather than in the host programming language. The embedded alien syntax shall be clearly distinguishable from the host language so that it can be processed by a pre-processor.

Method 4 is suitable when the system facilities are too complex to be invoked by simple procedures (as for Method 2, User-Defined Procedural Interfaces). The method could be implemented by having the pre-processor generate Module Definitions as in Method 2.

The advantage of Method 4 over Method 2 is that simple programs, particularly those that may have a short life, may be easier to create. The advantage of Method 4 over Method 3 is that the independence of host language specifications from system facility specifications is maintained, so development of each can progress more quickly.

The disadvantage of Method 4 over Method 2 is that this method substantially complicates the relationships between applications and system facilities. Although the alien syntax should be very similar for all host languages, the pre-processor will need to 'know about' the conventions of each host language to be able to generate the correct interfacing code.

The disadvantage of Method 4 compared with Method 3 is that the programmer has to know two languages and may be confused by the differences between them.

Method 4 is one of the options in the ISO database standards.

3.6 Binding Pre-Existing Language Elements (Method 5)

In some cases, the host language may contain language elements that can be directly identified with corresponding elements of the abstract system facility. For example, in a binding to a system facility that opened and closed files, the host language may already contain constructs for opening and closing files.

The advantage is that pre-existing constructs are used and no extra work in binding needs to be done. If that facility is already present in the language, then making use of that facility avoids unnecessary perturbations to the language.

Care should be taken that the language construct fully meets the requirements of the system facility.

3.7 Conclusions

The subsections above have described five different methods for developing functional bindings, and the circumstances in which they can be used. None of the methods is appropriate in all circumstances, or for all languages. In practice, a combination of methods may be appropriate. In some languages it is necessary to combine Method 4 with Method 5.

© ISO/IEC 2016 – All rights reserved
Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

It is possible, and often desirable, for a system facility to provide more than one method of binding, to give the implementor and user a choice. However, if an implementor provides only one of the standard methods, the user has no choice, and, unless there is a recognized way of converting between methods, portability problems result.

The objective of a standard language binding is to enable a program to be portable when it is written in a standard programming language and accesses a standard system facility. Often the system facility is written in a different language from the application program and requires a certain compatibility between the implementations of the two source language compilers. Of course, similar compatibility is necessary for different compiler implementations of the same source language. In particular:

a) the procedure calling mechanisms should be compatible, and

b) corresponding data types should have compatible machine representations.

Often, but not always, the hardware and operating system will determine appropriate standards or conventions for the representation of primitive data types and inter-program calls. Where there are mismatches, it is necessary for the implementor to create a layer of software to perform conversions between alternative data type representations or procedure calling mechanisms. There are now ISO/IEC JTC1 work items addressing a) and b) above. These are: work item 22.16 — Specification for a Model for Common Language-Independent Procedure Calling Mechanisms, and work item 22.17 — Specification for a Set of Common Language-Independent Data Types.

The methods described have been used in current ISO standards for database and graphics. Some papers defining bindings for communications facilities have also been reviewed, but the strategy to be adopted for ISO OSI bindings is yet to be determined.

4 Guidelines

4.1 Organizational Guidelines for Preparation of Language Bindings

This section describes some organizational guidelines that should be followed in order to facilitate the generation of binding standards. A general statement of each guideline is given, followed by some discussion. The guidelines appear in no particular order.

GUIDELINE 1

Standard bindings of some form should be developed for all standard system facilities that may be accessed from a standard programming language.

Here, “standard” means that an ISO standard or draft standard exists for both the system facility and the language.

There are standards describing system facilities which do not have standard language bindings associated with them. Lack of a standard may lead to implementor-defined interfaces, causing loss of portability.

GUIDELINE 2

Either the language committee or the system facility committee should have primary responsibility for the language binding.

In this area, current practice is ‘whichever committee perceives the need for a binding’ or ‘if the language has an external procedure call mechanism, then the system facility, otherwise the language committee’. Unfortunately, sometimes a binding is required, yet no-one takes the initiative to start binding work; some method for resolving this impasse is required.

It is expected that it is the primary responsibility of the system facility committee to establish a reference binding to an arbitrary language and a generic binding. Subsequent bindings should be the responsibility of the appropriate language committees. In practice it is expected that the system facility committee will seek support from the applicable language committee in the creation of an arbitrary

© ISO/IEC 2016 – All rights reserved

AVA Documents Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016

binding. This would increase the likelihood of getting a full range of language bindings to make a system facility useable. The system facility committee is more likely to have an interest in making the facilities accessible; furthermore, language committees might not have the necessary expertise to develop bindings to specialized facilities. Part of the primary responsibility is to respond to public comments.

GUIDELINE 3

Whichever committee is responsible for a particular binding, the other committee needs to be consulted as early as possible. The two committees have complementary responsibilities and concerns.

A system facility committee is concerned with

— fidelity to the functional specification, including relevant level structures.

— similarity of program structure independent of the programming languages.

— suitability of the system facility for binding to the various languages.

A language committee is concerned with

— correctness of the binding definition, and adherence to good practice in the language, including the avoidance of obsolete and deprecated features.

— consistency in the binding of similar concepts in similar ways throughout different bindings (for example, 'is a 2×3 matrix bound as a (3,2) array or a (2,3) array or a (6) array?' is a question to be answered by a language committee).

— the needs of programmers accessing more than one system facility in one program.

— suitability of the language for various binding methods.

Both committees are concerned with ease of use and orthogonality of concepts.

GUIDELINE 4

Specific guidelines should be produced alongside standards for particular system facilities and particular programming languages.

— A set of guidelines for producing language bindings for a system facility should be associated with the standard functional specification of any system facility.

— A set of guidelines for producing language bindings of different system facilities to a language should be associated with the standard of any programming language.

Potentially, there is an n × m problem of agreeing and processing n language bindings to m system facilities. Ideally, the development of appropriate guidelines should reduce the problem to one of order n+m.

Binding guidelines could be published as appendices to standards, and in some cases a supplemental standard could be considered. Sample programs would also be helpful. Publication of such guidelines by language committees would help not only system facility committees, but also any producers of packages needing bindings to languages, and would thus help promote portability.

GUIDELINE 5

Draft proposals for bindings should not progress beyond the standardization stage of the system facility or the language.

In addition, no system facility should progress to DIS (Draft International Standard) or IS (International Standard) until there is at least one language binding at or above the level of DP (Draft Proposed International Standard) or DIS, respectively. Users cannot fully judge a semantic standard without seeing the specific syntax which is their only access to it. Also, there are some difficulties with abstract semantics which are only revealed by the production of a language binding. Reference ISSUE 1: What should be the criteria for determining if the functional interface standard should be bound to a particular programming language?

© ISO/IEC 2016 – All rights reserved
Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: PD ISO/IEC TR 10182:2016