

**Minutes of the:
held in:
on:**

**Ecma TC39, ES3.1WG
Phone conference
22 May 2008**

1 Roll call and logistics

1.1 Participants

Doug Crockford (Yahoo!), Pratap Lakshman (Microsoft), Mark Miller (Google) and Kris Zyp (The Dojo Foundation)

2 Agenda

Discuss Mark's edits

(the following over email, if we run out of time)

Function.bind - in or out (based on Array generics thread on the discuss lists).

Should we pass in the thisObj parameter for the Array generics ? (based on the Array generics thread on the discuss lists).

Should we cut String.quote ? Last meeting I believe we thought it should be cut, but I just want to reconfirm.

3 Minutes

Lets do the shorter items first.

Function.bind

Came up on the thread on Array generics thread on the discuss lists - do we still need to support this in ES3.1 ? - yes, this is useful enough in its own right - lets add this to ES3.1

Array generics

Should we pass in the thisObj parameter for the Array generics ? - this came up on the Array generics thread on the discuss lists - not doing so might break real world apps - won't break apps if they augment the Array objects themselves - violates principle of least authority - gives the collection access to the object containing the closure you are iterating over - what FF does in not a good practice and we should not codify that in the standard - but not doing so would mean that right off the bat these ES3.1 Array generics would not be used - apps that rely on property detection before installing their overrides would be misled into thinking that the ES3.1 provided generics work like they do in FF; and then they would break because these did not take the thisObject - we either add the thisObject parameter or cut this from ES3.1 - agree to cut.

Will need an isArray though.

String.quote

Difference of opinions on what needs to be quoted - JSON stringify does that anyway - string.quote in FireFox does something different - reluctant to specify a string.quote that is incompatible with FireFox - ok, just drop it - since we have JSON, use JSON.stringify instead - opportunity for a cosmetic change; should we rename JSON.stringify to JSON.toString ? - no! the semantics are different - no changes to the JSON2 API.

with

rejected statically in strict mode - should we move it to appendix B then ? - appendix B is advice to implementers, and is non-normative - changes to 'with' need to remain in the definition of the language.

... back to discussing the edits

Review of Mark's edits to the ES3 - especially section 8.6.2.1.5 SetOwnProperty

Mark to invite Mike Samuel to Yahoo! F2F.

No ES3.1 WG phone meeting next week.

Meeting adjourned.