

IEEE Standards Interpretations for IEEE Std 1003.1c™-1995 IEEE Standard for Information Technology--Portable Operating System Interface (POSIX(R)) - System Application Program Interface (API) Amendment 2: Threads Extension (C Language)

Copyright © 1996 by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. 3 Park Avenue New York, New York 10016-5997 USA All Rights Reserved.

Interpretations are issued to explain and clarify the intent of a standard and **do not** constitute an alteration to the original standard. In addition, interpretations are not intended to supply consulting information. Permission is hereby granted to download and print one copy of this document. Individuals seeking permission to reproduce and/or distribute this document in its entirety or portions of this document must contact the IEEE Standards Department for the appropriate license. Use of the information contained in this document is at your own risk.

IEEE Standards Department, Copyrights and Permissions, 445 Hoes Lane, Piscataway, New Jersey 08855-1331, USA

Interpretation Request #40

Topic: sigsuspend **Relevant Clauses:** 3.3.7.3, Page 87, Line 1203

Is the phrase "Since the sigsuspend() function suspends process execution indefinitely," correct? It is clear from line 1190 that the function suspends the calling "thread", but why would the "process" be suspended indefinitely? Suggested Correction: Change the phrase to "Since the sigsuspend() function suspends thread execution indefinitely,."

Interpretation Response

The standard is clear that sigsuspend shall suspend the calling thread until the delivery of a signal. The explanatory subclause in the returns section is not a correct representation of what happens and this is being referred to the sponsor for correction as an editorial error.

Rationale for Interpretation

In the declarative text of the description for sigsuspend(), the wording is very clear that the function will suspend the thread. The Interpretations Committee believes that this is exactly what was intended by the working and balloting groups. The subclause in the returns section is clearly explanatory but does not match what the declarative text states and is incorrect. During development of the standard, there were several changes made that required changing process to thread and this was one that was missed.