

IEEE Standards Interpretation for IEEE Std 1003.1™-2001 IEEE Standard Standard for Information Technology -- Portable Operating System Interface (POSIX®)

Copyright © 2006 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 #82

Topic: `lio_listio()` `aio_sigevent` **Relevant Sections:** XSH `lio_listio()`

Nowhere in the document is it stated what happens if individual I/O requests issued via `lio_listio()` have `aio_sigevent` members which specify actions other than `SIGEV_NONE`. It is clear that the `sigevent` specified in the `lio_listio` parameter list is used.

A simple test shows that there is a difference in existing implementations. Solaris and AIX both handle the `sigevent` information for the individual requests. Linux does not and only issues one event when all the work is done.

I'm willing to concede that the Solaris/AIX semantics has its benefits and am willing to change my implementation. But the spec should be extended as well.

Action:

I suggest adding a new paragraph at line 23069:

The `aio_sigevent` member specifies the notification which occurs when the request specified by this element of `/list/` is completed.

Interpretation Response

The working group believe the standard is clear but concerns have been raised about this which are being referred to the sponsor.

Rationale for Interpretation

The working group felt that this is required but that adding further clarification could be justified for a future revision.