

## **IEEE Standards Interpretation for IEEE Std 1003.1™-1990 IEEE Standard for Information Technology--Portable Operating System Interfaces (POSIX®)**

Copyright © 2001 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 #90**

**Topic:** `sem_getvalue()` **Relevant Sections:** Page 251 , clause 11.2.8 PASC

The description for `sem_getvalue()` states on lines 362-365: "If sem is locked, then the value returned by `sem_getvalue()` shall be either zero or a negative number whose absolute value represents the number of processes waiting for the semaphore at some unspecified call during the call." Is an implementation that always returns zero when sem is locked conforming? Such an implementation interprets the wording of the specification to be that the return value is EITHER zero OR a negative value ....

### **Interpretation Response**

Yes this is conforming, the intent of the specification is to permit either implementation - either the one that always returns zero or the one that indicates the number of processes waiting on the semaphore.

### **Rationale for Interpretation**

As noted in the proposed solution the rationale behind the current specification should allow both behaviours to be conforming. Forwarded to Interpretations group: 3 May 1998 Proposed Interpretation: 17 Jul 1998 Finalised: February 17 1999

### **Note to Project Editor (not part of interpretation)**

The rationale should be updated to note that this is the intent.