

Subject: More information about GET_COMMAND[_ARGUMENT] failure
From: Van Snyder

1 **Number**

2 TBD

3 **Title**

4 More information about GET_COMMAND[_ARGUMENT] failure.

5 **Submitted By**

6 J3

7 **Status**

8 For consideration.

9 **Basic Functionality**

10 Provide more information if GET_COMMAND or GET_COMMAND_ARGUMENT fails.

11 **Rationale**

12 It would be useful to know more precisely why GET_COMMAND or GET_COMMAND_ARGUMENT
13 fails.

14 **Estimated Impact**

15 Trivial for standard, probably trivial-to-small for processors.

16 **Detailed Specification**

17 Set the STATUS argument of GET_COMMAND to -2 if the processor does not support the concept of
18 a command line.

19 Set the STATUS argument of GET_COMMAND_ARGUMENT to -2 if the value of the NUMBER
20 argument is negative or more than the number of command arguments.

21 Here are proposed edits, to give an idea of the effect on the standard.

22 [Replace “a processor-dependent . . . fails” by “the value -2 if the processor does not support the concept 317:17
23 of a command line. It is assigned a processor-dependent positive value if the command retrieval fails for
24 any other reason”.]

25 [Insert “It is assigned the value -2 if NUMBER is negative or greater than the number of command 318:6
26 arguments.” after “NUMBER.” Insert “for any other reason” after “fails”.]

27 **History**