User Interface - Bug #3212

OS inconsistency related to SET ... VALIDATE construct

11/18/2016 04:21 AM - Ovidiu Maxiniuc

Status:	Closed		**Start date:**	
Priority:	Normal		**Due date:**	
Assignee:	Ovidiu Maxiniuc		**% Done:**	100%
Category:			**Estimated time:**	0.00 hour
Target version:				
billable:	No		**case_num:**	
vendor_id:	GCD		**version:**	

Description

History

#1 - 11/18/2016 06:02 AM - Ovidiu Maxiniuc

At the moment when the validate was implemented/fixed, the only test machine for P4GL was a 9.X on Linux. Later on, when the implementation was finetuned, some differences were noticed when the testcases were executed. A code like:

```
def var x as int extent 5.
set x validate(x > 0, "aa")  with frame f1.
```

(thanks Constantin for the simplified testcase) ceased to compile. At this moment on linux machines, this procedure fails to compile:

```
** An array was specified in an expression, on the right-hand side of an
assignment, or as a parameter when no array is appropriate or expected. (361)
```

Something has changed in newest version of ABL 10.X.

However, from my tests this week, the very same procedure compiles and is successfully executed on both ABL 9.X and 10.X on windev01. This is a Windows machine. So it seems that even with latest reference P4GL version there are some differences in Progress syntax.

According to standard politics of considering the static converted code as valid, I am going to drop the current constraints from rules/annotations/validation_post.rules and allow the above testcase to be converted without errors. This is in concordance with some application environments where the code is mostly executed on Windows OS.

#2 - 11/18/2016 07:33 AM - Greg Shah

I'm OK with this. Since it works in most places and *only fails at compile time* on 9.x in Linux, I think your approach is safe.

If we had a *runtime error* for this on 9.x Linux, then we would have to generate the error as expected because future customer apps might rely upon this behavior. But since the issue is compile-only, it is safe to enable this fully. Please put appropriate comments into validation_post.rules to explain this idea (both the fact that the behavior is a compile failure on 9.x in Linux but works properly elsewhere AND the idea that it is safe to ignore this for the purposes of conversion since no customer app can be broken by that decision).

#3 - 11/18/2016 07:37 AM - Constantin Asofiei

Greg Shah wrote:

> I'm OK with this. Since it works in most places and *only fails at compile time* on 9.x in Linux/Windows, I think your approach is safe.

Compilation fails on 10.2B on Linux, otherwise 10.2B/9.x on windows and 9.x on Linux (we can assume this from the old testing when the rules were initially added) it works.

#4 - 11/18/2016 08:37 AM - Greg Shah

OK, just make that clear.

#6 - 12/05/2016 08:13 AM - Ovidiu Maxiniuc

- Start date deleted (11/18/2016)

- Assignee set to Ovidiu Maxiniuc

- Status changed from New to WIP

The update for this issue is contained in branch 3201b. After it was committed, the branch has passed standard regression testing and all ETF testing.

#7 - 12/07/2016 08:38 AM - Greg Shah

- % Done changed from 0 to 100

- Project changed from Liberty to User Interface

- Status changed from WIP to Closed

3201b was merged to trunk as rev 11132.