Date: 29 May, 2000
To: J3
From: /interop
Subject: Miscellaneous edits
References: 00-007r1, 00-192r1, 00-201

Background/analysis:

Paper 00-192r1 raises a number of potential issues. Three of these (all on page 57 of 00-007r1 deal with TYPEALIAS. /interop believes the first and third of these are integration issues, and that the second issue asks if a clause is unnecessary. /interop believes it is not only unnecessary, but **wrong** as a circular definition results. Edits are provided for the first and third issues that introduced unresolved issues keyworded "Integration", and an edit to correct the second issues.

Paper 00-201 part 2 points out typos in section 4.7, ENUMs. Edits are provided to correct these.

EDITS:

[57:38-39] delete ", nor the same as any other accessible <type-alias-name> or derived type <type-name>.

[57:41] add "J3 internal note
Unresolved issue 270: Integration

<declaration-type-spec> includes "CLASS(...)". It was not the intent of /interop to allow classes in TYPEALIAS statements. Is the correct fix to change <declaration-type-spec> to <type-spec>?

J3 internal note
Unresolved issue 271: Integration

Can a type alias name be used as the parent type name in an extended type declaration (probably not), or can an parent type of an extended type have a type alias (probably)? Should something be said (perhaps a constraint) to disallow a type alias name from being used to specify the parent type of an extended type?"

[59:18] change "(724)" to a section reference 7.5, "(7.5)"

[59:38] change "PARAMATER" to "PARAMETER"

[58:21,23] Add the keywords ENUM and EMUMERATOR to the index.