Subject: Issues 289-292, 297, 299 and other related issues not previously identified
From: Van Snyder

1 Edits

Edits refer to 00-007r3. Page and line numbers are displayed in the margin. Absent other instructions, a page and line number or line number range implies all of the indicated text is to be replaced by immediately following text, while a page and line number followed by + (-) indicates that immediately following text is to be inserted after (before) the indicated line. Remarks for the editor are noted in the margin, or appear between [and] in the text.

1.1 Issue 289

[Editor: Delete. As a consequence of the new content of 14.1.2.3, and amendments thereto by the edits below in response to issue 297, this is covered by 14.1.2.3, which has the stature of a constraint.]	42:43-44
[Editor: Delete issue 289.]	43:1-20
[Editor: Delete. It's incorrect. See the resolution rules in 14.1.2.4.3 and issue 299.]	247:6-8

1.2 Issue 290

Issue 290 remarks that there is no introduction to subclause 14.1.2.4.3, and that it does not establish the scoping unit under discussion. None of the fifth-level subclauses in 14.1.2.4 have an introduction. The question of the scoping unit should be resolved, if it needs resolving, in 9.5.4.4.3.

[Editor: Delete "Also ... io)".]	350:29-34

1.3 Issue 291

[Editor: Insert "declared" before "type".]	48:30
[Editor: Delete issue 291. There is no problem in using PASS_OBJ for nonpolymorphic dummy arguments.]	48:33-38

1.4 Issue 292

[Editor: delete "type-bound generic interfaces" twice.]	53:44, 47
[Editor: Delete issue 292.]	54:1-4

1.5 Issue 297

Issue 297 laments that there are not any rules about DTIO in 14.1.2.3, even though the first sentence claims there will be.

[Editor: Delete issue 297.]	347:12-15
Within a scoping unit, if two procedures have the same *dtio-generic-spec* (12.3.2.1), their **dtv** arguments shall be type-incompatible or have different kind type parameters.	347:29+ New ¶

1.6 Issue 299

Concerning resolving DTIO references, issue 299 asks "What happens if both .. conditions are satisfied?" The answer is that 14.1.2.4.3 doesn't meet the spec, which was that interface block DTIO overrides type-bound DTIO.

[Editor: "If" ⇒ "Otherwise, if".]	350:39
[Editor: Delete issue 299.]	351:9-18

1.7 Issues not previously identified

The terms "corresponding procedure" and "corresponding binding" in 14.1.2.4.3 are not defined. The term "derived-type dummy argument" is now ambiguous.

[Editor: "derived-type" ⇒ "**dtv**" twice.]	350:36, 40
[Editor: "corresponding ... selected" ⇒ "the reference is to the specific procedure in the interface block that provides that interface" (cf [349:9-10]).]	350:37-38
[Editor: "corresponding binding" ⇒ "the reference is to the binding that has the same kind type parameters"	350:42
[Editor: "is selected." ⇒ ". This may be a binding to the same procedure as for the declared type, or one that overrides (4.5.3.2) it."]	350:43