1

Issue 308 - Oddities for PAD= in INQUIRE

- 2 To: J3
- 3 From: Craig Dedo
- 4 Date: January 4, 2001
- 5 Subject: Issue 308 Oddities for PAD= in Inquire

6 Issue

- 7 Paper 00-323r3 deleted all mention of what the PAD=specifier in INQUIRE does if there is no
- 8 connection or if the connection is not for formatted I/O. This seems unwise. I crafted words to
- 9 restate the previously specified behavior. But this made me notice that the previous specification
- 10 was...unusual. The "YES" above is not a typo; that's what the previous spec reduced to. I'd do the
- ¹¹ "obvious" fix for consistency except that this would be an incompatibility with f95. This may
- deserve an interp unless I'm more confused than usual, which is possible.

13 Analysis

- 14 I consider this situation to be an oversight. An examination of the normative text of the Fortran
- 15 90 and Fortran 95 standards shows that the PAD= specifier for the INQUIRE statement only
- returned either YES or NO ([1] 9.6.1.22; [2] 9.6.1.22). The normative text for this section in F95 is
- 17 unchanged from F90.

We should correct this oversight in the same way that similar situations are treated with the other I/O specifiers. If there is no connection or if the connection is not for formatted input/output, the PAD= variable is assigned the value UNDEFINED.

If there is any significant disagreement, we can have a straw vote on this proposed fix.

Whether or not to make the same fix for Fortran 95 is a separate issue and should be addressed through the interpretation process.

24 Edits

- Edits are with respect to the 01-007.
- 26 [201:30] Replace "YES" with "UNDEFINED".
- 27 [201:31-39] Delete J3 internal note.

28 **References**

- 29 [1] ISO/IEC 1539:1991, International Standard Fortran 90
- 30 [2] ISO/IEC 1539:1997-1, International Standard Fortran 95 Base Language
- 31 [3] 01-007, Fortran 2000 Draft
- 32 [4] 01-102, Changes to List of Unresolved Issues
- 33 [End of J3 / 01-111]