Craig T. Dedo August 20, 2001 Page 1 of 1

# Named Scratch Files - Proposed Response to WG5

2 To: J3

3 From: Craig Dedo 4 Date: August 20, 2001

5 Subject: Named Scratch Files - Proposed Response to WG5

### 6 Issue

1

- 7 In paper WG5/N1454, WG5 proposes:
- 8 2. At [174:18] it is not specified what happens if STATUS="SCRATCH" and FILE=... are both
- 9 specified, and the specified file exists. Because of this problem, and the fact that the desired
- functionality can be provided with named files, WG5 prefers that the named scratch file facility be
- 11 deleted.

# 12 Analysis

- There is no problem. It is not specified at [174:18] what happens in this case because it is already specified at [171:7-8], immediately prior to rule R904:
- 15 "If an existing file is not connected, execution of an OPEN statement that connects that file with a
- 16 STATUS of SCRATCH is not permitted."
- A rationale for the feature that is still valid is that library packages can create named scratch
- files that are deleted on normal termination, but the processor could retain them on abnormal
- 19 termination.

## 20 Edits

21 No edits are necessary.

#### 22 References

- 23 01-007r2. Fortran 2000 Draft
- 24 01-299, Si Response to a WG5 comment (named scratch files)
- 25 WG5/N1454, Comments arising from subgroup review of Section 9
- 26 97-162r2, Named Scratch Files
- 27 97-193r1, Edits Named Scratch Files
- 28 [End of J3 / 01-316r1]