Subject: Observations concerning section 12
From: Van Snyder
References: 99-134, 99-136

There are also observations concerning section 12 in papers 99-134 and 99-136.

Page and line numbers refer to 99-007r1.

The editor has a good idea in unresolved issue 142. In general, explicit interfaces reduce program fragility, and are therefore to be encouraged.	267:30-38
block ⇒ body	268:2, 4
Delete "MODULE"	268:6
At 269:1, it is explicit that a *procedure-name* is in a *procedure-stmt*. Either we need it here, or we don't need it there. Is there a technically supportable reason not to allow a *procedure-stmt* in a generic interface block to refer to an internal procedure? If not, add "internal procedure" to the list.	268:42-43
block ⇒ body	269:8-10
"...the interface may specify a procedure that is not pure if the procedure is defined to be pure" seems to be saying that in order for an interface to specify a procedure that is not pure, the procedure is required to be defined to be pure! Is it OK to replace "if" by "even if," or is more drastic surgery needed? (Or none?)	269:13-14
Since there is no way an actual argument could be absent, the restriction "Each argument shall be nonoptional" seems not to accomplish anything.	271:30
Add "or inherited" after "specific".	274:21
Add "(12.3.2.1.1)" after "operation".	274:23
Add "(12.3.2.1.2)" after "assignment".	274:24