Subject: Issues 289-292, 297 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 Issues not previously identified

Note to editor: If some revision of 00-320 passes, the following edits will probably be superceded.

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