

Subject: Comments on and related to Clause 2
 From: Van Snyder

1 **1 Edits**

2 Edits refer to 06-007. Page and line numbers are displayed in the margin. Absent other instructions, a
 3 page and line number or line number range implies all of the indicated text is to be replaced by associated
 4 text, while a page and line number followed by + (-) indicates that associated text is to be inserted after
 5 (before) the indicated line. Remarks are noted in the margin, or appear between [and] in the text.

6 [The only reason to have *end. . .* be part of *action-stmt*, and then have constraint C201, is to be able to 11:22-24,50-51,
 7 say at [14:8-9] “The executable statements are all of those that make up the syntactic class *executable-* 14:9
 8 *construct*. It would be simpler to remove the otherwise unused syntax rules and remove or simplify the
 9 six (!) constraints that prevent their application, and simply list the syntax terms in the description
 10 of executable statements. Editor: Delete *end. . .* from *action-stmt* and delete C201. Then add “, plus
 11 *end-program-stmt*, *end-function-stmt* and *end-subroutine-stmt*” at the end of [13:26].]

12 [Does 2.3 need a new 2.3.1 for its first paragraph?] 14:1+

13 [The first sentence of 2.3 belongs in 2.3.1; put it at [14:6], making it the first sentence.] 14:2

14 [The second sentence of 2.3 duplicates the first sentence of 2.3.2. Delete it. Thereby, 2.3 becomes empty 14:3-4
 15 so a new 2.3.1 becomes unnecessary.]

16 [Subclause 2.3.2 has nothing to do with **Execution concepts**. It belongs at [12:2+], and probably not as 14:2-15:1-
 17 a separate subclause.]

18 [Two possibilities: Editor: insert “2” after “note” in the “Misc. decls” row, or delete Table 2.2.] 15:Table 2.2

19 [The syntax only allows a program unit . . . to have one *end. . .* statement. Delete the sentence that 15:3-4
 20 begins “Each program unit. . .”]

21 [Subclause **2.3.4 Execution sequence** doesn’t account for specification expressions. Editor: “invoked, 15:13-14, 21+
 22 execution begins with” ⇒ “invoked, the specification expressions within the *specification-part* of the
 23 invoked procedure, if any, are evaluated in a processor dependent order. Thereafter, execution proceeds
 24 to”. Then insert the following item into the enumerated list:]

25 (2a) Execution of a BLOCK construct causes any specification expressions within the *specifica-*
 26 *tion-part* of the construct to be evaluated in a processor dependent order. Thereafter,
 27 execution proceeds to the first executable construct within the BLOCK construct.

28 [The phrase “is a named variable that is a local entity of the scoping unit” is inadequate given local 19:35-36
 29 declarations in BLOCK constructs, since BLOCK constructs are not scoping units and therefore variables
 30 declared within a BLOCK construct are “local entities of the scoping unit” in which the BLOCK appears.
 31 Replace it by “is a named variable that is declared implicitly (5.3) within the scoping unit or is declared
 32 explicitly within the *specification-part* of the scoping unit”.]

33 [Editor: Delete “, *end-program-stmt . . . end-subroutine-stmt*”.] 36:3-4

34 [Editor: Delete “, an *end-function-stmt . . . end-program-stmt*” and figure out why the hanging indenta- 36:6-7
 35 tion for the constraint didn’t work.]

36 [Editor: Delete “, *end-program-stmt . . . end-subroutine-stmt*”.] 177:12-13

37 [Editor: Delete “an *end- . . . end-program-stmt*,” twice.] 186:10,23