

Response to Chapter 5 Comments

1
2 To: J3
3 From: Craig Dedo
4 Date: August 23, 2001
5 Subject: Response to Chapter 5 Comments

6 The A Team considered the comments in 01-260 and recommends as follows.

- 7 1. We no longer have BINDNAME, so the comments on [65:13-14,16] are no longer relevant.
- 8 2. No to all of the comments from [66:29-30] through [68:16-18]. The redundancy is useful.
- 9 3. [68:41] Defer this issue to Data Subgroup.
- 10 4. [69:33] No. "Base object" is defined for variables [95:7]. Typo is fixed in 01-313.
- 11 5. [70:24-25] No. Paper 298r1 got rid of *bind-spec*.
- 12 6. [70:36] No.
- 13 7. [70:42,44] No. These terms are already set and we should not change them.
- 14 8. [72:12] No. This is the common English meaning of "defined".
- 15 9. [74:13] Yes. [74:16-17] Change "the dummy argument becomes disassociated" to "the
16 pointer association status of the dummy argument becomes undefined".
- 17 10. [74:35-37] and [76:9-10] Defer until Interpretation 31 is resolved.
- 18 11. [77:17] No. This is no longer relevant.
- 19 12. [77:36+] Yes. Add a new paragraph, "If the ALLOCATABLE and VOLATILE attributes are
20 both specified, then the volatility shall apply to the allocation status, bounds, and
21 definition status."
- 22 13. [83:40+] No. [30:37-38] says it already.
- 23 14. [87:27] No. Base object can be a variable.

24 **References**

25 01-007r2, Fortran 2000 Draft
26 01-260, Comments on Section 5
27 [End of J3 / 01-335r1]