Subject: Comments on Section 16
From: Van Snyder

1   Edits

Edits refer to 02-007. 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 associated text, while a page and line number followed by + (-) indicates that associated text is to be inserted after (before) the indicated line. Remarks are noted in the margin, or appear between [and] in the text.

[The editor was right to re-insert the cross reference for scoping unit. But now this cross 381:4-5,7 reference looks lonesome. Editor: Add "(2.2.1)" after "scope of a program", "(7.5.3, 7.5.4, 8.1)" after "scope of a construct" and "(3.3)" after "scope of a statement".]

[A name isn't necessarily global everywhere just because it's global in one scoping unit. Editor: 387:15 "A" ⇒ "Within a scoping unit, a".]

[Concerning lines 5-6 of Note 16.13, the editor complains (in 02-101) that the note discusses 390:5+ pointers, then their association status, then uses "they" to refer to one or the other, but to which it's not clear. It's the pointers. Editor: To make this clearer: "the association status ... undefined" ⇒ "such pointers to have an undefined association status".]

[The editor wondered whether the *Note to J3* in 01-354r1, after the edit for [379:27-31] in section 393:7+ 2 of that paper, was intended to be a note, an unresolved issue note, or a question for J3 to ponder during meeting 159. It was intended as the last of these, but no discussion ensued, so maybe it ought to be an unresolved issue note:]

J3 internal note

> Unresolved issue xxx
> 5.5.2.3 mentions "common blocks with the same name" and "blank common blocks". The above paragraph assumes a blank common block is the same entity no matter how many times it is declared. Which way do we want it?