Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
JP	5.1.6	Paragraph 1	ed	The phrase "string grammars" is not clear. What is the string grammar other than numeric string grammar?		Same as next item.
RU	5.1.6	p.9, par.4, line 1	ed	only "numeric string grammar" term is introduced in the doc, not just "string grammar"	"and string grammars" should be replaced with "and numeric string grammars"	Accepted, see next item
RU	5.1.6	p.9, par.4, line 1	ed	it looks like other grammars like RegExp or JSON grammar (i.e. not just the syntactic one) also use fixed width font for some of the terminal symbols	"some of the terminal symbols of the syntactic grammar" should be replaced with "some of the terminal symbols of other grammars"	Accepted as: "Terminal symbols of the lexical, RegExp, and numeric string grammars, and some of the terminal symbols of the ~~syntactic~~ other grammar, …"
JP	5.1.6	Paragraph 5	ed	The *DecimalDigit* production uses "**one of**" which is not defined yet.	Move the description of "**one of**" above the production.	Accepted
JP	5.1.6	Paragraph 10	ed	Some usages of "but not" are confusing, in which phrases following "but not" appear nonterminals while they are neither terminals nor non-terminals. For instance, in Section 7.4: *MultiLineNotAsteriskChar* **::** *SourceCharacter* **but not** *asterisk* ***** *"asterisk"* appears to be nonterminal here.	Describe the explanation of the notation.	Accepted, by removing descriptive words and adding "one of" in bnf productions in clauses 7.4, 7.8.4, 7.8.5, 15.10.1, 15.12.1.1, and Annex A.
JP	6	Paragraph 1	ed	"UAX #15: Unicode Normalization Forms" defines Normalization Form C (NFC). (See http://unicode.org/reports/tr15/) The specification refers to it using the different name "Normalised Form C".	Use "Normalization Form C" for clarification instead of the word "Normalised Form C".	Accepted The text is expected to have been normalised to Unicode ~~Normalised~~ Normalization Form C (canonical composition), as described…

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
Ecma	6	Paragraph 1	ed	Incorrect word tense	In last sentence replace the word "convert" with the word "converted"	Accepted
JP	6	Paragraph 1	ed	There is no "Syntax" heading before the *SourceCharacter* production.	Add "Syntax" heading.	Accepted
JP	6	*SourceCharacter*	te	The treatment of control characters has some ambiguities and implementation incompatibilities. In fact, current implementations do not uniquely treat control characters in *SourceCharacter*, so has incompatibility problems. JSON definition excludes from U+0000 to U+001F only as control characters. However, we believe that it should exclude more control characters. Moreover, control characters are assumed to be excluded in the followings: *PatternCharacter* *IdentityEscape* *ClassAtomNoDash*	Define *SourceCharacter* to initially exclude control characters, and add them when necessary. *SourceCharacter* **::** any Unicode code unit **except** *U+0000 through U+001F* **but include** *WhiteSpace* and *LineTerminator*	Rejected Whether SourceCharacter is defined expansively and individual refinements exclude certain characters or it is defined restrictively and individual refinements add certain characters is simply a difference in editorial approach that has no technical significance. The current grammar accurately reflects TC39's intent of for this version of ECMAScript and allowances for control characters in various context reflect either explicit decisions for this revision or carry over unchanged from previous editions. Excluding addition control character would be a new specification change that is more appropriate to consider in the context of a future revision.

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
JP	6	Paragraph 3	ed	It says "any characters (code unit) may also be expressed as a Unicode escape sequence consisting of six characters, namely `\u` plus four hexadecimal", but supplementary characters cannot be represented by a Unicode escape sequence.	It is good to note that a supplementary character can be represented by a surrogate pair, such as \uxxxx\uxxxx.	Rejected This section relates to the definition of the *SourceCharacter* grammar production. While two consecutive escape sequence can be used to encode a surrogate pair, such a pair would still be consider two distinct *SourceCharacters*.
Ecma	7.1	Table 1	te, ed	The code unit value for <ZWJ> is incorrectly stated.	In the first column of the second non-heading row replace "\u200C" with "\u200D"	Accepted
JP	7.4	Grammar productions	ed	See JP comment for 5.1.6 paragraph 10		Change productions as: *MultiLineNotAsteriskChar* **::** *SourceCharacter* **but not** ~~*asterisk*~~ ***** *MultiLineNotForwardSlash OrAsteriskChar* **::** *SourceCharacter* **but not one of** ~~*forward-slash*~~ **/ or** ~~*asterisk*~~ *****
Ecma	7.6	Grammar productions	ed	Grammar rules for *UnicodeLetter*, *UnicodeCombiningMark*, *UnicodeDigit*, *UnicodeConnectorPunctuation*, and *UnicodeEscapeSequence* are missing "::"	Insert **::** immediately after the names *UnicodeLetter*, *UnicodeCombiningMark*, *UnicodeDigit*, *UnicodeConnectorPunctuation*, and *UnicodeEscapeSequence* in the last 5 grammar rules in this section. Format consistently with the use of :: in other grammar rules in this section.	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
JP	7.6	Syntax	ed	The following five productions don't have colons: *UnicodeLetter* *UnicodeCombiningMark* *UnicodeDigit* *UnicodeConnectorPunctuation* *UnicodeEscapeSequence*	Add colons appropriately.	Duplicate of above
JP	7.6	Syntax	ed	The production for UnicodeEscapeSequence defined in 7.6 is not listed in Annex A.		This is a forward reference and should be handled similarly to the forward references at the end of the Syntax section of 7.8.4. Remove grammar production for UnicodeEscapeSequence from this section and replace it with paragraph: The definition of the nonterminal *UnicodeEscapeSequence* is given in 7.8.4.
JP	7.8.3	Syntax	te	For the production "*DecimalIntegerLiteral* **::** *NonZeroDigit DecimalDigits*$_{opt}$", only the semantics for "the MV of *DecimalIntegerLiteral* **::** *NonZeroDigit DecimalDigits*" (without $_{opt}$) is given.	Define the semantics for "the MV of *DecimalIntegerLiteral* **::** *NonZeroDigit*".	Accepted, add: • The MV of *DecimalIntegerLiteral* **::** 0 is 0. • The MV of *DecimalIntegerLiteral* **::** *NonZeroDigit* is the MV of *NonZeroDigit*.

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
JP	7.8.3 9.3.1	Syntax	ed	The following nonterminals are multiply defined in 7.8.3 and 9.3.1: *DecimalDigit* *DecimalDigits* *ExponentPart* *ExponentIndicator* *SignedInteger* *HexIntegerLiteral* *HexDigit* They are identical except that 7.8.3 uses double colon (::) and 9.3.1 uses triple colon (:::).	They should be shared.	Rejected Because these nonterminal are parts of two distinct grammars (as indicated by the number of colons in their definitions) they need separate definitions for each grammar. This issue may be worth revisiting in a future revision but the usage of the multiple grammars in to pervasive to address in this edition with a simple editoral tweak.
JP	7.8.4	Grammar productions	ed	See JP comment for 5.1.6 paragraph 10		Change productions as: *DoubleStringCharacter* **::** *SourceCharacter* **but not one of** ~~*double-quote*~~ **"** **or** ~~*backslash*~~ **\ or** *LineTerminator* **** *EscapeSequence* *LineContinuation* *SingleStringCharacter* **::** *SourceCharacter* **but not one of** ~~*single-quote*~~ **'** **or** ~~*backslash*~~ **\ or** *LineTerminator* **** *EscapeSequence* *LineContinuation*

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
						NonEscapeCharacter **::** *SourceCharacter* **but not one of** *EscapeCharacter* **or** *LineTerminator* Make corresponding changes to CV semantic definitions:: • The CV of *DoubleStringCharacter* **::** *SourceCharacter* **but not one of** ~~*double quote*~~ **"** **or** ~~*backslash*~~ **** **or** *LineTerminator* is the *SourceCharacter* character itself. … • The CV of *SingleStringCharacter* **::** *SourceCharacter* **but not one of** ~~*single quote*~~ **'** **or** ~~*backslash*~~ **** **or** *LineTerminator* is the *SourceCharacter* character itself. … • The CV of *NonEscapeCharacter*

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
						:: *SourceCharacter* **but not one of** *EscapeCharacter* **or** *LineTerminator* is the *SourceCharacter* character itself.
Ecma	7.8.4	First sentence of paragraph immediately following grammar productions	ed	"definitions" should be singular, incorrect subclause referenced.	Sentence should be: The definition of the nonterminal *HexDigit* is given in 7.8.3.	Accepted
JP	7.8.4	Semantics	te	No semantics is defined for "the SV of *DoubleStringCharacters* **::** *LineContinuation*" and "the SV of *SingleEscapeCharacter* **::** *LineContinuation*". Defining a rule in NOTE is not acceptable.	Define them.	Accepted with modification. It is really the CVs that need to be defined: • The CV of *DoubleStringCharacter* **::** \ *EscapeSequence* is the CV of the *EscapeSequence*. • The CV of *DoubleStringCharacter* **::** *LineContinuation* is the empty character sequence. … • The CV of *SingleStringCharacter* **::** \ *EscapeSequence* is the CV of the

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
						EscapeSequence. • The CV of *SingleStringCharacter* **::** **** *LineContinuation* is the empty character sequence.
JP	7.8.5	Syntax	ed	The production rule of *RegularExpressionBackslashSequence* is different between 7.8.5 and Annex A. The production ends with *RegularExpressionNonTerminator* in 7.8.5, but *NonTerminator* in Annex A.	*NonTerminator* should be *RegularExpressionNonTerminator*	Duplicate of an accepted item listed for Annex A.
JP	7.8.5	Grammar productions	ed	See JP comment for 5.1.6 paragraph 10		(add missing "one of" in three productions) *RegularExpressionFirstChar* **::** *RegularExpressionNonTerminator* **but not one of * or \ or / or [** *RegularExpressionBackslashSequence* *RegularExpressionClass* *RegularExpressionChar* **::** *RegularExpressionNonTerminator* **but not one of \ or / or [** *RegularExpressionBackslashSequence*

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
						RegularExpressionClass *RegularExpressionClassChar* **::** *RegularExpressionNonTerminator* **but not one of] or ** *RegularExpressionBackslashSequence*

JP	7.9.1	Syntax	te	The rule of automatic semicolon insertion doesn't reflect the behaviours of major ECMAScript implementations well.
				For example, JScript, SpiderMonkey and Chrome v8 accept the following code:
				
				`while(1)if(1)break`
				`;else;`
				
				But the specification doesn't permit it.
				BreakStatement is defined as follows:
				
				BreakStatement **:**
				break [no *LineTerminator* here] *Identifier*opt **;**
				
				This is the same as follows:
				
				BreakStatement **:**
				break [no *LineTerminator* here] **;**
				break [no *LineTerminator* here] *Identifier* **;**
						Rejected. Defer to a future edition. In developing this edition TC39 did not evaluate conformance of actual implementations to these aspects of the existing specification.

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)
2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial
NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
				The first semicolon in the above code is a restricted token which is separated from the previous token by a *LineTerminator*. So a semicolon is inserted as follows: `while(1)if(1)break;;else;` But this causes a syntax error. Note that the inserted semicolon is parsed as a part of the break statement. So the rule "a semicolon is never inserted automatically if the semicolon would then be parsed as an empty statement" is not applicable. Note also that REPL (read eval print loop) of ECMAScript implementations such as JavaScript console doesn't accept the code. This is inconsistent. It is desirable that consideration for REPL is described.		
Ecma	7.9.1	Grammar productions in NOTE	ed	In grammar rule for ThrowStatement, the word "throw" should not be italic	Corrected rule: *ThrowStatement* **:** **throw** [no *LineTerminator* here] *Expression* **;**	Accepted
JP	7.9.1	Note	ed	"*throw*" in the production "*ThrowStatement*: *throw* [no *LineTerminator* here] *Expression;*" is in Italic.	Change the typeface of the word to fixed width font.	Duplicated of previous item.
Ecma	7.9.1	Last sentence of note	ed	Grammar, "A" should be "An"	An *Identifier* in a **`break`** or **`continue`** statement should…	Accepted
JP	7.9.1	Paragraph	ed	The text after "The practical effect of these restricted productions is as follows:" should be indented or itemized.		Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
JP	7.9.1	Paragraph	ed	The text after "The resulting practical advice to ECMAScript programmers is:" should be indented or itemized.		Accepted
RU	8.6.2	p.33, par.3 from bottom, line 1	ed	Mistype	superfluous "is" should be removed	Accepted
JP	8.7.1	Semantics	ed	The dot notation is used as *desc*.[[Value]] in the step 4 of [[Get]] internal method. But the notation is not defined before that. Note that the notation is defined for Property Descriptor in 8.10.		Accepted. Added reference to 8.10 in step 4. Also to step 6a of [[Put]] algorithm in 8.7.2
JP	8.9	Paragraph 1	ed	The Completion type is defined as triples, that is, records in which each member is identified by its position. However, members of the type are retrieved by names, instead of positions, e.g. *s*.target in the last step of 12.1.	Describe that each member of the Completion type is accessed by its name and define the notation to do that.	Accepted
Ecma	8.12.3	Algorithm step number	ed	The number of the steps of the algorithm unintentionally are numbered starting at 8 rather than 1.	Renumber steps 8 through 13 as steps 1 through 6	Accepted
JP	9.3.1	Syntax	ed	There is no "Syntax" heading before the *StringNumericLiteral* production.		Accepted Insert heading
Ecma	9.8.1	Step 10 of algorithm	ed	Incorrect font and emphasis usage.	Revisions in red: 10. Return the String consisting of the most significant digit of the decimal representation of *s*, followed by a decimal point '.', followed by the remaining *k*–1 digits of the decimal representation of *s*, followed by the lowercase character 'e',	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
					followed by a plus sign '+' or minus sign '–' according to whether *n*–1 is positive or negative, followed by the decimal representation of the integer abs(*n*–1) (with no leading zeros).	
JP	9.8.1	Semantics	ed	The font of "e", "+" and "-" in "lowercase character `e', followed by a plus sign `+' or minus sign `-'" in step 10 should be bold face. (In step 9, "e" is in bold face correctly.)		Duplicate of previous item
Ecma	10.2.1.1.1	Algorithm step 3	ed	Missing period at end of sentence.	If it does not have such a binding, return **false**.	Accepted
RU	10.2.1.1.[2-4,7,8], 10.2.1.2.2	various	te	assert behavior is not explained clearly - what should happen, if it fails: an exception, work termination, undefined result?	better explain assert bahavior	Accepted, the following paragraph is added to 5.2 Algorithm Conventions immediate before the paragraph that begins "Mathematical operations…": A step may assert an invariant condition of its algorithm. Such assertions are used to make explicit algorithmic invariants that would otherwise be implicit. Such assertions add no additional semantic requirements and hence need not be "checked" by an implementation. They are used simply to clarify

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
						algorithms.
JP	10.2.1.1.2	Semantics	te	Step 2 uses "Assert:" notation but it is not defined.	Explain the notation somewhere else.	Duplicate of previous item
Ecma	10.2.1.1.3	First paragraph and step 4 of algorithm	te	The last two sentences and step 4 are incorrect and do not reflect actual practice by current implementations. The semantic change from existing practice was unintended	Revise paragraph as shown in red: The concrete Environment Record method SetMutableBinding for declarative environment records attempts to change the bound value of the current binding of the identifier whose name is the value of the argument *N* to the value of argument *V*. A binding for *N* must already exist. If the binding is an immutable binding, a **TypeError** is ~~always~~ thrown if *S* is **true**. ~~The *S* argument is ignored because strict mode does not change the meaning of setting bindings in declarative environment records.~~ Insert red text into algorithm step 4: 4. Else this must be an attempt to change the value of an immutable binding so if *S* is **true** throw a **TypeError** exception.	Accepted
Ecma	10.2.1.2.2	Algorithm step 5	te	Using false as the throw parameter to [[DefineOwnProperty]] could result in a silent error in strict mode if the global object is not extensible.	Replace false, with true as shown below: 5. Call the [[DefineOwnProperty]] internal method of *bindings*, passing *N*, Property Descriptor {[[Value]]:**undefined**, [[Writable]]: **true**, [[Enumerable]]: **true** , [[Configurable]]: *configValue*}, and **true** ~~**false**~~ as arguments.	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
RU	10.2.2.3	p.56, sect. 10.2.2.3, line 1	ed	Mistype	insert whitespace between "NewObjectEnvironment" and "is"	Accepted
JP	10.2.2.3	Paragraph	ed	Misspelling: " NewObjectEnvironmentis" in "operation NewObjectEnvironmentis called"	"NewObjectEnvironment is"	Duplicate of previous item
Ecma	10.5	Algorithm step 6	ed	Missing period at end of sentence.		Accepted
Ecma	10.5	Algorithm step 5.e	te	Step 5.e of original algorithm handled redefining existing global function declarations in a manner that was incompatible with prior editions of this standard and which in some cases would unintentionally invoke accessor functions	Renumber existing step 5.e as 5.f. Insert new step 5.e and substeps as follows: e. Else if *env* is the environment record component of the global environment then i. Let *go* be the global object. ii. Let *existingProp* be the resulting of calling the [[GetProperty]] internal method of *go* with argument *fn*. iii. If *existingProp* .[[Configurable]] is **true**, then 1. Call the [[DefineOwnProperty]] internal method of *go*, passing *fn*, Property Descriptor {[[Value]]: **undefined**, [[Writable]]: **true**, [[Enumerable]]: **true** , [[Configurable]]: *configurableBindings* }, and **true** as arguments. iv. Else if IsAccessorDescrptor(*existingProp*) or *existingProp* does not have attribute values {[[Writable]]: **true**,	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
					[[Enumerable]]: **true**}, then 1. Throw a TypeError exception.	
JP	11.1.4	Syntax	ed	The font of the comma "," in the production for *ArrayLiteral* is different from the comma in *ElementList* and *Elision*.		Accepted Make it the same as in *ElementList*
JP	11.1.5	Syntax	ed	The spacing is inconsistent in the production for *PropertyAssignment*. The spacing between ")" and "{" is different between "get ..." and "set ...". The spacing around "(" in "set ..." is different between 11.1.5 and Annex A. The spacing around ")" in "set ..." is different between 11.1.5 and Annex A.		Accepted
JP	11.1.5	Semantics	ed	The font of the comma "," in the production for "*PropertyNameAndValueList* : *PropertyNameAndValueList* , *PropertyAssignment*" is different from the comma in the Syntax.		Accepted
JP	11.2		ed	No evaluation rule is defined for "*MemberExpression* : *PrimaryExpression*". There are similar problems such as "*PostfixExpression* : *LeftHandSideExpression*" in 11.3, "*UnaryExpresion* : *PostfixExpression*" in 11.4, etc.	Define a general evaluation rule for "*LHS* : *RHS*" where *RHS* consists of a single symbol.	Rejected, Differ for a future edition. There are no explicitly stated rules for the association of semantic actions with syntactic productions. While this does not appear to have cause any problems for the interpretation of previous editions of this specification, it probably should be corrected in a future edition..
Ecma	11.2.3	Algorithm step 6.b.i	ed	Reference to variable "ref" should italic	Let *thisValue* be the result of calling the ImplicitThisValue concrete method of GetBase(*ref*).	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
RU	various	various	ed	There are 6 occurrences of mistyped "Enviroment Record"	Find & replace "Enviroment Record" with "Environment Record"	Accepted in 11.3.1, 11.3.2, 11.4.4, 11.4.5, 11.13.1, 11.13.2
JP	11.5.3		te	The 5th item, "If the dividend is a zero and the divisor is finite, the result is the same as the dividend." is unclear, because finite also includes zero.	"If the dividend is a zero and the divisor is non-zero finite, the result is the same as the dividend."	Accepted
JP	11.5.3		te	The result, r, needs to be rounded to be representable in IEEE 754 but its rule is not defined.		Accepted, added sentence about rounding r similar to what is stated in the list list item of section 11.5.2
JP	11.6.2	Step 7	ed	The font of "r" in the "*rnum*" in the step 7 is different from "*num*".	Change the font of "*rnum*" to "*rnum*".	Accepted
JP	11.9.3	NOTE 3	ed	NOTE 3 is hard to understand because no concrete example is given.	Add a concrete example such as: new String("a") == "a" and "a" == new String("a") are true, but new String("a") == new String("a") is false.	Accepted
JP	11.12	Syntax	te	The RHS of *ConditionalExpressionNoIn* is different between 11.12 and Annex A.3. The second operand is *AssignmentExpression* in 11.2 but *AssignmentExpressionNoIn* in A.3.		Accepted The 11.12 definition is correct so A.3 will be correctded
JP	11.13		ed	"**=**" should be separated from *AssignmentOperator* to make the correspondence between the syntax and the semantics clear. Currently the productions used in 11.13.1 and 11.13.2 are not listed literally in 11.13.	11.13 Change the productions as follows. *AssignmentExpression* : *ConditionalExpression* *LeftHandSideExpression* = *AssignmentExpression* *LeftHandSideExpression AssignmentOperator AssignmentExpression* *AssignmentExpressionNoIn* :	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
					ConditionalExpressionNoIn *LeftHandSideExpression* = *AssignmentExpressionNoIn* *LeftHandSideExpression AssignmentOperator AssignmentExpressionNoIn* *AssignmentOperator* : **one of** ***= /= %= += -= <<= >>= >>>= &= ^= |=** 11.13.2 Change: The production *AssignmentExpression* : *LeftHandSideExpression* @ = *AssignmentExpression*, where @ represents one of the operators indicated above to The production *AssignmentExpression* : *LeftHandSideExpression AssignmentOperator AssignmentExpression*, where *AssignmentOperator* is @= and @ represents one of the operators indicated above Annex A.3 Change the productions for *AssignmentExpression*, *AssignmentExpressionNoIn* and *AssignmentOperator* as above.	
JP	12	Semantics	ed	The return type of evaluation rule for statements is not clearly defined.	Make reference to the Completion type in 8.9. That will be great help for readers.	Accepted. Add sentence as second paragraph: The result of evaluating a *Statement* is always a

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
						Completion value.
JP	12.1	Algorithm	ed	It is difficult to find out a underlying reason to combine s.type, s.target and s1.value in step 5 of "*StatementList* : *StatementList Statement*" of which the reason is considered that `{1;;;;}`, `{1;{}}`, `{1;var a}`, etc. should return 1.	Such additional explanation with concrete examples is preferred.	Accepted Add a Note after last algorithm using this examples
Ecma	12.5	2nd algorithm step 3.	ed	The step number is in the wrong font. (should be Times New Roman rather than Arial)	Change font of "3." To Times New Roman	Accepted
JP	12.6.2	Algorithm	ed	The typeface of "n" in "*Expressio*n" in step 2.a is Roman.	Change the typeface of the word "*Expression*" to Italic.	Accepted
JP	12.6.3	Algorithm	ed	The step 1.b describes "Call GetValue(*exprRef*). (This value is not used.)". Meaning of the annotation is considered to be similar to the NOTEs in 11.4.2 and 11.14, but the annotation should have additional explanation for clarification.	Add the following note: "NOTE: GetValue must be called even though its value is not used because it may have observable side-effects."	Accepted
JP	12.6.3	Algorithm	ed	The typeface of "n" in "*Expressio*n" in step 3.a.i is Roman.	Change the typeface of the word "*Expression*" to Italic.	Accepted
JP	12.6.3	Algorithm	te	The step 3.a.ii for the productions for "*IterationStatement* **: for (** *ExpressionNoIn*opt **;** *Expression*opt **;** *Expression*opt **)** *Statement*" and "*IterationStatement* **: for (var** *VariableDeclarationListNoIn* **;** *Expression*opt **;** *Expression*opt **)** *Statement*" test the condition by "GetValue(*testExprRef*) is **false**". It is inconsistent to evaluation rule for the `if` statement (12.5) and the `while` statement (12.6.1).	Change " GetValue(*testExprRef*)" to "ToBoolean(GetValue(*testExprRef*))".	Accepted
Ecma	12.6.4	Final two normative paragraphs immediate	te	Implementers of the specification have found it to be unclear regarding whether shadowed inherited properties are included in a for-in enumeration. The intent for this situation needs to be made more explicit.	Add as the last sentence of the paragraph beginning "The mechanics and…": A property name must not be visited more	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
		before the note			than once in any enumeration. Add as the last sentence of the paragraph beginning "Enumerating the properties…": The values of [[Enumerable]] attributes are not considered when determining if a property of a prototype object is shadowed by a previous object on the prototype chain.	
Ecma	12.10	Algorithm step 4.	ed	Missing period at end of sentence.		Accepted
Ecma	12.11	Third algorithm in Semantics subsection, step 3	ed	CaseClause and CaseClauses should be italic	3. Let *B* be the list of *CaseClause* items in the second *CaseClauses*, in source text order.	Accepted
JP	12.11	Algorithm 3	ed	The typeface of "CaseClause" and "CaseClauses" is not Italic in the step 3 in the evaluation rule of the production "*CaseBlock* **:** { *CaseClauses*opt *DefaultClause CaseClauses*opt }".	Change the typeface of the two words to Italic.	Duplicate
Ecma	12.11	Third algorithm in Semantics subsection, step 5.b.i	ed	StatementList should be italic	i. If *C* has a *StatementList*, then	Accepted
Ecma	12.11	Third algorithm in Semantics subsection, step 9.b	ed	StatementList should be italic	b. If *C* has a *StatementList*, then	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
Ecma	12.11	Third algorithm in Semantics subsection, step 9.b.i	ed	StatementList should be italic	i. Evaluate *C*'s *StatementList* and let *R* be the result.	Accepted
JP	12.13	Semantics	ed	The last part of the sentence "The production ... is evaluated as:" should be "is evaluated as follows:".		Accepted
JP	12.14	Syntax	ed	In Syntax description, the typeface of "*finally*" in the production " *Finally* **:** *finally Block*" is Italic.	Change the typeface of the word to fixed width font.	Accepted
JP	12.14	Semantics	te	The result of try block, whose type is the Completion specification type, is visible from user code. It should be internal to this specification. *The production TryStatement* **: `try`** *Block Catch* is evaluated as follows: 1. Let *B* be the result of evaluating *Block*. 3. Return the result of evaluating *Catch* with parameter *B*. And, the production *Catch* **: `catch ( `** *Identifier* **`)`** *Block* is evaluated as follows: 1. Let *C* be the parameter that has been passed to this production. 5. Call the SetMutableBinding concrete method of *catchEnv* passing the *Identifier*, *C*, and **false** as arguments. A value of the Completion type is bound to *B*, *C* and finally used as the 2nd argument of SetMutableBinding. *catchEnv* is used to evaluate catch Block later. The code in the **`catch`** block can access to the Completion type value.	Change "evaluating *Catch* with parameter *B*" to "evaluating *Catch* with parameter *B*.value"	Accepted
JP	12.15	Syntax	ed	In Syntax description, "*debugger*" in the production "*DebuggerStatement* **:** *debugger* **`;`**" is in Italic.	Change the typeface of the word "debugger" to fixed width font.	Accepted
JP	13.2	Algorithm	te	The step 10 is not clear when *FormalParameterList* is omitted.	Add "Let *names* be an empty list if *FormalParameterList* is omitted."	Accepted
JP	13.2.3	Algorithm	ed	The step 1 is not a part of the algorithm.	Move it to a usual paragraph.	Accepted,

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
						And renumber the steps of the algorithm
Ecma	15.1.2.1	Algorithm step 5	ed	evalCtx should be italic	5. Exit the running execution context *evalCtx*, restoring the previous execution context.	Accepted
Ecma	15.1.2.2	First paragraph, last sentence	ed	Missing "the"	If *radix* is 16, the number may also optionally begin with the character pairs **0x** or **0X**.	Accepted
JP	15.1.2.2	Algorithm	te	The step 2 doesn't specify the behaviour when *inputString* doesn't contain a character that is not a *StrWhiteSpaceChar*. Example: "", " ", "\t\n", etc.	Append "Let *S* be an empty string if *inputString* does not contain any such character." to the step 2.	Accepted
JP	15.1.2.3	Algorithm	te	The step 2 doesn't specify the behaviour when *inputString* doesn't contain a character that is not a *StrWhiteSpaceChar*. Example: "", " ", "\t\n", etc.	Append "Let *S* be an empty string if *inputString* does not contain any such character." to the step 2.	Accepted
Ecma	15.1.3	Third paragraph	ed	Unnecessary "the"	where the italicised names represent components and ~~the~~ "**:**", "**/**", "**;**" and "**?**" are reserved characters used as separators.	Accepted
JP	15.1.3	NOTE	te	The text doesn't refer to the recent RFC for URI, RFC 3986. The text refers to RFC 1738 and RFC 2396 but they are updated and obsoleted by RFC 3986.		Accepted Add note that this specification is based upon RFC 2396 and not RFC 3986
JP	15.1.3	Syntax	ed	There is no "Syntax" heading before the *uri* production.		Accepted
JP	15.1.3	Syntax	ed	The font of the apostrophe character (') in *uriMark* is different between 15.1.3 and Annex A.6. It is slanted in Annex A.6 but not in 15.1.3.		Accepted
JP	15.1.3	Syntax	te	The characters in *uriReserved* are the reserved characters in RFC 2396. But reserved characters are updated by	Update *uriReserved* according to RFC 3986 or	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
				RFC 3986.	declare it is based on RFC 2396.	Will note based upon 2396. Adoption of 3986 deferred for a future edition.
JP	15.1.3	Syntax	te	The characters in *uriUnescaped* are the unreserved characters in RFC 2396. But unreserved characters are updated by RFC 3986. (Some unreserved characters, "`!`", "`*`", etc, are changed to reserved.)	Update *uriUnescaped* according to RFC 3986 or declare it is based on RFC 2396.	Accepted Will note based upon 2396. Adoption of 3986 deferred for a future edition.
JP	15.1.3	Algorithm 2	ed	The step 4.d.vii.10.a of the abstract operation Decode tests V <= 0x10FFFF. However, the step 4.d.vii.8 tests Octets are valid UTF-8. The valid UTF-8 doesn't have any code points bigger than 0x10FFFF. (RFC 3629) So V <= 0x10FFFF is always true in the step 4.d.vii.10.a.	Change "into a 32-bit value" to "into a value up to 21-bits" in the step 4.d.vii.8, and then remove the step 4.d.vii.10.a.	Accepted
JP	15.1.3.1		te	`decodeURI` doesn't preserve URI semantics. For example, **`decodeURI`** convert "`%25`" to "`%`". So, `decodeURI("http://example.org/%2531")` returns "`http://example.org/%31`". The result refers to a different resource from the argument. The concept of decoding whole URI is wrong. URI should be decoded for each component. Note that the new reserved characters in RFC 3986 may cause a similar problem. So it is very difficult to find a proper use case for `decodeURI`.	Describe a proper use case for `decodeURI` or move `decodeURI` to Annex B.	Rejected. Consideration of potential obsolesce of existing built-in functions is more appropriate to consider in the context of a future edition
JP	15.1.3.3		te	`encodeURI` doesn't preserve URI semantics. For example, `encodeURI` convert "`%`" to "`%25`". So, `encodeURI("http://example.org/%31")` returns "`http://example.org/%2531`". The result refers to a different resource from the argument.	Describe a proper use case for `encodeURI` or move `encodeURI` to Annex B.	Rejected. Consideration of potential obsolesce of existing built-in functions is more appropriate to consider in the context of a

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
				The concept of encoding whole URI is wrong. URI should be composed after components are encoded. So it is very difficult to find a proper use case for `encodeURI`.		future edition
JP	15.1.3.3.	Paragraph	te	UTF-8 needs up to four bytes for each character.	Change "one, two or three escape sequences" to "one, two, three or four escape sequences".	Accepted
JP	15.1.3.4		te	Some characters, "!", "*", etc., are unreserved in RFC 2396 but reserved in RFC 3986. `encodeURIComponent` doesn't escape them because *uriUnescaped* is defined according to unreserved in RFC 2396. The characters may break URI structure as a result of that `encodeURIComponent` embeds them as-is into a URI, which uses them as delimiters.	Update *uriUnescaped* according to RFC 3986.	Rejected Changing definition to match revised RFC deferred to a future edition Add note stating in accordance with 2396 and not 3986
JP	15.1.3.4.	Paragraph	te	UTF-8 needs up to four bytes for each character.	Change "one, two or three escape sequences" to "one, two, three or four escape sequences".	Accepted
Ecma	15.2.2.1	Algorithm step 2.	ed	"Assert" is misspelled as "Asset"		Accepted
JP	15.2.2.1	Algorithm	ed	"Asset:" in the step 2 is a misspelling.	"Assert:"	Duplicate
JP	15.2.2.1	Algorithm	ed	There's an extra "t" in "*obj* t to" in the step 4.	"*obj* to"	Accepted
Ecma	15.2.2.1	Algorithm step 7.	ed	Missing period at end of sentence.		Accepted
Ecma	15.2.3.7	Algorithm steps 5 and 6.	te	Steps 5 and 6 poorly describe the technical intent of the algorithm. In particular the reference to *P* in step 6.a is inadequately related to the use of *P* in step 5.	Replace the current text of step 5.c with: c. Append the pair (a two element List) consisting of *P* and *desc* to the end of *descriptors*.	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
					In step 6, replace the phrase "*desc* of" with "*pair* from". Relabel step 6.a as step c. Immediately above the relabled step 6.c insert the following new substeps of step 6: a. Let *P* be the first element of *pair*. b. Let *desc* be the second element of *pair*.	
JP	15.2.3.9	Algorithm	te	It seems that `Object.freeze` doesn't forbid the `[[Put]]` internal method for accessors. Is it intentional?		Yes, that is intentional.
Ecma	15.2.4.2	Algorithm all steps	te	The algorithm, as originally stated when implemented caused failure of a widely used Web framework. Revision to specification necessary to avoid such failures of deployed web content.	Renumber existing algorithm steps 1-3 as 3-5 Insert new steps 1 and 2: 1. If the **this** value is **undefined**, return **`"[object Undefined]"`**. 2. If the **this** value is **null**, return **`"[object Null]"`**.	Accepted
Ecma	15.3.2.1	Algorithm steps 5.d.1 and 5.e	ed	"*k*'th" should be "*k*'th"		Accepted
JP	15.3.2.1	Algorithm	te	When there is no parameter, P is an empty string. But the empty string doesn't match to *FormalParameterList* because *FormalParameterList* must have one or more identifiers. Thus, the description in the step 11, "passing *P* as the *FormalParameterList*" is not correct.	Change "Return a new Function object created as specified in 13.2 passing *P* as the *FormalParameterList* and *body* as the *FunctionBody*." To "Return a new Function object created as specified in 13.2 passing *P* as the *FormalParameterList*$_{opt}$ and *body* as the *FunctionBody*."	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
Ecma	15.3.4.3	Algorithm steps 5 and 7.	te	The validation checks in steps 5 and 7 are inconsistent with other similar generic array usages in the specification. The checks should be deleted	Delete existing algorithm steps 5 and 7. Renumber previous step 6 as step 5. Renumber previous steps 8-11 as steps 6-9	Accepted
JP	15.4.4.3	Algorithm	ed	The step 1 defines "*O*" but it is not used. The step 2 uses "*array*" but it is not defined.	Change "*O*" to "*array*" in the step 1.	Accepted
JP	15.4.4.4	Algorithm	ed	"n" in the step 5.c.ii is not in Italic.	Make it Italic.	Accepted
Ecma	15.4.4.9	Algorithm step 7.e	ed	fromPresent should be italic		Accepted
JP	15.4.4.15	Paragraph 2	te	The following text is unclear whether the element searched first is *O*`[`*fromIndex*`]` or *O*`[`*fromIndex*`-1]`: "The optional second argument *fromIndex* defaults to the array's length (i.e. the whole array is searched)."	Change "The optional second argument *fromIndex* defaults to the array's length (i.e. the whole array is searched)" to "The optional second argument *fromIndex* defaults to the array's length minus one (i.e. the whole array is searched)". And, change the step 5 to "If argument *fromIndex* was passed let *n* be ToInteger(*fromIndex*); else let *n* be *len*-1".	Accepted This is really a ed item as the algorithm produces the same result regardless regardless of whether or not step 5 is changed.
JP	15.4.4.15	Algorithm	ed	"Comparision" in "the Strict Equality Comparision" in the step 8.b.ii is a misspelling.	"the Strict Equality Comparison"	Accepted
Ecma	15.4.4.18	Algorithm step 8.	te	The return value is missing from step 8. It should be the **undefined** value	8. Return **undefined**.	Accepted
Ecma	15.4.4.21	Paragraph 4	ed, te	Cut/paste error results in reference to "filter" instead of the name of the current function.	In the last sentence of paragraph 4 replace "`filter`" with "`reduce`"	Accepted
JP	15.4.4.21	Paragraph 4	ed	The following text describes "filter" method in the clause of "reduce" method: "elements that are deleted after the call to `filter` begins and before being visited are not visited".	Change "filter" to "reduce".	Accepted
JP	15.4.4.21	Algorithm	ed	"ToUint32(*lenValue*)" in the step 3 seems to have an extra space after "*lenValue*".	Remove the extra space.	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
JP	15.4.4.22	Algorithm	ed	"ToUint32(*lenValue*)" in the step 3 seems to have an extra space after "*lenValue*".	Remove the extra space.	Accepted
Ecma	15.4.4.22	Algorithm step 9.c.ii	te	*Callbackfn* is called with **null** as the **this** value. All other similar functions pass **undefined** as the **this** value.	Replace **null** with **undefined**: ii. Let *accumulator* be the result of calling the [[Call]] internal method of *callbackfn* with ~~**null**~~ **undefined** as the **this** value and argument list containing *accumulator*, *kValue*, *k*, and *O*.	Accepted
JP	15.4.4.22	Algorithm	ed	**this** value for *callbackfn* call is inconsistent between `reduce` and `reduceRight`. 15.4.4.21 step 9.c.ii: "calling the `[[Call]]` internal method of *callbackfn* with **undefined** as the **this** value" 15.4.4.22 step 9.c.ii: "calling the `[[Call]]` internal method of *callbackfn* with **null** as the **this** value"		Duplicate
Ecma	15.4.4.22	Paragraph 2	ed	Incorrect font and emphasis for references to previousValue, currentIndex and currentValue.	Correct as shown: *callbackfn* is called with four arguments: the *previousValue* (or value from the previous call to *callbackfn*), the *currentValue* (value of the current element), the *currentIndex*, and the object being traversed. The first time the function is called, the *previousValue* and *currentValue* can be one of two values. If an *initialValue* was provided in the call to **`reduceRight`**, then *previousValue* will be equal to *initialValue* and *currentValue* will be equal to the last value in the array. If no *initialValue* was provided, then *previousValue* will be equal to the last value in the array and	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
					currentValue will be equal to the second-to-last value. It is a **TypeError** if the array contains no elements and *initialValue* is not provided.	
Ecma	15.4.4.22	Paragraph 4	ed, te	Cut/paste error results in reference to "filter" instead of the name of the current function.	In the last sentence of paragraph 4 replace "`filter`" with "`reduceRight`"	Accepted
JP	15.4.4.22	Paragraph 4	ed	The following text describes "filter" method in the clause of "reduceRight" method: "elements that are deleted after the call to `filter` begins and before being visited are not visited".	Change "filter" to "reduceRight".	Duplicate
JP	15.4.5.1	Algorithm	ed	The step 3.b, "Let *newLenDesc* be a copy of *Desc*" seems to have extra spaces before "*newLenDesc*" and "copy".		Accepted
Ecma	15.4.5.1	Algorithm step 3.k	ed	There are two periods at the end of the sentence.	Remove extra period	Accepted
Ecma	15.4.5.1	Algorithm step3 3.l.ii and 3.l.iii	te	Boolean sense of variable name is incorrect resulting in incorrectly inverted test	In both steps replace *cannotDelete* with *deleteSucceeded*. In step 3.l.iii replace **true** with **false**	Accepted
JP	15.5.4.7	Paragraph 1	ed	"-1" should be a single word; line break should be prohibited in between.		Accepted
Ecma	15.5.4.7	Algorithm step 8.	ed	The step number is in the wrong font. (should be Times New Roman rather than Arial)	Change font of "8." To Times New Roman	Accepted
JP	15.5.4.7	Algorithm	ed	The font of the step number "8" is wrong.		Duplicate
JP	15.5.4.7	Algorithm	ed	In the description of the step 8, there seems to be an extra ")" character.		Accepted
JP	15.5.4.8	Algorithm	ed	"-1" should be a single word; line break should be prohibited in between.		Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
JP	15.5.4.9	Paragraph 3, 5	te	The description "Furthermore, **`localeCompare`** returns **`0`** or **`-0`** when comparing two Strings that are considered canonically equivalent by the Unicode standard" and "If no language-sensitive comparison at all is available from the host environment, this function may perform a bitwise comparison" seems contradictory.	It will be desirable to drop the former description because NOTE 2 says the same thing.	Accepted Drop the para 3 text
Ecma	15.5.4.12	Algorithm step 5	ed	Two occurrences of regexp should be italic	5. Search the value *string* from its beginning for an occurrence of the regular expression pattern *rx*. Let *result* be a Number indicating the offset within *string* where the pattern matched, or –1 if there was no match. The **`lastIndex`** and **`global`** properties of *regexp* are ignored when performing the search. The **`lastIndex`** property of *regexp* is left unchanged.	Accepted
JP	15.5.4.13	Algorithm	ed	In the step 6, "max(*len* + *intStart*,0)" has an extra space before "*intStart*".		Accepted
JP	15.5.4.14	Algorithm	ed	"*A*`.length`" in step 13.c.iii.7.d should be "*lengthA*".		Accepted
Ecma	15.5.5.2	First paragraph	te, ed	Text should not imply that array index restrictions apply to the individual character properties of String Objects.	Update as indicated by red markup: String objects use a variation of the [[GetOwnProperty]] internal method used for other native ECMAScript objects (8.12.1). This special internal method is used to add access for ~~specify the array index~~ named properties corresponding to individual characters of String objects.	Accepted
Ecma	15.5.5.2	Algorithm steps 3 & 5	te	Steps 3 and 5 are imposing array index (Uint32) restrictions upon individual character properties.	Replace step 3 with: 3. If ToString(abs(ToInteger(*P*))) is not the	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
				However, such indices only require integer restrictions.	same value as *P*, return **undefined**. Update step 5 as indicated in red: 5. Let *index* be ~~ToUint32~~ ToInteger(*P*).	
Ecma	15.7.3	Second paragraph, first word	ed	Should be "properties" rather than "property"		Accepted
Ecma	15.7.4.2	Second paragraph, first sentence	ed	"RangeError" should have bold font emphasis		Accepted
JP	15.7.4.5	Algorithm	ed	"a" in "Let a be" in the step 8.c.iii is not in Italic.		Accepted
Ecma	15.7.4.6	Second paragraph, first sentence	ed	The word "decimal" is misspelled as "decmal"		Accepted
JP	15.7.4.6	Paragraph 1	ed	"decmal" in "decmal exponential notation" is a misspelling.	"decimal"	Duplicate
Ecma	15.8.2	First NOTE paragraph	ed	tan function is missing from list of functions in first sentence	Remove word "and" from between "sin" and "sqrt". Add a comma immediately after "sqrt" followed by the text "and **`tan`**"	Accepted
JP	15.9.1.1	Paragraph 2	te	Leap seconds should be permitted. The description "In time values leap seconds are ignored" forbids an implementation of ECMAScript with leap seconds. But it is difficult to implement Date if the host environment provides leap seconds. The popular timezone database, Olson's tzdata, provides leap seconds and it is used by various platforms including GNU/Linux, BSDs and Solaris. If a system is configured to use leap seconds, an		Rejected TC39 discussed this and other time representation issue and chose to not make any changes in this edition to the fundamental definition of an ECMAScript time value. This may be reconsider in

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
				application (ECMAScript implementation) on the system is difficult to ignore leap seconds.		future editions.
JP	15.9.1.1	Paragraph 2	ed	ECMAScript Number values can represent 9007199254740992 exactly.	Change "-9,007,199,254,740,991 to 9,007,199,254,740,991" to "-9,007,199,254,740,992 to 9,007,199,254,740,992".	Accepted
JP	15.9.1.8	Item (3)	ed	"WeekDay(TimeFromYear(YearFromTime(t))" in (3) lacks the last closing parenthesis.	Add a closing parenthesis.	Accepted
JP	15.9.1.9	Paragraph	te	UTC(*t*) cannot work well when *t* is ambiguous. For example, UTC(1289122200000) in Los Angeles (PST8PDT) is ambiguous. 1289122200000 is 2010-11-07 01:30:00. 2010-11-07 01:30:00 PST and 2010-11-07 01:30:00 PDT are both valid. They are 2010-11-07 09:30:00 UTC and 2010-11-07 08:30:00 UTC respectively. The argument of UTC(*t*) doesn't have enough information to choose one of them. Actually, UTC(*t*) returns the former.	Add the following note: "NOTE: When UTC(*t*) is ambiguous, it returns a standard time".	Rejected – Deferred. TC39 is aware that there is significant issues relating to daylight savings time in but 15.9.1.8 and 15.9.1.9 but was not able to reach consensus for this edition on an appropriate remediation. Instead, the design was made to maintain the status quo for this edition.
Ecma	15.9.1.12	Algorithm step 7	ed	Delete extra right parenthesis in step 7 immediately following "mn"		Accepted
JP	15.9.1.12	Algorithm	ed	There is an extra closing parenthesis after "*mn*" in "YearFromTime(*t*) == *ym* and MonthFromTime(*t*) == *mn*)".	Remove the extra parenthesis.	Duplicate
JP	15.9.1.15	Table	ed	The definition of **YYYY** doesn't specify explicitly how to format the years less than four digits. It should add leading zeros to make the format four digits.	Change "the decimal digits of the year in the Gregorian calendar" to "the decimal digits of the year 0000 to 9999 in the Gregorian calendar".	Accepted
Ecma	15.9.1.15	The table of field definitions,	ed	"hyphen" is misspelled as "hyphon"		Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
		second line				
JP	15.9.1.15	Table	ed	"**:**" in the definition of "**-**" seems wrong. And "hyphon" is a misspelling of "hyphen".	Change ""**:**" (hyphon) appears literally twice in the string" to ""**-**" (hyphen) appears literally twice in the string".	Accepted
Ecma	15.9.1.15	The table of field definitions, line for HH	te	The valid field range is not specified	Add "from 00 to 24" to the end of the definition: is the number of complete hours that have passed since midnight as two decimal digits from 00 to 24.	Accepted
Ecma	15.9.1.15	The table of field definitions, line for mm	te	The valid field range is not specified	Add "from 00 to 59" to the end of the definition: is the number of complete minutes since the start of the hour as two decimal digits from 00 to 59.	Accepted
Ecma	15.9.1.15	The table of field definitions, line for ss	te	The valid field range is not specified	Add "from 00 to 59" to the end of the definition: is the number of complete seconds since the start of the minute as two decimal digits from 00 to 59.	Accepted
Ecma	15.9.1.15	The table of field definitions	ed	The sentence "Both the …may be omitted" may be misleading. Other fields also may be omitted but are not explicitly called out in this manner. There is no reason to distinguish the two fields mentioned in the sentence.	Delete the sentence.	Accepted
Ecma	15.9.1.15	The table of field definitions, line for Z	ed	"hh" should be "HH"	is the time zone offset specified as "**z**" (for UTC) or either "**+**" or "**-**" followed by a time expression ~~**hhHH**~~**:mm**	Accepted
Ecma	15.9.1.15	The single sentence paragraph beginning "All numbers…"	te	The text fails to specify which values to use as defaults for omitted fields.	Add the following to this paragraph: If the **MM** or **DD** fields are absent "**01**" is used as the value. If the **mm** or **ss** fields are absent "**00**" is used as the value and the value of an	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
					absent **sss** file is "**000**". The value of an absent time zone offset is "**Z**".	
Ecma	15.9.1.15	Paragraphs immediately preceding and following the three "time-only" formats.	te	The text could be interpreted as allowing a date-time string that consists only of the time portion. However, the value produced when parsing such a string must always include a date. Yet which date to use when the date portion is missing is not specified. Time-only strings were not an intended use case for this format within ECMAScript. The text needs to clarify that the date portion is not optional.	Delete the trailing paragraph and modify the preceding paragraph as indicated in red: It also includes "date-time" forms that consist of one of the above date-only forms immediately followed by one of the following time ~~which It also includes time-only~~ forms with an optional time zone offset appended: **THH:mm** **THH:mm:ss** **THH:mm:ss.sss** ~~Also included are "date-times" which may be any combination of the above.~~	Accepted
JP	15.9.1.15	Table	te	The format is not clear. For example, the description, "Also included are "date-times" which may be any combination of the above" seems to permit "2010T12:00". "2010" is permitted as the date-only form, YYYY. "T12:00" is permitted as the time-only form, THH:mm. So the combination of them, "2010T12:00" is permitted. But the meaning of "2010T12:00" is not clear. It doesn't contain month and day. 2010-01-01T12:00 or 12:00 in every day in 2010 or another?	Define the format formally using BNF as follows: *DateFormat* **:::** *Year* **-** *Month* **-** *Day* **T** *Hour* **:** *Minute* **:** *Second* **.** *SubSecond* *Zone*opt *Year* **-** *Month* **-** *Day* **T** *Hour* **:** *Minute* **:** *Second* *Zone*opt *Year* **-** *Month* **-** *Day* **T** *Hour* **:** *Minute* *Zone*opt *Year* **-** *Month* **-** *Day* **T** *Hour* *Zone*opt *Year* **-** *Month* **-** *Day* *Zone*opt *Year* **-** *Month* *Zone*opt *Year* *Zone*opt	This item largely duplicates the preceding several items. The accepted revisions above define default values for missing fields. The use of a BNF grammar might be technically preferable but the existing text as modified above equally precise and adequate for this edition.

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
					Year **:::** *DecimalDigit DecimalDigit DecimalDigit DecimalDigit* **–** *DecimalDigit DecimalDigit DecimalDigit DecimalDigit DecimalDigit DecimalDigit* **+** *DecimalDigit DecimalDigit DecimalDigit DecimalDigit DecimalDigit DecimalDigit* *Month* **:::** *DecimalDigit DecimalDigit* *Day* **:::** *DecimalDigit DecimalDigit* *Hour* **:::** *DecimalDigit DecimalDigit* *Minute* **:::** *DecimalDigit DecimalDigit* *Second* **:::** *DecimalDigit DecimalDigit* *SubSecond* **:::** *DecimalDigit DecimalDigit DecimalDigit* *Zone* **:::** **z** **+** *Hour* **:** *Minute* **–** *Hour* **:** *Minute*	
JP	15.9.1.15	Paragraph 4	te	What happens when a time-only form is given for `Date.parse`? The format permits time-only forms, but the result of	Remove time-only forms.	Duplicate. Time only formats are deleted in response to one of the above items.

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
				`Date.parse(`*time-only-form*`)`, such as `Date.parse("T12:30")`, is not clear.		
JP	15.9.1.15.1	Paragraph	ed	The year range should be 285,426 years. The ECMAScript Date can represent 9007199254740992[ms] before/after 1970-01-01T00:00:00Z. The number of days in 400 years is 400 * 365 + 97. (The Gregorian calendar has 97 leap days in 400 years cycle.) 9007199254740.992 / ((400 * 365 + 97) * 24 * 60 * 60) * 400 = 285426.78 It seems that "285,616 years" in the text ignores leap years: 9007199254740.992 / (365 * 24 * 60 * 60) = 285616.41	Change "285,616 years" to "285,426 years".	Accepted
JP	15.9.1.15.1	Paragraph	ed	Several examples make it easier to understand the format.	Add several examples. For example: -283457-03-21T15:00:59.008Z 283458 B.C. -000001-01-01T00:00:00Z 2 B.C. +000000-01-01T00:00:00Z 1 B.C. +000001-01-01T00:00:00Z 1 A.D. +001970-01-01T00:00:00Z 1970 A.D. +002009-12-15T00:00:00Z 2009 A.D. +287396-10-12T08:59:00.992Z 287396 A.D.	Accepted Add NOTE with examples
JP	15.9.3.1	Algorithm	te	The algorithm uses UTC(*t*). So, some ambiguous times, such as 2010-11-07 01:30:00 PDT at Los Angeles, are not generatable.	Add a note about the problem as follows: "NOTE: Some ambiguous times, such as 2010-	Rejected – Deferred. See explanation for related item above.

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
					11-07 01:30:00 PDT at Los Angeles, are not generatable because UTC(*finalDate*) is used."	
JP	15.9.4.2	Paragraph	te	When some components of the date-time are not given, the behaviour of `Date.parse` is not clear. Additionally, the time zone selection rule should be described.	Describe the behaviour as follows: If *Month* is not given, `Date.parse` interprets it as one. If *Day* is not given, `Date.parse` interprets it as one. If *Hour* is not given, `Date.parse` interprets it as zero. If *Minute* is not given, `Date.parse` interprets it as zero. If *Second* is not given, `Date.parse` interprets it as zero. If *SubSecond* is not given, `Date.parse` interprets it as zero. If the timezone is not given in the string, it is interpreted as a local time. If the timezone is `Z`, the string is interpreted as a UTC. If the timezone is `+hh:mm` or `-hh:mm`, the string is interpreted as the specified time zone. Note that the above proposal doesn't describe time-only forms. See the comment about 15.9.1.15.	Duplicate These issues are addressed in the 15.9.1.15 changes above.

JP	15.9.5.28	Algorithm	te	The algorithm doesn't work well when UTC(*t*) is ambiguous. Consider the following program with the timezone PST8PDT (Los Angeles):
				`// 2010-11-07 00:30:00 -07:00 (PDT)`
				`dt = new Date(2010,11-1,7,0,30)`
				`t = dt.getTime()+3600*1000`
				`dt.setTime(t)`
					Declare `setMilliseconds` in the same way as `setUTCMilliseconds`. This is possible because no timezone changes the offset to UTC not by a multiple of a second.	Rejected – Deferred.
						See explanation for related ambiguous time item for 15.9.1.9 above.
						Also, potential backwards compatibility issues related

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**

				`// dt is 2010-11-07 01:30:00 -07:00 (PDT)`
				`dt.setMilliseconds(500)`
				`// dt should be`
				`// 2010-11-07 01:30:00.5 -07:00 (PDT)`
				`// but actually be 2010-11-07 01:30:00.5 -08:00 (PST)`
				
				This is because the algorithm uses UTC(t) and UTC(t) chooses the PST time, not PDT time. So the time is advanced by 500 milliseconds and 1 hour.
						to this change would need to be studied.

JP	15.9.5.30	Algorithm	te	The algorithm doesn't work well when UTC(t) is ambiguous. Consider the following program with the timezone PST8PDT (Los Angeles):
				
				`// 2010-11-07 00:30:00 -07:00 (PDT)`
				`dt = new Date(2010,11-1,7,0,30)`
				`t = dt.getTime()+3600*1000`
				`dt.setTime(t)`
				`// dt is 2010-11-07 01:30:00 -07:00 (PDT)`
				`dt.setSeconds(10)`
				`// dt should be`
				`// 2010-11-07 01:30:10 -07:00 (PDT)`
				`// but actually be 2010-11-07 01:30:10 -08:00 (PST)`
				
				This is because the algorithm uses UTC(t) and UTC(t) chooses the PST time, not PDT time. So the time is advanced by 10 seconds and 1 hour.
					Declare `setSeconds` in the same way as `setUTCSeconds`. This is possible because no timezone changes the offset to UTC not by a multiple of a second.	Rejected – Deferred.
						See explanation for related ambiguous time item for 15.9.1.9 above.
						Also, potential backwards compatibility issues related to this change would need to be studied.

JP	15.9.5.32	Algorithm	te	The algorithm doesn't work well when UTC(t) is ambiguous like `Date.prototype.setMilliseconds` and `Date.prototype.setSeconds`. Note that there were historical timezones whose offsets to UTC are not a multiple of a minute. An example is Europe/Lisbon until 1911 in Olson's tzdata. This fact can be ignored because ECMAScript always uses the current	Declare `setMilliseconds` in the same way as `setUTCMinutes`, or add a note to describe this problem.	Rejected – Deferred. See explanation for related ambiguous time item for 15.9.1.9 above. Also, potential backwards compatibility issues related to this change would need to

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
				timezone rule (15.9.1.8).		be studied.
JP	15.9.5.34	Algorithm	te	The algorithm doesn't work well when UTC(*t*) is ambiguous like `Date.prototype.setMilliseconds` and `Date.prototype.setSeconds`. Note that there are timezones whose offsets to UTC are not a multiple of an hour. An example is Australia/Adelaide in Olson's tzdata. So `setUTCHours` is not usable.	Add a note to describe this problem.	Rejected – Deferred. See explanation for related ambiguous time item for 15.9.1.9 above.
JP	15.9.5.36	Algorithm	te	The algorithm uses UTC(*t*). Therefore, it may cause the problem like `Date.prototype.setMilliseconds` and `Date.prototype.setSeconds`.	Add a note to describe the problem.	Rejected – Deferred. See explanation for related ambiguous time item for 15.9.1.9 above.
JP	15.9.5.38	Algorithm	te	The algorithm uses UTC(*t*). Therefore, it may cause the problem like `Date.prototype.setMilliseconds` and `Date.prototype.setSeconds`.	Add a note to describe the problem.	Rejected – Deferred. See explanation for related ambiguous time item for 15.9.1.9 above.
JP	15.9.5.40	Algorithm	te	The algorithm uses UTC(*t*). Therefore, it may cause the problem like `Date.prototype.setMilliseconds` and `Date.prototype.setSeconds`.	Add a note to describe the problem.	Rejected – Deferred. See explanation for related ambiguous time item for 15.9.1.9 above.
JP	15.10.1	grammar rule for *PatternCharacter*	ed	See JP comment for 5.1.6 paragraph 10		("any of" should be "one of") *PatternCharacter* **::** *SourceCharacter* **but not one ~~any~~ of:** **^ $ \ . * +** **? ( ) [ ]**

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
						{ } |
JP	15.10.1	Syntax	ed	The production of PatternCharacter doesn't start a new line after "::". The symbol in RHS should be placed in a different line from LHS. The production of PatternCharacter in Annex A.7 has the same problem.	Change *PatternCharacter* :: *SourceCharacter* but not any of: to *PatternCharacter* :: *SourceCharacter* but not any of:	Accepted, in combination with the previous item.
JP	15.10.1	Syntax	ed	The font of the hyphens in the six productions "*NonemptyClassRanges* **::** *ClassAtom* **-** *ClassAtom ClassRanges*", "*NonemptyClassRangesNoDash* **::** *ClassAtomNoDash* **-** *ClassAtom ClassRanges*" and "*ClassAtom* **::** **-**" in 15.10.1 and Annex A.7 is inconsistent. The hyphens in the production for *NonemptyClassRanges* and *NonemptyClassRangesNoDash* in Annex A.7 are longer than the others.		Accepted
JP	15.10.1	Syntax	ed	The font of "\" in "*ClassAtomNoDash* :: \ *ClassEscape*" is not fixed width font such as "\".		Accepted
Ecma	15.10.2.1	Fifth bullet item of second list, last sentence	ed	Incorrect font, emphasis and capitalization for first occurrence of "matcher"	Update as: If it can, the ~~m~~*Matcher* returns…	Accepted
JP	15.10.2.5	NOTE 3	ed	The explanation of `/(z)((a+)?(b+)?(c))*/.exec("zaacbbbcac")` describes "because each iteration of the outermost * clears all captured Strings contained in the quantified *Atom*, which in this case includes capture Strings numbered 2, 3, and 4". But, the quantified *Atom* also includes the capture String numbered 5.	"because each iteration of the outermost * clears all captured Strings contained in the quantified *Atom*, which in this case includes capture Strings numbered 2, 3, 4, and 5".	Accepted
Ecma	15.10.2.6	Algorithm	ed	"*multiline*" should be capitalized		Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
		step 3				
JP	15.10.2.6	Algorithm 7	ed	The character list of the step 3 contains two "`A`" redundantly.	The first character, "`A`", should be "`a`".	Accepted
JP	15.10.2.7	Algorithm 1, 2	ed	"*min* , *max*, and" in the step 2 of evaluation rules for "*Quantifier* :: *QuantifierPrefix*" and "*Quantifier* **::** *QuantifierPrefix* **?**" seem to have an extra space after "*min*".		Accepted
JP	15.10.2.10	Algorithm	te	The evaluation rule for "*CharacterEscape* **::** **c** *ControlLetter*" returns a code unit, but it should return a character. The evaluation rules for other choices of *CharacterEscape* returns a character. The evaluation rule for "*AtomEscape* **::** *CharacterEscape*" expects *CharacterEscape* to return a character.	Change "Return the code unit numbered *j*" to "Return the character whose code unit value is *j*".	Accepted
Ecma	15.10.2.15	Second paragraph	ed	Wrong font and emphasis for grammar symbols	Should have changes in red: The production *NonemptyClassRanges* **::** *ClassAtom* *NonemptyClassRangesNoDash* evaluates as follows:	Accepted
Ecma	15.10.2.15	Paragraph immediately following first algorithm	ed	Wrong font and emphasis for grammar symbols	Should have changes in red: The production *NonemptyClassRanges* **::** *ClassAtom* **-** *ClassAtom* *ClassRanges* evaluates as follows:	Accepted
JP	15.10.4.1	Paragraph 6	te	The text describes "The characters **/** or *backslash* **** occurring in the pattern shall be escaped in *S*" but no example is shown for "\" escaped in S. Since "****" is used to introduce an escape sequence, escaping "****" would break the escape sequence. Also, it is inconsistent that the character name of "**/**" is not	Change "The characters **/** or *backslash* **** occurring in the pattern shall be escaped in *S*" to "The character **/** occurring in the pattern shall be escaped in *S*".	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
				given whereas the character name of "\" is given.		
Ecma	15.10.6.2	Algorithm step 4	ed	Extra period at end of sentence should be removed		Accepted
Ecma	15.10.6.2	Algorithm step 9.a.ii	ed	"null" is in fixed pitch font it should be bold serif font		Accepted
JP	15.10.6.2	Algorithm	te	The variable "*i*" is advanced by 2 for each iteration of the loop of the step 9. When `[[Match]]` returned failure, the step 9.c.i increments "*i*". The step 9.e also increments "*i*". So "*i*" is incremented twice for each iteration. The step 18 refer to "*i*" as "the matched substring (i.e. the portion of *S* between offset *i* inclusive and offset *e* exclusive)". But "*i*" is changed by the step 9.e after [[Match]] succeeds. So "*i*" is not the beginning of the matched substring at the step 18.	Remove the step 9.e.	Accepted Also, *I* in step 20 should be *i*
JP	15.10.6.2	Algorithm	ed	The description "the position of the matched substring" in the step 14 is not clear. It can be interpreted as either the beginning of the matched substring, the end of the matched substring, or etc.	Change "the position of the matched substring" to "*i*". This proposal assumes that the step 9.e is removed as in the previous comment.	Accepted
Ecma	15.10.6.3	Step 1 of algorithm	ed	Incorrect subclass cross reference	The reference to "15.10.6.3" should be changed to "15.10.6.2"	Accepted
Ecma	15.11.1.1	Last paragraph	te	If the message argument is undefined, an own property should not be created with empty string value.	Delete last sentence (beginning, "Otherwise…")	Accepted
Ecma	15.11.2.1	Last paragraph	te	If the message argument is undefined, an own property should not be created with empty string value.	Delete last sentence (beginning, "Otherwise…")	Accepted
Ecma	15.11.4.4	Algorithm steps 6-8	te	Algorithm is buggy and does not deal with all possible value combinations.	Starting at step 6, the algorithm should be: 6. If *msg* is undefined, then let *msg* be the empty String; else let *msg* be ToString(*msg*). 7. If *name* and *msg* are both the empty String,	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
					return **"Error"**. 8. If *name* is the empty String, return *msg*. 9. If *msg* is the empty String, return *name*. 10. Return the result of concatenating *name*, "**:**", a single space character, and *msg*.	
Ecma	15.11.6.5	List of subclause references	ed	15.7.4.8 should not be in the list because it does not use TypeError exception	Delete "15.7.4.8" from the list	Accepted
JP	15.11.7.4	Title	ed	The word "New" in the section title "**New *NativeError* (message)**" is capitalised. The word "New" should not be capitalised.	"**new**"	Accepted
Ecma	15.11.7.4	Last paragraph	te	If the message argument is undefined, an own property should not be created with empty string value.	Insert word "own" after "message" in "the message property" Delete last sentence (beginning, "Otherwise…")	Accepted
JP	15.12.1.1	Paragraph	ed	"test" in "the ECMAScript lexical grammar defines the tokens of an ECMAScript source test" is a typo of "text".		Accepted
JP	15.12.1.1	Syntax	ed	The spacing before *JSONStringCharacters* in the production "*JSONString* **::** **"***JSONStringCharacters*$_{opt}$ **"**" seems different between 15.12.1.1 and Annex A.8. 15.12.1.1 has less spacing and Annex A.8 has more spacing.		Accepted
JP	15.12.1.1	Grammar productions	ed	See JP comment for 5.1.6 paragraph 10		(delete descriptive words before terminal symbols, add "one of", and format "thru" as meta grammar text) *JSONStringCharacter* **::** *SourceCharacter* **but not one of** ~~*double-quote*~~ **"** **or** ~~*backslash*~~

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
						\ **or** *U+0000* **thru** *U+001F* \ *JSONEscapeSequence*
JP	15.12.1.1	Syntax	te	*JSONStringCharacter* doesn't include U+0009(TAB). The major JSON.parse implementations (json2.js and Opera, IE8, Firefox, Chrome v8...) had allowed U+0009(TAB) in *JSONString*. But if new implementations (BESEN) are going to start disallowing U+0009(TAB), compatibility of existing JSON data can be a problem.	Clarify to either of the followings: 1. Include U+0009(TAB) into *JSONStringCharacter*, or 2. Add an explicit comment something like TAB is not allowed in *JSONStringCharacter*.	Reject 15.12 already explains that this grammar conforms to RFC 4627 and that it may not be extended (for use by JSON.parse)
JP	15.12.1.1	Syntax	te	*JSONStringCharacter* excludes only C0 controls (U+0000 through U+001F). However, we believe that it should also exclude DEL and C1 controls (U+007F through U+009F). FYI: "RFC 2616: Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.1" CTL = <any US-ASCII control character (octets 0 - 31) and DEL (127)> LWS = [CRLF] 1*(SP | HT) TEXT = <any OCTET except CTLs, but including LWS>	*JSONStringCharacter* :: *SourceCharacter* **except** *double-quote* **" or** *backslash* **\ or** *U+0000 through U+001F* **or** *U+007F through U+009F* **but include** *WhiteSpace* **** *JSONEscapeSequence*	Reject This specification uses the JSON grammar defined by RFC 4627
JP	15.12.1.1	Syntax	te	It is desirable that *JSONWhiteSpace* includes Byte Order Mark (BOM). BOM is generated by certain editors such as Windows Notepad. So adding BOM to *JSONWhiteSpace* makes us possible to edit JSON files in various editors.	Add <BOM> to *JSONWhiteSpace*.	Reject This specification uses the JSON grammar defined by RFC 4627
JP	15.12.1.1	Syntax	te	*JSONStringCharacter* doesn't exclude Unicode line separator U+2028 and Unicode paragraph separator U+2029. They are excluded from *DoubleStringCharacter* (*DoubleStringCharacter* excludes *LineTerminator* from		Yes, Reject

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
				SourceCharacter and *LineTerminator* contains them). So, JSON is not a subset of ECMAScript here. If a JSON text which contains them is evaluated as ECMAScript, it causes an error. Is it intentional?		This specification uses the JSON grammar defined by RFC 4627
JP	15.12.1.1	Syntax	te	JSON should have comment syntax. A comment syntax in data exchange format is useful to annotate data. Other formats, such as XML and YAML, have their comment syntax. Assume a configuration file is written in JSON. The comment syntax is useful for explanation in the configuration file.	Add *MultiLineComment* and *JSONSingleLineComment* to *JSONWhiteSpace*. *JSONSingleLineComment* can be defined as follows: *JSONSingleLineComment* **::** // *JSONSingleLineCommentChars*opt *JSONSingleLineCommentChars* **::** *JSONSingleLineCommentChar* *JSONSingleLineCommentChars*opt *JSONSingleLineCommentChar* **::** *SourceCharacter* **but not** <CR> **or** <LF>	Reject This specification uses the JSON grammar defined by RFC 4627
JP	15.12.1.1	Syntax	ed	The production for *JSONStringCharacter* in 15.12.1.1 and Annex A.8.1 uses the word "thru". Is there a reason not to use "through"?		Accepted Replace "thru" with "through"
JP	15.12.1.2	Syntax	ed	The production for *JSONArray* contains too wide spaces between "[" and "]".		Accepted It's a right-justification problem.
JP	15.12.3	Algorithm	te	The algorithm doesn't test that *space* contains white space characters only, when Type(*space*) is String. Is it intentional?		Rejected Yes, this is intentional
JP	9.3.1 15.1.3		ed	Several nonterminals are not used in RHSs and not declared as goal symbols explicitly.		Reject, Defer *StringNumericLiteral* and

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
	15.12.1.1 15.12.1.2			*StringNumericLiteral* (9.3.1) *uri* (15.1.3) *JSONWhiteSpace* (15.12.1.1) *JSONText* (15.12.1.2)		*JSONText* are the goal symbols of specific grammar identified in clause 5. The purpose of *JSONWhiteSpace* is described in first paragraph of 15.12.1.1. *uri* is the goal symbol of the grammar in 15.13. The uri grammar should be listed in clause 5 and arguably the goal symbols of the various grammars should be more explicitly identified. However these are editorial issues that are best dealt with in a future edition
Ecma	Annex A		ed	Annex A is an informative summary of normative grammar rules that occur in the main body of the specification. There are several transcription errors in this Annex	Correct Annex A items as indicated below	Accepted
Ecma	Annex A	A.1 Grammar rules for *UnicodeLetter*, *UnicodeCombiningMark*, *UnicodeDigit*, *UnicodeConnectorPunctuation*,	ed, te	Grammar rules for *UnicodeLetter*, *UnicodeCombiningMark*, *UnicodeDigit*, *UnicodeConnectorPunctuation*, and *UnicodeEscapeSequence* are missing "::" (this is the same error as described above for subclause 7.6 but transcribed into Annex A.1)	Insert **::** immediately after the names *UnicodeLetter*, *UnicodeCombiningMark*, *UnicodeDigit*, *UnicodeConnectorPunctuation*, and *UnicodeEscapeSequence* in the last 5 grammar rules in this section. Format consistently with the use of :: in other grammar rules in this section.	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
		and *UnicodeEscapeSequence*				
JP	Annex A.1	*FutureReservedWord*	ed	The production rule is different from the one in 7.6.1.2. Whereas Annex A says "or in strict mode code **one of** …", *FutureReservedWord* must also contain words listed above. However, the literal meaning of the sentence seems not to contain them.	Fix the definition in Annex A according to 7.6.1.2.	Accepted Make it clear that the strict mode identifiers extend the other list.
JP	Annex A.1	*NumericLiteral*	ed	In the production for *NumericLiteral*, the font of "NumericLiteral" is not Italic.		Accepted
Ecma	Annex A	A.1 between grammar rules for *DecimalDigit* and *ExponentIndicator*	Ed, te	The grammar rules for NonZeroDigit and ExponentPart are missing from the Annex.	*Insert the following two rules, each with a "See 7.8.3" reference:* *NonZeroDigit* **:: one of** **1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9** *ExponentPart* **::** *ExponentIndicator SignedInteger*	Accepted
Ecma	Annex A	A.1 grammar rule for *RegularExpressionBackslashSequence*	Ed, te	Rules definition is inconsistent with the normative rule in 7.8.5.	Replace "*NonTerminator*" with "*RegularExpressionNonTerminator*"	Accepted
Ecma	Annex A	A.1 grammar	ed, te	*RegularExpressionLiteral* is missing as a right-hand-side term	Add "*RegularExpressionLiteral"* on a new line immediately following the line containing	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
		rule for *Literal*			"*StringLiteral*"	
JP	Annex A.1	*Literal*	ed	The production for *Literal* have no *RegularExpressionLiteral* as an RHS in Annex A.1, but the production for *Literal* have *RegularExpressionLiteral* as an RHS in 7.8.		Duplicate
JP	15.12.1.1	Syntax	ed	The production for *JSONStringCharacter* is different between 15.12.1.1 and Annex A.8.1. 15.12.1.1 : *SourceCharacter* **but not** ... Annex A.8.1: *JSONSourceCharacter* **but not** ...		Duplicate
JP	Annex A	A1 grammar rule for *MultiLineNotAsteriskChar*	ed	See JP comment for 5.1.6 paragraph 10		Accepted (delete descriptive words before terminal symbols) *MultiLineNotAsteriskChar* **::** *SourceCharacter* **but not** ~~*asterisk*~~ *****
JP	Annex A	A1 grammar rule for *MultiLineNotForwardSlashOrAsteriskChar*	ed	See JP comment for 5.1.6 paragraph 10		Accepted (delete descriptive words before terminal symbols, add "one of) *MultiLineNotForwardSlashOrAsteriskChar* **::** *SourceCharacter* **but not one of** ~~*forward-slash*~~ **/ or** ~~*asterisk*~~ *****

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
JP	Annex A	A1 grammar rule for *DoubleStringCharacter*	ed	See JP comment for 5.1.6 paragraph 10		Accepted (delete descriptive words before terminal symbols, add "one of) *DoubleStringCharacter* **::** *SourceCharacter* **but not one of** ~~*double-quote*~~ **"** **or** ~~*backslash*~~ **\ or** *LineTerminator* **** *EscapeSequence* *LineContinuation*
JP	Annex A	A1 grammar rule for *SingleStringCharacter*	ed	See JP comment for 5.1.6 paragraph 10		Accepted (delete descriptive words before terminal symbols, add "one of) *SingleStringCharacter* **::** *SourceCharacter* **but not one of** ~~*single-quote*~~ **'** **or** ~~*backslash*~~ **\ or** *LineTerminator* **** *EscapeSequence* *LineContinuation*
JP	Annex A	A1 grammar rule for *NonEscape*	ed	See JP comment for 5.1.6 paragraph 10		Accepted ("one of" missing) *NonEscapeCharacter* **::**

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
		Character				*SourceCharacter* **but not one of** *EscapeCharacter* **or** *LineTerminator* *RegularExpressionBackslashSequence* *RegularExpressionClass*
JP	Annex A	A1 grammar rule for *RegularExpressionFirstChar*	ed	See JP comment for 5.1.6 paragraph 10		Accepted Accepted ("one of" missing) *RegularExpressionFirstChar* **::** *RegularExpressionNonTerminator* **but not one of * or \ or / or [** *RegularExpressionBackslashSequence* *RegularExpressionClass*
JP	Annex A	A7 grammar rule for *PatternCharacter*	ed	See JP comment for 5.1.6 paragraph 10		Accepted ("any of" should be "one of" and unnecessary ":") *PatternCharacter* :: *SourceCharacter* **but not ~~any~~ one of~~:~~**

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
						^ $ \ . * + ? ( ) [ ] { } |
JP	Annex A.1	*StringLiteral*	ed	The font of double quotes (") and single quotes (') in the production for *StringLiteral* is different between 7.8.4 and Annex A.1. The quotes in Annex A.1 are thinner.		Accepted
JP	Annex A.2		ed	There is no *NonZeroDigit* production defined in 7.8.3.		Duplicate, This is actually an A.1 item
	Annex A.3	*ArrayLiteral* *ElementList* *Elision*	ed	The font of comma in the production "*ArrayLiteral* **: [** *ElementList* **,** *Elision*opt **]**" , "*ElementList* **:** *ElementList* **,** *Elision*opt *AssignmentExpression*", "*Elision* **: ,**" and "*Elision* **:** *Elision* **,**" are different from the comma in the production for *Punctuator* in Annex A.1.		Accepted
JP	Annex A.3	*ObjectLiteral*	ed	The font of comma in the production "*ObjectLiteral* **: {** *PropertyNameAndValueList* **, }**" and "*PropertyNameAndValueList* **:** *PropertyNameAndValueList* **,** *PropertyAssignment*" are different from the comma in the production for *Punctuator* in Annex A.1.		Accepted
pa (JP?)	Annex A.3	*MemberExpression*	ed	The font of "Arguments" in the production "*MemberExpression* : `new` *MemberExpression* Arguments" is not Italic.		Accepted
JP	Annex A.7	*Regular Expressions*	ed	The font of "\" in the production "*ClassAtomNoDash* :: \ *ClassEscape*" seems not fixed width font "\".		Accepted
Ecma	Annex A	A.8.1 grammar rule for *JSONString*	ed, te	Rules definition is inconsistent with the normative rule in 15.12.1.1	Replace "*JSONSourceCharacter*" with "*SourceCharacter*"	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
		Character				
JP	Annex A.8.1	*JSONString Character*	ed	JSONStringCharacter refers to JSONSourceCharacter in the RHS, but JSONSourceCharacter is not defined.		Duplicate
JP	Annex A	A.8.1 grammar rule for *JSONString Character*	ed	See JP comment for 5.1.6 paragraph 10		Accepted (delete descriptive words before terminal symbols, add "one of", and format "thru" as meta grammar text) *JSONStringCharacter* **::** *SourceCharacter* **but not one of** ~~*double quote*~~ **"** **or** ~~*backslash*~~ **** **or** *U+0000* **thru** *U+001F* **** *JSONEscapeSequence*
JP	Annex B.1.2	Syntax	ed	The font of "**4 5 6 7**" in the production "*FourToSeven* **:: one of 4 5 6 7**" is not fixed width font.		Accepted
Ecma	Annex C	Bullet list	ed, te	Informative text is missing a summary item for a normative requirement.	Add as first bullet of the list: • The identifiers "**`implements`**", "**`interface`**", "**`let`**", "**`package`**", "**`private`**", "**`protected`**", "**`public`**", "**`static`**", and "**`yield`**" are classified as *FutureReservedWord* tokens within strict mode code. (7.6.12).	Accepted
Ecma	Annex C	Next to last	ed	Informative text is confusing/misleading and has	Update bullet items as indicated by the following	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
		bullet item		incomplete clause references.	red insertions and deletions: An implementation may not extend, beyond that defined in this specification, the ~~associate special~~ meanings within strict mode functions of ~~to~~ properties named **`caller`** or **`arguments`** of function instances. ECMAScript code may not create or modify properties with these names on function objects that correspond to strict mode functions (10.6, 13.2, 15.3.4.5.3).	
Ecma	Annex D	Fifth paragraph	ed	Extra period after ":" following clause number prefix.	Delete the period	Accepted
Ecma	Annex D	Sixth paragraph	ed	Extra period after ":" following clause number prefix.	Delete the period	Accepted
JP	Bibliography		ed	Referenced documents are not the latest. ANSI/IEEE Std 754-1985 is referred to but there is 2008 version. The Unicode Standard Version 3.0 is referred to but there is Version 5.2. Unicode Technical Report #15: Unicode Normalization Forms seems to refer to 1998 version but there is revision 31 released at 2009-09-03. It seems that there is a reason to refer to the Unicode Standard Version 3.0, because 7.2 and 7.6 depend on the character categories in Unicode 3.0. But it is not clear that the other documents are not latest. Is that intentional?		Accepted The Unicode V3 reference should remain but it should be ok to change the other two
JP	Bibliography		ed	Several documents referred to in the text are not listed.	Add the following references:	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
					• ISO 8601 Data elements and interchange formats – Information interchange -- Representation of dates and times • RFC 1738 "Uniform Resource Locators (URL)" • RFC 2396 "Uniform Resource Identifiers (URI): Generic Syntax" • RFC 3629 "UTF-8, a transformation format of ISO 10646" • RFC 4627 "The application/json Media Type for JavaScript Object Notation (JSON)"	
JP	Bibliography		ed	There are several documents which may be good to refer to. e.g. Character Model for the World Wide Web 1.0: Normalization http://www.w3.org/TR/charmod-norm/		Rejected – deferred It seems premature to list them in the biblio without first considering how to integrate references in the main text.
JP	4.2.1 4.3.4 11.1.4 11.1.5 10.2.1.1 10.2.1.1.1 10.2.1.1 10.2.1 10.2.1.1 etc.		ed	The specification uses the words "initialise", "initialisation", "initialize", "initialization" and "uninitialized" inconsistently. Some of occurrences: initialise: 4.2.1, 4.3.4, etc. initialisation: 11.1.4, 11.1.5 initialize: 10.2.1.1, 10.2.1.1.1, etc. initialization: 10.2.1.1 uninitialized: 10.2.1, 10.2.1.1, etc.		Accepted All textual uses should use the British spelling ("s") However, when used as a name to name a specification artefact the American spelling should be used.
JP	5.2		ed	The word "parameterized" is used in the second paragraph.	"parameterised"?	accepted
JP	5.2 7.8.3 8.5 9.3.1		ed	"non-zero" and "nonzero" are used inconsistently. "non-zero" in 11.5.1, 11.5.2. "nonzero" in 5.2, 7.8.3, 8.5, 9.3.1, etc.		Accepted Change uses of "non-zero" to "nonzero"

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Editor's proposed disposition of comments on ISO/IEC DIS 16262 3rd edition (ECMA-262 5th edition)

Date: 2010-09-27

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Editor's Disposition**
	11.5.1 11.5.2 etc.					
JP	7.1 8.6.2		ed	The specification uses the words "summarized" and "summarises" inconsistently. summarized 7.1 summarises 8.6.2		Accepted Change uses of "summarized" to summarised"
JP	4.2.2 7.2 7.4 7.6 15.9.4.2 15.10.4.1 15.12.1.1		ed	The specification uses the words "recognised", "recognize", "recognized" and "unrecognizable" inconsistently. recognised 7.4, 15.10.4.1 recognize 7.2, 7.2, 7.6 recognizes 4.2.2, 15.12.1.1 unrecognizable 15.9.4.2		Accepted All uses should use the British spelling ("s")
JP	9.8.1 11.6.3 9.8.1 11.9.6 15.7.4.5 15.7.4.6 15.7.4.7 B.2.2		ed	The specification uses the words "zeros" and "zeroes" inconsistently. zeros : 9.8.1, 11.6.3 zeroes: 9.8.1, 11.9.6, 15.7.4.5, 15.7.4.6, 15.7.4.7, B.2.2		Accepted Replace uses of "zeros" with "zeroes"
JP	15.7.4.2	*Paragraph 2*	ed	Is the word "generalization" OK? "generalisation"?		Accepted Replace "generalization"

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.