### Wording in Conformance definitions

These are some suggestions for improving the wording of some of
the text in Chapter 1 touching upon conformance issues.

About the definitions of implementation-defined, unspecified, and
undefined behaviour in 1.3:

   These terms are explained in more detail in 1.8, so the definitions
   in 1.3 should have references to 1.8.

   The mention of correct/erroneous programs and data in these
   definitions is confusing.  There seems to an assertion here
   that programs with implementation-defined or unspecified behavior
   are "correct" in some sense, but it is not clear what sense is
   intended.

   Since there are better definitions of these terms in 1.8,
   I suggest simply removing the references to correct and
   erroneous programs?

   The examples in the definition of "undefined behavior" are a bit
   confusing.  The juxtaposition of "behaving ... in a documented
   manner (with or without ... a diagnostic ...)" and "terminating
   ... execution (with ... a diagnostic ...)" suggests that, if the
   program is terminated, there must be a diagnostic.  Producing
   a diagnostic is certainly a good idea, but should not be required.
   I suggest added "or without" to the last parenthesized phrase.

If we apply all the above suggestions, then these three definitions
would become:

   -- implementation-defined behaviour:  Behaviour that depends on
      the implementation and that each implementation shall document
      (1.8).  The range of possible behaviours is delimited by the
      standard.

   -- undefined behaviour:  Behaviour for which the standard imposes
      no requirements (1.8).  Permissible undefined behaviour ranges
      from ignoring the situation completely with unpredictable
      results, to behaving during translation or program execution
      in a documented manner characteristic of the environment
      (with or without the issuance of a diagnostic message), to
      terminating a translation or execution (with or without the
      issuance of a diagnostic message).

   -- unspecified behaviour:  Behaviour that depends on the
      implementation.  The implementation is not required to
      document which behaviour occurs (1.8).

The definition of unspecified behaviour in 1.3 says "usually the
range of possible behaviours is delineated by the standard."
1.8p3 says "In each case ...".  These two sections should agree

on whether it is "usually" or "always".  Unless we are confident
that the standard does (or will) document the possibilities in
every case, I suggest changing "In each case" in 1.8p3 to
"In most cases".


The term "diagnosable errors" is used in 1.7p2, but not defined.
Perhaps we could change the end of 1.7p1 to

    ... that contains a diagnosable error, except as noted in this
    International Standard.  A diagnosable error is a violation
    of any diagnosable semantic rule or of any syntax rule.