The paper N2687 proposes two changes to 6.5.1. Primary expressions, concerning paragraphs 2 and 3, which are the ones which define when an identifier is a primary expression. One of them consists in moving the footnote to the main text. The other one is the rewording of paragraph 2 because, according to the author, it implies that enumeration constants are not primary expressions. While the first proposal met agreement, the proposed wordings for the second one were disliked. In connection to this it was proposed to simply interchange the order of paragraphs 2 and 3.

I take the idea of interchanging the paragraphs’ order. Yet, I still think that paragraph 2, as it is written, implies that enumeration constants are not primary expressions. I therefore propose three separate polls, devising a new wording for the third one, different than the ones I had proposed in N2687.

**Straw polls:** Should the following changes be incorporated to 6.5.1. Primary expressions?:

I: To move the footnote to the main text:

   An identifier is a primary expression, provided it has been declared as designating an object (in which case it is an lvalue) or a function (in which case it is a function designator). **An undeclared identifier is a violation of the syntax.**

   *(And the footnote is removed)*

II: To interchange the order of paragraphs 2 and 3.

III: To modify the wording of current paragraph 2 as follows:

   An identifier which has been declared as designating an object or a function is a primary expression. In the first case it is an lvalue, in the second it is a function designator.