## Results of X3T9 Letter Ballot to forward SCSI-2 CAM as a dpANS

This thirty day Letter Ballot opened on 7 September 1991 and closed on 11 October 1991. For this Letter Ballot there were 25 members. Therefore the minimum majority *two-thirds* voting requirement is 17 votes. Minimum yes vote requirements for the 23 votes received is 12 voting yes.

The voting result was 23 yes, 0 no, and 2 no response, therefore the Letter Ballot passed. There was one comment accompanying the yes vote of NIST.

Note that NCR did not vote as they became part of AT&T during the Letter Ballot period.

## Results were as follows:

X3T9 Company/Voted by	SCSI .
AMD/Shah	yes
AMP/Brill	yes
AT&T/Knerr	yes
BOEING/Rigsbee	yes
DIGITAL/Shoemaker	yes
FIBRONICS/Cooper	no response
FUJITSU/Pandanda	yes
HP/Strohl	yes
HUGHES/Myers	yes
IBM/Zeitler	yes
LANL/Tolmie	yes
LBL/Fink	yes
LLNL/Michael	yes
MAXTOR/Lamers	yes
MOTOROLA/Miller	yes
NCR/Lohmeyer	no response
NETWORK SYSTEMS/Stone	yes
NIST/Burr	yes/comment
SEAGATE/Milligan (individual vote)	yes
SIEMENS/van Doorn	yes
STANATEK/Hamstra	yes
STORAGETEK/Cummings	yes
SYNERNETICS/McClure	yes
SYNOPTICS/Vogt	yes
UNISYS/Ross	<u>yes</u>
totals (yes-no-no response)	23,0,2

W. E. Burr 24 September 1991

## Bill Burr Comment on SCSI-2 CAM LB

accumpanying the YES vote

I am troubled by clause 7, which is based on three specific at least somewhat proprietary commercial operating systems: Novell Netware, UNIX and DOS. I call attention to Clause 7.2 of the Style manual for preparation of proposed American National Standards, Eighth Edition, Version 1.0, dated 3/1/91, which states:

References to commercial equipment in a standard shall be generic and shall not include trademarks or other proprietary designations. Where a sole source exists for essential equipment or materials, it is permissible to supply the name and address of the source in a footnote, so long as the words "or the equivalent," are added to the reference.

The trade name UNIX is still, as I understand it, a trademark owned by AT&T and can only be applied under license from AT&T. We can't use "POSIX" here, because it deals only with the application interface and does not cover the I/O driver. I believe that it is intended to provide a POSIX interface on top of internally "non-UNIX" operating systems.

Similarly "Novell" is the name of a company, and "Novell Netware 386" is the name of a product of that company. Surely "Netware" and "Netware 386" are trademarks. Although widely licensed, "Netware" is still a proprietary trade name, and not even as widely emulated as UNIX (that is, there are, as far as I know, no "Netware clones." as there are "UNIX clones").

"DOS" may be unobjectionable. DOS may not even be a trade name, although "MS-DOS" (Tm Microsoft Corp.) surely is. If clause 7.3 applies to DR-DOS (Tm Digital Research, Inc.) then there are completely independent implementations. If 7.3 does apply to DR-DOS as well as MS-DOS and PC-DOS (Tm IBM Corp.), then I think that the term DOS may be generic and well understood enough to stand by itself without further explanation or qualification.

I have raised an problem for which I should attempt to provide a solution. The best idea that occurs to me is to use suitably bland, reasonably descriptive substitutes for UNIX and Netware with explanatory footnotes. I suggest something like "Timesharing OS" (TOS?) and "Network Server OS" (NSOS). Perhaps some amplification of the terminology is needed to cover the various flavors of Netware (2.x, 3.x, 386, portable or whatever) and UNIX.

I don't believe that there is any point to providing an address in the footnote. There are many dealers, knowing where to get UNIX or Netware is not a problem and you don't normally get UNIX directly from AT&T or Netware directly from Novell.

<sup>1.</sup> UNIX (Tm AT&T) System V or any equivalent operating system which maintains the same interface for I/O drivers

Novell Netware (Tm Novell, Inc.)or any equivalent operating system which maintains the same I/O driver interface.