

ENDL  
14426 Black Walnut Court  
Saratoga CA 95070



February 12th, 1992

Dear Dal

I'd appreciate it if you would submit this letter to the x3t9.2 committee and incorporate into the records of the next committee meeting.

As Microsoft's representative to cam/x3t9.2 I'd like to express Microsoft's concerns with respect to Microsoft's operating system platforms and the XPT/SIM document.

As the committee is undoubtedly aware, Microsoft, in conjunction with several industry players, has developed a device driver layering model different from that specified by the XPT/SIM document. While Microsoft does not wish to engage in public criticism of the XPT/SIM model, neither does it intend to use the XPT/SIM model - Microsoft believes that its own layering model is more appropriate for its own operating systems.

This leads to Microsoft's two main concerns:

1. That the XPT/SIM document may fail to clearly indicate that:
  - a. It is offered as an *alternative* to existing de facto standards
  - b. It is intended to be used where no de facto standard exists
  - c. Existing de facto standards are to continue to be used indefinitely unless their 'owner' withdraws them.
2. That wording used in the XPT/SIM document may have marketing overtones that cannot be ignored.

The following is an example of wordings which would be a problem:

"The SIM/XPT model is used (*or 'as used'*) by standard (*or 'industry standard'*) operating systems (*or 'operating environments', or 'network operating systems' or 'network operating environments'*) . . ."

I understand the extremely difficult task of specifying that slightly different flavors of XPT/SIM are intended for use by UNIX, Netware, and Apple given that it is not permitted to use trade names in the standard, but I urge the committee to find some wording that would allow Microsoft to continue to take a neutral position with respect to this proposed standard.

Sincerely yours

Andy Crick, Microsoft Corporation