

This file contains the following:

- 1) P1003.26/D3 Comments and Resolutions
- 2) Outstanding Comments and Resolutions from Previous Drafts.

\*\*\*\*\*  
P1003.26/D3 Comments and Resolutions  
\*\*\*\*\*

18 ballot objections, comments, and editorial comments were received on P1003.26/D3.

The following table summarizes the resolutions. Complete text of each objection, comment, or editorial comment and its detailed resolution follows the table.

Number	Balloter's ID	Resolution
ERN #1	[josey-1]	Accept
ERN #2	[martin-1]	Accept
ERN #3	[JMG-1]	Accept
ERN #4	[prindle-1]	Accept
ERN #5	[dwc-1]	Accept
ERN #6	[dwc-2]	Accept
ERN #7	[JMG-2]	Accept
ERN #8	[dwc-3]	Accept as marked
ERN #9	[prindle-2]	Accept
ERN #10	[prindle-3]	Accept
ERN #11	[JMG-3]	Accept as marked
ERN #12	[dwc-4]	Accept as marked
ERN #13	[prindle-4]	Accept
ERN #14	[JMG-4]	Accept
ERN #15	[prindle-5]	Accept
ERN #16	[dwc-5]	Accept
ERN #17	[JMG-5]	Accept
ERN #18	[JMG-6]	Accept

---

OBJECTION Enhancement Request Number 1  
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 12)  
[josey-1]

---

Accept  Accept as marked below  Duplicate  Reject   
Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

---

Page: 0 Line: 0 Section: all

Problem:  
I am familiar with Donald W. Cragun 's Ballot and would object if these changes were not included in this standard.

Action:  
This objection can be resolved by resolving Donald W. Cragun's ballot.

---

OBJECTION Enhancement Request Number 2  
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 13)

[martin-1]

Accept X      Accept as marked below \_\_\_\_\_      Duplicate \_\_\_\_\_      Reject \_\_\_\_\_  
Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

Page: 0    Line: 0    Section: all

Problem:

I have reviewed and am familiar with the objections and comments included in the negative ballot submitted by Don Cragun, Sun Microsystems. I support those objections and comments.

Action:

Take the required actions as proposed in Don's ballot.

EDITORIAL      Enhancement Request Number 3  
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org      Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 6)  
[JMG-1]

Accept X      Accept as marked below \_\_\_\_\_      Duplicate \_\_\_\_\_      Reject \_\_\_\_\_  
Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

Page: 3    Line: 21-23    Section: 1.2.1.2

Problem:    The word "explicit" doesn't quite convey the intent.

Action: Replace "explicit" with "precise", or with the phrase "precise and explicit".

EDITORIAL      Enhancement Request Number 4  
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org      Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 14)  
[prindle-1]

Accept X      Accept as marked below \_\_\_\_\_      Duplicate \_\_\_\_\_      Reject \_\_\_\_\_  
Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

Page: 3    Line: 47    Section: 1.2.2.1

Problem:

The revision to this paragraph has slightly mangled the grammar.

Action:

Change "with the following constraints:" to "with the constraints that such an application:".

OBJECTION      Enhancement Request Number 5  
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org      Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 1)  
[dwc-1]

Accept  Accept as marked below \_\_\_\_\_ Duplicate \_\_\_\_\_ Reject \_\_\_\_\_  
Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

---

Page: 4,10,10,11,11,11 Line: 24,24,37,12,16,24 Section: 1.2.2.1,3.2

Problem:

(\_POSIX26 Symbols)

The POSIX.1 standard and text that you have on P11, L44-49 says that names starting with `posix_`, `POSIX_`, and `_POSIX_` are reserved for use by POSIX standards. According to the C standard and the POSIX.1 standard, all other names starting with `_POSIX` are reserved for implementation use (except for a few names starting with `_POSIX2` that are explicitly defined as reserved names in POSIX.1).

I'm also suggesting changing `_SC_POSIX26_VERSION` to `_SC_POSIX_26_VERSION` to match the change to `_POSIX26_VERSION` even though it doesn't violate the namespace requirements in the standards.

Action:

Change `"_POSIX26_C_SOURCE"` on P4, L24 to `"_POSIX_26_C_SOURCE"`.

Change `"_POSIX26_VERSION"` on P10, L24 to `"_POSIX_26_VERSION"`.

Change `"_POSIX26_C_SOURCE"` on P10, L37 to `"_POSIX_26_C_SOURCE"`.

Change `"_SC_POSIX26_VERSION"` on P11, L12 to `"_SC_POSIX_26_VERSION"`.

Change `"_POSIX26_VERSION"` on P11, L16 to `"_POSIX_26_VERSION"`.

Change `"_POSIX26_C_SOURCE"` on P11, L24 to `"_POSIX_26_C_SOURCE"`.

---

EDITORIAL Enhancement Request Number 6  
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 2)  
[dwc-2]

---

Accept  Accept as marked below \_\_\_\_\_ Duplicate \_\_\_\_\_ Reject \_\_\_\_\_  
Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

---

Page: 7 Line: 48 Section: 2.1

Problem:

(missing period)

There is no period at the end of the text for footnote 3.

Action:

Change "edition" on P7, L48 to "edition.".

---

EDITORIAL Enhancement Request Number 7  
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 7)  
[JMG-2]

---

Accept  Accept as marked below \_\_\_\_\_ Duplicate \_\_\_\_\_ Reject \_\_\_\_\_  
Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

---

Page: 9 Line: 35-37 Section: 3.1.1

Problem: The word "still" conveys the wrong impression.

Action: Delete the word "still".

---

EDITORIAL	Enhancement Request Number 8
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org	Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 3)
[dwc-3]	

---

Accept\_\_\_\_\_ Accept as marked below X Duplicate\_\_\_\_\_ Reject\_\_\_\_\_

Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

Some character special files (i.e., terminals) have a structure defined by POSIX.1. Therefore, we prefer the text suggested in ERN-9, below.

---

Page: 9 Line: 42 Section: 3.1.1

Problem:  
(extraneous word)  
The last sentence on P9 is not a proper English sentence.

Action:  
Change:

Character special files that have no structure defined by POSIX.1, but they can be accessed as defined in Section 5.

on P9, L42-43 to:

Character special files have no structure defined by POSIX.1, but they can be accessed as defined in Section 5.

or to:

Character special files are files that have no structure defined by POSIX.1, but they can be accessed as defined in Section 5.

---

EDITORIAL	Enhancement Request Number 9
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org	Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 15)
[prindle-2]	

---

Accept X\_\_\_\_\_ Accept as marked below \_\_\_\_\_ Duplicate\_\_\_\_\_ Reject\_\_\_\_\_

Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

---

Page: 9 Line: 43 Section: 3.1.1

Problem:  
The revision to this paragraph has slightly mangled the grammar.

Action:  
Change "POSIX.1, but they can be accessed" to "POSIX.1 can be accessed".

---

EDITORIAL	Enhancement Request Number 10
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org	Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 16)

[prindle-3]

---

Accept  Accept as marked below \_\_\_\_\_ Duplicate \_\_\_\_\_ Reject \_\_\_\_\_  
Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

---

Page: 14 Line: 26 Section: 4.2.1

Problem:  
This abbreviation is not used in this document.

Action:  
Remove the abbreviation.

---

EDITORIAL Enhancement Request Number 11  
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 8)  
[JMG-3]

---

Accept \_\_\_\_\_ Accept as marked below  Duplicate \_\_\_\_\_ Reject \_\_\_\_\_  
Rationale for rejected or partial changes:  
POSIX.13 is no longer referenced, so instead we will remove the abbreviation.

---

Page: 14 Line: 29-35 Section: 4.2.3

Problem: The editorial note says that if P1003.13R-200x isn't approved,  
all reference to 1003.13 will be removed. Is this so? There is always  
1003.13-1998.

Action: Change note to cover both possibilities, so we don't forget.

---

EDITORIAL Enhancement Request Number 12  
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 4)  
[dwc-4]

---

Accept \_\_\_\_\_ Accept as marked below  Duplicate \_\_\_\_\_ Reject \_\_\_\_\_  
Rationale for rejected or partial changes:  
POSIX.13 is no longer referenced, so instead we will remove the abbreviation.

---

Page: 14 Line: 31 Section: 4.2.3

Problem:  
(missing period)  
The definition of the POSIX.13 abbreviation doesn't have a terminating  
period.

Action:  
Change "(AEP)" on P14, L31 to "(AEP).".

---

EDITORIAL Enhancement Request Number 13  
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 17)

[prindle-4]

---

Accept  Accept as marked below \_\_\_\_\_ Duplicate \_\_\_\_\_ Reject \_\_\_\_\_  
Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

---

Page: 14 Line: 35 Section: 4.2.3

Problem:  
This abbreviation is not used in this document.

Action:  
Remove the abbreviation.

---

EDITORIAL Enhancement Request Number 14  
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 9)  
[JMG-4]

---

Accept  Accept as marked below \_\_\_\_\_ Duplicate \_\_\_\_\_ Reject \_\_\_\_\_  
Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

---

Page: 19 Line: 27-28 Section: A.1

Problem: Reference B3 points to 1003.13-1998, which is in the process of being revised.

Action: Add an editorial note saying that the reference will be updated if P1003.13R-200x is approved in time, so we don't forget.

---

EDITORIAL Enhancement Request Number 15  
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 18)  
[prindle-5]

---

Accept  Accept as marked below \_\_\_\_\_ Duplicate \_\_\_\_\_ Reject \_\_\_\_\_  
Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

---

Page: 19 Line: 27 Section: A.1

Problem:  
This bibliographic entry should reference the revision if revision is approved by the time .26 is approved, since the revision will supercede the '98 version.

Action:  
Add the note:  
Editor's Note: This note will not appear in the final standard. If the IEEE 1003.13 Revision is approved at the time of approval of this standard, the above bibliographic entry will be changed to point to the revised standard.

---

COMMENT Enhancement Request Number 16  
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 5)

[dwc-5]

Accept  Accept as marked below \_\_\_\_\_ Duplicate \_\_\_\_\_ Reject \_\_\_\_\_  
Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

Page: 22 Line: 4-5 Section: B.1

Problem:  
(strange document reference)  
The reference on P22, L4-5 to X/Open UNIX is strange. Although "X/Open UNIX" is a marking at the top of some pages in The Single UNIX Specification indicating that the material on that page is required for systems that claim X/Open UNIX Conformance, it is not the name of the document that defined ioctl(). Furthermore, the document that did define ioctl() is not listed in Appendix A.

Action:  
Add a new entry in section A.2 after P20, L9:  
{B11} X/Open CAE Specification System Interfaces and Headers, Issue 4, Version 2. X/Open Company Ltd, September 1994. UK ISBN: 1-85912-037-3.

Change:  
in their X/Open UNIX,  
on P22, L4-5 to:  
in the X/Open System Interfaces and Headers, Issue 4, Version 2 {B11},

EDITORIAL Enhancement Request Number 17  
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 10)  
[JMG-5]

Accept  Accept as marked below \_\_\_\_\_ Duplicate \_\_\_\_\_ Reject \_\_\_\_\_  
Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

Page: 22 Line: 41 Section: B.3

Problem: "Rationale" is the title of the volume, not just a description, but this isn't typographically clear.  
Action: Change "Rationale" to an italics font.

EDITORIAL Enhancement Request Number 18  
pasc-sswg-rt-core@pasc.org Bugs in 1003.26d3 (rdvk# 11)  
[JMG-6]

Accept  Accept as marked below \_\_\_\_\_ Duplicate \_\_\_\_\_ Reject \_\_\_\_\_  
Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

Page: 24 Line: 1 Section: B.4

Problem: Stray word "to" in "posix\_devctl() and to ioctl()".

Action: Delete "to", so it reads "posix\_devctl() and ioctl()".

\*\*\*\*\*  
Outstanding Comments and Resolutions from Previous Drafts  
\*\*\*\*\*

There was one balloter who voted negative on P1003.26/D2.1 and who did not submit a new ballot on P1003.26/D3. For completeness, his two comments are given below, although they have already been distributed to balloters via the Draft 3 recirulation ballot.

---

COMMENT Enhancement Request Number 26  
Steve Schwarm Bug in 1003.26 D2.1 (rdvk# 5)  
[schwarm-1]

---

Accept\_\_\_\_\_ Accept as marked below\_\_X\_\_ Duplicate\_\_\_\_\_ Reject\_\_\_\_\_

Rationale for rejected or partial changes:  
Also, SSWG-RT will replace 'A "special device" is' with 'In this standard, a "special device" is'. The same term is used in .13 with a slightly different meaning.

SSWG-RT will use an improved (and more precise) wording for the action, i.e.:  
Add the sentences:  
The driver for a "special device" may respond to the write() function to transfer data to the device or the read() function to collect information from the device. The interpretation of the information is still implementation defined.

Status: done.

---

Page: 9 Line: 43 Section: 3.2.1

Problem:  
A special device may still use read and/or write for data transfer but that is not clear from this description

Action:  
Add the sentence:  
A "special device" may use the write() function to transfer data to the device or the read() function to collect information from the device.  
The interpretation of the information is still implimentation defined.

---

COMMENT Enhancement Request Number 42  
Steve Schwarm Bug in 1003.26 D2.1 (rdvk# 6)  
[schwarm-2]

---

Accept\_\_\_\_\_ Accept as marked below\_\_\_\_\_ Duplicate\_\_\_\_\_ Reject\_\_X\_\_

Rationale for rejected or partial changes:

In many hardware architectures, an integral number of whole pages of data would need to be transferred to the driver. This will in general be more than nbytes of data, but this in no way gives permission to the driver to move more than nbytes of data from memory to the device.

---

Page: 15 Line: 45 Section: 5.1.1.2

Problem:

the phrase "at least nbyte bytes" is incorrect. The device should not read past the location `dev_data_ptr + (nbyte-1)`. This would implies that it is ok for the device to do so.

Action:

replace "at least nbyte bytes" with "no more than nbyte bytes"

---