Voting Results on T10 Letter Ballot 00-023r0 on
Making PPR Pace_On bit reserved

```
Organization                     Name                 S Vote Add'l Info
-------------------------------- -------------------- - ---- ----------
Adaptec, Inc.                                         DNV
AMP / Tyco Electronics           charles brill        P Yes
Amphenol Interconnect            Bill Mable           P Yes
Berg Electronics                 Douglas Wagner       P Yes
BREA Technologies, Inc.          Bill Galloway        P Yes
Brocade Communications           Robert Snively       P Yes
CMD Technology                   Edward Haske         P Yes
Compaq Computer Corp.            Robert C Elliott     P Yes
Crossroads Systems, Inc.         Neil Wanamaker       P Abs   Cmnts
Dallas Semiconductor             Charles Tashbook     P Yes
Dell Computer                                         DNV
EMC                              Gary S Robinson      P Yes
ENDL                             Ralph O. Weber       P Yes   IV
Exabyte Corp.                    Mike Taylor          P Yes
Fujitsu                                               DNV
General Dynamics                 Nathan Hastad        P Yes
Genroco, Inc.                    Don Woelz            P Yes
Hewlett Packard Co.              steve jerman         P Yes
Hitachi Cable Manchester,Inc     Zane Daggett         P Yes
Honda Connectors                                      P Yes
IBM Corp.                        George Penokie       P YesC Cmnts
Iomega Corp.                     Tim Bradshaw         P Yes
KnowledgeTek, Inc.               Dennis P. Moore      P Yes
LSI Logic Corp.                  John Lohmeyer        P Yes
Madison Cable Corp.              Jie Fan              P Yes
Maxtor Corp.                     Pete McLean          P Abs   Cmnts
Molex Inc.                       Joe Dambach          P Yes
Ophidian Designs                 Ed Gardner           P Yes   IV
Panasonic Technologies, Inc      Han Zou              P Yes
Philips Electronics              Bill McFerrin        P Yes
QLogic Corp.                     Richard Moore        A Yes
Quantum Corp.                    Mark Evans           P YesC Cmnts
Seagate Technology               Gene Milligan        P YesC IV Cmnts
Storage Technology Corp.         Erich Oetting        P Yes
Sun Microsystems, Inc.           Vit NOvak            A Yes
Texas Instruments                Paul Aloisi          P Yes
The JPM Co.                      Bob Gannon           A Yes
Toshiba America Elec. Comp.      Tasuku Kasebayashi   P Yes
Woven Electronics                Doug Piper           P Yes
```

Ballot totals:
 34 Yes
  0 No
  2 Abstain
  3 Organization(s) did not vote
 39 Total voting organizations
  5 Ballot(s) included comments

This simple majority ballot passed.
34 Yes is more than 18 [(39 Orgs - 2 Abstain) / 2]

Key:
P   Voter indicated he/she is principal member
A   Voter indicated he/she is alternate member
O   Voter indicated he/she is observer member
?   Voter indicated he/she is not member or does not know status
YesC   Yes with comments vote
Abs   Abstain vote
DNV   Organization did not vote
IV   Individual vote (not organizational vote)
Cmnts   Comments were included with ballot
NoCmnts No comments were included with a vote that requires comments
DUP   Duplicate ballot (last ballot received from org. is counted)

PSWD   The password was not correct (vote not counted)
ORG?   Organization is not voting member of T10 (vote not counted)

****

Comments attached to Abs ballot from Neil Wanamaker of
Crossroads Systems, Inc.:

1) I have seen no compelling technical arguments in either direction.

2) This appears to be the wrong forum for deciding a technical issue.

3) I would not like to set a precedent that we have a Letter Ballot on each
disputed technical issue.

****

Comments attached to YesC ballot from George Penokie of
IBM Corp.:

The proposal 00-292r0 should replaced with 00-292r1 as 00-292r1 contains
additional deletions related to the pace_on bit that were not included in the
00-292r0 document.

****

Comments attached to Abs ballot from Pete McLean of
Maxtor Corp.:

1. Do not feel technically qualified to vote yes or no.

****

Comments attached to YesC ballot from Mark Evans of
Quantum Corp.:

I agree with the concept of making the PACE_ON bit in the PPR message be
obsolete. However, 00-292r0 (and 00-292r1 for that matter) are incomplete or
incorrect. The editor needs to carefully insure that all references to the
PACE_ON bit are deleted from SPI-4, and that there is a clear tie between a
transfer period factor less than or equal to eight and paced, DT, and IU
transfers ONLY. We are still voting yes on this ballot as we expect the SPI-4

editor will make the appropriate corrections to the draft standard.

****

Comments attached to YesC ballot from Gene Milligan of
Seagate Technology:

I am definitely opposed to this additional kamikaze packetized proposal.
Instead I am in favor of an evolutionary approach to packetized that preserves

the long successful strategy for SCSI of adding features for migration but not

precipitously chopping off the current implementations to force a premature,
for some customers or applications, migration to a new feature. Each in their
own time.

This is an entirely inappropriate issue to vote for on a letter ballot. Letter

ballots are excessively biased to passing whatever is stated. The reason for
this is that explanations of No votes are required while an explanation for a

Yes vote is not required. A gross bias. This thesis could have been easily tested by reversing the thrust of the question being voted.

While all letter ballots are grossly biased at least letter ballots on final actions have serious attention given to letter ballot comments (by courtesy to Yes comments and by more stringent procedure requirements for No comments).

In addition I find this vote on an inappropriate matter for a letter ballot to

be an unfortunate precedent on the question of what the Chair should do if petitioned to conduct an inappropriate letter ballot. To my recollection this is the first petition of any T9 or descendent T9 committee (T10-T13) to have occurred for a letter ballot. We have many times noted that the SD-2 defines how many members are required to petition the Chair for a letter ballot but the SD-2 does not define whether or not the chair has to comply with the petition. It is unfortunate that the first petition is for an inappropriate matter better handled by a meeting vote and a shame that such an inappropriate

petition is granted making an apparent precedent that even inappropriate petitions for letter ballots should be granted.

So with all this opposition to the question of the letter ballot why am I voting Yes? When the appropriate time comes to restore data group operations with Fast 160 to provide an evolutionary migration to higher performance packetized, I do not want to be prevented from making a motion to reverse this

inappropriate ballot by the technicality of Robert's Rules of Order.

******************** End of Ballot Report ********************