PLENARY MESSAGE TO THE SPI-4 AD HOC

- **AFTER SEVERAL MONTHS OF INTENSE AND SIGNIFICANTLY DIVISIVE DEBATE AND INTERACTION THE SPI-4 AD HOC ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2000 BY A VOTE OF 5 TO 4 TO 5 APPROVED A RECOMMENDATION TO HAVE A PROPOSAL FOR SIGNALING PARAMETERS AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS INCORPORATED INTO SPI-4**

- **THIS RECOMMENDATION SHOULD BE SOUNDLY REJECTED BY THE SCSI PLENARY AS NOT BEING IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF SCSI AS DETAILED IN THE FOLLOWING SLIDES**

PLENARY MESSAGE TO THE SPI-4 AD HOC

- THE PROPOSAL CONTAINS PROVISION FOR AT LEAST SIX VARIANTS WHICH ARE NOT INTEROPERABLE (SEE NEXT SLIDE)

- THE EXPLOSION OF VARIANTS IS MOSTLY A DIRECT RESULT OF ACTIVE DEVICE COMPONENT SUPPLIERS ATTEMPTING TO PRESERVE THEIR FAVORITE METHODOLOGY FOR THE SILICON INTERFACE DESIGN (PRECOMP VS AAF)

- THE NEEDS OF PASSIVE AND ACTIVE INTERCONNECT COMPONENTS HAVE BEEN MOSTLY IGNORED IN THIS PROCESS AND AS A RESULT THERE IS NO SINGLE SPECIFICATION FOR THE REQUIREMENTS ON INTERCONNECT AND NO EFFECTIVE WAY TO EVALUATE THE SIGNALS IN SOME CASES

PLENARY MESSAGE TO THE SPI-4 AD HOC

- **THE SIX PROPOSED VARIANTS ARE AS FOLLOWS:**
  - **HIGH LAUNCH SIGNAL LOW LOSS INTERCONNECT**
  - **HIGH LAUNCH SIGNAL NORMAL LOSS INTERCONNECT**
  - **HIGH LAUNCH SIGNAL HIGH LOSS INTERCONNECT**
  - **LOW LAUNCH SIGNAL LOW LOSS INTERCONNECT**
  - **LOW LAUNCH SIGNAL NORMAL LOSS INTERCONNECT**
  - **LOW LAUNCH SIGNAL HIGH LOSS INTERCONNECT**
- **NO PROVISION IS MADE ON HOW TO DETERMINE WHICH VARIANT IS APPLICABLE**
  - **NO MECHANISM TO SWITCH BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW LAUNCH**
  - **NO MECHANISM TO DETERMINE WHICH LOSS REGIME APPLIES**

PLENARY MESSAGE TO THE SPI-4 AD HOC

- **THE PRESENT PROPOSAL GUARANTEES CONFUSION IN THE MARKET PLACE AND IS ALMOST THE ANTITHESIS OF WHAT AN OPEN INTEROPERABLE TECHNOLOGY SHOULD ENBRACE**

- **ENEMIES OF SCSI SHOULD BE DELIGHTED THAT SCSI IS CONSIDERING HEXFURCATING ITS FORMALLY RELATIVELY SIMPLE AND UNDERSTANDABLE REQUIREMENTS**

- **WHEN SSA AND FC WERE BATTLING A FEW YEARS AGO, SCSI WAS THE MAIN BENEFICIARY -- NOW SCSI IS CONSIDERING DOING THE SAME THING FOR ATA, FC, IB, AND GBE**

PLENARY MESSAGE TO THE SPI-4 AD HOC

- **THE TIME URGENCY FOR SPI-4 CLAIMED BY SOME FOLKS SEEMS TO NOT RESULT FROM MARKET PULL FOR RAPID AVAILABILITY FOR ULTRA320 BUT RATHER FROM A DESIRE AMONGST ACTIVE COMPONENT SUPPLIERS TO NOT BE BEAT TO MARKET AND TO NOT BE DEFINED OUT OF THE STANDARD**

- **WHILE THESE PRESSURES ARE REAL FOR THESE SUPPLIERS, THE PRICE FOR YIELDING AND EFFECTIVELY ABDICATING THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SCSI STANDARDS BODY TO PRODUCE A SIMPLE, INTEROPERABLE STANDARD IS TOO HIGH**

- **THE SCSI PLENARY SHOULD GIVE A STRONG MESSAGE TO THE SPI-4 AD HOC TO DELIVER A PROPOSAL THAT HAS THE FOLLOWING FEATURES:**
    - **A SINGLE SET OF REQUIREMENTS ON THE SIGNALS INDEPENDENT OF THE LOSS ENVIRONMENT**
    - **A SINGLE SET OF REQUIREMENTS ON THE LAUNCHED SIGNAL LEVEL**
    - **A SINGLE SET OF REQUIREMENTS ON THE INTERCONNECT THAT ARE ENFORCEABLE BY PRACTICAL MEASUREMENTS**

- **AS ALWAYS, CLOSED, ENGINEERED SOLUTIONS THAT USE OTHER PROPERTIES ARE NOT PRECLUDED BY THIS APPROACH**

- **THIS DIRECTIVE MAY PRODUCE SOME NEAR TERM "LOSERS" BUT WILL NOT DAMAGE SCSI AS A TECHNOLOGY -- THE TIME IT TAKES TO PRODUCE THE NEW PROPOSAL WILL BE WELL SPENT**

- **FAILING THIS APPROACH, THE MARKET WILL PRODUCE THE SAME LOSERS AND WILL DRAG THE REST OF SCSI DOWN AS WELL**