Voting Results on T10 Letter Ballot 01-183r0 on
Forwarding SST to first public review

Organization	Name	S	Vote	Add'l Info
Adaptec, Inc.	Ron Roberts	P	Yes	
Amphenol Interconnect	Michael Wingard	A	Yes	
Ancot Corp.	Bart Raudebaugh	P	Yes	
Andiamo Systems, Inc.	Claudio DeSanti	P	Yes	
BREA Technologies, Inc.	Bill Galloway	P	Abs	Cmnts
Brocade Comm. Systems, Inc.	Robert Snively	P	YesC	Cmnts
Circuit Assembly Corp.	Dennis Lang	A	Yes	
Cisco Systems, Inc.	David Peterson	P	Yes	
CMD Technology			DNV	
Compaq Computer Corp.	Robert C. Elliott	P	YesC	Cmnts
Congruent Software, Inc.	Peter Johansson	P	Abs	Cmnts
Crossroads Systems, Inc.	John Tyndall	A	Yes	
Dallas Semiconductor	Charles Tashbook	P	Yes	
Dell Computer Corp.	Kevin Marks	A	Yes	
EMC	Gary S. Robinson	P	Yes	
Emulex	Robert H. Nixon	P	Abs	Cmnts
ENDL Texas			DNV	
Exabyte Corp.			DNV	
FCI	Douglas Wagner	P	Yes	
Fujitsu	Eugene Lew	P	Yes	
General Dynamics	Tim Mackley	A	Yes	
Genroco, Inc.	Donald Woelz	P	Yes	
Hewlett Packard Co.			DNV	
Hitachi Cable Manchester	Zane Daggett	P	Yes	
Honda Connectors	Thomas J. Kulesza	P	Yes	
IBM / Tivoli Systems	George O. Penokie	P	No	Cmnts
Intel Corp.	Cris Simpson	P	Yes	
Iomega Corp.	Tim Bradshaw	P	Yes	
KnowledgeTek, Inc.	Dennis Moore	P	Yes	
LSI Logic Corp.	John Lohmeyer	P	Yes	
Maxtor Corp.	Mark Evans	P	Yes	
Microsoft Corp.	Emily Hill	A	Abs	Cmnts
Molex Inc.	Jay Neer	P	Yes	
Nishan Systems Inc.	Charles Monia	P	Yes	
Ophidian Designs			DNV	
Panasonic Technologies, Inc	Terence J. Nelson	P	Yes	
Philips Electronics/CD Edge	William P. McFerrin	P	Yes	
QLogic Corp.	Skip Jones	P	Yes	
Quantum Corp.	Patrick McGarrah	A	Yes	
Seagate Technology	Gerald Houlder	P	Yes	
Storage Technology Corp.	Erich Oetting	P	Yes	
Sun Microsystems, Inc.	Kenneth Moe	P	Yes	
Texas Instruments	Paul D. Aloisi	P	YesC	Cmnts
Toshiba America Elec. Comp.			DNV	
Troika Networks, Inc.	Rick Casaly	A	Yes	
TycoElectronics			DNV	
Woven Electronics			DNV	

Ballot totals:
 34 Yes
  1 No
  4 Abstain
  8 Organization(s) did not vote
 47 Total voting organizations
  8 Ballot(s) included comments

This 2/3rds majority ballot passed.
34 Yes is at least a majority of the membership [greater than 23] AND
34 Yes is at least 24 (2/3rds of those voting, excluding abstentions [35])

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
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 Mr. Bill Galloway of
BREA Technologies, Inc.:

I did not participate in any work on this document.

****

Comments attached to YesC ballot from Mr. Robert Snively of
Brocade Comm. Systems, Inc.:

From: Bob Snively
              Brocade Communications
              408-487-8135
              rsnively@brocade.com

Date: July 5, 2001

Subject: Comments on SST, Revision 08B

This document lies outside the areas of primary interest
of Brocade Communication Systems and therefore has not
been completely reviewed. A partial review has identified
the following comments. A more detailed review would
focus on the mappings to ST and the error recovery procedures,
but has not been done.

1) T10 editorial conventions required (editorial)

  All sections:

  Proper T10 formatting requires a series of appropriate
  editorial conventions to be followed. These include,
  but are not restricted to:

  Correction of the word "which". In most cases, the
  word should either be deleted, replaced with that,
  or the sentence should be rewritten.

  Hanging paragraphs should be removed. See 5.2 as
  an example.

2) Variable length and bi-directional CDBs (technical)

  We chose to support these in FCP-2. Do we
  want to do so in SST?

****

Comments attached to YesC ballot from Mr. Robert C. Elliott of
Compaq Computer Corp.:

CPQ 1 Section 5.3.5
This section refers to COPY, which is obsolete. Upgrade this reference to
EXTENDED COPY.

CPQ 2 Section 5.3.5
This section refers to a "64-bit field." This length restriction is present in
all third-party commands (like EXTENDED COPY). Replace "specify a 64-bit field"
with "specify a field".

(reference)
5.3.5 Third-party SCSI commands
Certain third-party SCSI commands and parameters specify a 64-bit field that is
defined to access other SCSI devices addressable from that port. These commands
include COPY, RESERVE, and several others.
The ST protocol does not specify a specific address format. However, ST is
usually run on an LLP that does specify an address format. Therefore, the
address formats for third-party SCSI commands in the SST protocol are a function
of the LLP address format. Address formats are beyond the scope of this
standard.

CPQ 3 Section 5.4,
In Table 2, Make LOGICAL UNIT RESET lowercase in the SST column to match the
others.

CPQ 4 Global
Don't use TM as an acronym for "task management" since it more commonly means
"trademark". There are only about 13 uses of it, so spelling out the phrase is
not onerous.

CPQ 5 Section 2 and Global
Replace "(see ANSI X3.270)" with "(see SAM)" or "(see SAM-2)".
Replace "(see ANSI NCITS.337-2000)" with "(see ST)".
Remove the approved reference SCSI-2. It is not referenced anywhere.

CPQ 6 Global
All "hanging paragraphs" need to be removed to meet ISO style rules. Any
section that has a subsection is not supposed to contain text itself. Change:
2 section name
< hanging paragraph text>
2.1 subsection A

to:
2 section name
2.1 overview (or introduction)
<hanging paragraph text>
2.2 subsection A

These sections are afflicted:
2, 3.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.4.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.2.5, 6.3, 6.4, A, B

CPQ 7 Global
The PDF logical page number starts with page 2
Set logical page number 1 to match printed page 1 with the Document:Number
Pages command in Acrobat.
PDF page 12 (11 of 51) has a printed page number of ii. It should be xii. The
next page iii should be xiii. The next page is entirely blank, which may be a
problem.
Printed page 1 lacks a page number.
Delete blank last page

CPQ 8 Preliminary pages (iii/iv/vi/etc)
Update George Penokie's information (now Tivoli).
Remove page iv (comments on rev 8b)
Change 2000 to 2001 in copyright notice on page vi
Remove NCITS member list
Update T10 member list
Add annexes to the Introduction page
Table of Contents references to page 19 are inconsistently formatted

CPQ 9 Section 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.3, 6.1
broken cross-references: "as described in 0"

CPQ 10 Section A.4
Cross references like "Table 1 lists" should be "Table A.1 lists"

CPQ 11 Sections 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.3
Text references introducing Figures 3, 4, and 5 are needed.

CPQ 12 Sections 6.1.1, 6.2, 6.2.6, 6.4, B
Figure 6 should be a Table
Figure 8 should be a Table
Figure 10 should be a Table. The Byte numbers don't line up with the contents.
The Bytes intended to be labeled 16-19 and 20-23 are really variable based on
RSP_LEN. The caption uses a normal dash instead of an emdash like the other
figures.
Figure 13 should be a Table.
Figures 6, 8, 10, 13 should probably be drawn with one byte per row so the byte
order is clear.
Captions for figures B.1, B.2, B.3 don't have emdashes like the others.
Label the MSB and LSB of multibyte quantities where it matters (e.g. size
fields, but not CDB field). Add those to the acronym list.
You may also want to convert figures 7, 9, and 11 to tables to use the same
format.

CPQ 13 Sections 3.2, 5.4.1.1, 5.4.1.2, 5.4.1.3
Add these rules to 3.2 (take from SPI-4):
"An alphanumeric list (e.g., a,b,c or A,B,C) of items indicate the items in the
list are unordered.
A numeric list (e.g., 1,2,3) of items indicate the items in the list are
ordered (i.e., item 1 must occur or complete before item 2)."

and format the lists in 5.4.1.x accordingly.

There are quite a few lists introduced with dashes that should probably use a)
b) format.

CPQ 14 Sections 5.3.1, 5.3.4, 7.1
5.3.1 Change which to that: "operation which initiated the task"
5.3.4 "operation which signifies"
7.1 "remain outstanding which could" (twice)

CPQ 15 Global
SAM-2 dictates that "Each SCSI protocol specification shall describe a
mechanism for Asynchronous Event Reporting."   This is missing from SST.

CPQ 16 Global
Are any of the Disconnect-reconnect mode page parameters
supported/required/prohibited for SST devices? Most protocol standards define
that page, the Logical Unit control mode page, and the Port control mode page,
even if they are not used.

CPQ 17 Sections 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.3, 6.3.6
5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.3 Change "the SCSI REQUEST SENSE information" with "the SCSI
sense data"
6.3.6 Replace "The SNS_INFO field contains the information specified by ANSI
X3.270 for presentation by the REQUEST SENSE command" with "The SNS_INFO field
contains the sense data specified by SAM-2"

CPQ 18 Annex B
In Figures B.1 and B.2, some of the text is truncated in the figures (e.g. "CTS
Send" and "End")

CPQ 19 Section 3.1.17
add (ST) after "Scheduled Transfer"

CPQ 20 Section 6.1
In Table 3, change 0h to 0000h and 1h to 0001h since the field holding these
values is 16 bits wide.

CPQ 21 Annex A
MB is defined as 10^6. Earlier versions of SST defined it as 2^20. Is the
current definition correct for Table A.3's STU Size maximum, block size maximum,
and buffer size maximum rows?

4

The STU size minimum, block size minimum, and buffer size minimum rows should
add units of "bytes".

****

Comments attached to Abs ballot from Mr. Peter Johansson of
Congruent Software, Inc.:

My abstention is because of lack of technical expertise in the subject area.

****

Comments attached to Abs ballot from Mr. Robert H. Nixon of
Emulex:

Emulex-001: Neither I nor others at my company are technically prepared to
take a position on this question.

****

Comments attached to No ballot from Mr. George O. Penokie of
IBM / Tivoli Systems:

Date: July 10, 2001
To: T10 Committee (SCSI)
From: George Penokie (IBM)
Subject: Comments on SST Letter Ballot
General
There following are comments.
Comment number: Company and person
E/T for Editorial/Technical
Physical Page
Location of comment on page
Comment/Recommendation

1: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page iii
Section 'Comments on Rev 06'
This entire section needs to be removed before this can be forwarded.

2: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page many
Section many
Unordered list should be a,b,c. Change all unordered lists in this standard to
the following a,b,c format:
Text before list:
a) entry one;
b) entry two;
c) second to last; and/or
d) last one.

3: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
page 1
section 2.1
The should not be a reference to both SAM and SAM-2. You should only reference
one and I suggest that
be SAM-2.

4: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 1
section 2

The text between section 2 and section 2.1 is a hanging section. This needs to
be fixed here are anywhere
else there is a hanging paragraph.

5: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 1.There is no page 1 number at the bottom of the page.

6: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 1-2
Section 2
The ISO references to standards should be used in all cases.

7: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 2
section 3.1.6
The 'which' should be changed into a 'that'. The standard should be searched
for 'which's' and, in most cases,
those 'which's' should be changed to 'that's'.

8: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 3
section 3.1.8
The 'note' needs to be listed as a separate paragraph with the note being
numbered and the font changed
to 9 point. This needs to be made so in all cases.

9: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 3
Section 3.1.8
All references to SAM should be changed to SAM-2.

10: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 3
Section 3.1.11
The e.g., should be in the form (e.g., ...). This needs to be the case in all
cases when examples are used.

11: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 3
Section 3.1.13
The capitalization in this standard is excessive. In most cases the words that
are capitalized should not be.
For example the term 'Data' in this section should not be capitalized. I
recommend removed the capital letter
from all words.

12: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 3
Section 3.1.14
The term 'Op' is in quotes. The quotes need to be removed. All field names
should be put into small caps
to indicate a field name.

13: Tivoli comment from George Penokie.E
Page 3
Section 3.1.17
All references to standards in the body of the standard (beyond section 2)
should be listed by name not number.
For example SAM-2, SPC-2.

14: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
T

Page 4
Section 3.1.21
The term 'end device' is not defined. This needs to be fixed.

15: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 4
Section 3.1.19
The term 'etc' should never be used at the end of an e.g list.
Page 19

16: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 5
Section 3.1.30
The term 'could' should not be used as it is a form of can. The statement
should be change to 'A ULP may
be implemented in hardware or software, or may be distributed between the
two.'.

17: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 7
Section 4.1 - 1st paragraph
The statement 'SST layers only on ST.' in not a complete sentence and makes no
sense. This needs to be
fixed.

18: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 8
Section 5.1
The '='s needs to be replaced with 'is set to'. This needs to be changed in
most cases.

19: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 8
Section 5.1 - 4th paragraph
The last sentence should be changed to 'ST Data Channel flag bits shall be set
to reflect (?).' I don't know
what the 'this' is referring to in this sentence.

20: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 8
Section 5.1 - 5th paragraph.The sentence should be 'Instead, entire tasks are
retried as described in 7.4.'.

21: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 8
Section 5.1 - last paragraph
The term 'big-endian ordering' is not defined anywhere in this document. This
needs to be fixed or the sentence
deleted.

22: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 8
Section 5.2 (the hanging paragraph)
The note needs to be made into a note using the correct format for notes.

23: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 9
Figure 2 and others
The italicized text needs to be change to non-italicized text.

24: Tivoli comment from George Penokie

E
Page 9
Section 5.2.1 - 1st paragraph
The term 'well known port' is not defined anywhere. This needs to be fixed.

25: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 9
Section 5.2.1 - 2nd paragraph
The statement 'If the SSTVC Responder is willing to accept the SSTVC, it shall
respond...' should be
changed to 'If the SSTVC Responder supports SSTVC, it shall respond...'

26: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 9
Section 5.2.1 - 4th paragraph
The statement 'If the SSTVC parameters are unacceptable to the SSTVC
Responder,...' should be 'If the
SSTVC parameters are not supported by the SSTVC Responder,...' There are other
cases of the items 'un-acceptable'
and 'acceptable' being used. These terms are unacceptable and need to be
replaced with 'not
supported by' and 'supported by' in most cases.

27: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 10
Section 5.2.1
The term 'can' and 'cannot' need to be removed this standard in all cases.
Start here.

28: Tivoli comment from George Penokie.E
Page 10
Section 5.2.2 - 1st sentence
The first sentence needs to be moved so it is right above the list.

29: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 10
Section 5.2.2 - 1st paragraph
The sentence 'The exact duration of the timer is implementation specific.'
should be 'The duration of the timer
is not specified by this standard.

30: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 10
Section 5.3 - hanging section note.The note makes no sense. Are you trying to
state:
'Note xx: Linked SCSI commands are processed serially.'

31: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 11
Section 5.3 - 1st paragraph after note
The statement 'in the following clauses' is not a clear reference. At best you
should point to the actual sub-clauses
or at least change to 'following subclauses or this subclause.'.

32: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
T
Page 11
Section 5.3 - 2nd paragraph after note
The term 'will' needs to be remove from this standard in all cases. In this
case the 'will' should be a 'shall'.

33: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 11

Section 5.3 - 2nd paragraph after note
The statement 'the manner described above' is not a clear reference. This
needs to fixed.

34: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
T
Page 11
Section 5.3 - 2nd to last paragraph
The Note contains a requirement (i.e., a shall). Notes cannot contain
requirements this needs to fixed. If this
is a requirement it should part of the main line text not a note.

35: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 11
Figure 3
There is no reference to this figure. All figures and tables needs to be
referenced from the text.

36: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 12
Section 5.3.1 - 1st paragraph after figure 3
The statement 'as described below' is not a clear reference. This needs to
fixed.

37: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 12
Figure 4
There is no reference to this figure. All figures and tables needs to be
referenced from the text.

38: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 14
Figure 5
There is no reference to this figure. All figures and tables needs to be
referenced from the text.

39: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 14
Section 5.3.5 - 2nd paragraph
The statement 'However, ST is usually run on an LLP...' should be 'However, ST
may on an LLP...'.

40: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 15
Table 2
The statement 'bit set' is not clear is it 'bit set to zero' or bit set to
one'. This needs to be fixed.

41: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 15
Section 5.4
Why are you creating a new acronym for task management. No other SCSI standard
has and I see no reason
to have one here. Change all TMs back to task management.

42: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 15
Section 5.4 - 3rd paragraph
The statement 'As with all other tasks.' should be deleted as it contains no
useful information.

43: Tivoli comment from George Penokie

E
Page 15
Table 2
The column heading should be changed from 'required' to 'mandatory'.

44: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 15
Section 5.4.1 - 2nd paragraph
The statement '...and target are free to reuse the...' should be '...and
target may reuse the...'.

45: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 15
Section 5.4.1 - last paragraph
The term 'Generally' should be deleted as it contain no useful information.

46: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 15 and 16
All the lists.This list numbering implies and unordered list with an ordered
sublist for some of the unordered
items. If that is what is intended then OK but I do not think so. If not then
fix it using the standard convention
for lists in SCSI standards.

47: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 17
Figure 6
This figure is not a figure it is a table and should be labeled as such. Also
the format is not consistent with
that used in SCSI standards. This and all other tables need to be fixed to be
consistent with the other SCSI
standards. Note that the same format is now starting to be used in FC
standards, specifically the latest ver-sion
of FS.

48: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 17
section 6.1.1.1
As stated before the '=' symbol should only be used in equations. In most
cases it should be replaced with
'set to' or 'a value of'. This needs to be fixed throughout the standard.

49: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
T
Page 17
Figure 6
There is no indication as to the size of the fields listed in bytes 00-03.
This needs to be fixed.

50: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 17
Figure 6
All field names should be in small caps. This should be changed throughout the
standard.

51: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E.Page 17
Section 6.1.1.3 - 1st paragraph
The statement 'Note that' should be deleted.

52: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 17
Section 6.1.1.4 - 1st paragraph

10

The statement 'and described in the following text'. should be deleted.

53: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 18
Figure 7
This is another example of how not to do tables. As statement in the other
comments these need to be in
the same format as the other SCSI standards.

54: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 18
Section 6.1.1.4
The flag values need to be specified as 'set to one' or 'set to zero' not 1b
or 0b. This needs to be fixed
throughout the standard.

55: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
T
Page 18
Section 6.1.1.5 - 2nd paragraph
The statement '...requested will reflect the desired level of task...' should
be '...requested reflects the recommend
level of task...'.

56: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 18
Section 6.1.1.6 1st paragraph
The statement '(as shown in table 4)' should be '(see table 4)'.

57: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 18
Table 4
The table heading and the table are on separate pages. This should never
happen. This should be prevented
using features of the word processor.

58: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 19
Section 6.2.3
The term 'allowable' has not value and should be deleted.

59: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 19
Section 6.2.4
The term 'desired' is offensive and not needed therefore it should be deleted.

60: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 20
Section 6.2.5.1
The sentence 'TASK ATTRIBUTE shall be selected as defined in ANSI X3.270,
shown in table 5 as an aid
to the reader.' should be 'See table 5 for the supported TASK ATTRIBUTEs. See
SAM-2 for the TASK AT-TRIBUTE
definitions.'.

61: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 20
Section 6.2.5.1 title.
The title is stated as 'Task Codes, Byte 1' but there is no task codes field
shown in byte 1. This needs to be
fixed.

62: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 20
Section 6.2.5.2
There is no definition of what 'execution management codes' are. They are
nothing I have ever heard of in
SCSI. This needs to be fixed or deleted.

63: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 21
Section 6.2.6
The term 'actual' in the 1st sentence should be deleted.

64: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
T
Page 21
Section 6.2.6
It appears variable length CDB are not supported. All the other protocols do
support them and so should
this one. I would like to see support for them in this standard.

65: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 21
Section 6.3
In the first equation the symbol used for divide should be change to a '/'
because the used symbol, when
viewed in a pdf, looks like a plus sign.

66: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 21
Section 6.3 - 1st paragraph after equations
The statement '(opaque in the ST specification)' is not clear as to what is
being stated. It appears to contain
no useful information.

67: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 21
Section 6.3 - 2nd paragraph after equations
The term 'entire' is redundant and should be deleted.

68: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 22
Section 6.3.1 - last paragraph
The statement 'Byte 3 contains...' should be 'The SCSI Status Byte
contains...'.

69: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 23
Section 6.3.2 - last paragraph
The statement '...field in not meaningful and may contain any value.' should
be '...field shall be ignored.'.

70: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 23
Section 6.3.3 - 2nd paragraph
The statement '...field in not valid...' should be '...field shall be
ignored...'.

71: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 23
Section 6.4.3
The format of the hex values should be changed to xxxxxxxxh in all cases in

12

this standard.

72: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 23
Section 6.34 - 3rd paragraph
The statement '...field in not valid...' should be '...field shall be
ignored...'.

73: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 24
table 6
There is no reference to this table. This needs to be fixed.

74: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 25
Section 7.1 - 1st paragraph.
The statement 'The SST task timeout, the only timeout, is used...' makes no
sense. What is ',the only time-out,
' supposed to mean?

75: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 25
section 7.1- 4th paragraph
The statement '...cases are cleaned up...' should be '...cases are
removed...'.

76: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 25
Section 7.1 - last paragraph
The statement 'If an implementation desires more rapid cleanup than is...'
should be 'If an implementation
requires a more rapid removal than is...'.

77: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 25
Section 7.2 - 1st paragraph
The text in ()s should start with either an e.g. or an i.e. depending when
this is a complete list or an example
of list.

78: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 25
Section 7.2 - 2nd paragraph
The statement ', i.e.512 bytes.' should be '(i.e., 512 bytes)'.

79: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 26
Section 7.4 - 1st paragraph
It is not clear what a 'device operation' is. This needs to be fixed.

80: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 26
Section 7.4
There are cans and wills that need to be fixed in this section.

81: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 26
Section 7.4 2nd paragraph after the list.
The term 'immediately' is not quantify able therefore should be removed.

82: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
T
Page 26
Section 7.4 -3rd paragraph after 1st list.
The statements 'within an appropriate period of time' and 'an appropriate
number of times' are not specific
enough for a standard, I have no idea of what 'appropriate' is and what I
think is appropriate would not be
what the next person though is appropriate. This needs to be resolved.

83: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
page 27
section a.1 - 1st paragraph
This sentence should be deleted as it states the obvious.

84: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 27
Section A.1 - 1st paragraph after invocable
The statement '...in the following clauses list...' should be '...in this
annex list...'.

85: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 27
Section A.1 1st paragraph after invocable
The statement in 2 places 'compliance with this profile' is not correct for a
standard. It should be 'compliance
with this annex'.

86: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
T
Page 27
Annex A
Annex A is listed as normative and as a profile. Generally profiles are
technical reports which are informative.
Therefore I would like this annex to be informative. If all of my other
comments on this annex are accepted
the word 'profile' disappears and this comment could then be rejected.

87: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 27
Section A.1 - Sentence before last list.
The statement '...table entries in these clauses:' should be '...table entries
in this annex:'.

88: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 27
Annex A title
The title of this annexes should be changed to 'SCSI on ST'.

89: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 28
Table a.2 - last row
The term 'viability' is not clearly defined. What is it supposed to mean?

90: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
E
Page 28
Section A.3
The statement 'This profile and the ST...' should be changed to 'This annex
and the ST...'.

****

14

Comments attached to Abs ballot from Ms. Emily Hill of
Microsoft Corp.:

Not something directly affecting our products or areas of concern...

****

Comments attached to YesC ballot from Mr. Paul D. Aloisi of
Texas Instruments:

Figures B1 and B2 - some of the blocks cut off the bottom of the lettering.

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