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

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

Ballot totals:
35 Yes
1 No
4 Abstain
7 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 OBB

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.
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".

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.

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

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.

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.

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

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

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

Broken cross-references: 'as described in 0'

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)."

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?
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 ivi
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 anywhere else there is a hanging paragraph.

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

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

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

10: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
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
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
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
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
Page 4
Section 3.1.21
The term 'end device' is not defined. This needs to be fixed.

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

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

24: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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
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
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
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
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
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
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
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
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
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
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
The column heading should be changed from 'required' to 'mandatory'.

Section 5.4.1 - 2nd paragraph
The statement '...and target are free to reuse the...' should be '...and target may reuse the...'.

The term 'Generally' should be deleted as it contain no useful information.

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.

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 version of FS.

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.

There is no indication as to the size of the fields listed in bytes 00-03. This needs to be fixed.

All field names should be in small caps. This should be changed throughout the standard.

The statement 'Note that' should be deleted.

The statement 'Note that' should be deleted.
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
E 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
this standard.

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

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

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

81: Tivoli comment from George Penokie
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...'.

*****************************************************************************************
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 ***************************