

From: Gerry.Houlder@seagate.com
 Subject: Public Review comment on INCITS 362
 To: ddonovan@i ti c.org
 Cc: psa@ansi.org,
 lohmeier@t10.org,
 gop@us.ibm.com
 X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.6a January 17, 2001
 Message-Id: <0FBE29BA2A.A2220586-0N86256B8B.00586E74@notes.seagate.com>
 Date: Fri, 29 Mar 2002 10:49:01 -0600
 X-MIMETrack: Serialized by Router on SV-GW1/Seagate Internet(Release 5.0.8
 |June 18, 2001) at 03/29/2002 08:49:14 AM
 MIME-Version: 1.0
 Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

This is a public review comment on INCITS 362 (T10 committee SPI-4 draft).

In section 10.7.4.3.3, after the words "SCSI target ports shall begin pacing transfers by:", a phrase reads

2) SCSI target port shall assert and negate P1 at least 8 times (e.g., (2 x 6,25 ns) x 8 = 100 ns at fast-160); and

This phrase is ambiguous. The phrase "assert and negate P1 at least 8 times" can be interpreted as requiring 8 cycles on the P1 signal. However the e.g. phrase incorrectly equates this to a 100 ns interval for fast-160 transfers. 8 cycles of the P1 signal would be 200 ns because this signal is half the frequency of the fast-160 data.

This requirement must be changed to unambiguously require the 100 ns interval because several companies (including my company Seagate Technology) have designed the 100 ns requirement into hardware. I have polled other known implementors and all believed that their receiver design would work correctly with a 4 cycle (100 ns at fast-160) preamble. Therefore, to prevent requiring a number of companies to redesign their hardware the phrase must be changed to:

2) SCSI target port shall assert and negate P1 at least 4 times (e.g., (2 x 12,5 ns) x 4 = 100 ns at fast-160); and

This information has also been sent to the T10 committee and has been documented in proposal T10/ 02-114r1.

Unless this change is made, my company would have to vote NO on INCITS 362.