

Accredited Standards Committee*
X3, Information Processing Systems

Doc. No. X3T10/94-119R0
Date: May 19, 1994
Project:
Ref. Doc.:
Reply to: J. Lohmeyer

To: Membership of X3T10

From: L. Lamers

Subject: FAST-20 Project Proposal Letter Ballot Comments

Fast-20 Letter Ballot Results: 51:0:0:8 = 59

Yes, with comment: Quantum, Milligan (Seagate), Unitrode, Western Digital

Did not respond: AMD, Apple, Compaq, Future Domain, Harbor Electronics, Maxtor, P.E. Logic, Samsung

=====
=====

Quantum comment:

On Fast-20, Quantum votes to IN FAVOR and strongly endorses developments in this area.

Milligan (Seagate) comment:

Comments Accompanying SCSI-4 Fast 20 PI Yes Ballot

The following changes should be made to the project proposal:

- 1) The title should be reordered to fit the normal layered standards descriptions. Move "SCSI-3" to the start of the title.
- 2) I think we should cut the cord on SCSI-3 activity this year. Consequently I suggest making the project the first SCSI-4 project. (The lack of Command set editorial help may make it difficult to cut the cord this year.)
- 3) The statement in 2.3 does not seem to have any relationship to the item. I suggest replacing it with the usual inane statement "The proposed project involves evolutionary expansion of the SCSI-3 SPI standard."
- 4) 3.7 is currently a misstatement of fact. Delete "for two days".
- 5) Based upon the frequency of revising the interface standard it seems incredulous to claim in 3.9 a life of over ten years. I suggest over three years.
- 6) In 4.4 I think there are known legal considerations. AMD had claimed a patent that relates to SPI. Western Digital noted that there is a patent which relates to the transceivers, slew rate control, and ESD protection.
- 7) In Section 5.1 and 5.5 SCSI-2 should be listed and in 5.2 and 5.5 SCSI-3. In 5.4 and 5.6 the transceiver and connector standards should be mentioned.

*Operating under the procedures of The American National Standards Institute.
X3 Secretariat, Computer and Business Equipment Manufacturers Association (CBEMA)
 1250 Eye Street NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20005-3922
 Telephone: 202-737-8888 (Press 1 twice) FAX: 202-638-4922 or 202-628-2829

- 8) Regarding the Scope of the project I doubt that the cabled environment will be sufficiently controlled to result in a reliable standard. Consequently the scope should be limited to backplane SCA applications. I debated whether this should yield a "No" vote and concluded that even if the scope of the project is not limited, as it should be, that this point can be further addressed by requiring sufficient testing to demonstrate that the cabled environments can be widely accommodated.

Unitrode comment: "Remove last line 2.0 -- Contradicts 2.1.1"

Western Digital comment:

While we vote "yes" for the project proposal, we strenuously object to the following item in the project proposal:

In clause 2.2, item "c)", the phrase following the comma "," reading:

"...and other capabilities that may be proposed during the development phase by the participants in the project."

should be deleted. This phrase leaves the proposal too wide open. This is not a connector project, but this phrase allows for such a thing. A connector project, if called for, should rightly be a separate effort. For those concerned that the project be flexible enough to allow development of the 20 megatransfer standard, the first part of item "c)" should be sufficient (and I propose that this be the full text for item "c)"):

"c) Other capabilities which fit within the general scope of implementing 20 megatransfer per second synchronous data transfers on a broad range of applications."

This seems quite sufficient for any purpose for the development of the standard, including the definition of any connector or cable specifications specifically required to achieve the higher transfer rate.

I trust that the committee will make the appropriate adjustment to the proposal. Thank you for your attention.