

X3 SUBGROUP LETTER BALLOT

Authorized by X3 Procedures -- Distributed by X3 Subgroup X3T10

Reference Documents: X3T10/94-099 rev 0 (In April '94 X3T10 Mailing)	Doc: X3T10/94-124r0 Date: May 27, 1994 Proj: 991-D Ballot 991-D
Ballot Closes NOON DATE: Thursday -- July 7, 1994	Return to: John B. Lohmeyer AT&T/NCR Microelectronics 1635 Aeroplaza Dr. Colo. Spgs., CO 80916 Fax: 719-597-8225

Subject: **Approval of forwarding a revised project proposal for a Method for a SCSI-3 Generic Packetized Protocol Technical Report to X3 for approval.**

Statement: **In January 1994, X3T10 voted to "... take the appropriate steps to convert [GPP] from a dpANS and to publish it as a technical report." In May 1994, X3T10 failed to forward the revised project proposal (that would convert the project to a Technical Report) due to insufficient people present to vote. (See reverse side for more information.)**

Question: **Do you approve of forwarding the revised project proposal on a "Method for a SCSI-3 Generic Packetized Protocol" (X3T10/94-099) to X3 for approval?**

YES¹

NO²

Signature: _____

Name: _____
(Please Print)

Organization Represented: _____
(Please Print)

Principal Alternate Date: _____

¹ American National Standards are developed by the voluntary participation of all parties and with the intention and expectation that the standards will be suitable for wide application. Since their use is likewise voluntary, an affirmative vote does not commit an organization or group represented on the committee to the use of the American National Standard under consideration.

² If you find that you cannot vote YES and wish to vote NO, please state this and explain the reasons for your position on a separate sheet(s) with each response numbered, and with each page numbered and titled to identify the corresponding Letter Ballot. Electronic submissions of your comments are vastly preferred to expedite the response process. ABSTENTIONS are not permitted on technical issues.

Explanation of the Effect of this Ballot

GPP is currently an approved X3 project (991-D) to create an American National Standard for a Generic Packetized Protocol (GPP). In November 1993, the following motion was made at the X3T9.2 meeting:

Whereas having two I/O protocols for each SCSI physical interconnect is a problem for the industry although there may be some niche applications where GPP is useful, Gene Milligan moved and Ed Gardner seconded that X3T9.2 take the appropriate steps to convert it from a dpANS and to publish it as a technical report.

After much debate, the consideration of the motion was deferred until the January 1994 X3T10 meeting. In January 1994, X3T10 passed the above motion 36:11:0:11.

The appropriate step to do the conversion from a dpANS to a Technical Report is for X3T10 to forward a revised project proposal to X3 establishing a GPP Technical Report project instead of a GPP Standards project. Gene Milligan prepared a revised project proposal (94-099), which was included in the April 1994 X3T10 mailing. A forwarding motion was included on the May 1994 X3T10 agenda. The motion failed 20:4:0:35 due to lack of a majority of the total X3T10 membership voting in favor (both 2/3rds of those voting and greater than 50% of the total X3T10 membership were necessary--the 2/3rds was met, but 30 yes votes were also necessary).

This letter ballot is being issued to insure that all X3T10 members are given an opportunity to vote (as they are required to do).

If this motion passes, the revised GPP project proposal will be forwarded to X3 for approval. If it fails, then GPP will remain a standards project (in conflict with X3T10's earlier decision).

There were some questions at the May '94 X3T10 meeting regarding the differences in processing a Technical Report (TR) vs. a Standard. On May 24th I spoke to Lynn Barra (X3 Secretariat) about this topic. She provided the following information:

The processing up to the time that the Operational Management Committee (OMC) reviews the TR is identical to the processing of a draft standard. At that point, the process differs. The draft TR is sent out concurrently for public review and six-week X3 letter ballot whereas draft standards do not go to X3 until satisfactory completion of the public review.

Any comments received during the TR public review are responded to, but they do not necessarily affect the TR. In effect, the public review merely serves as public notice of the existence of the Technical Report. Since Technical Reports are not Standards, they do not require the same degree of consensus.

If you are still confused, call me at 719-573-3362.

Sincerely,



John Lohmeyer, Acting Chair X3T10

Please note: This ballot is on the revised GPP project proposal, not the GPP draft document. Comments on the draft document, except as they may related to forwarding the revised project proposal, are not appropriate.