Subj: Letter Ballot results on the ATA-3 and ATAPI Project Proposals X3T10/94-193r0
Date: 94-09-01 14:26:14 EDT
From: jlohmeye@ncr-mpd.ftcollinsco.ncr.com
To: X3T10 Membership

The ATA-3 Project Proposal (X3T10/94-019 r4) passed: 50-0-0-10.

The Yes ballot from Peter Brown of Oak Technology included the following comment:

"I think that the initial proposal offered a better partition and would be more useful to people attempting to build products adhering to the specifications. I further think that the reason that the proposal was changed was an attempt to orphan ATAPI. I object to this tactic."

The following organizations failed to return their ballots:

AMD, CMD, Compaq, Fujitsu, Harbor Electronics, Hitachi, Linfinity Micro, Maxoptix, Qlogic, and Quantum.

The ATAPI Project Proposal (X3T10/94-022 r4) passed: 47-3-0-10. We are obligated to attempt to resolve the negatives.

The No ballots from Scott Smyers of Apple, Peter Brown of Oak Technology, and Bob Snively of Sun Microsystems included the following comments:

Apple:

The use of ATAPI is primarily intended to be a "low-cost" interface for CD-ROM and tape devices. I don't understand the concept behind "overlapped commands using a multi-threaded protocol." This scope will have a direct impact on the development time, the availability, and the cost of ATAPI devices.

We would like to maintain ATAPI as a "low-cost", relatively simple interface. We would request to remove item b) of the Recommended Scope from the project proposal, dated July 21, 1994.

Oak Technology:

I voted NO on the ATAPI proposal. I will change my NO vote to a yes if either the scope statement explicitly states that ATAPI may be used for hard disk drives or if 2.2.d is deleted.

Although 2.2.d is ambiguous it could be easily argued that "other than traditional ATA devices" excludes ATAPI HDD's.

Section 4.1 and 4.2 points-out the possibility of
"nonstandard evolution or
revolution" in the case that HDD is specifically excluded from the spec. The scope of the document should accept the inevitability of ATAPI HDD's.

Sun Microsystems:

I regret that I must vote no on the project proposal for the ATA Packet Interface as the proposal is presently worded. By making the changes described in the following paragraphs, my vote would be changed to a yes vote.

1)   Section 2.2
The last sentence of the clause now reads:

"The application for the proposed standard does not require compliance with the SCSI-3 Architectural Model (SAM)." It is very important that the ATAPI definition provide a software interface that is compatible with standard SCSI devices and drivers. At the same time, it is clear that ATAPI implementations integrate a large number of the functional interfaces defined by SAM. For this reason, the referenced sentence should be rewritten to read:

"The proposed standard shall define services and functions compliant with those visible to the application client defined by the SCSI-3 Architectural Model (SAM). An ATAPI device may internally implement those services in a manner that does not comply with the SAM."

The following organizations failed to return their ballots:

AMD, CMD, Compaq, Fujitsu, Harbor Electronics, Hitachi, Linfinity Micro, Maxoptix, Qlogic, and Quantum.