Accredited Standards Committee
X3, Information Processing Systems

Doc:	X3T10/94-235 R0
Date:	8 November, 1994
Ref Doc.:	X3T10.1/94-036 R2
Reply to:	John Scheible

To: X3T10.1 Membership
From: John Scheible, IBM
Subject: Response to SSA-SCSI2 project proposal

During the Nov 8th, 1994 X3T10.1 plenary, the membership agreed unanimously to the following response to the X3T10 comments from the SSA-SCSI2 project proposal (X3T10.1/94-036 R1), and are incorporated in X3T10.1/94-036 R2.

Gene Milligan comments (Seagate)

Comment 1) I have no intrinsic objection to the project. However I do have a few objections to the formulation of the project proposal. Satisfactory resolution of comments 2 and 3 would allow me to change my vote from NO to YES.
Response 1) I hope we have satisfactorily addressed your concerns.

Comment 2) The project proposal does not include the underlying reason(s) why the project is proposed as a Technical Report rather than as a Standard.
Response 2) Add to needs section: "SSA-SSP is anticipated to replace SSA-SCSI2 as the market migrates from SCSI-2 to SCSI-3, resulting in a shorter anticipated life than for many standards. For this reason and the potentially quicker approval process a TR is preferred over a dpANS."

Comment 3) The project proposal is written as a sub-rosa standard. If it is a Technical Report it seems to me:
Comment 3a) 3.8 should change from dpANS to TR.
Comment 3b) 3.9 should not be applicable.
Comment 3c) Perhaps 4-4.2 are OK.
Comment 3d) 4.4 can't apply since there is no requirement to conform to a TR the ANSI Patent Policy is not applicable.
Response 3abcd) Done as requested, also other standard references changed to Technical Report.

Comment 4a) Since it is Serial Storage Architecture SCSI-2 Protocol why isn't it (SSA-SCSI-2)?
Response 4a) SSA-SCSI2 is easier to type than SSA-SCSI-2.
Comment 4b) 2.2 and 2.4 should be "Technical Report" not "Standard".
Comment 4c) X3T10.1 is not a technical committee. Change X3T10.1 to X3T10 at least in 3.6.
Comment 4d) 3.5 should be "IN THE SUBJECT MATTER".
Comment 4e) SCSI-3 command sets should be added to 5.2.
Comment 4f) SCSI-2 should be added to 5.5.
Response 4bcdef) Done as requested

Comment 5) What happens, in regard to the justification, if the SCSI-3 command sets forward prior to SSA-SCSI-2?
Response 5) Regardless of the date when SCSI-3 command sets are forwarded, we feel there is a near term requirement for SSA-SCSI2.

<u>Unitrode comments:</u>

<u>Comment</u>) SCSI-2 was never intended for any physical layers other than parallel. A document that references Serial implementations to SCSI-2 is not appropriate.
<u>Response</u>) SCSI-2 does not prohibit other physical interfaces, for example, CAM and ATAPI use SCSI-2 commands.

<u>Comment</u>) A document at references implementations against a current working draft of SCSI-3 is more appropriate. 989D scheduled for Nov 94 completion, the document should be against it instead of against SCSI-2.
<u>Response</u>) We do have a project for SCSI-3 (i.e. SSA-SSP), however, compatibility with current products and product schedules dictate support of SCSI-2 as well as SCSI-3. We believe it is preferable to document the SCSI-2 implementations in a TR rather than only with vendor specific product specifications.

Sincerely,

John Scheible
X3T10.1 Chairman
Voice: (512) 823-8208
FAX: (512) 823-0758
Email: Scheible@vnet.ibm.com