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".

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.
Unitrode comments:

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

Comment) 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.
Response) 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,
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