1/12/95
Duncan Penman

ATA SYSTEM ISSUES PROPOSAL - Status

1. <u>Is it needed?</u> Based on email and discussions at Tahoe this week, the answer is a clear "YES". The real interest is in the next 2 issues.

2. <u>Scope of activity?</u> Unresolved. Some comments I've received.
   - Should span all potential HW platforms, not just x86.
   - Create standards in this area (probably as an arm of X3T10) ? or specs that are de facto standards? or just provide a forum to bring in people that don't participate in standards bodies, then submit the outcome to standards bodies that already exist?
   - Provide a publishing function for information that is otherwise hard to find.
   - Several technical agenda items have been proposed. A high level charter hasn't yet been established.

3. <u>Form of organization?</u> Several variations of the items below. #1&2 are the options with majority support.
   - Put this activity under SFF. Pro: a name people recognize, credibility as a place things get done. Con: dues too high, many critical parties are not members, publishing mechanism is weak, no approval procedures (votes are published, not binding).
   - Create a new organization for this purpose. Pro: no procedural baggage carried from other organizations, dues could be low, based on services provided/donated. Con: a lot of work to set up even a simple organization, legal exposure must be covered.
   - Put this activity under X3T10, either as part of CAM or as a new WG. Pro: It keeps standards related work in one place, this sort of activity falls within the original scope of CAM.. Con: many of the critical people won't attend X3T10 meetings due to politics and procedural overhead, much of the work is outside the scope of the actual ATA interface, much of the work will not result in formal standards.
   - Create a "virtual organization" whose only communication is electronic. Pro: it could be much more efficient and effective. Con: people don't know how to use the technology yet, OK to use electronics means but not exclusively.