Accredited Standards Committee*
X3, Information Technology

Doc. No.:	X3T10/95-280 r0
Date:	July 13, 1995
Project:	
Ref. Doc.:	95-016 -- 95-017
Reply to:	Mr. John Lohmeyer
	Symbios Logic, Inc.
	1635 Aeroplaza Dr.
	Colo Spgs, CO 80916
	(719) 573-3362

To: X3T10 Membership
From: John Lohmeyer, X3T10 Chair
Subject: Comment Resolution on X3T10 Letter Ballots 95-016 and 95-017

Letter ballots 95-016 (SPI-2 project proposal) and 95-017 (ESPC, now EPI, technical report project proposal) both were approved by X3T10 by votes of 55:0:0:4. The Gene Milligan (Seagate) included comments on both project proposals with his yes ballots. Dal Allan (ENDL) included comments on the ESPC project proposal with his yes ballot. This document includes the resolution of these yes comments.

Comments received for ballot X3T10/95-016 (SPI-2 Project Proposal):

Seagate Technology (Gene Milligan):

The following comments accompany Gene Milligan's YES vote on the proposed new project SPI-2:

1) SPI-2 should be a new addition of SPI not a revision. Delete revise SPI to.

> *Accepted.*

2) According to the balance of the proposal SPI-2 will be faster than Fast-20. Delete and would incorporate Fast-20 into SPI-2 (it is currently a separate draft standard) from the needs.

> *Accepted.*

3) It has been the recent practice of X3T10 to leave connector issues to other groups to conserve X3T10 resources for items that are more central to their scope. Consequently 2.2. (b) should either be deleted or expanded to include the SCA connectors.

> *Accepted (2.2b deleted).*

4) Although the title of 3.7 indicates a duration, either for one day should be deleted or made more flexible.

> *Accepted ('for one day' deleted).*

5) I think 4.4 is not correct. I think at least AMP has identified patents and if SPI-2 includes SCA I know this to be the case.

> *Rejected (since comment 3 was accepted).*

Comments received for ballot X3T10/95-017 (ESPC Project Proposal):

ENDL (Dal Allan):

I vote in favor of the project and vote against the acronym.

ESPC can all too readily be confused with Enhanced/Extended SPC (SCSI-3 Primary Commands).

This project is unique to parallel SCSI, so parallel ought to be a discrimination factor in the title and as this is a physical interface it ought to have an I to imply 'interface' rather than a C to imply 'Commands'.

If we are to go to 4-letter acronyms then I suggest ESPI for Enhanced SPI (SCSI-3 Parallel Interface)

Dropping back to 3-letter acronyms:

EPC for Enhanced Physical Configuration has less to dislike but it still does not imply the physical interface.

My preference is EPI for Enhanced Parallel Interface.

> *Accepted (Name was changed to SCSI Enhanced Parallel Interface (EPI)).*

Seagate Technology (Gene Milligan):

The following comments accompany Gene Milligan's YES vote on the proposed new
project for ESPC:

1) To provide a vector for document order entry, add SCSI to an appropriate place in the title.

> *Accepted (see response to Dal Allan's comment).*

2) Delete the last paragraph of 2.1. It is not clear and misleading and probably wrong.

> *Accepted.*

3) For the same reason delete the first paragraph of 2.2. I suspect a high degree of compatibility or my concept of interoperability is intended rather than compatibility.

> *Accepted.*

4) I can not agree to item (g) being included in the scope without knowing much more about what this statement means.

> *Accepted ('terminator' added in front of 'power distribution').*

5) A technical report does not document. Change 2.3 by deleting documenting the and deleting however, the ESPC technical report would serve to document these applications rather than invalidate them.

> *Accepted.*

6) Change section 2.4 from a standard to a technical report.

> *Accepted.*

7) Change section 3.3 to Not Applicable as the text.

> *Accepted.*

8) Change 3.5 to ... the subject matter

> *Accepted.*

9) Although the title includes duration, either delete for one day or make it more flexible.

Accepted.

10) Change the text of 4.2 and 4.3 to Not Applicable.

Accepted.

11) I think 4.4 is misleading. I don't think the ANSI patent policy is applicable to technical reports. I think the text should be changed to Not Applicable.

Rejected (Gene accepted action item to draft a letter to X3 regarding applicability of patent policy to technical reports).

12) Why is SCSI-2 a closely related standard?

Accepted (SCSI-2 deleted as reference).

13) I think 5.2 should be expanded and certainly SIP is a candidate.

Accepted.