

June 30, 1988



Mr. John Lohmeyer, Chairman X3T9.2
NCR Corporation
3718 N. Rock Road
Wichita, KS 67226

Re: IBM 60 Pin SCSI Proposal

Dear John:

I would like to express some concerns regarding the optional 60 pin SCSI-2 Physical Interface proposed by IBM. Specifically, my concerns stem from the proposed adoption of yet another connector, and the timing of this proposal.

The adoption of another connector arrangement can only lead to confusion in the industry. Since both 50 pin and 60 pin hosts will exist, the peripheral manufacturers will have to support both connector types; hence, they will have to offer two different versions of every SCSI device.

I believe that IBM has identified some real problems which should be addressed, but I would strongly urge that the committee investigate solutions that can be accommodated within the existing 50 pin interface (perhaps by using "OPEN" pins).

I would also strongly suggest that this proposal be addressed in SCSI-3, since I believe we have passed the cut-off date for new input to SCSI-2, and it is very late in the development cycle to accept an addition of this magnitude.

In closing, while I believe the IBM proposal has merit, I strongly suggest that the problems it identifies be addressed within the existing 50 pin interface and be deferred to SCSI-3.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Fred Berkowitz", is written over a horizontal line.

Fred Berkowitz

FB:lc

cc: Dal Allan, Vice-Chairman X3T9.2