

The letter ballot to forward D1248 Revision 4 to NCITS for further processing closed with the following results:

Charles	Brill	AMP, Inc.	P	DNV***
Richard	Kalish	Adaptec, Inc.	P	Y
Ron	Roberts	Apple Computer	A	Y
Irv	Tjomsland	Award	P	Y
Victor	Siu	CMD Technology	P	Y
Ben	Chang	Cirrus Logic Inc.	P	DNV
Hale	Landis	Consultant	P	Y
Paul	Raikunen	Digital	P	Y
Robert	Liu	Fujitsu Computer Products	P	Y
Tony	Goodfellow	GSI	P	Y
J. R.	Sims	Hewlett Packard Co.	P	N
Anthony	Yang	Hitachi America Ltd.	P	DNV
Dan	Colegrove	IBM Corp.	P	Y
Darrell	Redford	Iomega Corp.	P	DNV
Pete	McLean	Maxtor Corp.	P	Y
Lance	Flake	O.R. Technology	P	DNV**
Dan	Salmonsens	Oak Technology	P	DNV
Curtis	Stevens	Phoenix Technologies	P	Y
Greg	Elkins	QLogic Corp.	P	Y
Mark	Evans	Quantum Corp.	P	Y
Paresh	Sheth	Silicon Systems Inc.	P	DNV
Kenichi	Kojima	Sanyo Electric Co Ltd	P	Y
Gene	Milligan*	Seagate Technology	P	YWC
Alan	Longo	SyQuest Technology Corp	P	DNV
Tokuyuki	Totani	Toshiba America Info.	P	Y
Tom	Hanan	Western Digital Corp.	P	Y

\* Individual vote            DNV=Did not vote            YWC=Yes with comment

\*\* No vote submitted without comment    \*\*\* Blank ballot submitted

The letter ballot passed 17:1:0:8. The comment resolution will be addressed at the October T13 meetings.

The No vote from Hewlett Packard had the following comment:

1) This standard conflicts with other proposals that appear to have wider industry support. It will cause further confusion and incompatible product lines.

The Yes vote from Gene Milligan had the following comments:

1) Change the foreword from "This standard was developed by the ATA ad hoc working group of Accredited Standards Committee NCITS during 1996-97." to "This standard was developed by the ATA ad hoc working group of T13 a Technical Committee of Accredited Standards Committee NCITS during 1996-97." or to "This standard was developed by T13 a Technical Committee of Accredited Standards Committee NCITS during 1996-97."

and from "Subcommittee T13 on ATA Interfaces, that reviewed this standard, had the following members:" to "Technical Committee T13 on AT Attachment, that reviewed this standard, had the following members":

and from "1394 to ATA/ATAPI ad hoc Working Group, that developed this standard, had the following additional participants:" to "1394 to ATA/ATAPI ad hoc working group of T13, that developed this standard, had the following additional participants:"

2) Referring to "The tailgate shall have the following limitations over those features and capabilities defined in the SBP-2 and ATA-3 standards:" are ATA-4 versions not allowed or just do not have restrictions? (Note implied conflict with Normative references.)

3) Editors work is needed in clause 2.2.1 "(See **Error! Reference source not found.** for the naming convention used for naming bits.)"

- 4) A check should be made to determine if the normative reference for “IEEE Std 1394 1995, Standard for a High Performance Serial Bus” which requires licenses of patents should result in a different patent statement. I think it should.
- 5) Change the note below table 6 from “NOTE - It should be noted that the Alternate Status and Device Control registers are not addressable by the initiator via the tailgate. The tailgate standard defines other mechanisms for generating the ATA SRST function provided in the Device Control Control Block register. Control of the interrupt enable is left to the tailgate which intercepts and processes device interrupts. There is no mechanism to poll the Alternate Status register provided via a tailgate.” to “NOTE - The Alternate Status and Device Control registers are not addressable by the initiator via the tailgate. The tailgate standard defines other mechanisms for generating the ATA SRST function provided in the Device Control Control Block register. Control of the interrupt enable is left to the tailgate which intercepts and processes device interrupts. There is no mechanism to poll the Alternate Status register provided via a tailgate.” and should “Device Control Control Block register” be “Device Control Block register”?
- 6) The note in clause 4.3.1 and other notes contain several normative requirements. The notes should be edited to either make the normative requirements part of the body text or to delete the normative requirements.
- 7) If the normative requirements remain, is the standard definitive enough to allow a compliance check that “hung” device has been detected? (Is a “hung” equivalent to a “hang”?)
- 8) I have heard that Tailgate is intended to be a stop-gap method of connecting devices to 1394 until native 1394 devices are more widely available. If this is true, is it anticipated that the Tailgate standard would be withdrawn as the 1394 devices become widely available? Should Tailgate be a Technical Report rather than a standard?