STATINTL

MEMORANDUM FOR: [ ] SPS/ODP

FROM: [ ], Jr.
Deputy Director of Data Processing

SUBJECT: SAFE Draft RFP

Attached are some comments that I have as

a result of reading through the SAFE Draft RFP.

STATINTL

[ ]

STATINTL

Att: a/s

cc: DD/P/ODP

O/D/ODP [ ] ee/3-3-80

Distribution:
  Orig - adse
    1 - ODP Registry w/o att.
    1 - DD/P/ODP w/att.
    2 - O/D/ODP (1 w/att)

Comments on SAFE Draft RFP

1.   Section F.0.1. states that SAFE will be available to the users 99.5% of the time. Section F.1.2.7.1. requires an availability of 99.9% for the global processor. Who measures and how? Can you ever get from 99.9% equipment to 99.5% system availability with as many components as are required in the SAFE architecture?

2.   Section F.2.1.3.3.1. specifies that the Site I EIP/MAP function have the ability to interface 75 lines. This number has been the subject of much previous informal discussion. This specification should be changed to indicate a minimum of 75 lines. It should also require easy and rapid expansion, which is critical to the design.selected for implementation. As recently as last week the 75 was indicated to be an absolute minimum by OCR.

3.   Section F.3.2.3.1. specifies a requirement for higher order languages that includes COBOL. What's the need? Why not PL/I as a required language instead? Section H.3. on desirable software features includes PL/I. In light of our investment in PL/I and disinvestment in COBOL over the last 12 years, wouldn't it make more sense to make PL/I mandatory and COBOL desirable?

4.   Annex 3 on the Global II DBMS and Report Writer speaks only of the Site II requirements. Having heard on 29 February 1980 that the Site I requirement is not to be satisfied with a DBMS, I am terribly uneasy about a Site II software requirement driving a Site I hardware configuration that may give us something that is difficult to build upon. I don't see how Site I can be indifferent or am I missing something?

5.   The Site I equipment quantities shown in Figure F.0.2. are said not to be strictly mandatory in Section F.0.2., apparently leaving the door open to a vendor to propose alternate quantities. Is such a change a change in architecture? Why shouldn't someone be allowed to propose, e.g., a smaller number of midi processors if he can "clearly explain why the differences exist and what advantages would accrue to [   ] in accepting the proposed modifications?"

STAT