```
-----------------------------------
| | | | | | | | |
| d | i | g | i | t | a | l |              I n t e r o f f i c e
| | | | | | | | |              M e m o r a n d u m
-----------------------------------
```

TO: Shrike-Full.dis   DATE: 13 JUNE 1988
                                 FROM: TOM RARICH
                                 DTN : 296-4138
                                 M/S : UPO1-3
                                 MAIL: UPOVAX::RARICH

SUBJECT: SHRIKE Cancellation

Last thursday the Executive Committee cancelled the entire Prism
program: Shrike, Osprey, Romulus, Morraine, Rock, Mica products
as well as the Prism architecture. They also cancelled several other
major programs as well, in order to bring corporate costs in line
with corporate affordability.

Several new products were authorized to replace the products
cancelled. The MIPS architecture was selected to replace Prism.
Workstation products for Desktop, Deskside, Server, and very high
performance applications were designated. The STF gave some
suggestions on how these products might be designed, referring to Fox
and XMI bus designs, but no final plans were reached. Dom Lacava
and Bill Demmer have the responsibility to propose detail plans for
all these needs. It will take some time to determine what specific
products are to be produced, and to determine what development teams
will be assigned to each product. I have proposed the attached
Shrike/Mips alternative to meet the customer need, and this is being
evaluated.

At this time, Prism specific work (e.g. chips) should be suspended and
archived. Work which would support a MIPS based Shrike product design
(e.g. packaging, graphics and software) should continue until final
product directions are chosen.

I would like to thank all of you personally for the hard work and
effort you have delivered on behalf of the Shrike program to date.
I am hopeful that when the plans are finalized we may continue
together to deliver a winning "Shrike-class" product to the
corporation.

Regards,
Tom

       ATTACHMENT
From: UPOA1::RARICH "14-Jun-1988 0830" 14-JUN-1988 08:36
To: @MSHRIKE.DIS
Subj: SHRIKE FUTURE DIRECTIONS

```
-----------------------------------
| | | | | | | | |
| d | i | g | i | t | a | l |              I n t e r o f f i c e
| | | | | | | | |              M e m o r a n d u m
-----------------------------------
```

TO: BILL STRECKER   DATE: 13 JUNE 1988

```
        DOM LACAVA                    FROM:  TOM RARICH
CC:  ART WILLIAMS                     DTN :  296-4138
     BOB SUPNIK                       M/S :  UPO1-3
     DON MCINNIS                      MAIL:  UPOVAX::RARICH
     SAM FULLER
     STEVE HANSMIRE
     JOE DINUCCI
```

SUBJECT: SHRIKE FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The current discussion of RISC architectural directions will soon choose MIPS or PRISM as the workstation architecture for DEC. If PRISM is chosen, the current design for Shrike will be implimented as planned.

If MIPS is chosen, the company will still need a Shrike-class price/performance workstation in the product family. The Shrike team is currently staffed and in place, and can potentially deliver a MIPS based Shrike product in the same or shorter time than the current PRISM based plan.

There are two alternatives for a Shrike/MIPS product. The first is a redesign of the Shrike CPU module to utilize a MIPSCO R3000 CPU/FPU. All other Shrike modules and packaging would remain the same. Preliminary sizing of the MIPS chip real estate indicates this should be feasable.

A second alternative would produce a cheaper and more capable system. This product would use the current Shrike package and graphics system, but would utilize a 37.5 MB/sec NuBus as the system backplane. This would significantly increase system I/O performance over the current design, would provide DMA I/O and would eliminate the NuBus Adapter module from the system since NuBus would be native. This change would impact memory design, as well as GSSC, and TBC chip interface designs but may result in time to market similar to the first alternative, since graphics software would probably become the critical path.

The Shrike team stands ready to execute whichever strategy the corporation adopts. If a change in architecture occurs, it is important to refocus the team quickly to maintain momentum. I would like your input and guidance on the above choice of alternatives, for the Mips/Shrike, and would be happy to provide more detail on the above proposal.

Regards,

Tom