

Send all comments, criticisms and contributions to the editor  
T. W. Lanzatella

---

#### IRREGULARITIES IN DEADSTART TAPE IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

As most of our readers already know, the Systems group is presently grappling with a new level of KRONOS 2.1, LEVEL 8 (PSR 393/393). Several problems continue to elude us and no serious check-out can proceed until these problems are corrected. At present we anticipate the new system to be ready by Tuesday, 2 September-- six days late. The submission of modifications for the next deadstart tape will remain at 1 September. The implementation date for the next deadstart tape also remains at 11 SEPTEMBER.

#### NOTICE OF CHANGES TO THE OPERATING SYSTEM

Changes made by CDC to level 7 are far too numerous to be included here. These changes are, however, documented in two places. One, in the release newsletter published by CDC and two, in the form of MODIFY style comments embedded in the source listing of modifications to level 7. Curious readers should contact T. W. Lanzatella if they desire copies of either of these documents.

Public apology is here offered to E. J. Mundstock because I mistakenly buried an important modification to CALLPRG under a pile of junk on my desk. The modification, which should have been implemented on the last tape, repairs a WRITEUP bug which impaired retrieval of more than one record with a single WRITEUP card. Additionally, the modification fixes continuation card processing in the CALLPRG index and removes the restriction that user maintained, local CALLPRG indices must have the user number specified on each index card.

The following modification, due to Bill Elliott, though never formally proposed, has received unanimous approval from the Systems staff. Bill has taken the heavily modified PP routine LDS (DSD's helper) and removed most of the local features and restored these features in a new PP program LDU. This maneuver greatly simplifies the problem of appending operator messages to jobs purged from the rollout queue. Which feature, additionally, is being added with this modification.

#### PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE OPERATING SYSTEM

The following proposal is by Tim Salo.

New, extensively rewritten versions of DMQ/LDQ are now completed. These programs are new resequenced decks named DUMPQ/LOADQ. They are control card compatible with the current programs which they will replace. The primary modification is to change the 'queue' file archive tape to a format similar to that used by Dumppf - each queue file is written on the archive tape as one record consisting of a 7700 table, a 7400 table, and a control word copy of the file. An output file will also be written listing all queue files dumped or loaded for accounting purposes.

Bill Elliott proposes to add two new processing options to the LABEL card:

PO=M enable all recovery error messages to the user dayfile  
(not the error log).

PO=X override "LABEL NOT EXPIRED" retention date in tape label.

Readers are again reminded of the upcoming changes to PFM and the minor reconfiguration of the Permanent File FET. These changes were proposed by K. C. Matthews on 25 June 1975 and referenced in the Deadstart Systems Newsletter, Vol. 1, No. 5. This proposal was never reprinted in its entirety in the DSN. Readers should contact T. W. Lanzatella for a copy of the proposal. These changes will become a production system reality on either 11 September or 25 September 1975.

The following discussion is reprinted by gracious permission of the author, N. L. Reddy. Though not yet a proposal, the topic merits careful staff scrutiny.

Some Ideas for Discussion by the Committee on Automatic Output Divert  
by N. L. Reddy

Generally there are 2 categories of output, 1) files released to queue at the end of job 2) files released to queue by "DISPOSE" with a definite destination specified.

1. I suggest that we establish a validation file similar to other validation files in the system, which contains the following information:

There is an entry for each known terminal. There is a sub-entry for each known queue file type. The latter contains a sector limit and the name of another site to which the file would be diverted, if the length of the current file exceeds the limit. If a site does not have a punch, the limit for this file type would be zero, and probably the alternate site would be BC.

As an example, the 1004 site at 4B has a sector limit of 1000 sectors for print files. A job read from there produces a print file of 10,000 sectors. This would then be automatically diverted at the end of job to the alternate site (say) EA. Now if the sector limit for EA for print files is 5000 sectors, the print file from 4B would be diverted to the alternate site for EA (say BC) rather than to EA. In any event an output of one page will be generated and sent to the user at 4B, informing him of the fact that his print file was diverted to EA or BC, as the case may be. A limit of 777777 sectors would be considered infinite and no divert would take place.

In addition, two control cards would be implemented NODVT and DVT. NODVT will set a flag(s) in the control point area indicating to the system that the file type(s) specified on the NODVT card should not be diverted regardless of size. This would be useful to BATCHER jobs. DVT cancels the effect of NODVT.

The following questions arise:

- a. The scheme is in a way rigid. What happens, if for a day, a site wants the output diverted to site X instead of Y?
- b. What effect it has on accounting?
- c. Should the terminal user and/or the Cyber operator have dynamic control over the sector limits?
- d. Would a program similar to MODVAL to alter the file either from the console or from a job with account numbers having "terminal access," solve some of the above problems?

## 2. Disposed Files

Two questions arise in regard to disposed files.

- a. As the user wants the file to go to a specified destination, should the automatic divert take place?
- b. Should there be different sector limits for disposed files? For example, some terminals might not want to receive any disposed files at all (except, of course, from their own jobs). Then this limit could be set to zero.
- c. If the size of the file prevents it from being sent to the specified destination, what should be done? For TELEX users, they can be informed right away of the fact. What about BATCH users? Should the job be aborted or the file sent to the alternate site with the proper dayfile message? Or should the action depend on the DVT/NODVT flag at the control point?
- d. At the time a job is initialized, should all the flags in the control point be set to DVT or set to different values depending on the site it came from?

In all cases, the account message, when the file is printed will be of this format:

```
JOBNAMEZZ.PG nn.nnn KPR. YY
```

Where ZZ is the site where the job came from originally  
YY is the site where it was printed finally.

Operations can distinguish such diverted print files in the following way:

The dayfile looks normal, i.e., there is no message indicative that it was disposed. The banner page indicates that the job origin is other than their own site. For example, a job read in from 49 at Lauderdale gets diverted to BC and prints there. The banner page will indicate that the origin is 49. The dayfile will be normal, with no message about it being a disposed file. So it would become necessary for operators to look both at banner page and dayfile routinely. Terminal users also (particularly from 49 at Lauderdale) should be encouraged to use BIN card more often.

What should Operations do with such printed output?

SYSTEM MAINTENANCE: PEOPLE AND PROCEDURES

Marisa Riviere would like to announce that each Wednesday at noon is now the deadline for submission of modifications for both the Library Tape and the CALLPRG index. Marisa has begun and significantly dented the thankless task of documenting library maintenance procedures and CALLPRG index maintenance procedures. The completed document will appear in the Deadstart Systems Newsletter.