

# ENDL T E X A S

Date: 14 October 2000  
 To: T10 Technical Committee  
 From: Ralph O. Weber  
 Subject: Response to T10 Letter Ballot comments on SPC-2

This document contains the responses to the T10 Letter Ballot comments on forwarding SPC-2 to first public review. The summary of the T10 Letter Ballot results can be found in 00-017r0.

This revision reflects changes agreed by the September, 2000 CAP working group as well as showing the editor's proposed responses for all comments on clauses up to and including clause 7.5. Proposed responses for comments on other clauses appear at the whim of the editor.

All references to SPC-2 PDF pages are based on spc2r18.pdf. All dictionary references quoted by the editor come from the *Random House Dictionary of the English Language Second Edition Unabridged*.

In preparing this revision of the comments resolution document the following areas have been reviewed:

- Clauses 1 through 6
- All subclauses relating to the EXTENDED COPY and RECEIVE COPY RESULTS commands

The SNIA-BWG also will be reviewing the resolutions for comments against the EXTENDED COPY and RECEIVE COPY RESULTS commands in document 00-369.

The following topics are proposed for working group discussion to provide input for the next revision of this document.

Reconsider changing variable length CDB ENCRYPTION IDENTIFICATION field to Reserved as requested on T10 Reflector. See comments:

Brocade 8) Definition of encryption field, and  
 Seagate 22) Is encryption allowed?

Making COPY, COMPARE, and COPY AND VERIFY obsolete could be viewed as making the SEGMENT NUMBER field in REQUEST SENSE data obsolete too (see PDF page 171). What is the group's pleasure regarding the disposition of this field? See comment:

Brocade 15) COPY command obsolete

Does the working group have any advice to offer SNIA-BWG regarding how a copy manager should respond to unit attention conditions reported by the devices that are the sources and destinations of EXTENDED COPY operations? See comment:

IBM 103) What states have changed?

Are there any objections to the proposed resolution of:

Crds 1) EXTENDED COPY Informative Annex

Does the working group agree to the EXTENDED COPY target descriptor wording changes in the following comments:

O26) Elliott - N\_Port means Fibre Channel

O27) Elliott - World Wide Name is not just for Fibre Channel

The group needs to discuss release/reservation and remove/registration. See comment:

Seagate 48) What's difference between 'releasing' and 'removing' a reservation?

What does Bob Snively think of this comment?

Seagate 45) Delete registration resources note

Does the working group agree to the quick arbitration and selection and information unit transfer wording changes from 00-252? See comment:

O25) Elliott - QAS/IU wording should match SPI

As agreed by the September working group, I have provided specific wording changes to make VPD pages 83h and 00h mandatory. Are there any issues with the proposed wording? **(N.B. these changes will not be discussed at the working group unless extra time is available or someone requests a discussion.)** See comment:

Brocade 29) VPD page 83 mandatory.

Is the service delivery port contention resolution rewrite found in the response to comment "Quantum 24) Rewrite contention resolution options for multi-port targets" acceptable?

What additional changes are required in the description of reservations in the presence of multiple service delivery ports? See comment:

Seagate 59) Why 'all initiators (regardless of port)'?

Should discussion of communications devices be removed from SPC-2? Note that this decision affects the contents of the ASC/ASCQ, Operation Codes, Log Page Codes, and Mode Page Codes tables in addition to issues noted in letter ballot comments. If discussion of communications devices is to be removed, what about scanner devices? See comment:

Seagate 63) Remove comparison of processor to communications devices

Is FC-FS a sufficient normative reference for the WWN identifiers used in the Device Identifier VPD page (page 83)? Or, to the normative references to FC-PH, AM 1, and FC-PH-3 need to be maintained? See comments:

- Seagate 8) Why are FC-PH, AM 1, FC-PH-3, and FC-FS normative references?
- IBM 304) Change 'FC-PH ...' to 'FC-FS'
- IBM 305) Change 'FC-PH ...' to 'FC-FS'

Can SPC-2 reference SAM-2 instead of SCSI-2 for the definition of CA? See comment:

- Seagate 11) Reference SAM-2 (not SCSI-2) for CA definition

Should SPC-2 reference those diagnostic pages that apply to all device types, but that are defined by SES? See comments:

- Brocade 37) Page codes for diagnostics?
- LSI 11) Table 128 Should specify SES pages

It seems only fair that your attention be directed to the ENDL comments that I intend to accept. Pay particular attention to the second comment listed. See comments:

- ENDL 1) Replace 'Overview' with 'Introduction'
- ENDL 3) Mode Page code 0Dh s/b Obsolete

Do commands go to logical units or device servers? See comments:

- Seagate 21) Commands go to logical units

Should the names of log pages and mode pages be all caps (like command and status names)? There are comments that suggest the change for one log page and one mode page name, but the editor doesn't understand how the change could be made for one log/mode page but not for all the others. N.B. If accepted, this change will impact all Command Set standards documents. See comments:

- IBM 45) Capitalization of 'Self-test results' log page
- IBM 232) Make 'translate address' s/b all caps because it's a mode page name

Related to this are the names of other things that might fall under the rubric described in the following sentence from 3.4 (Conventions):

"Names of commands, statuses, sense keys, additional sense codes, and additional sense code qualifiers are in all uppercase (e.g., REQUEST SENSE)."

Would it be unreasonable to follow this convention for any thing that appears in a table where the column heading is 'Name'? (N.B. this still doesn't get log/mode pages because there the table column is headed 'Description'.) Cases where it does apply are:

- Table 78 — Persistent Reservation Scope Codes, where the names defined are LOGICAL UNIT (which should be LU) and ELEMENT. This change would have a bearing on the following comments:  
 IBM 159) Don't capitalize 'Logical Unit'  
 IBM 160) Change 'LU' to '0h'  
 IBM 161) Don't capitalize 'Logical Unit'  
 IBM 162) Change 'Element' to '2h'  
 IBM 164) Don't capitalize 'element'
- Table 79 — Persistent Reservation Type Codes, where the names defined are WRITE EXCLUSIVE, EXCLUSIVE ACCESS, WRITE EXCLUSIVE — REGISTRANTS ONLY, and EXCLUSIVE ACCESS — REGISTRANTS ONLY. This change would have a bearing on the following comment:  
 IBM 67) Capitalization
- Table 120 — SELF-TEST CODE field values  
 Seagate 31) Don't capitalize 'abort'

Is "...(field=xxb)..." and "...(bit=0/1)..." appropriate notation for a SCSI standard? See comments:

- IBM 123) 'dc=0/1' s/b 'if dc is set to 0/1'
- IBM 283) Change 'TST=xxxb' to 'the TST field equals xxxb'

The following comments are marked for global application and might be worthy of discussion:

- CPQ 4) Spelling of "nonvolatile"
- IBM 20) Change 'device' to 'SCSI device'
- IBM 22) 'see x' instead of 'see clause x'
- IBM 39) Don't capitalize 'autosense data'
- IBM 54) Don't capitalize 'persistent reservation'
- IBM 57) Don't capitalize 'reserve/release'
- IBM 182) Use 'vendor specific' not 'vendor-specific'
- IBM 206) Don't capitalize 'standby' or 'idle'
- IBM 286) Change 'An SCSI' to 'A SCSI'
- Quantum 1) Use 'specify' instead of 'indicate'
- Quantum 2) Start definitions with a sentence
- Seagate 18) Change 'on...logical unit(s)' to 'of...logical unit(s)'
- Seagate 86a) Use 'in an initiator' not 'on an initiator'

Should draft or approved standards be referenced? See comments:

- Seagate 29) Why reference draft standards over published?
- Seagate 76) Should SPC-2 reference draft or approved standards?

Should the acronyms for SCSI standards be listed in the Acronyms subclause? Should the standard numbers be listed with the acronyms? See comments:

- IBM 21) Should the acronyms for standards be listed as acronyms?
- Seagate 15) Document numbers in acronyms?

Table formatting issues Should all tables have a double line between header and body rows? Be sure to consider tables such as 54, 55, 114, 115, and 169. This is a very pervasive change. Is it required that notes be indented? Should tables be constrained to fit on a page wherever possible? How far should the editor go to make this happen? Smaller fonts? Reduced space between rows? Other? Is an entire page of white space minus one or two lines of text an acceptable result if the table fits wholly on the next page? Can a table float a page or two away from the text that describes it if that will get it fitting on a page? See comments:

- IBM 48) Reformat table 6
- IBM 52) Reformat table 7
- IBM 59) Force table 8 to one page (example of two lines of text + 8.5" of white space)
- IBM 72) Double lines in Tables
- IBM 101) Force table to one page
- IBM 119) Indent footnote
- IBM 120) Force table to one page
- IBM 128) Force table to one page
- IBM 224) Force table to one page
- IBM 265) Force table to one page

Several comments propose changes from SPC and SCSI-2 and the editor is reluctant to make these changes without working group review.

Proposed Changes Differ From SPC and SCSI-2

SPC-2 Identical to			Comment
SCSI-2	SPC r11	ANSI SPC	
<b>Potentially Substantive Changes</b>			
No 'medium' definition	Yes	Yes	Brocade 1) Definition of medium
processor command specific	Yes	Yes	IBM 13) Eliminate baggage in 'data packet' def
Yes	Yes	Yes	Seagate 20) 'transfer length' by another name
Yes	Yes	Yes	IBM 41) Remove not 'especially useful' statement Seagate 24) Use TEST UNIT READY to check media status

## Proposed Changes Differ From SPC and SCSI-2

SPC-2 Identical to			Comment
SCSI-2	SPC r11	ANSI SPC	
'lengthy disconnects'	Yes	Yes	Seagate 25) Delete advisory description of TEST UNIT READY
Yes	Yes	Yes	Seagate 26) Is parameter rounding always allowed?
<b>Definitely Not Substantive Changes</b>			
Yes	Yes	Yes	IBM 34) Delete 'etc'
Yes	Yes	Yes	IBM 35) Delete 'etc'
Yes	Yes	Yes	IBM 38) All information is useful
Yes	Yes	Yes	IBM 42) Kill the ly (generally) words
Yes	Yes	Yes	Seagate 105) Left justify 2nd column of table 132
Yes	Yes	Yes	Seagate 107) Too many notes (e.g., note 52)

I'm still struggling with how to handle the capitalization issues no already mentioned above. See comments:

- IBM 167) Don't capitalize 'service'
- IBM 169) Don't capitalize 'element'
- IBM 206) Don't capitalize 'standby' or 'idle'
- IBM 241) Don't capitalize 'buffer'
- IBM 246) Don't capitalize 'buffer'
- IBM 263) Don't capitalize 'self-test'
- IBM 288) Don't capitalize 'Target Role Agent'
- IBM 298) Don't capitalize 'standby' or 'idle'
- IBM 307) Don't capitalize 'Canonical'
- IBM 316) Don't capitalize 'Log Parameters'
- IBM 320) Don't capitalize 'Power Condition' and 'Fault Failure Reporting Page'
- Quantum 6) Consistent capitalization
- Quantum 9) Consistent capitalization

## Unresolved Comments List

Brocade 1) Definition of medium . . . . .	26
Brocade 28) Obsolete TranDis . . . . .	35
Brocade 32) Discard mechanism is ill-defined . . . . .	38
Brocade 34) Target s/b LUN . . . . .	39
Brocade 35) Logical unit reservation mandatory? . . . . .	39
Brocade 36) Identifier field not VS . . . . .	39
Brocade 37) Page codes for diagnostics? . . . . .	39
Brocade 38) References confuse text. . . . .	39
Brocade 39) Additional vendor identification. . . . .	40
Crds 1) EXTENDED COPY Informative Annex . . . . .	44
ENDL 1) Replace 'Overview' with 'Introduction' . . . . .	45
ENDL 3) Mode Page code 0Dh s/b Obsolete . . . . .	45
IBM 13) Eliminate baggage in 'data packet' def. . . . .	47
IBM 20) Change 'device' to 'SCSI device' . . . . .	48
IBM 21) Should the acronyms for standards be listed as acronyms? . . . . .	49
IBM 22) 'see x' instead of 'see clause x'. . . . .	49
IBM 34) Delete 'etc' . . . . .	51
IBM 35) Delete 'etc' . . . . .	51
IBM 38) All information is useful . . . . .	52
IBM 39) Don't capitalize 'autosense data' . . . . .	52
IBM 41) Remove not 'especially useful' statement. . . . .	52
IBM 42) Kill the ly (generally) words . . . . .	52
IBM 45) Capitalization of 'Self-test results' log page . . . . .	53
IBM 48) Reformat table 6 . . . . .	54
IBM 52) Reformat table 7 . . . . .	54
IBM 54) Don't capitalize 'persistent reservation' . . . . .	54
IBM 57) Don't capitalize 'reserve/release' . . . . .	55
IBM 59) Force table 8 to one page . . . . .	55
IBM 67) Capitalization . . . . .	59
IBM 72) Double lines in Tables . . . . .	59
IBM 101) Force table to one page . . . . .	66
IBM 103) What states have changed? . . . . .	66
IBM 119) Indent footnote . . . . .	70
IBM 120) Force table to one page . . . . .	71
IBM 123) 'DC=0/1' s/b 'if DC is set to 0/1' . . . . .	71
IBM 127) Eliminate SCSI-3 and spellout 1 . . . . .	72
IBM 128) Force table to one page . . . . .	72
IBM 129) Use 'see SAM-2'. . . . .	72
IBM 130) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	72
IBM 131) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase & Spellout 2 . . . . .	72
IBM 132) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	73
IBM 133) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	73
IBM 134) List standards in an ordered list . . . . .	73
IBM 135) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	73
IBM 136) Eliminate execution . . . . .	73
IBM 137) Spellout 'byte 1' . . . . .	73
IBM 138) Spellout 'byte 1' . . . . .	73
IBM 139) How to build CDB usage bit map? . . . . .	73
IBM 140) Change 'thus' to 'for example'. . . . .	74
IBM 141) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	74
IBM 142) Delete discussion of multi-port issue . . . . .	74

**Unresolved Comments List (continued)**

IBM 143) Description of 'independent' Mode Pages . . . . .	74
IBM 145) Change 'may' to 'shall' . . . . .	74
IBM 146) Commas not parentheses . . . . .	74
IBM 148) Add 'may' . . . . .	75
IBM 149) Eliminate note . . . . .	75
IBM 151) Eliminate notes . . . . .	75
IBM 152) Eliminate notes . . . . .	75
IBM 153) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	75
IBM 154) Eliminate note . . . . .	75
IBM 155) 'zero' not '0' . . . . .	75
IBM 158) 'Reservation descriptor' is a field name . . . . .	76
IBM 159) Don't capitalize 'Logical Unit' . . . . .	76
IBM 160) Change 'LU' to '0h' . . . . .	76
IBM 161) Don't capitalize 'Logical Unit' . . . . .	76
IBM 162) Change 'Element' to '2h' . . . . .	76
IBM 164) Don't capitalize 'element' . . . . .	77
IBM 165) Eliminate 'execute' . . . . .	77
IBM 166) Eliminate 'execute' . . . . .	77
IBM 167) Don't capitalize 'service' . . . . .	77
IBM 169) Don't capitalize 'element' . . . . .	77
IBM 170) Clarify 'specified above' . . . . .	77
IBM 173) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	78
IBM 174) Add a comma . . . . .	78
IBM 175) Use command descriptor block or CDB . . . . .	78
IBM 177) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	79
IBM 199) Add e.g. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	82
IBM 200) 'standard inquiry' s/b all caps . . . . .	82
IBM 201) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	82
IBM 202) Change 'action concerns' to 'action applies to' . . . . .	83
IBM 203) 'space' means 'bytes' . . . . .	83
IBM 204) 'on all ports' adds no value . . . . .	83
IBM 205) Eliminate 'execution' . . . . .	83
IBM 206) Don't capitalize 'standby' or 'idle' . . . . .	83
IBM 207) Add e.g. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	83
IBM 208) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	83
IBM 209) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	83
IBM 210) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	84
IBM 211) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	84
IBM 212) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	84
IBM 213) Make 'command-specific information' all caps . . . . .	84
IBM 214) Make 'sense key' all caps . . . . .	84
IBM 215) Make 'additional sense bytes' all caps . . . . .	84
IBM 216) 'SKSV' is a field name . . . . .	84
IBM 217) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	84
IBM 219) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	85
IBM 221) Clarify 'as described below' . . . . .	85
IBM 222) Eliminate 'execution' . . . . .	85
IBM 223) Clarify 'described below' . . . . .	85
IBM 224) Force table to one page . . . . .	85
IBM 225) Add e.g. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	85
IBM 226) Add e.g. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	85



**Unresolved Comments List (continued)**

IBM 227) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	85
IBM 228) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	86
IBM 229) Add e.g. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	86
IBM 230) Commas not parentheses . . . . .	86
IBM 231) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	86
IBM 232) Make 'translate address' s/b all caps because it's a mode page name . . . . .	86
IBM 233) Put e.g. in parentheses . . . . .	86
IBM 234) Put e.g. in parentheses . . . . .	86
IBM 235) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	87
IBM 236) Change 'action concerns' to 'action applies to' . . . . .	87
IBM 237) Don't capitalize 'Identifier' . . . . .	87
IBM 238) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	87
IBM 239) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	87
IBM 240) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	87
IBM 241) Don't capitalize 'buffer' . . . . .	87
IBM 242) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	87
IBM 243) Add e.g. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	88
IBM 244) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	88
IBM 245) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	88
IBM 246) Don't capitalize 'buffer' . . . . .	88
IBM 248) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	88
IBM 249) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	88
IBM 251) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	89
IBM 252) Change 'event (or events)' to 'event(s)' . . . . .	89
IBM 253) Clarify 'below' . . . . .	89
IBM 254) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	89
IBM 255) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	89
IBM 256) Change 'Thus the updated' to 'As a result the updated' . . . . .	89
IBM 257) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	90
IBM 258) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	90
IBM 259) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	90
IBM 260) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	90
IBM 261) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	90
IBM 262) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	90
IBM 263) Don't capitalize 'self-test' . . . . .	90
IBM 264) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	91
IBM 265) Force table to one page . . . . .	91
IBM 266) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	91
IBM 267) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	91
IBM 270) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	91
IBM 271) 'zero' not '0' . . . . .	91
IBM 272) 'zero' not '0' . . . . .	92
IBM 273) 'zero' not '0' . . . . .	92
IBM 274) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	92
IBM 275) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	92
IBM 276) 'one' not '1' . . . . .	92
IBM 277) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	92
IBM 278) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	92
IBM 280) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	93
IBM 281) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	93
IBM 282) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	93

**Unresolved Comments List (continued)**

IBM 283) Change 'TST=xxxb' to 'the TST field equals xxxb' . . . . .	93
IBM 284) Commas not parentheses . . . . .	93
IBM 285) Commas not parentheses . . . . .	93
IBM 286) Change 'An SCSI' to 'A SCSI'. . . . .	93
IBM 287) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	93
IBM 288) Don't capitalize 'Target Role Agent' . . . . .	94
IBM 289) Change 'thus' to 'therefore'. . . . .	94
IBM 291) Remove 'etc.' . . . . .	94
IBM 292) Commas not parentheses . . . . .	94
IBM 294) Just SAM-2. . . . .	94
IBM 295) Which hunt . . . . .	94
IBM 296) Which hunt . . . . .	95
IBM 297) Which hunt . . . . .	95
IBM 298) Don't capitalize 'standby' or 'idle' . . . . .	95
IBM 300) Change 'Thus' to 'For that reason' . . . . .	95
IBM 301) Use 'CDB' not 'Use command descriptor block' . . . . .	95
IBM 302) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	95
IBM 303) Change 'SCC' to 'SCC-2' . . . . .	95
IBM 304) Change 'FC-PH ...' to 'FC-FS' . . . . .	95
IBM 305) Change 'FC-PH ...' to 'FC-FS' . . . . .	96
IBM 306) 'eight' not '8' . . . . .	96
IBM 307) Don't capitalize 'Canonical'. . . . .	96
IBM 308) Remove A/B Ports . . . . .	96
IBM 309) Footnotes in wrong format . . . . .	96
IBM 310) Command not in table . . . . .	96
IBM 311) Commas not parentheses . . . . .	96
IBM 312) Just CDB . . . . .	96
IBM 313) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	97
IBM 314) Just CDB . . . . .	97
IBM 315) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	97
IBM 316) Don't capitalize 'Log Parameters' . . . . .	97
IBM 318) Change 'will' to 'shall' . . . . .	97
IBM 319) Use 'SBC-2' . . . . .	97
IBM 320) Don't capitalize 'Power Condition' and 'Fault Failure Reporting Page' . . . . .	97
LSI 6) Unclear requirement for Generation field . . . . .	100
LSI 7) Allocation Length of Persistent Reserve . . . . .	100
LSI 8) Initiator identification . . . . .	100
LSI 9) Add 'Generation Number Incremented' column. . . . .	100
LSI 10) Sense data information field and Beyond 2 Tbytes . . . . .	101
LSI 11) Table 128 Should specify SES pages . . . . .	101
LSI 13) First Burst Size definition. . . . .	101
Quantum 1) Use 'specify' instead of 'indicate' . . . . .	102
Quantum 2) Start definitions with a sentence . . . . .	102
Quantum 6) Consistent capitalization . . . . .	103
Quantum 9) Consistent capitalization . . . . .	104
Quantum 40) Name the 'applicable standards' . . . . .	112
Quantum 41) <a href="#">Restructure paragraphs</a> . . . . .	112
Quantum 43) Use 'Quick Arbitration and Selection'. . . . .	113
Quantum 44) How many bytes to return when SUPPORT=001b . . . . .	113
Quantum 45) Delete 'primarily'. . . . .	113
Quantum 46) 'target' or 'device server'? . . . . .	113

**Unresolved Comments List (continued)**

Quantum 50) Add requirement . . . . .	114
Quantum 51) Remove 'actual' . . . . .	115
Quantum 53) Use RESERVATION CONFLICT status . . . . .	115
Quantum 54) Change 'are' to 'is' . . . . .	115
Quantum 65) What does 'usually' mean? . . . . .	118
Quantum 66) Restructure SKSV sentence . . . . .	118
Quantum 69) Deferred error handling unclear . . . . .	119
Quantum 70) What is 'external system intervention'? . . . . .	119
Quantum 71) 'initiator' not 'causing initiator' . . . . .	119
Quantum 72) <a href="#">Rewrite sentence</a> . . . . .	119
Quantum 73) <a href="#">Rewrite sentence</a> . . . . .	120
Quantum 74) <a href="#">Rewrite sentence</a> . . . . .	120
Quantum 75) Rewrite PF bit description . . . . .	120
Quantum 77) Put notes in table 126 . . . . .	120
Quantum 78) <a href="#">Reword du bit description</a> . . . . .	121
Quantum 79) Change 'LBIN' to 'LBIN bit' . . . . .	121
Quantum 80) Change data allowed in application client log page . . . . .	121
Quantum 81) Put note in table 138 . . . . .	121
Quantum 84) <a href="#">Rewrite sentence</a> . . . . .	121
Quantum 85) <a href="#">Rewrite sentence</a> . . . . .	122
Quantum 86) <a href="#">Rewrite sentence</a> . . . . .	122
Quantum 87) <a href="#">Rewrite sentence</a> . . . . .	122
Quantum 88) <a href="#">Rewrite sentence</a> . . . . .	122
Quantum 89) <a href="#">Rewrite sentence</a> . . . . .	122
Quantum 92) Units of time not specified . . . . .	123
Seagate 8) Why are FC-PH, AM 1, FC-PH-3, and FC-FS normative references? . . . . .	125
Seagate 11) Reference SAM-2 (not SCSI-2) for CA definition . . . . .	126
Seagate 15) Document numbers in acronyms? . . . . .	126
Seagate 18) Change 'on...logical unit(s)' to 'of...logical unit(s)'. . . . .	127
Seagate 20) 'transfer length' by another name . . . . .	127
Seagate 21) Commands go to logical units . . . . .	127
Seagate 23) 'logical unit' not 'device server' . . . . .	128
Seagate 24) Use TEST UNIT READY to check media status . . . . .	128
Seagate 25) Delete advisory description of TEST UNIT READY . . . . .	128
Seagate 26) Is parameter rounding always allowed? . . . . .	129
Seagate 29) Why reference draft standards over published? . . . . .	129
Seagate 45) Delete registration resources note . . . . .	133
Seagate 59) Why 'all initiators (regardless of port)'? . . . . .	138
Seagate 63) Remove comparison of processor to communications devices. . . . .	139
Seagate 76) Should SPC-2 reference draft or approved standards? . . . . .	143
Seagate 77) Would an acronym be helpful? . . . . .	143
Seagate 80) Is MCHNGR embedded in device or vice versa? . . . . .	144
Seagate 82) Parameters effect initiators . . . . .	144
Seagate 83) Why define the additional length field so many times? . . . . .	144
Seagate 85) Why define the ADDITIONAL LENGTH field so many times? . . . . .	144
Seagate 86) Definition of field value of LU. . . . .	145
Seagate 86a) Use 'in an initiator' not 'on an initiator' . . . . .	145
Seagate 87) Application clients can't execute tasks . . . . .	145
Seagate 88) Delete 'if required' . . . . .	145
Seagate 89) PREEMPT AND ABORT definition error . . . . .	145
Seagate 90) <a href="#">Obsolete function in PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT</a> . . . . .	146

**Unresolved Comments List (continued)**

Seagate 98) Handling of obsolete RELEASE bits . . . . . 148  
Seagate 99) Information on what? . . . . . 148  
Seagate 100) Change 'is' to 'are' . . . . . 148  
Seagate 101) Use 'cached' not 'buffered'. . . . . 149  
Seagate 102) Handling of obsolete RESERVE bits. . . . . 149  
Seagate 104) Unacceptable field names . . . . . 149  
Seagate 105) Left justify 2nd column of table 132. . . . . 150  
Seagate 106) What does xx mean? . . . . . 150  
Seagate 107) Too many notes (e.g., note 52) . . . . . 150  
Seagate 108) What is 'steady state'? . . . . . 150

## Rejected Comments List

Brocade 11) Default self-test blocks subsequent commands . . . . .	29
Brocade 12) COMPARE success . . . . .	29
Brocade 13) COMPARE pad . . . . .	29
Brocade 17) COPY AND VERIFY comparison . . . . .	31
Brocade 18) Verification model . . . . .	31
Brocade 19) Concurrent COPY & EXTENDED COPY . . . . .	31
Brocade 26) Additional note for LUN identified devices . . . . .	34
Brocade 33) FAILED SEGMENT DETAILS is redundant . . . . .	38
Crds 2) RECEIVE COPY RESULTS requires tagged queuing . . . . .	44
Crds 3) Access Controls missing . . . . .	45
IBM 1) Remove Processor Commands . . . . .	46
IBM 18) Undefine 'logical unit inventory' . . . . .	48
IBM 43) Put 'segments' in glossary . . . . .	53
IBM 61) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	56
IBM 63) Which hunt . . . . .	57
IBM 71) 'zero' not '0' . . . . .	59
IBM 73) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	60
IBM 74) Eliminate parenthesis . . . . .	60
IBM 75) 'zero' not '0' & 'one' not '1' . . . . .	60
IBM 76) Table anchor placement . . . . .	60
IBM 77) Eliminate parenthesis . . . . .	61
IBM 78) Clarify what's changed . . . . .	61
IBM 79) Eliminate parenthesis . . . . .	61
IBM 80) Eliminate parenthesis . . . . .	61
IBM 81) 'RSmk' is a field name . . . . .	62
IBM 82) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	62
IBM 83) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	62
IBM 97) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	65
IBM 100) Eliminate '(tape)' . . . . .	66
IBM 109) Remove protocol specific stuff . . . . .	68
IBM 111) Add parentheses . . . . .	68
IBM 112) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	69
IBM 114) Add parentheses . . . . .	69
IBM 118) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	70
IBM 122) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	71
IBM 125) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	72
IBM 156) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase & 'zero' not '0' . . . . .	76
IBM 157) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase & 'zero' not '0' . . . . .	76
IBM 171) Don't capitalize 'Activate Persist Through Power Loss' . . . . .	78
IBM 172) Commas not parentheses . . . . .	78
IBM 176) Just '(see xxxx)' . . . . .	79
IBM 196) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	82
IBM 290) Commas not parentheses . . . . .	94
Quantum 16) Use 'number of allocation length bytes' . . . . .	105
Quantum 17) Extra white space before 5.2 . . . . .	106
Quantum 19) 'aptp!' should be capitalized . . . . .	106
Quantum 23) Move usage of the word 'value' . . . . .	107
Quantum 25) 'affected' not 'effected' . . . . .	108
Quantum 26) Clarify COMPARE description . . . . .	109
Quantum 27) Change 'need not' to 'may not' . . . . .	109
Quantum 28) Same list definition, not same list . . . . .	109

**Rejected Comments List (continued)**

Quantum 31) Remove 'need to' . . . . . 110  
 Quantum 34) Change 'bits' to 'bit' . . . . . 110  
 Quantum 37) Rewrite sentence . . . . . 111  
 Quantum 39) Unit Attention results in CHECK CONDITION . . . . . 112  
 Seagate 31) Don't capitalize 'abort' . . . . . 130  
 Seagate 32) Specifically identify subsequent command as the one terminated . . . . . 130  
 Seagate 34) Why two reservations checking requirements? . . . . . 130  
 Seagate 44) Persistent Reservations question . . . . . 133  
 Seagate 46) Two lists with same introduction . . . . . 134  
 Seagate 54) How can != SERVICE ACTION RESERVATION KEY point to a registration? . . . . . 137  
 Seagate 55) Figure 2 has more requirements than the text . . . . . 138  
 Seagate 71) Is EXTENDED COPY residual data handling statement clear? . . . . . 141  
 Seagate 75) How can the TUR bit be optional? . . . . . 143  
 Seagate 96) Insufficient allocation length in FAILED SEGMENT DETAILS . . . . . 147  
 O1) Gardner - Restrict Variable Length CDB Size. . . . . 151

**Substantive Comments Accepted As Proposed**

O6) Katata - Missing MMC-2 ASC/ASCQ Assignments ..... 153  
O7) Katata - Incorrect ASC/ASCQ..... 153  
O8) Katata - ASC/ASCQ Conflict Between MMC-2 & EXTENDED COPY ..... 153  
O18) T10 - Incorporate TASK ABORTED status..... 155

**Substantive Comments Accepted With Noted Changes**

Brocade 8) Definition of encryption field . . . . . 28  
Brocade 14) COMPARE obsolete. . . . . 30  
Brocade 15) COPY command obsolete . . . . . 30  
Brocade 16) COPY AND VERIFY obsolete . . . . . 31  
Brocade 20) EXTENDED COPY parameter length. . . . . 32  
Brocade 29) VPD page 83 mandatory . . . . . 35  
Brocade 31) "Oldest held data" is relative. . . . . 37  
IBM 33) Add 64-bit LBA . . . . . 51  
IBM 180) What does 'immediately' mean? . . . . . 79  
Seagate 19) 64-bit LBAs . . . . . 127  
Seagate 22) Is encryption allowed? . . . . . 128  
Seagate 94) What does 'immediately' mean? . . . . . 146  
O21) Penokie - Two variable length CDB sizes. . . . . 155



## Accepted As Proposed Non-Substantive Comments List

Brocade 2) Spelling . . . . .	26
Brocade 3) Definition of sense data . . . . .	26
Brocade 4) Service response definition . . . . .	26
Brocade 22) Stripped vs. Striped . . . . .	33
Brocade 24) Residual count . . . . .	33
CPQ 5) RELEASE Cross Reference . . . . .	43
ENDL 2) Incorrect Cross Reference . . . . .	45
IBM 2) Use 'this standard' . . . . .	46
IBM 4) Wrong Normative References format . . . . .	46
IBM 5) ISO Format for Normative References . . . . .	46
IBM 6) Eliminate 'execution' . . . . .	46
IBM 7) Add AER acronym in glossary . . . . .	47
IBM 8) Add ACA acronym in glossary . . . . .	47
IBM 9) Add CDB acronym in glossary . . . . .	47
IBM 10) Use (e.g., ...) form . . . . .	47
IBM 11) Add CA acronym in glossary . . . . .	47
IBM 12) Delete 'thus' in 'copy manager' def . . . . .	47
IBM 14) Is 'effective progress' different from 'progress'? . . . . .	47
IBM 15) Eliminate morbid command deaths . . . . .	48
IBM 17) Use (e.g., ...) form . . . . .	48
IBM 23) Just SAM-2. . . . .	49
IBM 24) 'Notation for Procedures and Functions' clause . . . . .	49
IBM 25) Expunge Bold Text . . . . .	49
IBM 26) Use command descriptor block or CDB . . . . .	49
IBM 37) Just SAM-2. . . . .	52
IBM 40) There is no such thing as 'device specific' . . . . .	52
IBM 47) Change 'never' to 'not' . . . . .	53
IBM 49) Eliminate note. . . . .	54
IBM 50) Eliminate 'execution' . . . . .	54
IBM 51) Eliminate 'execution' . . . . .	54
IBM 55) Don't say just 'the table' . . . . .	54
IBM 56) 'table 8' and 'table 9' . . . . .	55
IBM 60) Eliminate 'execution' . . . . .	55
IBM 68) Change 'port' to 'service delivery ports' . . . . .	59
IBM 69) Change 'port' to 'service delivery ports' . . . . .	59
IBM 85) Eliminate 'execute' . . . . .	62
IBM 86) Change 'activities' to 'actions' . . . . .	63
IBM 87) The identification is unique, not the value . . . . .	63
IBM 92) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	64
IBM 93) Don't capitalize 'Inline' . . . . .	64
IBM 94) Eliminate 'in the manner' . . . . .	64
IBM 96) Parity is out of date. . . . .	65
IBM 104) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	67
IBM 107) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	67
IBM 110) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	68
IBM 117) Change parentheses to commas . . . . .	70
IBM 121) Spellout CAT=1 and PAD=1. . . . .	71
IBM 126) 'field' should be 'fields' . . . . .	72
IBM 144) 'PS' is a field name . . . . .	74
IBM 147) Delete wording that means 'may' . . . . .	74
IBM 150) Commas not parentheses . . . . .	75

**Accepted As Proposed Non-Substantive Comments List (continued)**

IBM 163) Just SMC-2. . . . .	77
IBM 168) Just '(see xxxx)' . . . . .	77
IBM 178) 'zero' not '0'. . . . .	79
IBM 179) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	79
IBM 181) Remove 'then'. . . . .	79
IBM 183) Clarify 'matching list identifier' . . . . .	80
IBM 185) Change 'Operating' to 'Operation'. . . . .	80
IBM 187) 'held data' is a field name. . . . .	80
IBM 190) Clarify 'same list identifier' . . . . .	81
IBM 193) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	81
IBM 195) Don't capitalize 'list' . . . . .	82
IBM 218) Non ISO number format '65536'. . . . .	84
IBM 220) Non ISO number format '65536'. . . . .	85
IBM 247) Use subclause . . . . .	88
IBM 250) Use subclause . . . . .	89
IBM 268) Use subclause . . . . .	91
IBM 279) Use subclause . . . . .	92
IBM 293) 'set' does not mean 'set to one' . . . . .	94
IBM 299) Use subclause . . . . .	95
IBM 317) Use subclause . . . . .	97
LSI 4) Bad table reference . . . . .	99
LSI 5) Misspelling of 'striped'. . . . .	100
LSI 12) Incorrect table references . . . . .	101
Quantum 4) Show acronyms in definitions . . . . .	103
Quantum 5) Delete comma . . . . .	103
Quantum 7) "...during the Data-Out Buffer"???. . . . .	103
Quantum 11) 'indicates' not 'indicated'. . . . .	104
Quantum 12) Add missing clause cross reference . . . . .	104
Quantum 14) Change 'field uses' to just 'fields'. . . . .	105
Quantum 18) Change verb to match nouns. . . . .	106
Quantum 20) 'a unit attention' not 'an unit attention' . . . . .	106
Quantum 21) Add 'the'. . . . .	106
Quantum 29) 'read-ahead' not defined. . . . .	109
Quantum 30) Change 'need not' to 'may not'. . . . .	109
Quantum 33) Missing preposition 'of'. . . . .	110
Quantum 35) Missing preposition 'if' . . . . .	111
Quantum 38) Change 'the' to 'a'. . . . .	111
Quantum 42) Change 'upto' to 'up to'. . . . .	113
Quantum 47) Use '(6)' to specify the mode commands. . . . .	114
Quantum 49) Convention for command names. . . . .	114
Quantum 52) Missing article 'the'. . . . .	115
Quantum 56) Field needs to contain a value . . . . .	116
Quantum 57) Misspelled 'Operation' . . . . .	116
Quantum 61) Add article 'the'. . . . .	117
Quantum 64) Change 'values' to 'value'. . . . .	118
Quantum 67) Too many prepositional phrases . . . . .	119
Quantum 68) Illegal parameters are always an error. . . . .	119
Quantum 82) Spellout the log page name . . . . .	121
Quantum 83) Spellout the log page name . . . . .	121
Quantum 90) Change 'include' to 'implement' . . . . .	122
Quantum 93) Change 'A' to 'An'. . . . .	123

**Accepted As Proposed Non-Substantive Comments List (continued)**

Seagate 1) Update NCITS e-mail address . . . . .	123
Seagate 2) Reword Processor usage for AER . . . . .	123
Seagate 3) Delete redundant sentence . . . . .	124
Seagate 4) Add 'of'. . . . .	124
Seagate 7) Missing ISO/IEC standards numbers . . . . .	125
Seagate 10) Change 'protocol-specific' to 'transport protocol specific' . . . . .	126
Seagate 12) Delete 'Although ...' uninformative text . . . . .	126
Seagate 13) Which hunt & change 'by' to 'as' . . . . .	126
Seagate 14) Just 'exception condition'. . . . .	126
Seagate 16) Remove bold text . . . . .	126
Seagate 28) Use '...as soon as practical...' instead of '...as soon as possible...' . . . . .	129
Seagate 41) You cannot provide a think but you can't remove it. . . . .	132
Seagate 60) What are 'machine states'? . . . . .	139
Seagate 61) Change 'may interpret' to 'interprets'. . . . .	139
Seagate 64) Change 'protocol dictated' to 'protocol specified'. . . . .	140
Seagate 65) Add 'OB = Obsolete in table 10. . . . .	140
Seagate 70) Add specific reference to table 36. . . . .	141
Seagate 72) Add cross references . . . . .	142
Seagate 78) REPORT LUNS support when HISUP=0 . . . . .	143
Seagate 81) Change 'upto' to 'up to'. . . . .	144
Seagate 84) Change singular to plural . . . . .	144
Seagate 91) Clarify 'zero filling' requirement . . . . .	146
Seagate 92) Clarify APTPL bit description. . . . .	146
Seagate 93) Add MSB/LSB to BUFFER CAPACITY field . . . . .	146
Seagate 95) Values => 02h conflict with ISO/IEC standards. . . . .	147
Seagate 109) Add ISO/IEC JTC 1 web site . . . . .	151
TI 1) Old John Lohmeyer email address . . . . .	151
O2) Suhler - Change 'and etc.' to just 'etc.' . . . . .	152
O3) Elliott - Change 'aproved' to 'approved'. . . . .	152
O4) Elliott - Change 'conserdation' to 'consideration'. . . . .	152
O5) McKean - Incorrect table references. . . . .	152
O9) Weber - Missing TOC entries and bookmarks . . . . .	153
O11) Weber - Add 'LBA' acronym . . . . .	154
O12) Weber - Explain field value usage . . . . .	154
O13) Quicksall - 'log page' not 'mode page'. . . . .	154
O14) Weber - 'PERSISTENT RESERVE IN/OUT' not 'P... RESERVATION ...'. . . . .	154
O15) Weber - APTPL s/b small caps. . . . .	154
O16) Elliott- SES Amendment version descriptor . . . . .	154
O17) Elliott - 'SCSI Parallel Bus' not 'SCSI-2 ...' . . . . .	155
O19) Elliott - 'additional sense code' usage differs from glossary . . . . .	155
O20) Houlder - Change SEND DIAGNOSTIC from 'O' to 'Z'. . . . .	155
O22) CAP WG - Don't use 'power off' . . . . .	156
O23) Weber - 'valid' s/b small caps . . . . .	156
O24) Weber - 'stream' s/b 'sequential-access'. . . . .	156
O25) Elliott - QAS/IU wording should match SPI. . . . .	156
O26) Elliott - N_Port means Fibre Channel . . . . .	157
O??) Update Vendor Identifier List . . . . .	158

**Accepted With Noted Changes Non-Substantive Comments List**

Brocade 5) Command Descriptor Block . . . . .	27
Brocade 6) Operation Code and Control Code . . . . .	27
Brocade 7) Restrict use of Service Action . . . . .	27
Brocade 9) Self test is obligatory . . . . .	28
Brocade 10) Self test clarification . . . . .	28
Brocade 21) EXTENDED COPY priority . . . . .	32
Brocade 23) Supported target devices . . . . .	33
Brocade 25) Assumption of single fabric . . . . .	34
Brocade 27) Resource exhaustion question . . . . .	34
Brocade 30) Use correct units . . . . .	37
CPQ 1A) Allowing PTPL When Media Stopped . . . . .	40
CPQ 1B) PTPL Description . . . . .	41
CPQ 2) Persistent Reservations NOT READY . . . . .	42
CPQ 3) REPORT DEVICE IDENTIFIER NOT READY . . . . .	42
CPQ 4) Spelling of "nonvolatile" . . . . .	43
IBM 3) Specify Figure 1 . . . . .	46
IBM 16) Which hunt . . . . .	48
IBM 19) Redefine 'target' . . . . .	48
IBM 27) Add 32 byte CDB format . . . . .	50
IBM 28) Duplicate of IBM 29) . . . . .	50
IBM 29) Use table 1, table 2, . . . . .	50
IBM 30) Use subclause . . . . .	50
IBM 31) Kill the ly (explicitly) words . . . . .	51
IBM 32) Change 'device' to 'SCSI device' . . . . .	51
IBM 36) Variable CDB s/b under 4.3 (not 4.4) . . . . .	52
IBM 44) Don't say 'the following clauses' . . . . .	53
IBM 46) Use command descriptor block or CDB . . . . .	53
IBM 53) Subscript 's' . . . . .	54
IBM 58) No need to say 'clause' . . . . .	55
IBM 62) Remove/replace 'significant' . . . . .	56
IBM 64) Don't capitalize 'Active PTPL' . . . . .	58
IBM 65) PTPL Description . . . . .	58
IBM 66) Description of READ KEYS uses 'port' . . . . .	58
IBM 70) Commas not parentheses . . . . .	59
IBM 84) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	62
IBM 88) 'zero' not '0' & 'one' not '1' . . . . .	63
IBM 89) Remove 'most' . . . . .	63
IBM 90) Change 'dictated' to 'defined' . . . . .	63
IBM 91) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	64
IBM 95) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	65
IBM 98) Clarify what's changed . . . . .	65
IBM 99) 'zero' not '0' & 'one' not '1' . . . . .	66
IBM 102) Spellout 'NUL=1' . . . . .	66
IBM 105) Reference FC-FS not FC-PH . . . . .	67
IBM 106) Reference FC-FS not FC-PH . . . . .	67
IBM 108) Remove references to FC-PH . . . . .	68
IBM 113) Eliminate 'will' . . . . .	69
IBM 115) Rewrite to eliminate parenthetical phrase . . . . .	69
IBM 116) Which hunt . . . . .	70
IBM 124) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	71
IBM 182) Use 'vendor specific' not 'vendor-specific' . . . . .	79

**Accepted With Noted Changes Non-Substantive Comments List (continued)**

IBM 184) What does 'eight' refer to? . . . . .	80
IBM 186) 'megabytes' not 'mega-bytes' etc.. . . . .	80
IBM 188) What does 'immediately' mean? . . . . .	80
IBM 189) 'zero' not '0'. . . . .	81
IBM 191) Kill the ly (immediately) words . . . . .	81
IBM 192) 'one' not '1' . . . . .	81
IBM 194) 'power of two' not 'power of 2'. . . . .	81
IBM 197) 'zero' not '0'. . . . .	82
IBM 198) Delete the last sentence. . . . .	82
IBM 269) Use subclause . . . . .	91
LSI 1) Only FC Loops use Primitive Signals . . . . .	98
LSI 2) Redundant information in persistent reservations overview . . . . .	98
LSI 3) Misleading description of PREEMPT . . . . .	99
Quantum 3) Mark page intentionally left blank. . . . .	103
Quantum 8) Compare 'idle condition' to 'active condition' . . . . .	104
Quantum 10) Which hunt . . . . .	104
Quantum 13) Restructure typical CDB subclause . . . . .	105
Quantum 15) Clarify transfer length equals zero . . . . .	105
Quantum 22) Restructure PREEMPT description for readability . . . . .	107
Quantum 24) Rewrite contention resolution options for multi-port targets. . . . .	107
Quantum 32) Add missing 'the' & replace 'indicate'. . . . .	110
Quantum 36) Breakup complex sentence . . . . .	111
Quantum 48) Name the specific MODE SENSE commands . . . . .	114
Quantum 55) Add 'content of' ... field . . . . .	116
Quantum 58) 'megabytes' not 'mega-bytes' etc. . . . .	116
Quantum 59) Segment descriptors don't hold data . . . . .	117
Quantum 60) Use 'number of bytes' not 'length' . . . . .	117
Quantum 62) Questionable description of copy devices . . . . .	118
Quantum 63) 'concerns' s/b 'concern' . . . . .	118
Quantum 76) Opcode & service action wording . . . . .	120
Quantum 91) Eliminate 'actual execution' . . . . .	123
Seagate 5) Reword description of Roadmap figure . . . . .	124
Seagate 6) Incorrect ISO/IEC standards numbers . . . . .	124
Seagate 9) Delete or replace 'possible' . . . . .	125
Seagate 17) Delete 'typical'. . . . .	127
Seagate 27) Simplify SEND DIAGNOSTIC status description. . . . .	129
Seagate 30) Use '...as soon as practical...' instead of '...as soon as possible...' . . . . .	129
Seagate 33) Add types of reservations overview. . . . .	130
Seagate 35) Match 'queuing' description to SAM-2. . . . .	131
Seagate 36) Match 'queuing' description to SAM-2. . . . .	131
Seagate 37) Rewrite sentence to eliminate 'most'. . . . .	131
Seagate 38) Change 'is' to 'may be'. . . . .	131
Seagate 39) Change 'SCSI' to 'SCSI commands'. . . . .	132
Seagate 40) Change 'power...is lost' to 'power...is removed'. . . . .	132
Seagate 42) Use APTPL acronym. . . . .	132
Seagate 43) Where is 'scope-specific address' defined? . . . . .	133
Seagate 47) 'aptpl' should be in small caps . . . . .	134
Seagate 48) What's difference between 'releasing' and 'removing' a reservation? . . . . .	134
Seagate 49) What happens to the reservation? . . . . .	136
Seagate 50) 'removed' not 'preempted'? . . . . .	136
Seagate 51) SERVICE ACTION RESERVATION KEY != reservation? . . . . .	136

**Accepted With Noted Changes Non-Substantive Comments List (continued)**

Seagate 52) Improper use of 'should' . . . . . 137

Seagate 53) What's an inactive persistent reservation? . . . . . 137

Seagate 56) Queuing restrictions time-out? . . . . . 138

Seagate 57) Use 'vendor specific' . . . . . 138

Seagate 58) Rewrite contention resolution options for multi-port targets . . . . . 138

Seagate 62) Change 'unusual condition' to 'exception condition' . . . . . 139

Seagate 66) Value that matches what? . . . . . 140

Seagate 67) What is arithmetic precedence of +16/32? . . . . . 140

Seagate 68) Remove 'sensible' . . . . . 141

Seagate 69) Unclear requirement in a note 11 . . . . . 141

Seagate 73) Identify where 'processing' is described . . . . . 142

Seagate 74) Identify where 'processing' is described . . . . . 142

Seagate 79) Use 'shall indicate' . . . . . 143

Seagate 97) Note describing the 50 reserved FAILED SEGMENT DETAILS bytes . . . . . 148

Seagate 103) Concerns about 'concerns' . . . . . 149

TI 2) Figure 1 is not a roadmap . . . . . 151

O10) Elliott - 'other' unclear . . . . . 154

O27) Elliott - World Wide Name is not just for Fibre Channel . . . . . 158

## Comments Concerning the Extended Copy Feature

Brocade 19) Concurrent COPY & EXTENDED COPY (Rejected)	31
Brocade 20) EXTENDED COPY parameter length (Substantive)	32
Brocade 21) EXTENDED COPY priority	32
Brocade 22) Stripped vs. Striped	33
Brocade 23) Supported target devices	33
Brocade 24) Residual count	33
Brocade 25) Assumption of single fabric	34
Brocade 26) Additional note for LUN identified devices (Rejected)	34
Brocade 27) Resource exhaustion question	34
Brocade 30) Use correct units	37
Brocade 31) "Oldest held data" is relative (Substantive)	37
Brocade 32) Discard mechanism is ill-defined [needs SNIA-BWG input] (Substantive)	38
Brocade 33) FAILED SEGMENT DETAILS is redundant (Rejected)	38
Crds 1) EXTENDED COPY Informative Annex	44
Crds 2) RECEIVE COPY RESULTS requires tagged queuing (Rejected)	44
IBM 84) Eliminate parentheses	62
IBM 85) Eliminate 'execute'	62
IBM 86) Change 'activities' to 'actions'	63
IBM 87) The identification is unique, not the value	63
IBM 88) 'zero' not '0' & 'one' not '1'	63
IBM 89) Remove 'most'	63
IBM 90) Change 'dictated' to 'defined'	63
IBM 91) Eliminate parentheses	64
IBM 92) Eliminate parentheses	64
IBM 93) Don't capitalize 'Inline'	64
IBM 94) Eliminate 'in the manner'	64
IBM 95) Eliminate parentheses	65
IBM 96) Parity is out of date	65
IBM 97) Eliminate parentheses (Rejected)	65
IBM 99) 'zero' not '0' & 'one' not '1'	66
IBM 100) Eliminate '(tape)' (Rejected)	66
IBM 101) Force table to one page	66
IBM 102) Spellout 'NUL=1'	66
IBM 103) What states have changed? [needs SNIA-BWG discussion]	66
IBM 104) Eliminate parentheses	67
IBM 105) Reference FC-FS not FC-PH	67
IBM 106) Reference FC-FS not FC-PH	67
IBM 107) Eliminate parentheses	67
IBM 108) Remove references to FC-PH	68
IBM 109) Remove protocol specific stuff (Rejected)	68
IBM 110) Eliminate parentheses	68
IBM 111) Add parentheses (Rejected)	68
IBM 112) Eliminate parentheses (Rejected)	69
IBM 113) Eliminate 'will'	69
IBM 114) Add parentheses (Rejected)	69
IBM 115) Rewrite to eliminate parenthetical phrase	69
IBM 116) Which hunt	70
IBM 117) Change parentheses to commas	70
IBM 118) Eliminate parentheses (Rejected)	70
IBM 119) Indent footnote	70
IBM 120) Force table to one page	71

**Comments Concerning the Extended Copy Feature (continued)**

IBM 121) Spellout CAT=1 and PAD=1. . . . .	71
IBM 122) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Rejected) . . . . .	71
IBM 123) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	71
IBM 124) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	71
IBM 125) Eliminate parentheses (Rejected) . . . . .	72
IBM 126) 'field' should be 'fields' . . . . .	72
IBM 179) Eliminate parentheses . . . . .	79
IBM 180) What does 'immediately' mean? (Substantive) . . . . .	79
IBM 181) Remove 'then'. . . . .	79
IBM 182) Use 'vendor specific' not 'vendor-specific' (Global) . . . . .	79
IBM 183) Clarify 'matching list identifier' . . . . .	80
IBM 184) What does 'eight' refer to? . . . . .	80
IBM 185) Change 'Operating' to 'Operation'. . . . .	80
IBM 186) 'megabytes' not 'mega-bytes' etc. . . . .	80
IBM 187) 'held data' is a field name . . . . .	80
IBM 188) What does 'immediately' mean? . . . . .	80
IBM 189) 'zero' not '0'. . . . .	81
IBM 190) Clarify 'same list identifier' . . . . .	81
IBM 191) Kill the ly (immediately) words . . . . .	81
IBM 192) 'one' not '1' . . . . .	81
IBM 193) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase . . . . .	81
IBM 194) 'power of two' not 'power of 2'. . . . .	81
IBM 195) Don't capitalize 'list' . . . . .	82
IBM 196) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Rejected) . . . . .	82
IBM 197) 'zero' not '0'. . . . .	82
IBM 198) Delete the last sentence. . . . .	82
LSI 5) Misspelling of 'striped' . . . . .	100
Quantum 29) 'read-ahead' not defined. . . . .	109
Quantum 30) Change 'need not' to 'may not'. . . . .	109
Quantum 31) Remove 'need to' (Rejected) . . . . .	110
Quantum 32) Add missing 'the' & replace 'indicate'. . . . .	110
Quantum 33) Missing preposition 'of'. . . . .	110
Quantum 34) Change 'bits' to 'bit' (Rejected) . . . . .	110
Quantum 35) Missing preposition 'if' . . . . .	111
Quantum 36) Breakup complex sentence . . . . .	111
Quantum 37) Rewrite sentence (Rejected) . . . . .	111
Quantum 38) Change 'the' to 'a'. . . . .	111
Quantum 57) Misspelled 'Operation' . . . . .	116
Quantum 58) 'megabytes' not 'mega-bytes' etc. . . . .	116
Quantum 59) Segment descriptors don't hold data . . . . .	117
Quantum 60) Use 'number of bytes' not 'length' . . . . .	117
Quantum 61) Add article 'the'. . . . .	117
Quantum 62) Questionable description of copy devices . . . . .	118
Seagate 66) Value that matches what? . . . . .	140
Seagate 67) What is arithmetic precedence of +16/32? . . . . .	140
Seagate 68) Remove 'sensible' . . . . .	141
Seagate 69) Unclear requirement in a note 11 . . . . .	141
Seagate 70) Add specific reference to table 36. . . . .	141
Seagate 71) Is EXTENDED COPY residual data handling statement clear? (Rejected). . . . .	141
Seagate 72) Add cross references . . . . .	142
Seagate 73) Identify where 'processing' is described . . . . .	142



### **Comments Concerning the Extended Copy Feature (continued)**

Seagate 74) Identify where 'processing' is described . . . . .	142
Seagate 75) How can the tur bit be optional? (Rejected) . . . . .	143
Seagate 94) What does 'immediately' mean? [requires SNIA-BWG input] (Substantive) . . . . .	146
Seagate 95) Values => 02h conflict with ISO/IEC standards. . . . .	147
Seagate 96) Insufficient allocation length in FAILED SEGMENT DETAILS (Rejected). . . . .	147
Seagate 97) Note describing the 50 reserved FAILED SEGMENT DETAILS bytes . . . . .	148
O2) Suhler - Change 'and etc.' to just 'etc.' . . . . .	152
O23) Weber - 'valid' s/b small caps . . . . .	156
O24) Weber - 'stream' s/b 'sequential-access'. . . . .	156
O26) Elliott - N_Port means Fibre Channel . . . . .	157
O27) Elliott - World Wide Name is not just for Fibre Channel . . . . .	158

## 1. Brocade Communications

Brocade Communications principle representative Robert Snively submitted a No vote with the following comments.

### 1.1 [1] Brocade 1) Definition of medium (Unresolved)

PDF page 35, page 7, clause 3.1.35

The definition of medium is not consistent with common industry practice, nor with the subsequent definitions in 3.1.36 and 3.1.37. The medium is the physical entity on which the media information is stored. SAM-2 rev 13 does not mention medium information, but does use the word medium to refer to the physical entity on which the media information is stored.

Proposed resolution, the text be changed to read:

3.1.35 medium: The physical entity that records, stores, and returns data as required by commands transmitted to the device server.

### 1.2 [2] Brocade 2) Spelling (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 35, page 7, clause 3.1.47

Correct "autonsense" to "autosense".

### 1.3 [3] Brocade 3) Definition of sense data (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 35, page 7, clause 3.1.47

The last sentence should be improved to read:

"The format of sense data is the format defined for parameter data returned by the REQUEST SENSE command in 7.23.2."

### 1.4 [4] Brocade 4) Service response definition (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 39, page 11, clause 4.2

After much consideration, the FCP-2 study group chose to represent the service calls using the following format:

command (IN(a,b,c),OUT(x,y,z))

SPC-2 (and incidentally SAM-2) should do the same, as follows:

Service response = Execute Command (IN(Task Identifier, CDB, [Data-Out Buffer], Task Attributes), OUT([Data-In Buffer], [Autosense Data], [Autosense Return Flag], Status))

**1.5 [5] Brocade 5) Command Descriptor Block (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 39, page 11, clause 4.3

SEE ALSO comments 5.36 [87] IBM 36) and 7.13 [397] Quantum 13)

Since this clause is in parallel with "variable length descriptor block" in 4.4, I propose that it be entitled "fixed length command descriptor block (CDB)". Alternatively, a superior clause could be created called "Command Descriptor Block" with parallel inferior clauses for fixed length and variable length CDBs.

**Editor's note:**

Subclause 4.3 will be restructured as follows:

**4.3 The Command Descriptor Block (CDB)**

4.3.1 CDB usage and structure

4.3.2 The fixed length CDB

4.3.3 The variable length CDB

4.3.4 Common CDB fields

4.3.4.1 Operation code

4.3.4.2 Service action

4.3.4.3 Logical block address

4.3.4.4 Transfer length

4.3.4.5 Parameter list length

4.3.4.6 Allocation length

4.3.4.7 Control

Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause and any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

**1.6 [6] Brocade 6) Operation Code and Control Code (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 40, page 12, clause 4.3.1

SEE ALSO comment 7.13 [397] Quantum 13)

All fields but the Operation Code and Control fields are defined in separate paragraphs, often very short. I propose that they also be removed to separate paragraphs, since they are at the same level of hierarchy in the description process.

**Editor's note:**

Subclause 4.3 will be restructured as described in the response to 1.5 [5] Brocade 5). Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause including the changes agreed in response to this comment. Any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

**1.7 [7] Brocade 7) Restrict use of Service Action (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 42, page 14, clause 4.3.2

The last sentence now reads:

"When the specific field SERVICE ACTION is not defined in a CDB format, the bits identified as the SERVICE ACTION field in a typical CDB may be used for other purposes."

I propose that the restriction on the bits be more explicit.

"When the specific field SERVICE ACTION is not defined in a CDB format, the bits identified as the SERVICE ACTION field in a typical CDB shall be used or reserved as specified by the particular CDB."

**Editor's note:**

Incorporate as specified but change instance of 'CDB' just before the period to 'CDB format'. Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause including the changes agreed in response to this comment. Any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

**1.8 [8] Brocade 8) Definition of encryption field (Accepted, Substantive)**

(key technical comment)  
 PDF page 43, page 15, clause 4.4  
 SEE ALSO comment 8.22 [499] Seagate 22)

The encryption field now is presently defined as zero for no encryption and all other values as reserved. This seems to me to be the same as reserving the entire field. There is no clear evidence that encryption is the proper use of that field or that the field is the proper size to describe the encryption algorithm or to provide an encryption key. I would recommend reserving the field instead of defining it until an encryption model is at least proposed.

**Editor's note:**

Per the agreement of the September, 2000 CAP working group (minutes in 00-307), the ENCRYPTION IDENTIFICATION field will be changed to Reserved. Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause including the changes agreed in response to this comment. Any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

**1.9 [9] Brocade 9) Self test is obligatory (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 45, page 17, clause 5.4.1  
 SEE ALSO comments 5.40 [91] IBM 40) and 10.20 [609] O20)

The sentence indicates that self test is required for all devices that support SEND DIAGNOSTICS. Clause 5.2.1 requires that all devices support SEND DIAGNOSTICS. By extension, clause 5.4.1's first paragraph should be reworded to read:

"The default self-test is mandatory for all device types."

**Editor's notes:**

T10 approved proposal 97-256r2 changed the SEND DIAGNOSTICS command from "mandatory" to "optional". Therefore, this issue probably should be corrected by deleting subclause 5.2.4 and changing 'four' to 'three' in 5.2.1. It may be necessary to move text from 5.2.4 to 5.4, perhaps adding a new 5.4.1 subclause.

**1.10 [10] Brocade 10) Self test clarification (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 45, page 17, clause 5.4.1 and 5.4.2

The default self-test is not clearly separated from the short and long self tests, which may be run foreground and background. I would propose the first sentence of 5.4.2 be changed to read:

"There are two optional types of self-test aside from the mandatory default self-test that may be invoked using the SELF-TEST CODE field in the SEND DIAGNOSTICS command: a short self-test and an extended self-test."

Alternatively, an additional clause should be placed in front of 5.4.1 called "Types of self-test available", with all five types of self-test mentioned and a table of mandatory versus optional, with references.

**Editor's note:**

The first alternative (reworded first sentence in 5.4.2) will be used.

**1.11 [11] Brocade 11) Default self-test blocks subsequent commands (Rejected)**

PDF page 45, page 17, clause 5.4.1

In section 5.4.3.3, table 7, the behavior for background and foreground self tests is specified. There is no similar specification for default self-test with respect to the processing of subsequent commands. I would propose that subsequent commands shall present BUSY status until the default self-test is completed.

**Reason for rejection:**

The UNITOFFL and DEVOFFL bits in the SEND DIAGNOSTICS CDB control the behavior of the device or logical unit with respect to subsequent commands (see 7.27). If both UNITOFFL and DEVOFFL are zero then 'any diagnostic operations that may be detected by subsequent tasks' are prohibited. Therefore the proposed change is incorrect.

**1.12 [12] Brocade 12) COMPARE success (Rejected)**

PDF page 67, page 39, clause 7.2

The third paragraph says: "If the comparison is unsuccessful, the command shall be terminated with CHECK CONDITION status and the sense key shall be set to MISCOMPARE."

No definition is provided defining the "successful" or "unsuccessful" nature of the compare. I assume that it is intended to state here that a comparison of equal between all bytes of equal length destination and source fields is successful, while any other comparison (<, >, not equal, different lengths) is unsuccessful.

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COMPARE command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.14 [14] Brocade 14).

**1.13 [13] Brocade 13) COMPARE pad (Rejected)**

PDF page 67, page 39, clause 7.2

Table 11 defines the PAD bit. What comparison is performed for padded characters?

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COMPARE command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.14 [14] Brocade 14).

**1.14 [14] Brocade 14) COMPARE obsolete (Accepted, Substantive)**

PDF page 67, page 39, clause 7.2

I propose that, since Brocade 12 and 13 have never been addressed by any other user, that the COMPARE command cannot be implemented successfully, has never been implemented, and should be made obsolete.

**Editor's notes:**

Making this command obsolete in SPC-2 was unanimously agreed by the September CAP working group meeting (minutes in 00-307). See editor's notes for comment 1.15 [15] Brocade 15) for a list of the actions required to make this command obsolete.

**1.15 [15] Brocade 15) COPY command obsolete (Accepted, Substantive)**

(key technical comment)

PDF page 68, page 40, clause 7.3

I propose that the COPY command cannot be implemented successfully, has never been implemented, and should be made obsolete. I conclude this because of the following fundamental errors in the definition of COPY.

clause 7.3.1, 3rd paragraph.

The parameter list length of zero is considered to be not an error. However, there is no mechanism to tell what is to be copied from what when no parameters are provided. If this is not an error, I do not know what is. I propose, if COPY is not made obsolete, that a zero length parameter field should be treated as some type of INVALID PARAMETER FIELD error.

clause 7.3.1, 6th paragraph

The priority field establishes a relative priority of a copy command. However, the interaction of the priority field with the obligatory SCSI task queueing requirements is not specified. As a result, it is not clear whether or not priority can over-ride queue ordering, head of queue behavior, or queued commands ordered from another initiator. I propose that the relative priority field be deleted on the assumption that copy functions between a particular pair of devices will be single-threaded.

**Editor's notes:**

Making this command obsolete in SPC-2 was unanimously agreed by the September CAP working group meeting (minutes in 00-307). In addition to removing the defining subclauses: the following changes are required to obsolete COMPARE, COPY, and COPY AND VERIFY:

- Make the commands obsolete table 10 (PDF page 65)
- Remove the commands from the list in the definition "copy manager" (PDF page 33)
- Remove the commands from table 8 (PDF page 50)
- The sense data SEGMENT NUMBER field needs to be discussed (PDF page 171)
- Remove the commands from the lists in the descriptions of the sense data INFORMATION and COMMAND-SPECIFIC INFORMATION fields (PDF page 172)
- Remove **two occurrences** of the commands from the description of the COPY ABORTED sense key (PDF page 177)
- Remove the commands from the list in note 45 (PDF page 193)
- Make the commands obsolete table 186 (PDF page 248)
- Make the commands obsolete in table C.2 (COPY on PDF page 282, others PDF page 283)

**1.16 [16] Brocade 16) COPY AND VERIFY obsolete (Accepted, Substantive)**

PDF page 76, page 48, clause 7.4

The command should be made obsolete if COPY and COMPARE are made obsolete.

**Editor's notes:**

Making this command obsolete in SPC-2 was unanimously agreed by the September CAP working group meeting (minutes in 00-307). See editor's notes for comment 1.15 [15] Brocade 15) for a list of the actions required to make this command obsolete.

**1.17 [17] Brocade 17) COPY AND VERIFY comparison (Rejected)**

PDF page 76, page 48, clause 7.4

The second paragraph refers again to successful comparison. The word here should be verification (or verification of equality), since compare can be high, low, equal, or invalid because of length mismatches.

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COMPARE command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.16 [16] Brocade 16).

**1.18 [18] Brocade 18) Verification model (Rejected)**(key technical comment)  
PDF page 76, page 48, clause 7.4

The concept of verification is a big vague and has no model. The reason this is important is that devices expected to participate in verification must support any function that a copy manager may choose to execute to perform the verification. Without a model, uncertainty about what functions are required could cause interoperability issues. I propose that a model for verification be placed in clause 5 unless COPY AND VERIFY is made obsolete. Incidentally, this is also a problem in SBC.

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COMPARE and COPY AND VERIFY commands are being made obsolete, as requested in comments 1.14 [14] Brocade 14) and 1.16 [16] Brocade 16).

**1.19 [19] Brocade 19) Concurrent COPY & EXTENDED COPY (Rejected)**

PDF page 77, page 49, clause 7.5

COPY and EXTENDED COPY may create interactions that cause data integrity problems. I propose that it be made explicit that the receipt of a COPY command while an EXTENDED COPY command is queued or in process or the receipt of an EXTENDED COPY command while a COPY command is queued or in process be considered an INVALID COMMAND error of some sort. This is another good reason to make COPY and its partners obsolete.

**Reason for rejection:**

This is grasping at straws. Both COPY and EXTENDED COPY permit multiple instances of the command to be in process concurrently. While COPY and EXTENDED COPY have different ways of communicating the functions to be performed, both perform essentially the same function. The EXTENDED COPY command is essentially a superset of the COPY command, which means that anything that can be done with COPY can be done with

EXTENDED COPY. So, if a COPY command is being processed concurrently with an EXTENDED COPY command, the exact same condition is achievable with two appropriately constructed EXTENDED COPY commands are performed concurrently, a situation that no one I know of wishes to prohibit.

### **1.20 [20] Brocade 20) EXTENDED COPY parameter length (Accepted, Substantive)**

PDF page 77, page 49, clause 7.5

The parameter list length of zero is considered to be not an error. However, there is no mechanism to tell what is to be copied from what when no parameters are provided. If this is not an error, I do not know what is. I propose that a zero length parameter field should be treated as some type of INVALID PARAMETER FIELD error.

If this solution is not acceptable, then the behavior of the copy manager when it receives a parameter field length of zero should be specified. I would expect that the explicit behavior would be of the nature:

No commands are executed to any attached SCSI target. No internal states of the copy manager are changed or established. GOOD status is presented.

I would propose that a parameter field length that truncates a parameter list should also be an INVALID PARAMETER FIELD error of some sort, since an incomplete copy function will be specified.

#### **Editor's Notes:**

The two sentences at issue currently read:

"A parameter list length of zero indicates that no data shall be transferred. This condition shall not be considered as an error."

They will be changed to read:

"A parameter list length of zero indicates that copy manager shall not transfer any data or alter any internal state; this shall not be considered an error. If the parameter list length causes truncation of the parameter list in a target descriptor or segment descriptor, no data shall be transferred and the EXTENDED COPY command shall be terminated with a CHECK CONDITION status. The sense key shall be set to ILLEGAL REQUEST and the additional sense code shall be set to PARAMETER LIST LENGTH ERROR."

### **1.21 [21] Brocade 21) EXTENDED COPY priority (Accepted, Editorial)**

(key technical comment)

PDF page 79, page 51, clause 7.5.1

The priority field establishes a relative priority of the command. However, the interaction of the priority field with the obligatory SCSI task queueing requirements is not specified. As a result, it is not clear whether or not priority can over-ride queue ordering, head of queue behavior, or queued commands ordered from another initiator. I propose that the relative priority field be deleted on the assumption that copy functions between a particular pair of devices will be single-threaded.

Alternatively, a model must be provided for the behavior of a command with a specified priority field relative to other commands. I am not sure what the reviewers would consider an appropriate model.

#### **Editor's Notes:**

There was never any intention that the PRIORITY field would alter the command queuing behavior. Rather, the intention is to establish a relationship between the I/O operations resulting from the command, i.e., all the effects



of command queuing have done their thing before the PRIORITY field takes effect. The sentence referenced by the comment currently reads:

"The PRIORITY field establishes the priority of this EXTENDED COPY command relative to other commands being executed by the same device server."

It will be changed to read:

"The PRIORITY field establishes the priority of data transfer operations resulting from this EXTENDED COPY command relative to data transfer operations resulting from other commands being executed by the same device server."

### 1.22 [22] Brocade 22) Stripped vs. Striped (Accepted, Editorial)

Global & PDF page 79, page 51, clause 7.5.1  
SEE ALSO comment 6.5 [376] LSI 5)

In a number of places, "stripped" (naked) should be changed to "striped" (formatted in bands).

### 1.23 [23] Brocade 23) Supported target devices (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 79, page 51, clause 7.5.1

The sixth paragraph on the page specifies that not all target devices are supported. A cross reference to 7.17 should be provided to hint to people that there is a mechanism to determine which are supported.

#### Editor's Note:

The sentence at issue currently reads:

"A copy manager need not support all target descriptor formats."

It will be changed to read:

"A copy manager need not support all target descriptor formats and shall list all target descriptor formats supported in response to the RECEIVE COPY RESULTS command with OPERATING PARAMETERS service action (see 7.17.4)."

### 1.24 [24] Brocade 24) Residual count (Accepted, Editorial)

(key technical comment)  
PDF page 81, page 53, clause 7.5.3, item d

The definition of residual count should be refined. It should only indicate data as having been transferred if the transferring CDB was properly executed and resulted in GOOD status. Data that has flowed across the transport protocol but not been acknowledged with GOOD status should not be considered as having been transferred. If transfers were out of order and some were successful but others were not, then the residual count should be based on the highest displacement byte of data that contiguously from byte 0 was successfully transferred.

Editors's notes:

It appears to the editor that the requirement stated first in the comment includes the second requirement stated in the comment. Therefore, the second requirement has been omitted from the proposed text additions.

The following text will be placed between the second and third sentences of the paragraph (list entry d).

Any command sent by the copy manager that has not been completed by the destination device with a GOOD status shall not be included in computations for the residual count. If the copy manager has used out of order transfers the residual byte count shall be based solely on the contiguous completed transfers with GOOD status starting at relative byte zero of the segment. (i.e., any successfully completed transfers farther from relative byte zero than the first incomplete or unsuccessful transfer shall not contribute to the computation of the residual count).

### **1.25 [25] Brocade 25) Assumption of single fabric (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 86, page 58, clause 7.5.6.3

PDF page 87, page 59, clause 7.5.6.4

The assumption that all these ports are in the same fabric must be explicitly stated. If this is not stated, an additional "fabric name" parameter must be defined and included.

#### **Editor's Note:**

The following note will be added in both subclauses.

Note n: Use of N\_PORT addressing restricts this target descriptor format to a single fabric.

### **1.26 [26] Brocade 26) Additional note for LUN identified devices (Rejected)**

PDF page 89, page 61, clause 7.5.6.6

The handy note in section 7.5.6.2 (Note 10) should be paraphrased in 7.5.6.6 to indicate that the copy manager is burdened with identifying available paths, N\_Ports, and logical units that will access the specified LUN.

#### **Reason for rejection:**

The normative text clearly indicates the burdens on the copy manager in statements such as, "The target descriptor format shown in table 30 **instructs the copy manager to locate** a target and logical unit that returns a device identification VPD page (see 8.4.4) containing an Identification descriptor having the specified CODE SET, ASSOCIATION, IDENTIFIER TYPE, IDENTIFIER LENGTH, and IDENTIFIER field values," and "If multiple N\_Port, ... combinations access matching VPD field values, the copy manager ... shall try other combinations in the event that one combination becomes non-operational during the processing of an EXTENDED COPY command."

### **1.27 [27] Brocade 27) Resource exhaustion question (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 105, page 77, clause 7.5.7.8

The fourth paragraph indicates that data should be saved up for the application client. What happens if there are insufficient resources in the copy manager to save that information at the time the particular segment descriptor is processed?

#### **Editor's Note:**

The following sentence occurs in 7.5.7.2 (PDF page 97), 7.5.7.3 (PDF page 98), 7.5.7.4 (PDF page 99), 7.5.7.5 (PDF page 101), and 7.5.7.8 (PDF page 105):

"For descriptor type code ... shall be held for delivery to the application client upon completion of the EXTENDED COPY command in response to a RECEIVE COPY RESULTS command with RECEIVE DATA service action as described in 7.17.3."

The following sentence will be added after the sentence listed above in all five instances listed:

"The maximum amount of held data supported by the copy manager is returned in the response data for the RECEIVE COPY RESULTS command with OPERATING PARAMETERS service action (see 7.17.4)."

Note: the description in 7.17.4 includes a description of what happens when the held data resource is exhausted.

### **1.28 [28] Brocade 28) Obsolete TranDis (Unresolved)**

PDF page 125, page 97, clause 7.6.3

The CONTINUE TASK and TARGET TRANSFER DISABLE messages are obsolete in SPI-3. The SPC-2 INQUIRY data bits that indicate their presence should be similarly made obsolete.

### **1.29 [29] Brocade 29) VPD page 83 mandatory (Accepted, Substantive)**

(key technical comment)

PDF page 126, page 98, TBD clause

The device identification page (section 8.4.4) should be specified as mandatory either here in section 7.6.4 or in section 8.4.1 or 8.4.4.

Editor's notes:

As agreed at the September, 2000 CAP working group meeting, support for VPD pages 83h and 00h will be made mandatory in SPC-2. The following changes will be made:

In 7.6.1 (INQUIRY command overview, PDF page 115), the first paragraph after table 52 will be changed from:

"An enable vital product data (EVPD) bit of one specifies that the device server shall return the optional vital product data specified by the PAGE OR OPERATION CODE field. If the logical unit does not support vital product data and this bit is set to one, the device server shall return CHECK CONDITION status with the sense key set to ILLEGAL REQUEST and an additional sense code of INVALID FIELD IN CDB."

to:

"An enable vital product data (EVPD) bit of one specifies that the device server shall return the optional vital product data specified by the PAGE OR OPERATION CODE field. ~~If the logical unit does not support vital product data and this bit is set to one, the device server shall return CHECK CONDITION status with the sense key set to ILLEGAL REQUEST and an additional sense code of INVALID FIELD IN CDB.~~"

In 7.6.4 (Vital product data, PDF page 126), the first two paragraphs will be changed to a single paragraph. The first sentence of the first paragraph will be replaced by the first sentence of the second paragraph and the remainder of the second paragraph will be deleted. With the result that the text goes from:

"Implementation of vital product data is optional. See 8.4 for details about vital product data. The information returned consists of configuration data (e.g., vendor identification, product identification, model, serial number), manufacturing data (e.g., plant and date of manufacture), field replaceable unit data and other vendor- or device-specific data.

"The application client requests the vital product data information by setting the EVPD bit to one and specifying the page code of the desired vital product data (see 8.4). If the device server does not implement the requested page it shall return CHECK CONDITION status. The a sense key shall be set to ILLEGAL REQUEST and the additional sense code shall be set to INVALID FIELD IN CDB."

to:

~~"Implementation of vital product data is optional. The application client requests the vital product data information by setting the EVPD bit to one and specifying the page code of the desired vital product data. See 8.4 for details about vital product data. The information returned consists of configuration data (e.g., vendor identification, product identification, model, serial number), manufacturing data (e.g., plant and date of manufacture), field replaceable unit data and other vendor- or device-specific data.~~

~~"The application client requests the vital product data information by setting the EVPD bit to one and specifying the page code of the desired vital product data (see 8.4). If the device server does not implement the requested page it shall return CHECK-CONDITION status. The a sense key shall be set to ILLEGAL-REQUEST and the additional sense code shall be set to INVALID-FIELD-IN-CDB."~~

In 7.6.5 (Command support data PDF page 128) 6th paragraph on the page, the example must be changed to use a command other than INQUIRY. The current example:

"Thus, the CDB usage bit map for the INQUIRY command for a device server that implements command support data but not vital product data is: 12h, 02h, FFh, 00h, FFh, 07h."

will be replaced with an example based on the SEND DIAGNOSTIC command:

"Thus, the CDB usage bit map for the SEND DIAGNOSTIC command of a device server that implements only the default self-test capability is: 1Dh, 04h, 00h, 00h, 00h, 07h."

In 8.4.1 (Vital product data parameters overview and page codes, PDF page 241), change the first sentence from:

"This clause describes the optional vital product data page structure..."

to:

"This subclause describes the ~~optional~~ vital product data page structure..."

In 8.4.1 (Vital product data parameters overview and page codes, PDF page 241), delete the last sentence in the subclause (which requires support for VPD page code 00h) and add a "Support Requirement" column to table 174 with the row entries in the new column being as follows:

- page codes 00h and 83h - Mandatory
- all other page codes that have a subclause reference - Optional
- all other page codes - blank

In 8.4.4 (Device identification page, PDF page 245), add the following text to the end of the first paragraph on the page:

At least one identification descriptor shall contain 1h, 2h, or 3h in the IDENTIFIER TYPE field and 0h in the ASSOCIATION field. At least one identification descriptor should contain 3h in the IDENTIFIER TYPE field and 0h in the ASSOCIATION field.

Add a subclause to 10.2 that describes the vital product data implementation for Processor type devices and names page codes 00h-80h, 82h, 83h, and C0h-FFh as acceptable for implementation by Processor devices.

**1.30 [30] Brocade 30) Use correct units (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 156, page 128, clause 7.17.2, table 96

SEE ALSO comments 5.186 [237] IBM 186), 7.58 [442] Quantum 58), and 8.96 [573] Seagate 95)

The table should use the proper [prefix] bytes binary abbreviations and names. There is a proposed binary byte count ( $10^{**10}$ ,  $10^{**20}$ ) etc. defined as "kilo byte binary" (Kibe). I have been trying to find the referent, but we should use that.

The reference has been reported as: IEC 60027-2, passed in Jan. 99.

One source is: <http://physics.nist.gov/cuu/Units/binary.html>

Editor's notes:

A normative reference will be added for:

Letter symbols to be used in electrical technology - Part 2: Telecommunications and electronics  
(Amendment 2)

ISO/IEC 60027-2-am2 (1999-01)

Table 96 will be changed to appear as follows:

**Table 96 — COPY STATUS TRANSFER COUNT UNITS values**

Value	Meaning	<u>Binary Multiplier Name [1]</u>	Multiplier to convert TRANSFER COUNT field to bytes
00h	Bytes		1
01h	<u>Ki bytes</u>	<u>Kilobinary</u>	$2^{10}$ or 1024
02h	<u>Mi bytes</u>	<u>Megabinary</u>	$2^{20}$
03h	<u>Gi bytes</u>	<u>Giabinary</u>	$2^{30}$
04h	<u>Ti bytes</u>	<u>Terabinary</u>	$2^{40}$
05h	<u>Pi bytes</u>	<u>Petabinary</u>	$2^{50}$
06h	<u>Ei bytes</u>	<u>Exabinary</u>	$2^{60}$
<u>07h - FFh</u>	Reserved		
Note: [1] Nomenclature defined in ISO/IEC 60027-2-am2 (1999-01), Letter symbols to be used in electrical technology - Part 2: Telecommunications and electronics (Amendment 2)			

Nominally, the editor would prefer to omit the note since the normative reference would be expected to be obvious. In this case, however, the reference is not likely to be obvious.

**1.31 [31] Brocade 31) "Oldest held data" is relative (Accepted, Substantive)**

PDF page 157, page 129, clause 7.17.3

Held data should not be identified as "oldest to newest". It should be identified as beginning with the lowest byte number for the first descriptor requiring data to be held, going up through the highest byte number for the last

descriptor asking for data to be held. The data may or may not have actually been obtained in that order, depending on the particular segment descriptors and their relationships.

**Editor's note:**

Because "oldest" and "newest" are convenient short hand terms for the bytes (particularly in describing the discard requirements), the current text will be modified to make local definitions for these terms. The text currently reads:

The held data is the data held by the copy manager for delivery to the application client as proscribed by several segment descriptor type codes. The oldest byte read and held is returned in byte 4 and the byte most recently read and held is returned in byte n.

It will be changed to read:

The held data is the data held by the copy manager for delivery to the application client as proscribed by several segment descriptor type codes. Unless the copy manager's held data limit (see 7.17.4) is exceeded, the first byte held in response to the first segment descriptor in the EXTENDED COPY parameter list proscribing the holding of data (called the oldest byte held) is returned in byte 4. The last byte held in response to the last segment descriptor in the EXTENDED COPY parameter list proscribing the holding of data (called the newest byte held) is returned in byte n.

### 1.32 [32] Brocade 32) Discard mechanism is ill-defined (Unresolved)

PDF page 157, page 129, clause 7.17.3  
SEE ALSO comment 5.191 [242] IBM 191)  
**Need SNIA-BWG discussion**

The discard mechanisms for held data are somewhat primitive. Why is data held? If it is held to be read, it should not be thrown away, since the application may need it. It would be better to prohibit the discarding of data or to warn before discarding the data. If no change is to be made, the model requiring this behavior needs to be explained so that it will not be misused.

**Editor's notes:**

The SNIA-BWG is considering rewriting the held data discard requirements. **Care should be taken to avoid ...ly words in the revised text to address comment 5.191 [242] IBM 191).**

### 1.33 [33] Brocade 33) FAILED SEGMENT DETAILS is redundant (Rejected)

PDF page 160, page 132, clause 7.17.5

What does RECEIVE COPY RESULTS (FAILED SEGMENT DETAILS) do for you that the sense information developed by the rules in 7.5.3, rule e) does not?

If nothing, the FAILED SEGMENT DETAILS service action should be deleted. If something, the text in 7.5.3 or 7.17.5 should make this clearer. Similarly, rule i) should be deleted unless there is some functionality not provided by rule e).

**Reason for rejection:**

As described to me by the SNIA-BWG (Storage Networking Industry Association - Backup Working Group) the FAILED SEGMENT DETAILS service action serves two purposes. In the long term, the reserved 50 bytes will be replaced by various counters and other status information that will assist the initiator in determining what failed. In the near term (SPC-2), some host adapters do not preserve **all** the autosense data for the very large sense data blocks returned by EXTENDED COPY as described in 7.5.3 and the FAILED SEGEMENT DETAILS provides a

mechanism for retrieving all the sense data. Since it is inappropriate to discuss specific implementations in SPC-2, this explanation cannot be added as requested by the comment.

### **1.34 [34] Brocade 34) Target s/b LUN (Unresolved)**

PDF page 167, page 139, clause 7.21

The sentence "The target shall return the same Identifier to all initiators on all ports." should say "The logical unit shall return the same Identifier to all initiators on all ports."

### **1.35 [35] Brocade 35) Logical unit reservation mandatory? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 191, page 163, clause 7.24.2 and 7.24.3

The titles of these sections indicate that these capabilities are mandatory. In fact, they are mandatory only if the corresponding RESERVE command is implemented, an optional behavior. This should be removed from the title where it cannot be interpreted clearly and a new sentence should be placed in the section in the appropriate location indicating, "Logical Unit Reservation is mandatory if the RESERVE(10) command is implemented." Similar sentences should go in the other corresponding paragraphs.

### **1.36 [36] Brocade 36) Identifier field not VS (Unresolved)**

PDF page 196, page 168, clause 7.27

The sentence "The IDENTIFIER field shall be a vendor specific value, to be returned in subsequent REPORT DEVICE IDENTIFIER commands." should read "The IDENTIFIER field is a value selected by the application client by mechanisms outside the scope of this standard to be returned in subsequent REPORT DEVICE IDENTIFIER commands."

### **1.37 [37] Brocade 37) Page codes for diagnostics? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 203, page 175, clause 8.1.1, Table 128

SEE ALSO comment 6.11 [382] LSI 11)

Should table 128 reference those pages that apply to all device types, but that are defined by SES? It might make them easier to find. That would include codes 01h through 0Fh.

### **1.38 [38] Brocade 38) References confuse text (Unresolved)**

PDF page 249, page 221, clause 9.3

The AER data is apparently defined in table 189, not table 119. This flaw shows up in two separate paragraphs of section 9.3 and somewhat confuses the intent of the paragraph:

"If the SCSI-3 bit is zero, then the AEN data format (as defined by the SCSI-2 standard) shall be used. If the SCSI-3 bit is one, then the AER data format shown in table 119 shall be used."

The difference is apparently only in LUN length. Is that correct?

**1.39 [39] Brocade 39) Additional vendor identification (Unresolved)**

PDF page 301, page 273, Annex D

The name BROCADE should be applied for Brocade Communications Systems, Incorporated.

Note that the page number is missing on this page.

**Editor's note:**

The request for a vendor identifier has been forward to the T10 chair for processing. Once the vendor identifier is assigned, incorporating it in SPC-2 will follow normal procedures.

**2. Compaq Computer Corp.**

Compaq Computer Corp. principle representative Rob Elliott submitted a Yes vote with the following comments.

**2.1 [40] CPQ 1A) Allowing PTPL When Media Stopped (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 53-54, page 25-26, clause 5.5.3.2

**Editor's Note:** Since this comment is both substantive and non-substantive, it is being split into two comments. This comment is the technical one. The change from 'APTPL' to 'PTPL', which is not substantive, has been placed in comment ] CPQ 1B).

The persist-through-power-loss description in the persistent reservations section has proven confusing for some implements. A device which stores its reservation table on media might interpret this as requiring it to return a CHECK CONDITION after the media has been STOPped. We'd rather see the device cache the reservation table in RAM and use it as long as a power on reset has not occurred. Suggested changes are listed below:

The capability of preserving persistent reservations and registration keys across power cycles requires the use of a nonvolatile memory within the SCSI device. Any SCSI device that supports the Persist Through Power Loss (APTPL) a ...

Replace "memory within the SCSI device" with "memory (not necessarily the media) within the SCSI device."

Replace "APTPL" with "PTPL". { ] CPQ 1B)}

... capability of persistent reservation and has non-volatile memory that is not ready shall allow the following commands into the task set:

- a) INQUIRY;
- b) LOG SENSE;
- c) READ BUFFER;
- d) REPORT LUNS;
- e) REQUEST SENSE;
- f) START/STOP UNIT (with START bit = 1 and POWER CONDITIONS field value of 0); and
- g) WRITE BUFFER.

When nonvolatile memory is not ready, any commands, other than those listed above shall return CHECK CONDITION status. The sense key shall be set to NOT READY and the additional sense data shall be set as described in the TEST UNIT READY command (see 7.28).



Replace "When nonvolatile memory is not ready" with "When PTPL is activated and nonvolatile memory is not ready".

Add sentence at end: "When PTPL is activated and nonvolatile memory is ready, all commands shall be subjected to the persistent reservation rules."

**Editor's note:**

In the opinion of the September, 2000 CAP working group meeting (minutes in 00-307) the following change is all that is required to satisfy the intent of the comment. In the first paragraph after the list at the top of PDF page 54 change from:

"When nonvolatile memory is not ready, any commands, other than those listed above ..."

to:

"When nonvolatile memory ~~is not ready~~ has not become ready since a power cycle, any commands, other than those listed above ..."

## 2.2 [41] CPQ 1B) PTPL Description (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 52-53, page 24-25, clause 5.5.3.2

SEE ALSO comments 5.64 [115] IBM 64), 5.65 [116] IBM 65), and 8.42 [519] Seagate 42)

In "Any SCSI device that supports the Persist Through Power Loss (APTPL)...", Replace "APTPL" with "PTPL".

**Editor's notes:**

The editor is taking the plethora of comments on the general topic of APTPL and PTPL as evidence that some serious rewriting is needed. The gist of these changes are:

- PTPL (Persist Through Power Loss) is defined as an optional capability of some features. (This is done to allow other features such as Access Controls to have PTPL features without having a confusion of terms.)
- The APTPL bit is defined (or used) as the persistent reservations mechanism for invoking the optional PTPL feature.

The following steps will be taken.

PTPL Fix 1) The following glossary entry will be added.

3.1.x **persist through power loss:** An optional capability associated with some features that allows an application client to request that a device server maintain information regarding that feature across power failures.

PTPL Fix 2) The APTPL acronym will be removed from 3.2.

PTPL Fix 3) The first paragraph of 5.5.3.2 will be changed from:

"The application client may request the device server to preserve the persistent reservation and registration keys across power cycles by requesting the Activate Persist Through Power Loss (APTPL) capability. The application client may request this as part of registration by setting the APTPL bit to one."

to:

"The application client may request activation of the persist through power loss device server capability to preserve the persistent reservation and registration keys across power cycles by setting the APTPL bit to one in PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT parameter data sent with a REGISTER, or a REGISTER AND IGNORE EXISTING KEY service action."

PTPL Fix 4) From the 1st sentence in the 2nd paragraph of 5.5.3.2 to the bottom of PDF page 53, four (4) instances of 'APTPL capability' will be changed to 'persist through power loss capability'. Note: change 10.22 [611] O22) also affects two of these sentences.

PTPL Fix 6) In the last full paragraph before the list at the bottom of PDF page 53, 'Persist Through Power Loss (APTPL) capability' will be changed to 'persist through power loss capability'. Note: the sentence being changed here also is proposed for modification by comment 2.1 [40] CPQ 1A).

PTPL Fix 7) In the last paragraph before the list at the end of 5.5.3.6.1, 'APTPL capability' will be changed to 'persist through power loss capability'. This change is included in 10.22 [611] O22).

### **2.3 [42] CPQ 2) Persistent Reservations NOT READY (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 52-53, page 24-25, clause 5.5.3.2

The reference to 7.28 recommending which additional sense data to send with a CHECK CONDITION should be clearer. Several of the NOT READY codes in 7.28 shouldn't be used (e.g. FORMAT IN PROGRESS). I suggest listing the specific codes in this section.

The sense key shall be set to NOT READY and the additional sense data shall be set as described in the TEST UNIT READY command (see 7.28).

Replace "the TEST UNIT READY command (see 7.28)" with "table 5.xx".

List these in a new table in 5.5.3.2:

MEDIUM NOT PRESENT  
 LOGICAL UNIT NOT READY, CAUSE NOT REPORTABLE  
 LOGICAL UNIT IS IN PROCESS OF BECOMING READY  
 LOGICAL UNIT NOT READY, INITIALIZING COMMAND REQUIRED  
 LOGICAL UNIT NOT READY, MANUAL INTERVENTION REQUIRED

#### **Editor's notes:**

The September, 2000 CAP working group (minutes 00-307) noted that a FORMAT IN PROGRESS additional sense code is possible for a SCSI Controller Commands device, so that the TEST UNIT READY table continues to be an appropriate reference. The group also asked that '...as described in the TEST UNIT READY command (see 7.28)' be replaced with '...as described in Table 124 (see 7.28).'

### **2.4 [43] CPQ 3) REPORT DEVICE IDENTIFIER NOT READY (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 167, page 139, clause 7.21

This section also refers to 7.28 (it mistakenly refers to 7.27) and should be changed in the same manner as comment CPQ 2).

The execution of a REPORT DEVICE IDENTIFIER may require the enabling of a nonvolatile memory within the logical unit. If the nonvolatile memory is not ready, the device server shall return CHECK CONDITION status, rather than wait for the device to become ready. The sense key shall be set to NOT READY and the additional sense data shall be set as described in the TEST UNIT READY command (see 7.27). This infor-

mation should allow the application client to determine the action required to cause the device server to become ready.

Replace "the TEST UNIT READY command (see 7.27)" with "table 7.xx".

List these in a new table in 7.21:

MEDIUM NOT PRESENT  
LOGICAL UNIT NOT READY, CAUSE NOT REPORTABLE  
LOGICAL UNIT IS IN PROCESS OF BECOMING READY  
LOGICAL UNIT NOT READY, INITIALIZING COMMAND REQUIRED  
LOGICAL UNIT NOT READY, MANUAL INTERVENTION REQUIRED

**Editor's notes:**

The September, 2000 CAP working group (minutes 00-307) noted that a FORMAT IN PROGRESS additional sense code is possible for a SCSI Controller Commands device, so that the TEST UNIT READY table continues to be an appropriate reference. The group also asked that '...as described in the TEST UNIT READY command (see 7.27)' be replaced with '...as described in Table 124 (see 7.28).'

**2.5 [44] CPQ 4) Spelling of "nonvolatile" (Accepted, Editorial)**  
**Global**

Converge on one spelling for "non-volatile" or "nonvolatile"

**Editor's note:**

The spelling will be "nonvolatile".

**2.6 [45] CPQ 5) RELEASE Cross Reference (Accepted, Editorial)**  
PDF page 50-51, page 22-23, clause 5.5.1, table 8

In the footnotes of the table 8 (on two pages), section 5.19 is referenced. Both 5.19 and 5.20 RELEASE(6) and RELEASE(10) should be referenced.

### 3. Crossroads Systems, Inc.

Crossroads Systems, Inc. principle representative Neil Wanamaker submitted a Yes vote with the following comments.

#### 3.1 [46] Crds 1) EXTENDED COPY Informative Annex (Unresolved)

There should be an expository annex on use of Extended Copy. It would be exceedingly difficult for an implementor to use the command correctly from the text.

##### Reason for rejection:

The editor is in no position to write such an annex. If someone else should write one and propose it for inclusion in an SPC version, then that activity could be viewed as acceptance of this comment.

#### 3.2 [47] Crds 2) RECEIVE COPY RESULTS requires tagged queuing (Rejected)

PDF pages 153-161, pages 125-133, clause 7.17

The Send Copy Results (sic) command appears to be unusable on devices that do not support tagged queuing.

##### Reason for rejection:

The statement is not correct as regards the majority of RECEIVE COPY RESULTS usage and even when correct it is not an issue. Consider the following description of the RECEIVE COPY RESULTS command:

The RECEIVE COPY RESULTS command (see table 92) provides a means for the application client to receive information about the copy manager or the results of a previous (or current) EXTENDED COPY command (see 7.5).

The only function described above requiring tagged queuing is receiving information about the results of the current EXTENDED COPY command, and if the results cannot be received overall system operation is degraded but the system does not become non-operational. Furthermore, an initiator can determine that the command cannot be sent before attempting to send it as only one untagged command can be outstanding at anytime.

Well over 90% of the RECEIVE COPY RESULTS command's functions can be performed with untagged queuing, with the only exception being the COPY STATUS service action as applied to a current command. All the other RECEIVE COPY RESULTS service actions (RECEIVE DATA, OPERATING PARAMETERS, and FAILED SEGMENT DETAILS) and uses are functional when no EXTENDED COPY commands are active, in fact, the RECEIVE DATA and FAILED SEGMENT DETAILS service actions cannot be performed if the referenced EXTENDED COPY command is still active.

### **3.3 [48] Crds 3) Access Controls missing (Rejected)**

The Access Controls material that was to be included in SPC-2 is not present.

#### **Reason for rejection:**

The Access Controls proposal was approved for SPC-3, not SPC-2. Quoting the minutes from the May 2000 T10 plenary meeting (T10/00-207r0):

"Jim Hafner moved that 99-245r9 be approved for inclusion in SPC-3, SAM-2, FCP-2, SPI-4, SBC-2, MMC-3, and a future version of RBC. Rob Elliott second the motion. The motion passed on a vote of 20:0:0:18=38."

## **4. ENDL Texas**

ENDL Texas principle representative Ralph Weber submitted a No individual vote with the following comments.

### **4.1 [49] ENDL 1) Replace 'Overview' with 'Introduction' (Unresolved)**

Global/Clause \* clause 7

In the command descriptions that had a heading added to satisfy ISO style requirements (e.g., 7.3.1 COPY command overview), the word 'overview' should be replaced by 'introduction'. Particularly in the case of command descriptions, these clauses are not overviews but the initial paragraphs of the command description.

### **4.2 [50] ENDL 2) Incorrect Cross Reference (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 235, page 207, clause 8.3.8

The paragraph before table 169 contains an incorrect cross reference to table 103. The reference should be to table 169.

### **4.3 [51] ENDL 3) Mode Page code 0Dh s/b Obsolete (Unresolved)**

PDF pages 289-290, pages 261-262, clause C.5, table C.4

Change the description of mode page code 0Dh to 'Obsolete' and remove table note [1]. We had enough trouble referencing an internal T9.2 document in SPC. There should be no reason to raise NCITS hackles by referencing a 9 year old internal document from a TC that no longer exists in SPC-2.

Editor's note:

The table row will remain but the description column will be changed to 'Obsolete' and the note will be removed.

## 5. IBM

IBM principle representative George Penokie submitted a No vote with the following comments.

### 5.1 [52] IBM 1) Remove Processor Commands (Rejected)

Marked technical by comment author  
PDF page 28, page xvi, Introduction

The processor device sections do not contain any information that applies to other device types, therefore it does not belong in this standard. This standard is supposed to define the device model for all SCSI devices. Processor devices should be removed from this standard.

#### Reason for rejection:

The September CAP working group voted 7:1 to keep the processor commands in SPC-2 (minutes in 00-307).

### 5.2 [53] IBM 2) Use 'this standard' (Accepted, Editorial)

Global & PDF page 28, page xvi, Introduction

The last paragraph contains the statement 'SCSI Primary Commands -2' this should be changed to 'this standard'. This should be changed in all places that are not titles or headings in this document.

### 5.3 [54] IBM 3) Specify Figure 1 (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 29, page 1, clause 1, paragraph under figure 1  
SEE ALSO comments 8.5 [482] Seagate 5) and 9.2 [589] TI 2)

The statement 'The figure is not intended...' should be changed to 'Figure 1 is not intended...'.

#### Editor's note:

The complete revised text can be found in the resolution for comment 8.5 [482] Seagate 5).

### 5.4 [55] IBM 4) Wrong Normative References format (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 31, page 3-4, clauses 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5

This format deviates from the one being used in other standards. Use SPI-3 as a example of how these sections should be segmented.

### 5.5 [56] IBM 5) ISO Format for Normative References (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 31, page 3-4, clauses 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5

The format of the listed standards should conform to the ISO way. For examples of this see SPI-3.

### 5.6 [57] IBM 6) Eliminate 'execution' (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 33, page 5, clause 3.1.1

The term 'execution' should be deleted as it carries no useful information.

**5.7 [58] IBM 7) Add AER acronym in glossary (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 33, page 5, clause 3.1.5  
SEE ALSO comment 7.4 [388] Quantum 4)

The acronym AER should be placed as such 'asynchronous event reporting (AER):'

**5.8 [59] IBM 8) Add ACA acronym in glossary (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 33, page 5, clause 3.1.6  
SEE ALSO comment 7.4 [388] Quantum 4)

The acronym ACA should be placed as such 'auto contingent allegiance (ACA):'

**5.9 [60] IBM 9) Add CDB acronym in glossary (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 33, page 5, clause 3.1.11  
SEE ALSO comment 7.4 [388] Quantum 4)

The acronym CDB should be placed as such 'command descriptor block (CDB)'

**5.10 [61] IBM 10) Use (e.g., ...) form (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 33, page 5, clause 3.1.12

The statement '...type; e.g., SBC, SCC, SGC, SMC, SSC, MMC, SES, etc. (see clause 1).' should be type (e.g., SBC, SCC, SGC, SMC, SSC, MMC, SES) (see clause 1). The (e.g., ...) format should be used throughout the standard.

**5.11 [62] IBM 11) Add CA acronym in glossary (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 33, page 5, clause 3.1.13  
SEE ALSO comment 7.4 [388] Quantum 4)

The acronym CA should be placed as such 'contingent allegiance (CA)'

**5.12 [63] IBM 12) Delete 'thus' in 'copy manager' def (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 33, page 5, clause 3.1.14

The statement '...the operation thus requested.' should be '...the operation requested.'

**5.13 [64] IBM 13) Eliminate baggage in 'data packet' def (Unresolved)**

PDF page 34, page 6, clause 3.1.17

The statement 'A data packet often contains information at the beginning or end of the packet that describes the contents of the packet. A data packet may contain control or status information for the destination device.' should be deleted as to confused more than helps. This is only a processor device thing and is more confusing especially sense we now have protocols that uses things that look and feel like packets.

**5.14 [65] IBM 14) Is 'effective progress' different from 'progress'? (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 34, page 6, clause 3.1.23

The term 'effective' should be removed as it is not clear what the difference is between 'effective progress' and just plain old progress.

**5.15 [66] IBM 15) Eliminate morbid command deaths (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 34, page 6, clause 3.1.17

The statement '...complete the execution of a command...' should be changed to '...complete a command...' unless of course the command is to be executed by hanging, electrocution, or some other form of morbid death.

**5.16 [67] IBM 16) Which hunt (Accepted, Editorial)**

Global &amp; PDF page 34, page 6, clause 3.1.30

SEE ALSO comment 7.10 [394] Quantum 10) and 8.13 [490] Seagate 13)

There needs to be a which hunt in this standard. In most cases a which should be changed to a that. Which is the case in this section.

Editor's note:

This comment will be resolved as described in comment 8.13 [490] Seagate 13).

**5.17 [68] IBM 17) Use (e.g., ...) form (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 35, page 7, clause 3.1.41

The statement '... protocol; e.g., SPI-3, SBP-2, FCP-2, etc. (see clause 1).' should be '... protocol (e.g., SPI-3, SBP-2, FCP-2) (see clause 1).'

**5.18 [69] IBM 18) Undefine 'logical unit inventory' (Rejected)**

PDF page 35, page 7, clause 3.1.33

I am not sure of the value of this definition. It looks more like something that belongs where this is used.

**Reason for rejection:**

SAM-2 uses 'logical unit inventory' and references SPC-2 for the definition. Essentially, this definition and it's subclause references is glue between SPC-2 and SAM-2.

**5.19 [70] IBM 19) Redefine 'target' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 36, page 8, clause 3.1.54

The definition of a target should be change to 'A SCSI device that receives SCSI commands and directs such commands to one or more logical units.' This is the definition used in SPI.

Editor's note:

The choice between 'A SCSI' and 'An SCSI' depends on the resolution to comment 5.286 [337] IBM 286).

**5.20 [71] IBM 20) Change 'device' to 'SCSI device' (Unresolved)**

Global &amp; PDF page 36, page 8, clause 3.1.58

The statement '...to one device to perform...' should be change to '...to one SCSI device to perform...'. The term 'device' should be changed to 'SCSI device' in most cases.



**5.21 [72] IBM 21) Should the acronyms for standards be listed as acronyms? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 36-37, page 8-9, clause 3.2  
SEE ALSO comment 8.15 [492] Seagate 15)

Why are all the standards acronyms listed here. The only ones that are listed (if any) are ones that are used within the body of the standard. I do not consider the use in clause 1 as a reason for cluttering up this list.

**5.22 [73] IBM 22) 'see x' instead of 'see clause x' (Unresolved)**

Global & PDF page 39, page 11, clause 4.1

The terms 'see clause x' should be just 'see x' in all cases.

**5.23 [74] IBM 23) Just SAM-2 (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 39, page 11, clause 4.2

The usage of both SCSI Architecture Model-2 and SAM-2 is not required as the acronym has already been defined.

**5.24 [75] IBM 24) 'Notation for Procedures and Functions' clause (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 39, page 11, clause 4.2

The notation used in the service response equation needs to be defined. This should be placed in a section called 'Notation for Procedures and Functions'. Examples of this section are in SPI and SAM.

**5.25 [76] IBM 25) Expunge Bold Text (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 39, page 11, clause 4.2  
SEE ALSO comment 8.16 [493] Seagate 16)

The bold text in the middle paragraphs needs to be changed to normal text.

**5.26 [77] IBM 26) Use command descriptor block or CDB (Accepted, Editorial)**

Global & PDF page 39, page 11, clause 4.3.1  
SEE ALSO comments 5.46 [97] IBM 46) and 5.175 [226] IBM 175)

There is a mix of the usage of the term CDB and command descriptor block. This implies there is some difference between those two terms when there is none. Pick one way and stick with it.

**Editor's note:**

Subclause 4.3 will be restructured as described in the response to 1.5 [5] Brocade 5). Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause including the changes agreed in response to this comment. Any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

**5.27 [78] IBM 27) Add 32 byte CDB format (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 39, page 11, clause 4.3

This section should add in the 32 byte CDB that has been defined.

**Editor's note:**

Subclause 4.3 will be restructured as described in the response to 1.5 [5] Brocade 5). Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause including the changes agreed in response to this comment. Any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

**5.28 [79] IBM 28) Duplicate of IBM 29) (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 40, page 12, clause 4.3.1

Paragraphs below table 2, The term '...tables 1, 2, 3, and 4...' should be changed to 'table 1, table 2, table 3, and table 4...' This is one of those things that have been flagged by ANSI editors in the past.

**Editor's note:**

This specific instance of the 'tables x, y, and z' problem disappears as a result of the restructuring undertaken in response to comments 1.5 [5] Brocade 5), 5.36 [87] IBM 36) and 7.13 [397] Quantum 13).

**5.29 [80] IBM 29) Use table 1, table 2, ... (Accepted, Editorial)**

Global &amp; PDF page 40, page 12, clause 4.3.1

Paragraphs below table 2, The term '...tables 1, 2, 3, and 4...' should be changed to 'table 1, table 2, table 3, and table 4...' This should be corrected throughout the standard. This is one of those things that have been flagged by ANSI editors in the past.

**Editor's note:**

This specific instance of the 'tables x, y, and z' problem disappears as a result of the restructuring undertaken in response to comments 1.5 [5] Brocade 5), 5.36 [87] IBM 36) and 7.13 [397] Quantum 13).

Comment 5.56 [107] IBM 56) identifies two other occurrences of this problem. The only other occurrences of the problem are 'Tables A.7 and A.8' on PDF page 59 and five occurrences of 'tables B.1, B.2 and B.3' on PDF page 262.

**5.30 [81] IBM 30) Use subclause (Accepted, Editorial)**

Global &amp; PDF page 40, page 12, clause 4.3.1

The statement '...the clause defining that command.' should be '...the subclause defining that command.'

**Editor's note:**

Subclause 4.3 will be restructured as described in the response to 1.5 [5] Brocade 5). Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause including the changes agreed in response to this comment. Any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269. **The global search and replace will be performed to correct other instances.**

**5.31 [82] IBM 31) Kill the ly (explicitly) words (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 42, page 14, clause 4.3.2

The statement '...that explicitly contain...' should be changed to '...that contain...'. The term explicitly add no value.

**Editor's note:**

Subclause 4.3 will be restructured as described in the response to 1.5 [5] Brocade 5). Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause including the changes agreed in response to this comment. Any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

**5.32 [83] IBM 32) Change 'device' to 'SCSI device' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 42, page 14, clause 4.3.3

The term device should be SCSI device.

**Editor's note:**

Subclause 4.3 will be restructured as described in the response to 1.5 [5] Brocade 5). Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause including the changes agreed in response to this comment. Any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

**5.33 [84] IBM 33) Add 64-bit LBA (Accepted, Substantive)**

PDF page 42, page 14, clause 4.3.3

SEE ALSO comment 8.19 [496] Seagate 19)

There is nothing in this section about the 64-bit LBA that has been added into the 16 byte CDBs. This needs to be added in here and should be shown in the CDB tables above.

**Editor's note:**

It is not clear whether the intention of this comment is to replace the current table 4 or add another table. Another table has been added in the first revision of 00-269. Subclause 4.3 will be restructured as described in the response to 1.5 [5] Brocade 5). Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause including the changes agreed in response to this comment. Any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

**5.34 [85] IBM 34) Delete 'etc' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 42, page 14, clause 4.3.5

The term 'etc' should be removed as it is redundant with the e.g.

**5.35 [86] IBM 35) Delete 'etc' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 42, page 14, clause 4.3.6

The term 'etc' should be removed as it is redundant with the e.g.

**5.36 [87] IBM 36) Variable CDB s/b under 4.3 (not 4.4) (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 43, page 15, clause 4.4

SEE ALSO comments 1.5 [5] Brocade 5) and 7.13 [397] Quantum 13)

This section should be a subclause of 4.3 as it is a variant of the CDB.

**Editor's note:**

The comment will be resolved as described in the response to comment 1.5 [5] Brocade 5). Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause including the changes agreed in response to this comment. Any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

**5.37 [88] IBM 37) Just SAM-2 (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 44, page 16, clause 5.1

No need to list both SCSI Architecture Model-2 and SAM. Pick one and use consistently.

**5.38 [89] IBM 38) All information is useful (Unresolved)**

PDF page 44, page 16, clause 5.2.2

The statement '...other useful information...' should be changed to '...other information...'. I assume all information is useful.

**5.39 [90] IBM 39) Don't capitalize 'autosense data' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 44, page 16, clause 5.2.3

The term Autosense Data should not be capitalized.

**5.40 [91] IBM 40) There is no such thing as 'device specific' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 44, page 16, clause 5.2.4

SEE ALSO comment 1.9 [9] Brocade 9)

The term 'device specific' should be changed to 'vender specific'.

**5.41 [92] IBM 41) Remove not 'especially useful' statement (Unresolved)**

PDF page 44, page 16, clause 5.2.5

SEE ALSO comment 8.24 [501] Seagate 24)

[Remove] The statement 'It is especially useful to check the cartridge status of logical units with removable media.' as it contains no especially useful information.

**5.42 [93] IBM 42) Kill the ly (generally) words (Unresolved)**

PDF page 45, page 17, clause 5.3, note 2

The term 'generally' should be removed as generally the term adds no value to the statement.

**5.43 [94] IBM 43) Put 'segments' in glossary (Rejected)**

PDF page 45, page 17, clause 5.4.2, 2nd paragraph

The term segments should be added to the glossary.

**Reason for rejection:**

The English dictionary definition for 'segment' is "one of the parts into which something naturally separates or is divided; a division, portion or section." Substitute the word 'section' for every occurrence of 'segment' in this subclause and it becomes obvious that 'segment' is being used its normal English meaning, which suggests that a glossary entry would be inappropriate. Furthermore, any glossary entry introduced would have to recognize the other uses of 'segment' in SPC-2 such as COPY segment descriptors and the SEGMENT NUMBER field in sense data making it a horrifically complex glossary entry.

**5.44 [95] IBM 44) Don't say 'the following clauses' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 46, page 18, clause 5.4.3

The statement 'These modes are described in the following clauses.' should be removed or changed to 'These modes are described in 5.4.3.1 and 5.4.3.2'.

**Editor's note:**

The text will be changed as proposed.

**5.45 [96] IBM 45) Capitalization of 'Self-test results' log page (Unresolved)**

Global/Clauses &amp; PDF page 46, page 18, clause 5.4.3.1- 5.4.3.2

The term 'Self-test results' should be either no caps or all caps. I believe all caps is correct. This occurs in several places.

**5.46 [97] IBM 46) Use command descriptor block or CDB (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 46, page 18, clause 5.4.3.2

SEE ALSO comments 5.26 [77] IBM 26) and 5.175 [226] IBM 175)

Another case where CDB should be used instead of command descriptor block or the other way around.

**Editor's Note:**

CDB will be used.

**5.47 [98] IBM 47) Change 'never' to 'not' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 47, page 19, clause 5.4.3.2

SEE ALSO comment 8.28 [505] Seagate 28)

The statement '...shall never take longer...' should be '...shall not take longer...'

**5.48 [99] IBM 48) Reformat table 6 (Unresolved)**

PDF page 47, page 19, clause 5.4.3.2, table 6

The formatting of this table should be change to add a double line after the header and before the footer. The text in the footer should start with 'Note:' and the text indented.

**5.49 [100] IBM 49) Eliminate note (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 47, page 19, clause 5.4.3.2, note 3

This note looks like it should be part of the main text. It should be made so.

**5.50 [101] IBM 50) Eliminate 'execution' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 47, page 19, clause 5.4.3.3

The following statement '...during execution of a self-test to poll...' should be changed to '...during a self-test operation to poll...'

**5.51 [102] IBM 51) Eliminate 'execution' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 47, page 19, clause 5.4.3.3

The following statement 'While executing a self-test unless...' should be changed from 'While a self-test operation is in progress unless...'

**5.52 [103] IBM 52) Reformat table 7 (Unresolved)**

PDF page 48, page 20, clause 5.4.3.3, table 7

The formatting of this table should be change to add a double line after the header.

**5.53 [104] IBM 53) Subscript 's' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 48, page 20, clause 5.4.3.3, table 7, 3rd column, 2nd row

The 's' in self-test appears to have a subscript format.

**Editor's note:**

The problem is not evidenced in the Frame source file so there is a possibility that this is a PDF generation error. However, efforts will be made to ensure that the Frame source is a clean as possible in this area.

**5.54 [105] IBM 54) Don't capitalize 'persistent reservation' (Unresolved)****Global** & PDF page 49, page 21, clause 5.5.1, 2nd paragraph after a,b list

The term persistent reservation should not be capitalized. This should be changed throughout the standard.

**5.55 [106] IBM 55) Don't say just 'the table' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 49, page 21, clause 5.5.1, 3rd paragraph after a,b list

The statement '...in the table shall apply.' should be '...in table 8 shall apply.'

**5.56 [107] IBM 56) 'table 8' and 'table 9' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 49, page 21, clause 5.5.1, 4th paragraph after the a,b list  
 PDF page 49, page 21, clause 5.5.1, 7th paragraph after the a,b list

The following statement '...tables 8 and 9.' should be '...table 8 and table 9.'

**5.57 [108] IBM 57) Don't capitalize 'reserve/release' (Unresolved)**

**Global** & PDF page 49, page 21, clause 5.5.1

The term Reserve/Release should not be capitalized. This should be changed throughout the standard.

**5.58 [109] IBM 58) No need to say 'clause' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 50, page 22, clause 5.5.1, 1st paragraph before table 8

The statement '... standard's device model clause or in the clauses that define the specific commands.' should be '...standard's device model or in specific commands defined in that standard.'

**Editor's note:**

While the sentence in question is awkward:

"Depending on the particular command standard the conditions are defined in that standard's device model clause or in the clauses that define the specific commands."

The proposed wording leaves this reader thinking that the commands themselves somehow define the conditions that cause reservation conflicts. Also, it is worth noting that the proposed rewording fails to indicate a preference for providing the reservation conflict information in the device model. For these reasons, the sentence will be rewritten as follows:

"Command standards define the conditions either in the device model (preferred) or in the descriptions each specific command."

**5.59 [110] IBM 59) Force table 8 to one page (Unresolved)**

PDF page 50, page 22, clause 5.5.1, table 8

This table should be made to fit on one page. The footnotes should be indented on table 8 and table 9.

**5.60 [111] IBM 60) Eliminate 'execution' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 52, page 24, clause 5.5.1, 2nd to last paragraph

The statement 'The execution of any reserve/release...' should be 'Any reserve/release...',

**5.61 [112] IBM 61) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Rejected)**

PDF page 52, page 24, clause 5.5.2

The statement '...initiator (a third-party initiator).' should be changed to '...initiator (i.e., a third-party initiator).'

**Reason for rejection:**

Because about 30% of the IBM comments concern the use of parentheses in one way or another, it is reasonable to assume that a matter of writing style is at issue. Since the ISO style guide contains no requirements regarding the use of parentheses other references have been consulted. The *Chicago Manual of Style 13th edition* describes the use of parentheses as follows:

"[5.97] Parentheses, like commas and dashes, may be used to set off amplifying, explanatory, or digressive elements. If such parenthetical elements retain a close logical relationship to the rest of the sentence, commas should be used. If the logical relationship is more remote, dashes or parentheses should be used."

*Webster's Standard American Style Manual* offers this description of the use of parentheses.

"Parentheses enclose phrases and clauses that provide examples, explanations, or supplementary facts."

*Webster's* notes 9 additional and/or more specific uses of parentheses one of which is:

"Parentheses enclose phrases and clauses introduced by expressions such as *namely, that is, e.g., and i.e.* Commas, dashes, and semicolons are also used to perform this function."

A review of the approximately 96 IBM comments regarding the use of parentheses identifies four proposed resolutions:

- remove the parentheses
- replace the parentheses with commas
- add "i.e.," at the beginning of the parenthetical phrase
- add "e.g.," at the beginning of the parenthetical phrase

It would appear that the use of parentheses is thought to require the presence of "i.e.," or "e.g.,". Although the style guides cited above note this as one use of parentheses, they list it as only one of many uses. The editor's reading of the style guides indicates that parentheses may be used in place of paired comments to separate or emphasize a phrase with respect to the main body of a sentence and vice versa.

Since the existing use of parentheses fits the stylistically guidelines quoted above and since (in the judgement of the editor) making the propose change does not materially improve the readability of the standard and may actually distort the meaning, the change will not be made.

**5.62 [113] IBM 62) Remove/replace 'significant' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 52, page 24, clause 5.5.2, 2nd paragraph  
SEE ALSO comment 8.37 [514] Seagate 37)

The statement '...require significant reinitialization after...' should be changed to '...require reinitialization after...'. The term significant is not quantifiable.

**Editor's note:**

The sentence under discussion is:



"Reservations managed using the Reserve/Release method do not persist across some recovery actions (e.g., hard resets), so most systems require **significant** reinitialization after a failure that results in a hard reset."

While term 'significant' is not quantifiable, the sentence becomes ridiculously simplistic if 'significant' is removed. Therefore, the sentence will be rewritten to read as follows:

"Reservations managed using the Reserve/Release method do not persist across some recovery actions (e.g., hard resets). When a target performs one of these recovery actions, the application client(s) have to rediscover the configuration and re-establish the required reservations."

### 5.63 [114] IBM 63) Which hunt (Rejected)

PDF page 52, page 24, clause 5.5.3.1

SEE ALSO accepted comments 6.2 [373] LSI 2) and 8.38 [515] Seagate 38)

The which should be a that.

#### Reason for rejection:

For reference, the sentence under discussion is an example of where 'which' is the correct word.

"The Persistent Reservations management method is used among multiple initiators that require operations to be protected across initiator failures, which usually involve hard resets."

The *Chicago Manual of Style 13th edition* describes the use of adjectival phrases (phrases beginning with 'that' or 'which') as follows:

"[5.36] An adjectival phrase or clause that follows a noun and restricts or limits the reference of the noun in a way that is essential to the meaning of the sentence should not be set off by commas; but an adjectival phrase or clause that is nonrestrictive or is purely descriptive, which could be dropped without changing the reference of the noun, is set off by commas."

Note that the sentence itself is an example of when to use 'which'. The *Chicago Manual* provided two additional examples:

The report that the committee submitted was well documented.

The report, which was well documented, was discussed with considerable emotion.

With much appreciated help from Harvey Rosenfeld the relevant pages from the *Chicago Manual of Style 14th edition* were obtained wherein the following additional clarification can be found.

"[5.42] A distinction has traditionally been made between the relative pronouns *which* and *that*, the latter having long been regarded as introducing a restrictive clause, and the former, a nonrestrictive one. Although the distinction is often disregarded in contemporary writing, the careful writer and editor should bear in mind that such indifference may result in misreading or uncertainty."

The following example and discussion of the example is provided.

*Ambiguous:*

The report which Marshall had tried to suppress was greeted with hilarity.

*Which of the following is meant?*

The report, which Marshall had tried to suppress, was greeted with hilarity.

or

The report that Marshall had tried to suppress was greeted with hilarity.

When the commas intended to set off a nonrestrictive clause are omitted, perhaps with the purpose of using *which* restrictively, the reader may well wonder whether the omission was inadvertent. Some uncertainty will persist.

The difference between the two is whether the fact that Marshall tried to suppress the report is critical to the naming of the report or not. A test of this is whether the sentence changes meaning when the phrase is removed.

In the case identified by this comment the phrase beginning with the word 'which' is preceded by a comma and removing the phrase from the sentence does not alter meaning of the sentence. Therefore, 'which' is appropriate and will be left unchanged.

#### **5.64 [115] IBM 64) Don't capitalize 'Active PTPL' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 53, page 25, clause 5.5.3.2.

SEE ALSO comments] CPQ 1B), 5.65 [116] IBM 65), and 8.42 [519] Seagate 42)

The term Active Persist Through Power Loss should not be capitalized.

#### **Editor's note:**

This comment is resolved by the changes described in the response to comment ] CPQ 1B).

#### **5.65 [116] IBM 65) PTPL Description (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 53, page 25, clause 5.5.3.2, last paragraph of page before the a,b,c list

SEE ALSO comments] CPQ 1B), 5.64 [115] IBM 64), and 8.42 [519] Seagate 42)

The statement '...the Persist Through Power Loss (APTPL)...' should be '...the APTPL...'

#### **Editor's note:**

This comment is resolved by the changes described in the response to comment ] CPQ 1B).

#### **5.66 [117] IBM 66) Description of READ KEYS uses 'port' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 54, page 26, clause 5.5.3.3.2, last paragraph

The term port is used but a SCSI port has not been defined. I suggest port be changed to target in this case.

#### **Editor's note:**

The proposed change makes a correct statement incorrect. The sentence containing 'SCSI port' will be changed from:

"Each reservation key may be examined by the application client and correlated with one or more initiators and SCSI ports by mechanisms outside the scope of this standard."

to:

"The application client may examine the reservation keys to identify relationships between initiators based on mechanisms that are outside the scope of this standard."

**5.67 [118] IBM 67) Capitalization (Unresolved)**

Global & PDF page 57, page 29, clause 5.5.3.6.1

The capitals should be removed from the following terms 'Write Exclusive, Registrants Only or Exclusive Access - Registrants Only'. These terms appear in other sections and should have the caps removed in those places also.

**5.68 [119] IBM 68) Change 'port' to 'service delivery ports' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 62, page 34, clause 5.6

The statement 'Additional ports provide...' should be changed to 'Additional service delivery ports provide...'.

**5.69 [120] IBM 69) Change 'port' to 'service delivery ports' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 62, page 34, clause 5.6

The statement '...among the ports...' should be changed to '...among the service delivery ports...'. In the general case all references to port in this section should be changed to service delivery port.

**5.70 [121] IBM 70) Commas not parentheses (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 62, page 34, clause 5.6

SEE ALSO comment 8.59 [536] Seagate 59)

The following statement '...initiators (regardless of port) except...' should be changed to '...initiators, regardless of port, except...'

Editor's note:

The response to 8.59 [536] Seagate 59) includes the resolution to this comment.

**5.71 [122] IBM 71) 'zero' not '0' (Rejected)**

PDF page 63, page 35, clause 5.7, last paragraph

The statement '...element 0.' should be '...element zero.'

**Reason for rejection:**

As used in this sentence, 'element 0' is the name of a thing. The name is spelled 'element 0' not 'element zero'.

**5.72 [123] IBM 72) Double lines in Tables (Unresolved)**

PDF page 65, page 37, clause 7.1, table 10

The formatting of this table should be change to add a double line after the header and before the footer. This should be done for all tables in this standard. Also this table should be made to fit on one page.

**5.73 [124] IBM 73) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Rejected)**

PDF page 68, page 40, clause 7.3.1

The statement '...unit (source device) to a logical unit (destination device).' should be '...unit (i.e., source device) to a logical unit (i.e., destination device).'

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COPY command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.15 [15] Brocade 15).

**5.74 [125] IBM 74) Eliminate parenthesis (Rejected)**

PDF page 68, page 40, clause 7.3.1

The statement '...SCSI device (in fact all three may be the same logical unit).' should be '...SCSI device and all three may be the same logical unit.'

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COPY command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.15 [15] Brocade 15).

**5.75 [126] IBM 75) 'zero' not '0' & 'one' not '1' (Rejected)**

PDF page 68, page 40, clause 7.3.1, 2nd paragraph from bottom of page

The statement '...priority of 1. Priority 0...' should be '...priority of one. Priority zero...'

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COPY command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.15 [15] Brocade 15).

**5.76 [127] IBM 76) Table anchor placement (Rejected)**

PDF page 68, page 40, clause 7.3.1

The last sentence of the page is split between tables 13 and 14. This need to be corrected with those tables being placed after the end of the paragraph.

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COPY command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.15 [15] Brocade 15).

**5.77 [128] IBM 77) Eliminate parenthesis (Rejected)**

PDF page 70, page 42, clause 7.3.3, 2nd paragraph

The statement '...be the source or destination SCSI device (or both).' should be '...be either the source or destination SCSI device or both.'

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COPY command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.15 [15] Brocade 15).

**5.78 [129] IBM 78) Clarify what's changed (Rejected)**

PDF page 70, page 42, clause 7.3.3, paragraphs after a.b list

The statement '...of an area that contains (unchanged) the...' is unclear as to what is unchanged. This needs to be fixed.

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COPY command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.15 [15] Brocade 15).

**5.79 [130] IBM 79) Eliminate parenthesis (Rejected)**

PDF page 72, page 44, clause 7.3.5, 3rd paragraph after table

The statement '...transferred to or from (depending on the DC bit)...' should be '...transferred to, if the DC bit is set to x, or from, if the DC bit is set to y,...'

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COPY command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.15 [15] Brocade 15).

**5.80 [131] IBM 80) Eliminate parenthesis (Rejected)**

PDF page 74, page 46, clause 7.3.7, last paragraph

The statement '...transferred to or from (depending on the DC bit)...' should be '...transferred to, if the DC bit is set to x, or from, if the DC bit is set to y,...'

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COPY command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.15 [15] Brocade 15).

**5.81 [132] IBM 81) 'RSmk' is a field name (Rejected)**

PDF page 75, page 47, clause 7.3.7, item d in list

The term RSmk needs to be in small caps.

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COPY command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.15 [15] Brocade 15).

**5.82 [133] IBM 82) Eliminate parentheses (Rejected)**

PDF page 75, page 47, clause 7.3.8, 1st paragraph

The statement 'The PAD bit (in the command descriptor block) and the CAT bit (in each applicable segment descriptor)...' should be changed to 'The CDB PAD bit and the applicable segment descriptor CAT bit...'

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COPY command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.15 [15] Brocade 15).

**5.83 [134] IBM 83) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Rejected)**

PDF page 75, page 47, clause 7.3.8, table 19, 1st row

The statement '...blocks (variable-block...)' should be changed to '...blocks (i.e., variable-block...'

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COPY command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.15 [15] Brocade 15).

**5.84 [135] IBM 84) Eliminate parentheses (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 77, page 49, clause 7.5.1, 1st paragraph

The statement '...device (in fact all the devices and the copy manager may be the same logical unit).' should be changed to '...device. It is possible that all the SCSI devices and the copy manager are the same logical unit).'

**Editor's note:**

The parentheses are unbalanced in the proposed replacement text. The text will be changed to: '...device. It is possible that all the SCSI devices and the copy manager are the same logical unit.'

**5.85 [136] IBM 85) Eliminate 'execute' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 77, page 49, clause 7.5.1, 1st paragraph after table

The statement '...execute any activities necessary...' should be changed to '...take any necessary actions required...'

**5.86 [137] IBM 86) Change 'activities' to 'actions' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 77, page 49, clause 7.5.1, 1st paragraph after table

The statement 'These activities may...' should be changed to 'These actions may...'

**5.87 [138] IBM 87) The identification is unique, not the value (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 78, page 50, clause 7.5.1, paragraph under note 6

The statement '...is a unique value selected by the application client to identify the extended...' should be changed to '...is a value selected by the application client to uniquely identify the extended...'

**5.88 [139] IBM 88) 'zero' not '0' & 'one' not '1' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 79, page 51, clause 7.5.1, 1st paragraph of page

The statement '...priority of 1. Priority 0 is...' should be changed to '...priority of one. Priority zero is...'

**Editor's note:**

The text will be changed to '...priority of 1h. Priority 0h is...'

**5.89 [140] IBM 89) Remove 'most' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 79, page 51, clause 7.5.1, 2nd paragraph of page

The term most is used. But there is not clear definition of how many most is. What I consider to be most could be very different than what the next person thinks is most. This needs to be fixed but since I have no reference to pick from I will replace most with 99%.

**Editor's note:**

The phrase '...that most of the disk references...' will be changed to '...that the majority of the disk references...'

**5.90 [141] IBM 90) Change 'dictated' to 'defined' (Accepted, Editorial)**PDF page 79, page 51, clause 7.5.1, 3rd paragraph from top of page  
See also comment 8.66 [543] Seagate 66)

The statement '...actions and dictated by the...' should be changed to '...actions and defined by the...'

**Editor's note:**

This comment and 8.66 [543] Seagate 66) have highlighted several problems with paragraph containing the identified text. With respect to this comment a better replacement word for 'dictated' is 'specified'. The current text reads:

If the No Receive Copy Results (NRCR) bit is zero, the copy manager shall hold data for retrieval by the application client using the RECEIVE COPY RESULTS command (see 7.17) as described by the RECEIVE COPY RESULTS command service actions and dictated by the segment descriptors. If NRCR is one, the copy manager may discard any data accessible to the application client via the RECEIVE COPY RESULTS command and respond to RECEIVE COPY RESULTS commands with a matching value in the LIST IDENTIFIER field as if no EXTENDED COPY command has been processed.

The text will be modified as follows:

If the No Receive Copy Results (NRCR) bit is zero, the copy manager shall hold data for retrieval by the application client using the RECEIVE COPY RESULTS command with the RECEIVE DATA service action (see 7.17.3) (see 7.17) as described by the RECEIVE COPY RESULTS command service actions and dictated specified by the segment descriptors. If NRCR is one, the copy manager may discard ~~any~~ all data accessible to the application client via the RECEIVE COPY RESULTS command with the RECEIVE DATA service action. If application client requests delivery of data that has been discarded as a result of NRCR being one, the copy manager shall respond as if the EXTENDED COPY command has not been processed. and respond to RECEIVE COPY RESULTS commands with a matching value in the LIST IDENTIFIER field as if no EXTENDED COPY command has been processed.

The change from 'any' to 'all' intends to avoid the copy manager discarding randomly selected parts of the data.

### **5.91 [142] IBM 91) Eliminate parentheses (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 79, page 51, clause 7.5.1, 5th paragraph from top of page

The statement '...devices (which are the source and/or the destination logical units).' should be '...devices that are the source and/or the destination logical units).'

#### **Editor's note:**

The intent of this text is to make an in-line *glossary* definition of 'target device'. The use of a definition that does not appear in the glossary is appropriate because entering the EXTENDED COPY definition of 'target device' would serve only to produce confusion. Since the in-line definition of a term thoroughly qualifies as digressive text as described in the response to comment 5.61 [112] IBM 61), the definition will be enclosed in parentheses. The current text reads:

An EXTENDED COPY command may reference one or more target devices (which are the source and/or the destination logical units).

To more clearly indicate presences of a definition, the text will be changed to:

An EXTENDED COPY command may reference one or more target devices (which are the name given by the EXTENDED COPY command description to source and/or the destination logical units).

### **5.92 [143] IBM 92) Eliminate parentheses (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 79, page 51, clause 7.5.1, 3rd paragraph from bottom of page

The statement '...the descriptors (both target and segment) permitted...' should be changed to '...the target and segment descriptors permitted...'

### **5.93 [144] IBM 93) Don't capitalize 'Inline' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 79, page 51, clause 7.5.1

The term Inline should not be capitalized.

### **5.94 [145] IBM 94) Eliminate 'in the manner' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 79, page 51, clause 7.5.1, last paragraph of page

The statement '...in the manner...' should be changed to '...as...'



**5.95 [146] IBM 95) Eliminate parentheses (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 79, page 51, clause 7.5.1, last paragraph of page

The statement '(particularly stream devices)' is out of place. I suggest a note after this paragraph indicating that is in an important feature with streaming devices be added and the statement in ()s be deleted.

**Editor's note:**

The parenthetical expression is not out of place in this sentence. In fact, the sentence exists to define the behavior relative to stream devices. Clearly, the parenthetical text is not digressive as described in the response to comment 5.61 [112] IBM 61). Therefore, the parentheses will be changed to commas.

**5.96 [147] IBM 96) Parity is out of date (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 80, page 52, clause 7.5.2

The statement '...include parity errors...' is dated. Most new devices use CRC not parity for detecting error. The statement should be changed to '...include CRC or parity errors...'.

**5.97 [148] IBM 97) Eliminate parentheses (Rejected)**

PDF page 80, page 52, clause 7.5.3

The statement '...the ACA condition (if any)...' should be changed to '...any ACA condition...'.

**Reason for rejection:**

The expression "... (if any) ..." is a ubiquitous method of highlighting the possibility that a condition being discussed may not exist. Indeed, the expression is so ubiquitous that comment 5.21 [72] IBM 21) employs it. As such, the precise form, "... (if any) ...," conveys meaning and fits (however loosely) the concept of a digressive expression described in the response to comment 5.61 [112] IBM 61).

**5.98 [149] IBM 98) Clarify what's changed (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 81, page 53, clause 7.5.3, item e and f

Here, as in the copy command there is the term (unchanged) which makes just as little sense here as it did in the copy command. This needs to be fixed and/or explained.

**Editor's note:**

The phrase in question currently reads:

...an area that contains (unchanged) the source [destination] logical unit's status byte and sense data.

"source" is for item e) and "destination" is for item f).

The phrase will be clarified by changing it to read:

...an area that contains the status byte and sense data delivered to the copy manager by the source [destination] logical unit. The status byte and sense data shall not be modified by the copy manager or device server.

**5.99 [150] IBM 99) 'zero' not '0' & 'one' not '1' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 81, page 52, clause 7.5.3, the a,b,c list

There are a few cases where a 1 or 0 are used. These should be changed to one or zero.

Editor's notes:

There is one 0, in item d. There is one 1, in item d, see also 10.23 [612] O23).

**5.100 [151] IBM 100) Eliminate '(tape)' (Rejected)**

PDF page 82, page 54, clause 7.5.5, table 23, footnote

The term '(tape)' is redundant and should be deleted.

**Reason for rejection:**

The parenthetical expression "(tape)" is necessary to provide definition for the term as used in the shorthand column of the table (e.g., "filemark→tape").

**5.101 [152] IBM 101) Force table to one page (Unresolved)**

PDF page 82, page 54, table 23

This table should be made to fit on one page.

**5.102 [153] IBM 102) Spellout 'NUL=1' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 84, page 56, clause 7.5.6.1, 2nd paragraph of page

The statement ' NUL=1' should be changed to 'a NUL bit of one'.

Editor's note:

"NUL=1" will be changed to "the NUL bit set to one".

**5.103 [154] IBM 103) What states have changed? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 84, page 56, clause 7.5.6.1, 1st paragraph after table

**Need SNIA-BWG & T10 discussion**

The statement 'change the state' is not clear. What states are there to be changing from or to. To this point I have read nothing to help in the understanding of this.

Editor's notes:

At first I thought this phrase was intended to be as restrictive as the Verify Device Operation segment description with TUR=0. However, tightening the requirement to that degree would prohibit verifying all the device specific fields because MODE SENSE commands may be needed to do a complete verification. Therefore, I believe that "...change the state..." should be changed to "...change the read/write positioning...".

**5.104 [155] IBM 104) Eliminate parentheses (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 85, page, 57, clause 7.5.6.2, 2nd paragraph after table

The statement '...the target (source or destination)...' should be changed to '...the source or destination...'.

**5.105 [156] IBM 105) Reference FC-FS not FC-PH (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 85, page 57, clause 7.5.6.2, 3rd paragraph after table  
SEE ALSO comment 10.27 [616] O27) Elliott

This paragraph references where to find the WWID. There are several problems with this. For one not all SCSI protocols have a WWID port address so how what happens with those. For another FC-PH is the wrong standard to reference, FC-FS would be better. But it would be better to reference the device identifier VPD page which has the same WWID in it.

Editor's notes:

The Parallel Interface T\_L target descriptor format is provided for the protocol that does not have a World Wide Name. The Identification descriptor target descriptor format is provided for those implementations that desire to use the identifiers in VPD page 83h.

The reference to FC-PH in the description of the WORLD WIDE NAME field will be changed to FC-FS (as shown in the response to comment 10.27 [616] O27) Elliott). Note that no changes are needed in the normative references clause because FC-FS is already listed there.

**5.106 [157] IBM 106) Reference FC-FS not FC-PH (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 86, page 58, clause 7.5.6.3

Why is this protocol specific stuff in this document. It should be moved to the specific protocol document or made generic. Also there should be no references to FC-PH in this standard. All references should be to FC-FS or FC-PI as appropriate.

Editor's notes:

The definition of the N\_PORT field currently reads as follows:

The N\_PORT field shall contain the FC-PH port D\_ID to be used to transport frames including PLOGI and FCP-2 related frames.

It will be changed to:

The N\_PORT field shall contain the FC-FS port D\_ID to be used to transport frames including PLOGI and FCP-2 related frames.

Note that no changes are needed in the normative references clause because FC-FS is already listed there.

For reference, D\_ID (the object being referenced in the field description) is defined in FC-FS not in FC-PI.

See 5.109 [160] IBM 109) for resolution of issue regarding protocol specific discussions in SPC-2.

**5.107 [158] IBM 107) Eliminate parentheses (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 86, page, 58, clause 7.5.6.3, 2nd paragraph after table

The statement '...the target (source or destination)...' should be changed to '...the source or destination...'.

**5.108 [159] IBM 108) Remove references to FC-PH (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 87, page 59, clause 7.5.6.4

Why is this protocol specific stuff in this document. It should be moved to the specific protocol document or made generic. Also there should be no references to FC-PH in this standard. All references should be to FC-FS or FC-PI as appropriate.

**Editor's notes:**

The reference to FC-PH in the description of the WORLD WIDE NAME field will be handled as described in the resolution for comment 5.105 [156] IBM 105). The reference to FC-PH in the description of the N\_Port field will be handled as described in the resolution for comment 5.106 [157] IBM 106). See 5.109 [160] IBM 109) for resolution of issue regarding protocol specific discussions in SPC-2.

**5.109 [160] IBM 109) Remove protocol specific stuff (Rejected)**

PDF page 88, page 59, clause 7.5.6.5

Why is this protocol specific stuff in this document. It should be moved to the specific protocol document or made generic.

**Reason for rejection:**

Since the editor of SPI-4 has refused to incorporate protocol specific parameter data format information in his standard and thus established a precedent, the chances of moving these target descriptor formats out of SPC-2 and into a protocol specification document are next to nil. Since T10 approved these formats for incorporation in SPC-2 in July, 1999, changing them now would represent an unreasonable burden on the companies that have been implementing EXTENDED COPY for the past 1+ years. Therefore, no changes will be made.

**5.110 [161] IBM 110) Eliminate parentheses (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 88, page, 60, clause 7.5.6.5, 2nd paragraph after table,

The statement '...the target (source or destination)...' should be changed to '...the source or destination...'

**5.111 [162] IBM 111) Add parentheses (Rejected)**

PDF page 90, page 62, clause 7.5.6.7, The statement '...type.

'...type. That is, the copy manager may perform read operations from a source disk at any time and in any order during processing of an EXTENDED COPY command, provided that the relative order of writes and reads on the same blocks within the same target descriptor does not differ from their order in the segment descriptor list.' should be changed to '...type (i.e., the copy manager may perform read operations from a source disk at any time and in any order during processing of an EXTENDED COPY command, provided that the relative order of writes and reads on the same blocks within the same target descriptor does not differ from their order in the segment descriptor list).'

**Reason for rejection:**

The clarity of the text is not enhanced by splicing two sentences into a single, paragraph long sentence.

**5.112 [163] IBM 112) Eliminate parentheses (Rejected)**

PDF page 91, page 63, clause 7.5.6.8

The statement '(device type code value 01h)' should be deleted as it contains no useful information. Specific device type are used throughout this standard and in those places the code value is not specified so way is it here.

**Reason for rejection:**

Similar parenthetical expressions in the first sentences of 7.5.6.7 and 7.5.6.9 appear to contain sufficient useful information to have been unworthy of comment. In the editor's opinion, all three parenthetical expressions serve to specify the exact device types being discussed and thus have merit.

**5.113 [164] IBM 113) Eliminate 'will' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 91, page 63, clause 7.5.6.8, note 11

See also comment 8.69 [546] Seagate 69)

The term will is used. It needs to be replaced or removed.

Editor's note:

The response to comment 8.69 [546] Seagate 69) is a rewrite of note 11, including corrections based on this comment.

**5.114 [165] IBM 114) Add parentheses (Rejected)**

PDF page 91, page 63, clause 7.5.6.8

The following statement '...type. That is, the read operations required by a segment descriptor for which the source is a stream device shall not be started until all write operations for previous segment descriptors have completed.' should be changed to '...type (i.e., the read operations required by a segment descriptor for which the source is a stream device shall not be started until all write operations for previous segment descriptors have completed).'

**Reason for rejection:**

The clarity of the text is not enhanced by splicing two sentences into a single, paragraph long sentence.

**5.115 [166] IBM 115) Rewrite to eliminate parenthetical phrase (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 93, page 65, clause 7.5.7.1, 2nd paragraph after table

The statement 'structure (block or stream).' should be changed to 'structure (e.g., block or stream).'

Editor's note:

The paragraph in question will be changed to read:

The destination count (DC) bit is only applicable to segment descriptors with descriptor type code values of 02h and 0Dh. The DC bit is reserved for all other segment descriptors. Details of usage for the DC bit appear in the subclauses defining the segment descriptors that use it.

**5.116 [167] IBM 116) Which hunt (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 93, page 65, clause 7.5.7.1, item b in list

The which should be changed to a that.

Editor's notes:

Changing 'which' to 'that' will change the meaning of item b. So some other rewording is necessary. Item b currently reads as follows:

To process data, which generally designates data as destination data intended for transfer to the destination device; and

It will be changed to:

To process data, which an operation that generally designates data as destination data intended for transfer to the destination device; and

**5.117 [168] IBM 117) Change parentheses to commas (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 93, page 65, clause 7.5.7.1, item a in second list

The () should be replaced with ,.

**5.118 [169] IBM 118) Eliminate parentheses (Rejected)**

PDF page 94, page 66, clause 7.5.7.1, table 36, 3rd row and last row

Reword to get rid of the ()s.

**Reason for rejection:**

The parenthetical text definitely qualifies as 'supplementary facts' as described in the response to 5.61 [112] IBM 61). Also because commas are already used extensively, rewriting the text to eliminate the parentheses produces an unreadable mishmash of ideas.

**5.119 [170] IBM 119) Indent footnote (Unresolved)**

PDF page 94, page 66, clause 7.5.7.1, table 36

indent the footnote

Editor's notes:

As far as the editor can tell, the note format in this table follows the note format used in the body text. In the body text, notes are indented, but if only one note is present the note number is inline with the note text. If the body contains multiple notes, the note numbers form a column with the same intent for the header of the numbers column as for single note body entries.

This table note has the same intention as for the notes header is a list of table notes, with the note number inline with the note text, and the remainder of the note is indented.

**5.120 [171] IBM 120) Force table to one page (Unresolved)**

PDF page 95, page 67, clause 7.5.7.1, table 37

Make this table fit on one page.

**5.121 [172] IBM 121) Spellout CAT=1 and PAD=1 (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 95, page 67, clause 7.5.7.1, table 37, footnote 1

The 'CAT=1' should be 'the CAT bit is set to one'. and the 'PAD=1' should be 'the PAD bit is set to one'

**5.122 [173] IBM 122) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Rejected)**

PDF page 96, page 68, clause 7.5.7.1, 1 paragraph after table 37

All the ( )s should start with '(i.e.,'

**Reason for rejection:**

The parenthetical text is an elaborate and more informative form of cross reference that fits the description of an "amplifying or digressive element" as described in the response to comment 5.61 [112] IBM 61).

**5.123 [174] IBM 123) 'DC=0/1' s/b 'if DC is set to 0/1' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 100, page 72, clause 7.5.7.4

The statement '...processed (if DC=0) or to be written to the destination device (if DC=1).' should be changed to '...processed if DC is set to zero or to be written to the destination device if DC is set to one.'

**Editor's notes:**

Because this is not the paragraph defining the DC bit, the parenthetical text is digressive as described in the response to comment 5.61 [112] IBM 61) and the parentheses are appropriate. However, the use of the equal sign may be inappropriate.

**5.124 [175] IBM 124) Eliminate parentheses (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 104, page 76, clause 7.5.7.7, 3rd paragraph after table

The statement '...field (including embedded data).' should be changed to 'field. The DESCRIPTOR LENGTH field includes embedded data.'

**Editor's notes:**

The proposed change is unnecessarily wordy. The phrase '...field (including embedded data).' will be changed to '...field, including the embedded data.'

**5.125 [176] IBM 125) Eliminate parentheses (Rejected)**

PDF page 106, page 78, clause 7.5.7.9, last paragraph on page

The statement '(Test Unit Ready)' should be deleted. No where else is the bit acronym repeated after the initial definition.

**Reason for rejection:**

The editor can find only one instance of "(Test Unit Ready)" acting as a bit acronym definition in the cited paragraph.

**5.126 [177] IBM 126) 'field' should be 'fields' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 111, page 83, clause 7.5.7.14, last paragraph of page

The first field should be fields.

**5.127 [178] IBM 127) Eliminate SCSI-3 and spellout 1 (Unresolved)**

PDF page 115, page 87, clause 7.6.1, note 14

The statement 'An SCSI-3 application client...' should be changed to 'An application client...' because the term SCSI-3 is too narrow in this case and the references to SCSI-2 elsewhere are enough to cover the case being warned about. Also the statement '...bit set to 1...' should be '...bit set to one...'.  
The statement '...bit set to one...'

**5.128 [179] IBM 128) Force table to one page (Unresolved)**

**Global** & PDF page 118, page 90, clause 7.6.2, table 55

This table should be set so it will not be split between page boundaries. All tables should be set this way as it is not helpful to the reader/developers to have tables splitting when it is possible to make them fit on one page.

**5.129 [180] IBM 129) Use 'see SAM-2' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 119, page 91, clause 7.6.2, last paragraph on page

The statement '...CDB (as defined in SAM-2).' should be changed to '...CDB (see SAM-2).'

**5.130 [181] IBM 130) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 120, page 92, clause 7.6.2, 6th paragraph from top of page

The statement '...tagged tasks (command queuing)...' should be changed to '...tagged tasks (i.e., command queuing)...'.

**5.131 [182] IBM 131) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase & Spellout 2 (Unresolved)**

PDF page 120, page 92, clause 7.6.2, 8th paragraph from top of page

The statement '...multi-port (2 or more ports) device...' should be changed to '...multi-port (i.e., two or more ports) SCSI device...'



**5.132 [183] IBM 132) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 120, page 92, clause 7.6.2, 2nd paragraph from bottom of page,

The statement '...tagged tasks (command queuing)...' should be changed to '...tagged tasks (i.e., command queuing)...'.

**5.133 [184] IBM 133) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 120, page 92, clause 7.6.2

The statement '...the field (lowest offset)...' should be '...the field (i.e., lowest offset)....'

**5.134 [185] IBM 134) List standards in an ordered list (Unresolved)**

PDF page 121, page 93, clause 7.6.2, paragraph above table 58

The recommended order of listing standards would be better if it was in an ordered list (1,2,3).

**5.135 [186] IBM 135) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 125, page 97, clause 7.6.3

The statement '...SPI-n (where n is 2 or greater).' should be '...SPI-n, where n is two or greater.'

**5.136 [187] IBM 136) Eliminate execution (Unresolved)**

PDF page 126, page 98, clause 7.6.4, note 18

The statement '...prohibits normal command execution.' should be changed to '...prohibits normal command completion.'

**5.137 [188] IBM 137) Spellout 'byte 1' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 127, page 99, clause 7.6.5, table 63, row 001b

The statement '...byte 1 is undefined.' should be '...byte one is undefined.'

**5.138 [189] IBM 138) Spellout 'byte 1' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 128, page 100, clause 7.6.5 -1st paragraph from top of page

The statement '...byte 1 is not valid.' should be '...byte one is not valid.'

**5.139 [190] IBM 139) How to build CDB usage bit map? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 128, page 100, clause 7.6.5, 2nd paragraph under note 21

The sentence 'If the device server evaluates a bit as all or part of a field in the CDB for the operation code being queried, the usage map shall contain a one in the corresponding bit position.' is unclear. What information is it trying to provide that is not already in the remaining parts of the paragraph?

**5.140 [191] IBM 140) Change 'thus' to 'for example' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 128, page 100, 3rd paragraph after note 21

The statement 'Thus, the CDB... ' should be changed to 'For example, the CDB... '.

**5.141 [192] IBM 141) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 132, page 104, clause 7.8, a,b,c list, a item

The statement '...last update (in response... ' should be '...last update (i.e., in response... ').

**5.142 [193] IBM 142) Delete discussion of multi-port issue (Unresolved)**

PDF page 133, page 105, clause 7.9, 1st paragraph after table

The sentence 'Multiple port implementations may save one copy per logical unit and have it apply to all initiators on all ports or save a separate copy per logical unit for each initiator on each port.' should be deleted as we have not yet resolved the ports issues.

**5.143 [194] IBM 143) Description of 'independent' Mode Pages (Unresolved)**

PDF page 133, page 105, clause 7.9, 3rd paragraph after table

The statement 'The target may provide for independent... ' Should be changed to 'If a target provides for independent... ' It is stated above that this is allowed there is no need to restate it.

**5.144 [195] IBM 144) 'PS' is a field name (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 133, page 105, clause 7.9, last paragraph of page

The PS should be in small caps.

**5.145 [196] IBM 145) Change 'may' to 'shall' (Unresolved)**

Marked technical by comment author

PDF page 134 page 106, clause 7.9, paragraph between two a,b,c lists

The statement '...the device server may either:' is a problem because it implies there is some other way to handle rounding other than the ways listed. I do not believe this is the case so the 'may' should be changed to a 'shall'.

**5.146 [197] IBM 146) Commas not parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 134, page 106, clause 7.9, 2nd paragraph above note 24

The statement '...any mode page (even those reported as non-changeable) as a result of changes...' should be changed to '...any mode page, even those reported as non-changeable, as a result of changes... '.

**5.147 [198] IBM 147) Delete wording that means 'may' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 135, page 107, clause 7.11.1, paragraph under table 69

The statement '..., at the device server's discretion.' should be deleted as the 'may' stated earlier in the sentence implies just that.

**5.148 [199] IBM 148) Add 'may' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 136, page 108, clause 7.11.1, note 26

The statement 'Some devices implement no distinction between...' should be changed to 'Some SCSI devices may not distinguish between...'.  
'

**5.149 [200] IBM 149) Eliminate note (Unresolved)**

PDF page 136, page 108, clause 7.11.1, note 25

This note should be inline text not a note.

**5.150 [201] IBM 150) Commas not parentheses (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 136, page 108, clause 7.11.1, note 28

The statement '...block descriptor (if applicable).' should be '...block descriptor, if applicable.'

**5.151 [202] IBM 151) Eliminate notes (Unresolved)**

PDF page 136, page 108, clause 7.11.1, notes 27 and 28

These note should be part of the main line text.

**5.152 [203] IBM 152) Eliminate notes (Unresolved)**

PDF page 137, page 109, clause 7.11.3, notes 29 and 30

These notes should be made part of the main line text.

**5.153 [204] IBM 153) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 137, page 1.9, clause 7.11.3, note 29

The statement '...mode parameter (via MODE SELECT) results...' should be '...mode parameter using the MODE SELECT command shall result in...'.  
'

**5.154 [205] IBM 154) Eliminate note (Unresolved)**

PDF page 137, page 109, clause 7.11.5, note 31

This note should be part of the main line text.

**5.155 [206] IBM 155) 'zero' not '0' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 140, page 112, clause 7.13.3, 1st paragraph under table

The statement '...set to 0 as part..' should be '...set to zero as part...'.  
'

**5.156 [207] IBM 156) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase & 'zero' not '0' (Rejected)**

PDF page 140, page 112, clause 7.13.3, 2nd paragraph under table

The statement '...the list (byte 0 to the allocation length)...' should be change to '...the list (i.e., byte zero to the allocation length)...'.

**Reason for rejection:**

The use of '0' here matches the notation in the parameter data format table. If '0' is changed to 'zero' here then the left column of the table should be changed from '0', '3', '4', etc. to 'zero', 'three', 'four', etc.

**5.157 [208] IBM 157) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase & 'zero' not '0' (Rejected)**

PDF page 141, page 113, clause 7.13.4.1, 2nd paragraph under table

The statement '...the list (byte 0 to the allocation length)...' should be change to '...the list (i.e., byte zero to the allocation length)...'.

**Reason for rejection:**

The use of '0' here matches the notation in the parameter data format table. If '0' is changed to 'zero' here then the left column of the table should be changed from '0', '3', '4', etc. to 'zero', 'three', 'four', etc.

**5.158 [209] IBM 158) 'Reservation descriptor' is a field name (Unresolved)**

PDF page 141, page 113, clause 7.13.4.1, 3rd paragraph after table

The statement 'Reservation descriptor' should be all small caps or have no caps. This is true throughout this section.

**5.159 [210] IBM 159) Don't capitalize 'Logical Unit' (Unresolved)**

Global/Clause &amp; PDF page 142, page 114, clause 7.13.4.1, 2nd paragraph on page

The term 'Logical Unit' should not be capitalized throughout this section.

**5.160 [211] IBM 160) Change 'LU' to '0h' (Unresolved)**PDF page 142, page 114, clause 7.13.4.2.2  
SEE ALSO comment 8.86 [563] Seagate 86)

The statement '...value of LU shall...' should be '...value of 0h shall...'

**5.161 [212] IBM 161) Don't capitalize 'Logical Unit' (Unresolved)**

Global/Clause &amp; PDF page 142, page 114, clause 7.13.4.2.2

The term 'Logical Unit ' should not be capitalized throughout this section.

**5.162 [213] IBM 162) Change 'Element' to '2h' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 142, page 114, clause 7.13.4.2.3

The statement '..value of Element shall...' should be changed to '...value of 2h shall...'

**5.163 [214] IBM 163) Just SMC-2 (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 142, page 114, clause 7.13.4.2.3

The statement '...by the SCSI Medium Changer Commands -2 (SMC-2) standard.' should be '...by the SMC-2 standard'. The full name is already used in the normative references section and does not need to be repeated here.

**5.164 [215] IBM 164) Don't capitalize 'element' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 142, page 114, clause 7.13.4.2.3

The term 'Element' should not be capitalized.

**5.165 [216] IBM 165) Eliminate 'execute' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 143, page 115, clause 7.13.4.3, table 79, 2 nd row

The statement '...may execute tasks...' should be changed to '...may initiate tasks...'. Aside from the execution word; application clients do not execute they request executions.

**5.166 [217] IBM 166) Eliminate 'execute' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 143, page 115, clause 7.13.4.3, table 79, 6th row

The statement '...may execute tasks...' should be changed to '...may initiate tasks...'. Aside from the execution word; application clients do not execute they request executions.

**5.167 [218] IBM 167) Don't capitalize 'service' (Unresolved)**

Global/Clause PDF page 144, page 116, clause 7.14.1, 3rd paragraph after table

The term Service should not be capitalized throughout this section including table headings.

**5.168 [219] IBM 168) Just '(see xxxx)' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 145, page 117, clause 7.14.2, table 81

The statement '(for more information on xxx see xxx...' appears in several places. All should be changed to '(see xxxx).'

**5.169 [220] IBM 169) Don't capitalize 'element' (Unresolved)**

Global/Clause PDF page 146, page 118, clause 7.14.3, last paragraph of page

The term 'Element' should not be capitalized throughout this section and in table 83.

**5.170 [221] IBM 170) Clarify 'specified above' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 147, page 119, clause 7.14.3, 1st paragraph above table 83

The statement '...since it is specified above.' is not precise enough, there are 119 pages above which is being referred to. The 'above' needs to be deleted and replaced with a specific reference.

**5.171 [222] IBM 171) Don't capitalize 'Activate Persist Through Power Loss' (Rejected)**

PDF page 147, page 119, clause 7.14.3, 1st paragraph of page

The term 'Activate Persist Through Power Loss' should not be capitalized as this is not the convention used elsewhere in this document.

**Reason for rejection:**

There is no 'convention' for capitalization in this instance. A quick stroll through the description of the Standard INQUIRY data will clearly show the lack of a 'convention'. Picking only on instances that occur in the published SPC standard we have: "A terminate task (TrmTsk) bit...", "The Normal ACA Supported bit (NormACA)...", "An Enclosure Services (EncServ) bit ...", "A Multi Port (MultiP) bit ...", "A medium changer (MChngr) bit ...", "A relative addressing (RelAdr) bit ...", "A linked command (Linked) bit ...", and "A command queuing (CmdQue) bit ...". Since none of the above cited differences resulted in comments on this letter ballot, no changes will be made here.

**5.172 [223] IBM 172) Commas not parentheses (Rejected)**

PDF page 148, page 120, clause 7.15, table 85, rows 1 and 2

The statement '(if any)' should be changed to ',if any'.

**Reason for rejection:**

See response to comment 5.97 [148] IBM97).

**5.173 [224] IBM 173) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 148, page 120, clause 7.15

The statement '...11b (medium removal...)' should be changed to '....11b (i.e., medium removal...)'.

**5.174 [225] IBM 174) Add a comma (Unresolved)**

PDF page 148, page 120, clause 7.15, last paragraph

There should be a comma between EXISTING KEY and REGISTER.

**5.175 [226] IBM 175) Use command descriptor block or CDB (Unresolved)**

PDF page 149, page 121, clause 7.16.1, paragraph after table 86  
SEE ALSO comments 5.26 [77] IBM 26) and 5.46 [97] IBM 46)

The term 'command descriptor block' should be changed to 'CDB' or all CDBs should be changed to 'command descriptor block'.

**5.176 [227] IBM 176) Just '(see xxxx)' (Rejected)**

PDF page 150, page 122, clause 7.16.5

The statement '... field (see the description of the buffer ID in 7.16.4).' should be changed to 'field (see 7.16.4).'

**Reason for rejection:**

7.16.4 contains more than just a description of buffer ID. The reference cannot be reduced to just a section reference without introducing additional section headers.

**5.177 [228] IBM 177) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 151, page 123, clause 7.16.5, note 32

The statement '...reservations (to all logical units on the device) or...' should be '...reservations to all logical units on the SCSI device or...'

**5.178 [229] IBM 178) 'zero' not '0' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 152, page 124, clause 7.16.7, last paragraph on page

The statement 'An EBOS bit of zero means that the..' should be 'A EBOS bit of zero specifies that the...'

**5.179 [230] IBM 179) Eliminate parentheses (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 153, page 125, clause 7.17.1

The statement '...previous (or current)...' should be '...previous or current...'

**5.180 [231] IBM 180) What does 'immediately' mean? (Accepted, Substantive)**

PDF page 154, page 126, clause 7.17.1, table 93

See also comment 8.95 [572] Seagate 94)

The term 'immediately' is used but what does it mean? As part of the current connection? As the first thing on the next connection? What? This needs to be quantified.

**Editor's note:**

The response to comment 8.95 [572] Seagate 94) describes the resolution for this comment.

**5.181 [232] IBM 181) Remove 'then' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 155, page 127, clause 7.17.2

The statement '...command, then it shall...' should be '...command, it shall...'

**5.182 [233] IBM 182) Use 'vendor specific' not 'vendor-specific' (Accepted, Editorial)**

Global &amp; PDF page 155, page 127, clause 7.17.2

In some cases the term vendor specific is written as 'vendor specific' and in other cases as 'vendor-specific' this needs to be made consistent throughout the document.

**Editor's note:**

'vendor specific' (not dash) will be used throughout.

**5.183 [234] IBM 183) Clarify 'matching list identifier' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 155, page 127, clause 7.17.2, a,b,c list, a item

The statement '...with a matching list identifier;' should be '... and the list identifier matches the list identifier associated with the preserved COPY STATUS service actions data;'

**5.184 [235] IBM 184) What does 'eight' refer to? (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 155, page 127, clause 7.17.2, paragraph after a,b,c list

The sentence 'The AVAILABLE DATA field shall contain the number of bytes present in the parameter data that follows, eight.' does not make sense and references something that 'follows'. It is not clear if that is data or something in the standard. And what is 'eight' referring to?

Editor's notes:

The number of bytes that follow is eight. However, since that information is presented in the table above, the simplest fix is to delete "eight".

**5.185 [236] IBM 185) Change 'Operating' to 'Operation' (Accepted, Editorial)**PDF page 155, page 127, clause 7.17.2, table 95, 1st row  
SEE ALSO comments 7.57 [441] Quantum 57)

The statement 'Operating in progress' should be 'Operation in progress'.

**5.186 [237] IBM 186) 'megabytes' not 'mega-bytes' etc. (Accepted, Editorial)**PDF page 156, page 128, clause 7.17.2, table 96  
SEE ALSO comments 1.30 [30] Brocade 30), 7.58 [442] Quantum 58), and 8.96 [573] Seagate 95)

I do not believe there should be '-s between Kilo, mega, giag(sic), tera, peta, and bytes.

Editor's note:

The response to comment 1.30 [30] Brocade 30) contains the resolution for this comment.

**5.187 [238] IBM 187) 'held data' is a field name (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 157, page 129, clause 7.17.3, table 97

The term 'held data' should be small caps.

**5.188 [239] IBM 188) What does 'immediately' mean? (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 157, page 129, clause 7.17.3, 1st paragraph after table

The term 'immediately' is used but what does it mean? As part of the current connection? As the first thing on the next connection? What? This needs to be quantified.

Editor's note:

"immediately" will be changed to "as soon as practical".



**5.189 [240] IBM 189) 'zero' not '0' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 157, page 129, clause 7.17.3, a.b.c list, item b

The statement '...field set to 0;' should be '...field(sic) set to zero;'

**Editor's note:**

"0" will be changed to "0h".

**5.190 [241] IBM 190) Clarify 'same list identifier' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 157, page 129, clause 7.17.3, a.b.c. list, items c

The statement '...the same list identifier;' should be '... and the list identifier matches the list identifier associated with the preserved RECEIVE DATA service actions data;'

**5.191 [242] IBM 191) Kill the ly (immediately) words (Accepted, Editorial)**PDF page 157, page 129, clause 7.17.3, last paragraph on page  
SEE ALSO comment 1.32 [32] Brocade 32)

The statement '...bytes than are needed immediately, but...' should be '...bytes than are needed, but...'. The term immediately is not quantified and not necessary in this case as it add no additional information.

**Editor's note:**

The response to comment 1.32 [32] Brocade 32) contains the resolution for this comment.

**5.192 [243] IBM 192) 'one' not '1' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 159, page 131, clause 7.17.4

The statement 'set to 1' occurs several times in this section. All these should be changed to 'set to one'.

**Editor's notes:**

The phrase appears in the descriptions of the MAXIMUM SEGMENT LENGTH, DATA SEGMENT GRANULARITY, and INLINE DATA GRANULARITY fields. Also, in the descriptions of MAXIMUM SEGMENT LENGTH and DATA SEGMENT GRANULARITY fields, "pad" should be "PAD".

**5.193 [244] IBM 193) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 159, page 131, clause 7.17.4, 5th paragraph from bottom of page

The statement '...descriptor (segment descriptors...' should be '...descriptor (i.e., segment descriptors...'.

**5.194 [245] IBM 194) 'power of two' not 'power of 2' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 159, page 131, clause 7.17.4

The statement 'power of 2' should be 'power of two' in several places in this section.

**Editor's notes:**

The phrase appears in the descriptions of the DATA SEGMENT GRANULARITY, INLINE DATA GRANULARITY, and HELD DATA GRANULARITY fields.

**5.195 [246] IBM 195) Don't capitalize 'list' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 160, page 132, clause 7.17.4, **1st and 2nd** paragraphs on page

The term 'List' should not be capitalized.

**5.196 [247] IBM 196) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Rejected)**

PDF page 160, page 132, clause 7.17.5, 2nd paragraph

The statement '...target devices (in particular stream...)' should be '...target devices (i.e., stream...)'.

**Reason for rejection:**

Making the proposed change would water down the meaning of the sentence. The parenthetical text is an "amplifying or digressive element" as described in the response to comment 5.61 [112] IBM 61).

**5.197 [248] IBM 197) 'zero' not '0' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 160, page 132, clause 7.17.5, a.b.c list, item b

The statement '...field set to 0;' should be '...field set to zero;'.

**Editor's note:**

"0" will be changed to "0h".

**5.198 [249] IBM 198) Delete the last sentence (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 161, page 133, clause 7.17.5, note 33

SEE ALSO comments 7.62 [446] Quantum 62) and 8.98 [575] Seagate 97)

The last sentence should be deleted as it has not(sic) significant value.

**Editor's note:**

The response to comment 8.98 [575] Seagate 97) contains the resolution for this comment.

**5.199 [250] IBM 199) Add e.g. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 164, page 136, clause 7.19.3, note 36

The statement '...device (usually a copy...)' should be changed to '...device (e.g., a copy...)'.

**5.200 [251] IBM 200) 'standard inquiry' s/b all caps (Unresolved)**

PDF page 166, page 138, clause 7.21, 1st paragraph

The term 'standard inquiry' should be all caps as it is the name of a parameter list.

**5.201 [252] IBM 201) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 166, page 138, clause 7.21, 1st paragraph

The statement '...actions (that apply to SCC-2...)' should be '...actions (i.e., SCC-2...)'.

**5.202 [253] IBM 202) Change 'action concerns' to 'action applies to' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 166, page 138, clause 7.21, 1st paragraph

The statement '...action concerns all SCSI...' should be '...action applies to all SCSI...'

**5.203 [254] IBM 203) 'space' means 'bytes' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 166, page 138, clause 7.21, 2nd paragraph after table

The statement '...how much space has been...' should be 'how many bytes has been...'

**5.204 [255] IBM 204) 'on all ports' adds no value (Unresolved)**

PDF page 167, page 139, clause 7.21, 2nd to last paragraph on page

The statement '... to all initiators on all ports.' should be '...to all initiator.' The statement 'on all ports' add no addition value.

**5.205 [256] IBM 205) Eliminate 'execution' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 167, page 139, clause 7.21, last paragraph on page

The statement 'The execution of a REPORT DEVICE IDENTIFIER may require...' should be change to A REPORT DEVICE IDENTIFIER command may require...'

**5.206 [257] IBM 206) Don't capitalize 'standby' or 'idle' (Unresolved)**

Global/Clause &amp; PDF page 170, page 142, clause 7.23.1, 2nd paragraph after table

The terms 'Standby' and 'Idle' should not be capitalized throughout this section.

**5.207 [258] IBM 207) Add e.g. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 171, page 143, clause 7.32.2, last paragraph

The statement '...condition (end-of-partition, beginning-of-partition, out-of-paper, etc.)...' should be '...condition (e.g., end-of-partition, beginning-of-partition, out-of-paper)...'

**5.208 [259] IBM 208) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

Global/List \* PDF page 172, page 144, clause 7.23.2, a,b,c list

There are several places where the statement '(device type x)' should be changed to '(i.e., device type x)'

**5.209 [260] IBM 209) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

Global/List \* PDF page 172, page 144, clause 7.23.2, a,b,c list

There are several places where the statement '(residue)' should be changed to '(i.e., residue)'

**5.210 [261] IBM 210) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 172, page 144, clause 7.23.2, a,b,c list, item b

The sentence '(Negative values are indicated by two's complement notation.);' should be 'Negative values are indicated by two's complement notation.;'.

**5.211 [262] IBM 211) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

Global/Clause & PDF page 172, page 144, clause 7.23.2, a,b,c list, d,a item

The statement '...mode (block length field...)' should be '...mode (i.e., block length field...)' and the term 'block length' should be small caps.

**5.212 [263] IBM 212) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

Global/Clause PDF page 172, page 144, clause 7.23.2 -abc list, d.b item

The statement '...mode (the fixed bit of the...)' should be '...mode (i.e., the fixed bit of the...)' and the term 'fixed' should be small caps.

**5.213 [264] IBM 213) Make 'command-specific information' all caps (Unresolved)**

PDF page 172, page 144, clause 7.23.2

The 2nd to last paragraph on page the term 'command-specific information' should be all caps.

**5.214 [265] IBM 214) Make 'sense key' all caps (Unresolved)**

PDF page 172, page 144, clause 7.23.2, last paragraph of page

The term 'sense key' should be all caps.

**5.215 [266] IBM 215) Make 'additional sense bytes' all caps (Unresolved)**

PDF page 173, page 145, clause 7.23.3, last paragraph

The term 'additional sense bytes' should be all caps.

**5.216 [267] IBM 216) 'SKSV' is a field name (Unresolved)**

PDF page 173, page 145, clause 7.23.3, 1st and 2nd paragraphs

The term 'SKSV' should be in small caps.

**5.217 [268] IBM 217) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 173, page 145, clause 7.23.3, 2nd and 3rd paragraph after table, The statement

'(left-most)' should be '(i.e., left-most)'.

**5.218 [269] IBM 218) Non ISO number format '65536' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 174, page 146, clause 7.23.3, 1st paragraph after table 112

The number 65536 is not in the correct format. It should be 65 536.

**5.219 [270] IBM 219) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 175, page 147, clause 7.23.3, 2nd paragraph from top

The statement '(left-most)' should be '(i.e., left-most)'.

**5.220 [271] IBM 220) Non ISO number format '65536' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 175, page 147, clause 7.23.3, note 42

The number 65536 is not in the correct format. It should be 65 536.

**5.221 [272] IBM 221) Clarify 'as described below' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 175, page 147, clause 7.23.5, 3rd paragraph

The statement '...initiator as described below.' does not specific the location of 'below' this need to be corrected with a cross-reference.

**5.222 [273] IBM 222) Eliminate 'execution' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 175, page 147, clause 7.23.5

The statement 'The subsequent execution of a REQUEST SENSE command...' should be 'A subsequent REQUEST SENSE command...'.

**5.223 [274] IBM 223) Clarify 'described below' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 175, page 147, clause 7.23.5, 4th paragraph

The following statement '...to the rules described below:' should be '... the following rules;'.

**5.224 [275] IBM 224) Force table to one page (Unresolved)**

PDF page 176, page 148, clause 7.23.6, table 114

This table should be made to fit on one page.

**5.225 [276] IBM 225) Add e.g. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 176, page 148, clause 7.23.6, table 114, row 2

The statement '...report (first, last, most severe, etc.)...' should be '...report (e.g., first last, most severe)...'.

**5.226 [277] IBM 226) Add e.g. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 176, page 148, clause 7.23.6, table 114, row 5

The statement '...failure (for example, controller failure, device failure, parity error, etc.)...' should be '...failure (e.g, controller failure, device failure, parity error)...'.

**5.227 [278] IBM 227) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 176, page 148, clause 7.23.6, table 114, row 4

The statement '...failure (sense key 4h).' should be '...failure (i.e., sense key 4h)'.

**5.228 [279] IBM 228) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 177, page 149, clause 7.23.6, table 114(2 of 2), row 5

The statement '(See 7.3.3 for additional information about the use of this sense key with the COPY, COMPARE, and COPY AND VERIFY commands. See 7.5.3 for additional information about the use of this sense key with the EXTENDED COPY command.)' should have the ( )s removed.

**5.229 [280] IBM 229) Add e.g. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 177, page 149, clause 7.23.6, table 114(2of2), row 1

The statement '...commands (FORMAT UNIT, SEARCH DATA, etc.)' should be '...commands (e.g., FORMAT UNIT, SEARCH DATA).'

**5.230 [281] IBM 230) Commas not parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 193, page 165, clause 7.24.4

The statement '...reservation (other than the reservation being superseded),...' should be '...reservation, other than the reservation being superseded,...'.

**5.231 [282] IBM 231) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 194, page 166, clause 7.26, 1st paragraph

The statement '...feature (the selftest bit...' should be '...feature (i.e., the selftest bit...'.

**5.232 [283] IBM 232) Make 'translate address' s/b all caps because it's a mode page name (Unresolved)**

PDF page 194, page 166, clause 7.26, table 120

The term 'translate address' should be all caps as it is the name of a mode page.

**5.233 [284] IBM 233) Put e.g. in parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 195, page 167, clause 7.26, 1st paragraph after a,b,c list

The statement '...logical unit, e.g., write operations to the user accessible medium, or repositioning of the medium on sequential access devices.' should be '...logical unit (e.g., write operations to the user accessible medium, or repositioning of the medium on sequential access devices.)'.

**5.234 [285] IBM 234) Put e.g. in parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 195, page 167, clause 7.26, 2nd paragraph after a,b,c list

The statement '...target, e.g., alteration of reservations, log parameters, or sense data.' should be '... target (e.g., alteration of reservations, log parameters, or sense data).'

**5.235 [286] IBM 235) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 195, page 167, clause 7.216, 3rd paragraph after a,b,c list

The statement '...pages (PF bit set to...)' should be '...pages (i.e., PF bit set to...)'.

**5.236 [287] IBM 236) Change 'action concerns' to 'action applies to' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 195, page 167, clause 7.27, 1st paragraph

The statement '...action concerns all SCSI...' should be '...action applies to all SCSI...'.

**5.237 [288] IBM 237) Don't capitalize 'Identifier' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 196, page 168, clause 7.27, 2nd paragraph after table 121

The term 'Identifier' should not be capitalized.

**5.238 [289] IBM 238) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 199, page 171, clause 7.29.2

The statement '...command (mode 00b).' should be '...command (i.e., mode 00b).'

**5.239 [290] IBM 239) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 199, page 171, clause 7.29.4, 3rd paragraph

The sentence '(The capacity of the buffer may be determined by the BUFFER CAPACITY field in the READ BUFFER descriptor.)' should have the ()s removed.

**5.240 [291] IBM 240) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 200, page 172, clause 7.29.7, 3rd paragraph from bottom of page

The statement '...change (one or more commands) are...' should be '...change (i.e., one or more commands) are...'.

**5.241 [292] IBM 241) Don't capitalize 'buffer' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 200, page 172, clause 7.29.7, 2nd last paragraph from bottom of page

The term 'Buffer' should not be capitalized.

**5.242 [293] IBM 242) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 201, page 173, clause 7.29.8, 2nd paragraph from top of page

The sentence '(The capacity of the buffer may be determined by the BUFFER CAPACITY field in the READ BUFFER descriptor.)' should have the ()s removed.

**5.243 [294] IBM 243) Add e.g. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 201, page 173, clause 7.29.8, 2nd paragraph

The statement '...space (semiconductor, disk, or other)...' should be '...space (e.g., semiconductor, disk)...'.

**5.244 [295] IBM 244) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 201, page 173, clause 7.29.8, 4th paragraph from bottom of page

The statement '...change (one or more commands) are...' should be '...change (i.e., one or more commands) are...'

**5.245 [296] IBM 245) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 201, page 173, clause 7.29.8, last paragraph from bottom of page

The sentence '(The capacity of the buffer may be determined by the BUFFER CAPACITY field in the READ BUFFER descriptor.)' should have the ()s removed.

**5.246 [297] IBM 246) Don't capitalize 'buffer' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 201, page 173, clause 7.29.8, 3rd to last paragraph from bottom of page

The term 'Buffer' should not be capitalized.

**5.247 [298] IBM 247) Use subclause (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 203, page 175, clause 8.1.1, 1st paragraph The statement

'This clause describes the...' should be 'This subclause describes the...'

**5.248 [299] IBM 248) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 203, page 175, clause 8.1.1, 1st paragraph after table 127

The statement '...shall perform (SEND DIAGNOSTIC command) or the information being returned (RECEIVE DIAGNOSTIC RESULTS with PCV equal to one).' should be changed to '...shall perform as a result of a SEND DIAGNOSTIC command or the information being returned as a result of a RECEIVE DIAGNOSTIC RESULTS with PCV equal to one.'

**5.249 [300] IBM 249) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 203, page 175, clause 8.1.1, 3rd paragraph after table 127

The statement '...being sent (SEND DIAGNOSTIC), requested (RECEIVE DIAGNOSTIC RESULTS with PCV equal to one) or returned (RECEIVE DIAGNOSTIC RESULTS parameter data).' should be '...being sent as a result of a SEND.DIAGNOSTIC command, requested as a result of a RECEIVE DIAGNOSTIC RESULTS command with PCV equal to one, or returned as a result of a RECEIVE DIAGNOSTIC RESULTS parameter data.'



**5.250 [301] IBM 250) Use subclause (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 205, page 177, clause 8.2.1, 1st paragraph

The statement 'This clause describes the...' should be 'This subclause describes the...'.

**5.251 [302] IBM 251) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 206, page 178, clause 8.2.1, 1st paragraph

The statement '...parameters (strings)...' should be '...parameters (i.e., strings)...'.

**5.252 [303] IBM 252) Change 'event (or events)' to 'event(s)' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 206, page 178, clause 8.2.1, 1st paragraph

The statement '...event (or events)...' should be '...event(s)...'.

**5.253 [304] IBM 253) Clarify 'below' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 206, page 178, clause 8.2.1, 3rd paragraph after table 131

The statement '...are described below.' should be '...are described below in this subclause.'

**5.254 [305] IBM 254) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 206, page 178, clause 8.2.1, 4th paragraph under table 131

The statement '...values (indicated by the PC field of the LOG SELECT and LOG SENSE command descriptor block), the disable...' should be '...values (indicated by the PC field of the LOG SELECT and LOG SENSE commands, the disable...'.

Note: This comment was written exactly as shown above, but the editor suspects that the actual desired new text is, '...values as indicated by the PC field of the LOG SELECT and LOG SENSE commands, the disable...'. See comment 5.257 [308] for a similar change.

**5.255 [306] IBM 255) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 206, page 178, clause 8.2.1, note 50

The statement '...one (or a target-defined event occurs).' should be '...one or a target-defined event occurs.'

**5.256 [307] IBM 256) Change 'Thus the updated' to 'As a result the updated' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 206, page 178, clause 8.2.1, note 50

The statement 'Thus the updated...' should be 'As a result the updated...'.

**5.257 [308] IBM 257) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 206, page 178, clause 8.2.1, 3rd paragraph from bottom of page

The statement '...values (indicated by the PC field of the LOG SENSE command descriptor block) nor for list parameters (indicated by the LP bit).' should be '...values as indicated by the PC field of the LOG SENSE command nor for list parameters as indicated by the LP bit.'

**5.258 [309] IBM 258) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 206, page 178, clause 8.2.1, 2nd paragraph from bottom of page

The statement '...value (depending on the value in the PC field of the command descriptor block) in...' should be '...value, depending on the value in the PC field of the command descriptor block, in...'

**5.259 [310] IBM 259) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 207, page 179, clause 8.2.1, 3rd paragraph above a,b list

The statement '...correctly (except for the data counter being at its maximum value) and if...' should be '...correctly, except for the data counter being at its maximum value, and if...'

**5.260 [311] IBM 260) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 208, page 180, clause 8.2.1, 1st paragraph of page

The statement '...correctly (except for the parameter code being at its maximum value) and if...' should be '...correctly, except for the parameter code being at its maximum value, and if...'

**5.261 [312] IBM 261) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

Global/Clause & PDF page 213, page 185, clause 8.2.4, 1st paragraph

The statements '(page code xxh)' should all be changed to (i.e., page code xxh)'

**5.262 [313] IBM 262) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 213, page 185, clause 8.2.5, last paragraph

The statement '...one (binary information). The LP bit shall be set to one (list parameter).' should be '...one to indicate binary information. The LP bit shall be set to one to indicate a list parameter.'

**5.263 [314] IBM 263) Don't capitalize 'self-test' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 214, page 186, clause 8.2.8

The term 'Self-test' should not be capitalized.

**5.264 [315] IBM 264) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 216, page 188, clause 8.2.8, table 145, 2nd row

The statement '...100b (Abort background self-test).' should be '...100b (i.e., abort background self-test).'

**5.265 [316] IBM 265) Force table to one page (Unresolved)**

PDF page 217, page 189, clause 8.2.9, table 146

This table should be made to fit on one page.

**5.266 [317] IBM 266) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 219, page 191, clause 8.2.9, 1st paragraph on page

The statement '...lifetime (parameter code 0003h)...' should be '...lifetime (i.e., parameter code 0003h)...'.

**5.267 [318] IBM 267) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 219, page 191, clause 8.2.9, 1st paragraph after table

The statement '..cycles (parameter code 0004h)...' should be '..cycles (i.e., parameter code 0004h)...'.

**5.268 [319] IBM 268) Use subclause (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 220, page 192, clause 8.2.11, 1st paragraph

The statement 'This clause defines...' should be 'This subclause defines...'.

**5.269 [320] IBM 269) Use subclause (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 222, page 194, clause 8.3.1, 1st paragraph

The statement 'This clause defines...' should be 'This subclause defines...'.

**5.270 [321] IBM 270) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 223, page 195, clause 8.3.3, last paragraph on page

The statement '...times eight (if LONGLBA=0) or times sixteen (if LONGLBA=1),...' should be '...times eight if the LONGLBA bit is set to zero or times sixteen if LONGLBA bit is set to one,...'.

**5.271 [322] IBM 271) 'zero' not '0' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 224, page 196, clause 8.3.4.1, 1st paragraph

The statement 'When LONGLBA equals 0...' should be 'When the LONGLBA bit is set to zero...'.

**5.272 [323] IBM 272) 'zero' not '0' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 225, page 197, clause 8.3.4.2, 1st paragraph

The statement 'When LONGLBA equals 0...' should be 'When the LONGLBA bit is set to zero...'.  
'

**5.273 [324] IBM 273) 'zero' not '0' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 225, page 197, clause 8.3.4.2, 1st paragraph after table

The statement 'When LONGLBA equals 0...' should be 'When the LONGLBA bit is set to zero...'.  
'

**5.274 [325] IBM 274) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 225, page 197, clause 8.3.4.2, 1st paragraph above a,b,c list

The statement '...field (via a MODE SELECT command), the...' should be '...field using the MODE SELECT command, the...'.  
'

**5.275 [326] IBM 275) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 225, page 197, clause 8.3.4.2, note 57

The statement '...optimum values (the value that...' should be '...optimum values (i.e., the value that...'.  
'

**5.276 [327] IBM 276) 'one' not '1' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 226, page 198, clause 8.3.4.3, 1st paragraph

The statement 'When LONGLBA equals 1...' should be 'When the LONGLBA bit is set to one...'.  
'

**5.277 [328] IBM 277) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 226, page 198, clause 8.3.4.3, 1st paragraph above a,b,c list

The statement '...field (via a MODE SELECT command), the...' should be '...field using the MODE SELECT command, the...'.  
'

**5.278 [329] IBM 278) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 227, page 199, clause 8.3.4.3, note 58

The statement '...optimum values (the value that...' should be '...optimum values (i.e., the value that...'.  
'

**5.279 [330] IBM 279) Use subclause (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 227, page 199, clause 8.3.5, 1st paragraph after table

The statement '...in this clause...' should be '...in this subclause...'.  
'

**5.280 [331] IBM 280) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 227, page 199, clause 8.3.5, 2nd paragraph from bottom of page

The statement '...code 00h (vendor-specific page)...' should be '...code 00h (i.e., vendor-specific page)...'.

**5.281 [332] IBM 281) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 227, page 199, clause 8.3.5, 2nd paragraph from bottom of page

The statement '..pages (page code 3Fh)...' should be '...pages (i.e., page code 3Fh)...'.

**5.282 [333] IBM 282) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 230, page 202, clause 8.3.6, 1st paragraph above table 164

The statement '(see the TST field definition above)' should be deleted or changed to '(i.e, the TST field)'.

**5.283 [334] IBM 283) Change 'TST=xxxb' to 'the TST field equals xxxb' (Unresolved)**

Global &amp; PDF page 230, page 202, clause 8.3.6, 1st paragraph above table 164

The statement 'TST=xxxb' should be changed to 'the TST field equals xxxb' in all cases throughout the document.

**5.284 [335] IBM 284) Commas not parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 231, page 203, clause 8.3.6

The statement '(if defined)' should be deleted or changed to ',if defined,'.

**5.285 [336] IBM 285) Commas not parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 231, page 203, clause 8.3.6, 3rd paragraph before table 165

The statement '...event (other than upon completing an initialization sequence).' should be changed to '...event, other than upon completing an initialization sequence.'.

**5.286 [337] IBM 286) Change 'An SCSI' to 'A SCSI' (Unresolved)**

Global &amp; PDF page 232, page 204, clause 8.3.7, 1st paragraph

The statement 'An SCSI...' should be changed to 'A SCSI...' This should be checked for throughout the document.

**5.287 [338] IBM 287) Add i.e. to parenthetical phrase (Unresolved)**

PDF page 232, page 204, clause 8.3.7, 1st paragraph

The statement '...page (disconnect-reconnect)...' should be '...page (i.e., disconnect-reconnect)...'.

**5.288 [339] IBM 288) Don't capitalize 'Target Role Agent' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 232, page 204, clause 8.3.7, 1st paragraph after the table

The term 'Target Role Agent' should not be capitalized.

**5.289 [340] IBM 289) Change 'thus' to 'therefore' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 233, page 205, clause 8.3.7

The statement 'Thus INTEGER...' should be 'Therefore in this example INTEGER...'

**5.290 [341] IBM 290) Commas not parentheses (Rejected)**

PDF page 233, page 205, clause 8.3.7, 4th paragraph from bottom of page

The statement '...relationship (if any) between...' should be '...relationship, if any, between...'

**Reason for rejection:**

See response to comment 5.97 [148] IBM97).

**5.291 [342] IBM 291) Remove 'etc.' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 234, page 206, clause 8.3.8, last paragraph

The statement '...(e.g., a value of one means 512 bytes, two means 1024 bytes, etc.)' should be '...(e.g., a value of one means 512 bytes, two means 1024 bytes).'

**5.292 [343] IBM 292) Commas not parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 235, page 207, clause 8.3.8, 2nd paragraph from top of page

The statement '...time (as specified by the INTERVAL TIMER field),'...' ...should be '...time, as specified by the INTERVAL TIMER field,...'

**5.293 [344] IBM 293) 'set' does not mean 'set to one' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 235, page 207, clause 8.3.8, 2nd paragraph from top of page

The statement '...if the DEXCPT bit is not set.' should be '...if the DEXCPT bit is set to zero.'

**5.294 [345] IBM 294) Just SAM-2 (Unresolved)**

PDF page 235, page 207, clause 8.3.8, table 169, 2nd row

The term 'SCSI-3 Architecture Mode'(sic) should be 'SAM-2' to be consistent with the reset of this document.

**5.295 [346] IBM 295) Which hunt (Unresolved)**

PDF page 237, page 209, clause 8.3.9, 1st paragraph

The statement '...manner which reduces...' should be '...manner that reduces...'

**5.296 [347] IBM 296) Which hunt (Unresolved)**

PDF page 237, page 209, clause 8.3.9, 3rd paragraph

The statement '...condition which allows...' should be '...condition that allows...'

**5.297 [348] IBM 297) Which hunt (Unresolved)**

PDF page 237, page 209, clause 8.3.9, 3rd paragraph

The statement '...timer which maps...' should be '...timer that maps...'

**5.298 [349] IBM 298) Don't capitalize 'standby' or 'idle' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 238, page 210, clause 8.3.9

The terms Idle and Standby should not be capitalized.

**5.299 [350] IBM 299) Use subclause (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 241, page 213, clause 8.4.1, 1st paragraph

The statement 'This clause describes...' should be 'This subclause describes...'

**5.300 [351] IBM 300) Change 'Thus' to 'For that reason' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 242, page 214, clause 8.4.3, note 61

The statement 'Thus it is not...' should be 'For that reason it is not...'

**5.301 [352] IBM 301) Use 'CDB' not 'Use command descriptor block' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 242, page 214, clause 8.4.3, 1st paragraph after note 61

The term 'command descriptor block' should be changed to 'CDB'.

**5.302 [353] IBM 302) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 243, page 215, clause 8.4.3, 1 paragraph from top of page

The statement '...lines (or character strings).' should be '...lines or character strings.'

**5.303 [354] IBM 303) Change 'SCC' to 'SCC-2' (Unresolved)**

Global &amp; PDF page 243, page 215, clause 8.4.4, note 62

The term 'SCC' should be 'SCC-2'.

**5.304 [355] IBM 304) Change 'FC-PH ...' to 'FC-FS' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 243, page 215, clause 8.4.4, note 62

SEE ALSO 5.305 [356] IBM 305) and 8.8 [485] Seagate 8)

The statement '...in FC-PH, FC-PH-3 or FC-FS.' should be '...in FC-FS.'. FC-FS replaces the FC-PH standards.

**5.305 [356] IBM 305) Change 'FC-PH ...' to 'FC-FS' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 245, page 217, clause 8.4.4, table 181, row 4  
SEE ALSO comments 5.304 [355] IBM 304) and 8.8 [485] Seagate 8)

The statement '...in FC-PH, FC-PH-3 or FC-FS.' should be '...in FC-FS.'. FC-FS replaces the FC-PH standards.

**5.306 [357] IBM 306) 'eight' not '8' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 245, page 217, clause 8.4.4, table 181, rows 2 and 3

The term '8' should be changed to 'eight'.

**5.307 [358] IBM 307) Don't capitalize 'Canonical' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 245, page 217, clause 8.4.4, table 181, row 3

The term 'Canonical' should not be capitalized.

**5.308 [359] IBM 308) Remove A/B Ports (Unresolved)**

PDF page 245, page 217, clause 8.4.4, table 182, rows 2 and 3

The statements ',also known as port A' and ',also known as port B' should be deleted as there is no place else in any of the standards that talk about A or B ports.

**5.309 [360] IBM 309) Footnotes in wrong format (Unresolved)**

PDF page 246, page 218, clause 8.4.4, table 183 footnotes

The footnotes should not have letters or numbers just a -. Also the terms 'Notes:' should be on a line by itself.

**5.310 [361] IBM 310) Command not in table (Unresolved)**

PDF page 249, page 221, clause 9.3, 1st paragraph under table

This paragraph should be removed and this command place in a table in the same way it was for all the other commands in this document.

**5.311 [362] IBM 311) Commas not parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 250, page 222, clause 9.3, 1st paragraph under table

The statement '...format (as defined by the SCSI-2 standard) shall...' should be '...format, as defined by the SCSI-2 standard, shall...'

**5.312 [363] IBM 312) Just CDB (Unresolved)**

PDF page 253, page 225, clause, a.3, 2nd paragraph

The statement '...SENSE Command Descriptor Block (CDB) fields.' should be '...SENSE CDB fields.'



**5.313 [364] IBM 313) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 253, page 225, clause a.3, table a.1, row 4

The sentence in ()s should have the ()s removed.

**5.314 [365] IBM 314) Just CDB (Unresolved)**

PDF page 256, page 228, clause, a.4, 2nd paragraph

The statement '...SENSE Command Descriptor Block (CDB) fields.' should be '...SENSE CDB fields.'

**5.315 [366] IBM 315) Eliminate parentheses (Unresolved)**

PDF page 256, page 228, clause a.4, table a.4, row 5

The sentence in ()s should have the ()s removed.

**5.316 [367] IBM 316) Don't capitalize 'Log Parameters' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 257, page 229, clause a.4, 2nd paragraph from top of page

The term 'Log Parameters' should not be capitalized.

**5.317 [368] IBM 317) Use subclause (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 259, page 231, clause a.5, 1st paragraph

The statement 'This clause describes...' should be 'This subclause describes...'.

**5.318 [369] IBM 318) Change 'will' to 'shall' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 260, page 232, clause a.5, table a.9, 1st row

The statement '...activities will cause an ACA...' should be '...activities shall cause an ACA...'.

**5.319 [370] IBM 319) Use 'SBC-2' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 262, page 234, clause b.1, 1st paragraph

The statement '...next version of the SBC standard when, and if, a new version of that standard is published.' should be '...SBC-2 standard.'

**5.320 [371] IBM 320) Don't capitalize 'Power Condition' and 'Fault Failure Reporting Page' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 290, page 262, clause c.5, table c.4 2 of 2, footnotes

The term 'Power Condition' and 'Fault Failure Reporting Page' should not be capitalized.

## 6. LSI Logic Corp.

LSI Logic Corp. alternate representative Charles Binford submitted a Yes vote with the following comments.

### 6.1 [372] LSI 1) Only FC Loops use Primitive Signals (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 52, page 24, clause 5.5.3.1, 1st paragraph

Comment 5.182 [233] IBM 182) establishes a rule for consistent use of 'vendor specific'

The parenthetical statement in the second sentence of 5.5.3.1 says fibre channel uses primitive signals for hard resets. This is not accurate. LIP(f7) or LIP(f8) do not reset anything, LIP(alpd) causes a vendor specified reset that PLDA says to implement as a power-on reset.

#### Editor's note:

The comment is interpreted to mean that Fibre Channel Loops have a 'primitive signal' that causes the behavior of a hard reset, specifically LIP(alpd). With this in mind, the sentence at issue will be change to read:

"Even though different protocols that transport SCSI handle hard resets differently (e.g., parallel uses a reset signal, fibre channel loops uses primitive signals) the persistent reservation shall be protected."

This change is reflected in the rewrite found in the response to comment 6.2 [373] LSI 2).

### 6.2 [373] LSI 2) Redundant information in persistent reservations overview (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 52, page 24, clause 5.5.3.1, 1st paragraph

SEE ALSO comments 8.38 [515] Seagate 38), 8.39 [516] Seagate 39), 8.40 [517] Seagate 40) and rejected comment 5.63 [114] IBM 63)

The last sentence reads "Persistent reservations are optionally retained when power to the target is lost." This seems redundant with the following paragraph that clearly states the optional power cycle behavior.

Suggest deleting last sentence of first paragraph.

#### Editor's note:

The sentence referenced is not the only redundant sentence in this description. The following sentence also is redundant with the first sentence in the subclause:

"Persistent reservations may be used to enforce device sharing among multiple initiators."

The first two paragraphs of the subclause will be changed so that the first paragraph is descriptive of the function and the second paragraph states requirements. The paragraphs will be changed from:

"The Persistent Reservations management method is used among multiple initiators that require operations to be protected across initiator failures, which usually involve hard resets. Even though different protocols that transport SCSI handle hard resets differently (e.g., parallel uses a reset signal, fibre channel uses primitive signals) the persistent reservation shall be protected. Persistent reservations persist across recovery actions, to provide initiators with more detailed control over reservations recovery. Persistent reservations for failing initiators may be preempted by another initiator as part of the recovery process. Persistent reservations shall be retained by the device server until released, preempted, or until cleared by mechanisms specified in this standard. Persistent reservations are optionally retained when power to the target is lost.

"Persistent reservations are not reset by the TARGET RESET task management function or other global actions and may, optionally, be preserved across power cycles. Persistent reservations may be used to enforce device sharing among multiple initiators."

to (note that this rewrite reflects changes based on comments other than this one):

"The Persistent Reservations management method ~~is used among~~ is the mechanism specified by this standard for use by multiple initiators that require operations to be protected across initiator failures, which usually involve hard resets. Persistent reservations persist across recovery actions, to provide initiators with more detailed control over reservations recovery. Persistent reservations are not reset by the TARGET RESET task management function or other global actions.

"Persistent reservations for failing initiators may be preempted by another initiator as part of the recovery process. Persistent reservations shall be retained by the device server until released, preempted, or ~~until~~ cleared by mechanisms specified in this standard. Even though different protocols that transport SCSI commands handle hard resets differently (e.g., parallel uses a reset signal, fibre channel loops uses primitive signals) the persistent reservation shall be ~~protected~~ preserved. Optionally, persistent reservations may be retained when power to the target is removed."

### 6.3 [374] LSI 3) Misleading description of PREEMPT (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 60, page 32, clause 5.5.3.6.3.4, 1st paragraph

The first sentence of this section states "An application client may clear registrations without affecting a persistent reservation...". I believe this is a bit misleading, it gives the impression the initiator has the option to remove a registration without affecting a reservation. This behavior is a function of what reservations happen to be active at the time of the preempt and not necessarily a choice of the initiator.

Suggest rewording the sentence to clarify the behavior is not a choice, but rather a side effect of the current state of things in the device server.

#### Editor's note:

The text will be changed from the current wording:

"An application client may clear registrations without affecting a persistent reservation by issuing a PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command with a PREEMPT service action ..."

to:

"When a registered reservation key is not associated with a persistent reservation, an application client may clear the registration(s) without affecting a any persistent reservations by issuing a PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command with a PREEMPT service action ..."

### 6.4 [375] LSI 4) Bad table reference (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 68, page 40, clause 7.3.1, 1st paragraph

The 'see table 11' should specify table 12 instead.

**6.5 [376] LSI 5) Misspelling of 'striped' (Accepted, Editorial)**

Global & PDF page 79, page 51, clause 7.5.1  
SEE ALSO comment 1.22 [22] Brocade 22)

The second paragraph on page 51 uses the word 'stripped' twice. I believe both instances should be 'striped' instead.

**6.6 [377] LSI 6) Unclear requirement for Generation field (Unresolved)**

PDF page 140, page 112, clause 7.13.3, 1st paragraph after table 75

In the paragraph under Table 75 it states, "The counter shall not be incremented by a PERSISTENT RESERVE IN command, by a PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command that performs a RESERVE or RELEASE service action, or by a PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command that is not performed due to an error or reservation conflict."

How does a device server know if the persistent reserve out command is performed due to an error? This seems to be an impossible requirement to fulfill.

Suggest either clarifying or removing last part of quoted sentence.

**6.7 [378] LSI 7) Allocation Length of Persistent Reserve (Unresolved)**

PDF pages 140 & 141, page 112 & 113, clauses 7.13.3 & 7.13.4.1

In the second paragraph under Table 75 and the second paragraph under Table 76 the behavior specified for the condition when the allocation length is not sufficient is different than other commands. Section 4.3.6 specifies that device servers transmit up to allocation length number of bytes or all of the data, whichever is less. Persistent Reserve IN, however, specifies that either all of the data, or just the header. Was this deviation from the normal behavior on purpose or an oversight?

**6.8 [379] LSI 8) Initiator identification (Unresolved)**

PDF pages 144 & 146, page 116 & 118, clauses 7.14.1 & 7.14.3

In both of these sections there are clauses implying that an initiator is identified by its reservation key (paragraph above table 80, second paragraph below table 82). I believe this is confusing. If the initiator is identified by the reservation key, then does the reservation apply to all initiators registered with the same key, or just the initiator who sent the reservation?

Please reword to clarify.

**6.9 [380] LSI 9) Add 'Generation Number Incremented' column (Unresolved)**

PDF page 145, page 117, clause 7.14.2, Table 81

I believe it would be useful if table 81 had a column indicating whether or not the service action incremented the generation number.

**6.10 [381] LSI 10) Sense data INFORMATION field and Beyond 2 Tbytes (Unresolved)**

PDF page 172, page 144, clause 7.23.2, list entry a)

How does a LU with LBA addresses larger than 4 bytes fill in the INFORMATION field for case a) (middle of page 144)?

**Editor's note:**

George Penokie has proposed setting the VALID bit to zero if the LBA doesn't fit in the INFORMATION field. He also notes that the proposal is an interim solution and more aggressive measures will need to be approved of inclusion in SPC-3.

**6.11 [382] LSI 11) Table 128 Should specify SES pages (Unresolved)**

PDF page 203, page 175, clause 8.1.1, Table 128

SEE ALSO comment 1.37 [37] Brocade 37)

Table 128 indicates that pages 01h - 3fh apply to all device types. This table should split out pages 01h - 0fh as SES pages and reference that standard.

Suggestion, replace row:

01h - 3Fh Pages that apply to all device types

with:

01h - 0Fh Pages defined by SES (see xyz)

10h - 3Fh Pages that apply to all device types

**6.12 [383] LSI 12) Incorrect table references (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF pages 243 & 244, pages 215 & 216, clause 8.4.4

SEE ALSO comment 10.5 [594]

The first paragraph of 8.4.4 incorrectly references table 108 instead of table 177. The paragraph under Table 178 incorrectly references table 111 instead of table 178.

**6.13 [384] LSI 13) First Burst Size definition (Unresolved)**

PDF page 234, page 206, clause 8.3 7, 1st paragraph after table 167

FCP-2 has a slightly different definition of First Burst Size. This definition in SPC-2 needs to either be expanded or defer to the appropriate protocol document as to what "first burst" means. (In FCP, first burst refers to data sent to the target before the XFER\_RDY.)

## 7. Quantum Corp.

Quantum Corp. principle representative Mark Evans submitted a Yes vote with the following comments.

### 7.1 [385] Quantum 1) Use 'specify' instead of 'indicate' (Unresolved)

Global

SEE ALSO comment ] Quantum 32)

The word "indicate" (and several of its forms) is used in many places throughout the document.

My American Heritage Dictionary gives four definitions for "indicate": 1) To show the way to or the direction of; point out; 2) To serve as a sign, symptom, or token of; signify; 3) To suggest or demonstrate the necessity, expedience, or advisability of; 4) To state or express briefly.

The entry continues, "The central meaning [of indicate] is 'to give grounds for supposing or inferring the existence or presence of something'..." Words like "point out", "suggest", and "infer" seem to me to be too weak for many of the places where "indicate" is used in a standard.

Because of this, I think that, in many cases (though not all) where "indicate" is used in the document, a form of the word "specify", or the word "contain", or words something like "specified by the value in" are better choices. Yes, "specify" is given as a synonym for "indicate", but it's pretty far down the list.

As an example, one sentence in the document reads, "The maximum number of target descriptors permitted within a parameter list is indicated by the MAXIMUM TARGET COUNT field in the copy manager's operating parameters..." Well, yes, the "...maximum number of target descriptors permitted..." is "...pointed out..." by "...the MAXIMUM TARGET COUNT field...", but I think it would be much more precise to have this sentence to read, "The maximum number of target descriptors permitted within a parameter list is specified by the value in the MAXIMUM TARGET COUNT field in the copy manager's operating parameters..." Another precise way to state this is, "The MAXIMUM TARGET COUNT field in the copy manager's operating parameters contains the maximum number of the target descriptors permitted within a parameter list."

However, I do understand that it would be a huge task to find and replace each occurrence of "indicate" where I think it should be "specify" in this draft. In future, I would suggest that all editors try to be more precise in their use of "indicate".

### 7.2 [386] Quantum 2) Start definitions with a sentence (Unresolved)

Global/Clause \* PDF pages 33-36, pages 5-8, clause 3.1

With ten exceptions the first sentence of each of the definitions is not a complete sentence. I know it would be a lot of work to change the other 51, but I think it would help with clarity as those definitions that do begin with complete sentences read much better to me. As a fall-back, the following ten definitions could be changed to start with incomplete sentences: 3.1.5 asynchronous event reporting, 3.1.8 blocked task, 3.1.23 enabled task state, 3.1.35 medium,

3.1.37 medium changer, 3.1.39 page, 3.1.40 protocol-specific, 3.1.46 SCSI domain, 3.1.53 system, and 3.1.58 third-party.

### **7.3 [387] Quantum 3) Mark page intentionally left blank (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 26, page xiv

This page is blank. I think that, if this is intentional, it should be marked as such.

#### **Editor's note:**

All automatically generated blank pages (such as this one) will be removed. The intent was to format the document as ANSI would print it, however, inspection of the printed SPC shows that the effort was unsuccessful. As the majority T10 committee members do not print drafts anymore, formatting of this kind is not useful. BTW the editor knows of no way to get 'this page intentionally blank' on automatically generated blank pages.

### **7.4 [388] Quantum 4) Show acronyms in definitions (Accepted, Editorial)**

**Global/Clause** \* PDF pages 33-36, pages 5-8, clause 3.1

SEE ALSO comments 5.7 [58] IBM 7), 5.8 [59] IBM 8), 5.9 [60] IBM 9), and 5.11 [62] IBM 11)

I think that, where common acronyms are used for a defined phrase (in this case "AER"), the acronym should immediately follow the title phrase in parentheses. In this case, "3.1.5 asynchronous event reporting (AER):" From that point forward in the document only the acronym need be used, except where the whole phrase might be used for clarity. In this particular definition the last sentence references AER with the assumption that the reader knows what this is. This recommended format should also be used in 3.1.6 auto contingent allegiance (ACA), 3.1.11 command descriptor block (CDB), 3.1.13 contingent allegiance (CA), 3.1.34 logical unit number (LUN), and 3.1.36 medium auxiliary memory (MAM).

### **7.5 [389] Quantum 5) Delete comma (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 33, page 5, clause 3.1.8

I recommend that the comma in the first sentence (before the phrase, "as defined in SAM-2") be deleted.

### **7.6 [390] Quantum 6) Consistent capitalization (Unresolved)**

**Global** & PDF page 33, page 5, clause 3.1.7

Every other instance of this phrase that I found in the document had the first letters of each word capitalized ("Autosense Data"). I think that, one way or the other, the document should be consistent, the words should always capitalized or always not. The same is true for page 5 (PDF page 33), 3.1.15 data-in buffer, and page 6 (PDF page 34), 3.1.16 data-out buffer.

### **7.7 [391] Quantum 7) "...during the Data-Out Buffer"??? (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 34, page 6, clause 3.1.17

I think that the phrase in the first sentence, "..., or during the Data-Out Buffer..." is supposed to be, "..., or in the Data-Out Buffer..."

**7.8 [392] Quantum 8) Compare 'idle condition' to 'active condition' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 34, page 6, clause 3.1.27

I think that the second sentence should be change to read, "However, a logical unit in the Idle condition may take longer to complete the execution of a command than when in the active condition because it may have to activate some circuitry."

**Editor's note:**

Based on the numerous IBM comments removing 'executions' from SPC-2 (see for example 5.15 [66] IBM 15), it would be best to reword this as:

"However, a logical unit in the Idle condition may take longer to complete ~~the execution of a command~~ than when in the active condition because it may have to activate some circuitry."

**7.9 [393] Quantum 9) Consistent capitalization (Unresolved)**

PDF page 34, page 6, clause 3.1.27

The word "Idle" is capitalized in the definition. Searching the document I have found that the words, "active", "idle", and "standby" are not capitalized consistently when referring to a power condition. I think that, one way or the other, the document should be consistent, the words should always capitalized or always not.

**7.10 [394] Quantum 10) Which hunt (Accepted, Editorial)**

Global &amp; PDF page 34, page 6, clause 3.1.30

SEE ALSO comment 5.16 [67] IBM 16) and 8.13 [490] Seagate 13)

The word "which" is used in this definition for the first time in the normative part of the document. I thought that "which" was not to be used in ANSI standards, and that, in most cases, the word "that" was to be used instead. If my assumption is true, there are many "whichs" that have to be sought out in the document and replaced.

**Editor's note:**

This comment will be resolved as described in comment 8.13 [490] Seagate 13).

**7.11 [395] Quantum 11) 'indicates' not 'indicated' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 37, page 9, clauses 3.3.5 &amp; 3.3.6

This may be one of the appropriate places to use a form of "indicate", but it should be in the present tense. See also 3.3.6 may not.

**7.12 [396] Quantum 12) Add missing clause cross reference (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 38, page 10, clause 3.4

I think that the second sentence in the first paragraph should be changed to read something like, "These words and terms are defined either in clause 3 or in the text where they first appear."



**7.13 [397] Quantum 13) Restructure typical CDB subclause (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 40, page 12, clause 4.3.1

SEE ALSO comments 1.5 [5] Brocade 5), 1.6 [6] Brocade 6), and 5.36 [87] IBM 36)

I think that this text should be moved to after Table 4 - Typical CDB for 16-byte commands. In addition, I would recommend that the first sentence of the first paragraph of this text should be its own clause: 4.3.2 Field descriptions. I would then recommend that there be two new subclauses, 4.3.2.1 OPERATION CODE field, and 4.3.2.2 CONTROL field, and the subclauses that are now 4.3.2 through 4.3.6 be renumbered 4.3.2.3 through 4.3.2.7.

**Editor's note:**

The comment will be resolved as described in the response to comment 1.5 [5] Brocade 5). Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause. Any further change in the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

**7.14 [398] Quantum 14) Change 'field uses' to just 'fields' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 40, page 12, clause 4.3.1, the second paragraph currently following Table 2

I think the second sentence in this paragraph should be changed to, "The fields shown in tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 are used consistently by most commands."

**Editor's note:**

Subclause 4.3 will be restructured as described in the response to 1.5 [5] Brocade 5). Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause including the changes agreed in response to this comment. Any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

**7.15 [399] Quantum 15) Clarify transfer length equals zero (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 42, page 14, clause 4.3.4

I recommend that the last sentence be changed to, "A value of zero specifies that 256 blocks shall be transferred."

**Editor's note:**

Subclause 4.3 will be restructured as described in the response to 1.5 [5] Brocade 5). Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause including the changes agreed in response to this comment. Any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

**7.16 [400] Quantum 16) Use 'number of allocation length bytes' (Rejected)**

PDF page 42, page 14, clause 4.3.4

I recommend that the fourth sentence be changed to, "The device server shall terminate transfers to the Data-In Buffer when the number of allocation length bytes have been transferred or when all available data have been transferred, whichever is less."

**Reason for rejection:**

The use of 'allocation length' (the field name without the small caps) means the contents of or the value in the field. Thus, 'The device server shall terminate transfers to the Data-In Buffer when allocation length bytes have been transferred ...' is equivalent to 'The device server shall terminate transfers to the Data-In Buffer when number of bytes specified by the ALLOCATION LENGTH field have been transferred ...' The latter wording is the closest acceptable rewrite of the proposed text, but since the current text is correct and more direct no changes will be

made in this subclause. However, comment 10.12 [601] O12) describes a change need in subclause 3.4 (Conventions) to explain this usage of field names.

### **7.17 [401] Quantum 17) Extra white space before 5.2 (Rejected)**

PDF page 44, page 16, clause 5.2

There appears to be an extra carriage return above this clause heading in the PDF version that should be deleted.

#### **Reason for rejection:**

Subclause headings containing only one period (e.g., 5.2) are preceded by additional white space to set them apart from the preceding subclause. The exception is an x.1 subclause where the subclause heading immediately follows a clause heading. There the white space (or new page break) that precedes the clause heading is sufficient. It should be noted that the same usage white space occurs at the beginning of clause 4 but did not attract attention.

### **7.18 [402] Quantum 18) Change verb to match nouns (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 56, page 28, clause 5.5.3.5, 5th paragraph

So that the verb matches the nouns I recommend that the sentence read, "If the device server receives a PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command with a service action of RESERVE where the TYPE and SCOPE are the same as the existing TYPE and SCOPE from the initiator that created the persistent reservation, it shall not make any change to the existing reservation and shall return a GOOD status."

### **7.19 [403] Quantum 19) 'aptpl' should be capitalized (Rejected)**

PDF page 57, page 29, clause 5.5.3.6.1, last paragraph  
SEE ALSO comment 8.47 [524] Seagate 47)

In the second sentence I think that "aptpl" should be capitalized.

#### **Reason for rejection:**

Comment 8.47 [524] Seagate 47) correctly identifies how "aptpl" should be changed in this case.

### **7.20 [404] Quantum 20) 'a unit attention' not 'an unit attention' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 58, page 30, clause 5.5.3.6.2, bullet (d)  
PDF page 231, page 203, clause 8.3.6, 4th paragraph on PDF page 231

I think that "...an unit attention..." should be, "...a unit attention..." I searched the entire document, and these were the only instances of this that I found.

### **7.21 [405] Quantum 21) Add 'the' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 60, page 32, clause 5.5.3.6.3.3, (c) in 1st bulleted list

An article is missing in the second sentence of item (c). I think it should read, "The scope and type of the persistent reservation created by the preempting initiator may be different than the persistent reservation being preempted."

## 7.22 [406] Quantum 22) Restructure PREEMPT description for readability (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 60, page 32, clause 5.5.3.6.3.3, next to last paragraph

Comment 5.182 [233] IBM 182) establishes a rule for consistent use of 'vendor specific'

The formatting of this paragraph seems awkward to me, I would recommend that it be replaced with something like the following:

The following shall be subject in a vendor specific manner either to the restrictions established by the persistent reservation being preempted or to the restrictions established by the preempting initiator:

- a) A task received after the arrival, but before the completion of the PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command with the PREEMPT service action; or
- b) A task in the dormant, blocked, or enable state at the time the PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command with the PREEMPT service action is received

Completion status shall be returned for each task.

### Editor's note:

The proposed text will be used with the revisions indicated by underlines:

The following tasks shall be subjected in a vendor specific manner either to the restrictions established by the persistent reservation being preempted or to the restrictions established by the preempting initiator:

- a) A task received after the arrival, but before the completion of the PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command with the PREEMPT service action; or
- b) A task in the dormant, blocked, or enable state at the time the PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command with the PREEMPT service action is received.

Completion status shall be returned for each task.

## 7.23 [407] Quantum 23) Move usage of the word 'value' (Rejected)

PDF page 60, page 32, clause 5.5.3.6.3.3, last paragraph

I think that the first sentence should read, "A PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT specifying a PREEMPT service action with the value in the SERVICE ACTION RESERVATION KEY field equal to the reservation key is not an error."

### Reason for rejection:

I believe that the current usage, 'SERVICE ACTION RESERVATION KEY value', is clear, acceptable, and used elsewhere in SPC-2. The proposed wording change adds complexity to the sentence to achieve an unneeded level of specificity.

## 7.24 [408] Quantum 24) Rewrite contention resolution options for multi-port targets (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 62, page 34, clause 5.6, first bulleted list

SEE ALSO comments 8.57 [534] Seagate 57) and 8.58 [535] Seagate 58)

This confuses me. Item (a) reads, "If one port on a target is being used...", item (b) reads, "If the device has sufficient resources...", and the first sentence in the preceding paragraph reads,

"If a device has more than one service delivery port..." Is this correct and I'm just missing something?

Editor's note:

The text under discussion is:

If a device has more than one service delivery port, the arbitration and connection management among the ports is defined by the implementation. Above the interconnect implementation, two contention resolution options exist:

- a) If one port on a target is being used by an initiator, accesses attempted through another port may receive a status of BUSY; or
- b) If the device has sufficient internal resources, commands may be accepted through other ports while one port is being used.

It will be rewritten as:

If a device has more than one service delivery port, the arbitration and connection management among the ports is vendor specific. In addition two options exist for contention resolution among the service delivery ports. If one service delivery port is being used by an initiator, accesses attempted through other service delivery port(s) may:

- a) receive a status of BUSY; or
- b) be accepted as if the other service delivery port(s) were not in use.

## **7.25 [409] Quantum 25) 'affected' not 'effected' (Rejected)**

PDF page 63, page 35, clause 5.7, first paragraph

In the first sentence I would replace the word "effected" with the word "affected". Though the two words are almost interchangeable, "affect" is the first choice as a transitive verb, and "effect" is the first choice as a noun.

### **Reason for rejection:**

The statement, "...control over one medium transport element may be effected using medium changer commands..." is correct based on the following definition. *effect vt* to bring about; to accomplish; to make happen. The phrase can be rewritten as, "...control over one medium transport element may be made to happen using medium changer commands..." The definition of 'affect' allows no similar substitution. *affect vt* to act on; to produce an effect; to change in. As an example consider, "...control over one medium transport element may be acted on using medium changer commands..."

**7.26 [410] Quantum 26) Clarify COMPARE description (Rejected)**

PDF page 67, page 39, clause 7.2, 1st paragraph

I recommend that the first sentence reads, "The COMPARE command (see table 11) provides the means to compare data from one logical unit with data from another or the same logical unit in a manner similar to the COPY command."

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COMPARE command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.14 [14] Brocade 14).

**7.27 [411] Quantum 27) Change 'need not' to 'may not' (Rejected)**

PDF page 68, page 40, clause 7.3, 4th paragraph after table 12

The last sentence reads, "A device server need not support all function codes for its device type." I don't think "...need..." is the right word here as it is not defined as a keyword (and I have a little trouble with device servers having "needs"). I would recommend that it be changed to "...may..."

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COPY command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.15 [15] Brocade 15).

**7.28 [412] Quantum 28) Same list definition, not same list (Rejected)**

PDF page 76, page 48, clause 7.4, 1st paragraph

The second sentence reads, "The parameter list transferred to the device server is the same as for the COPY command." I think what is meant here is something like, "The definition for the parameter list transferred to the device server for the COPY AND VERIFY command has the same definition as the parameter list transferred for the COPY command." I recommend that this be changed accordingly.

**Reason for rejection:**

This issue does not need to be resolved because the COMPARE command is being made obsolete, as requested in comment 1.14 [14] Brocade 14).

**7.29 [413] Quantum 29) 'read-ahead' not defined (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 79, page 51, clause 7.5, 2nd paragraph on this page

In the second sentence the term "read-ahead" is used without any definition as to what this is. A good description may be found on page 62 (PDF page 90) in the second sentence of the third paragraph below Table 31 - Device type specific target descriptor parameters for block device types. I recommend that some words like this be used after the first occurrence of the term on page 51, as well.

**7.30 [414] Quantum 30) Change 'need not' to 'may not' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 51, page 79, clause 7.5, 5th paragraph on this page

In the fourth sentence there is another "...need not..." that I would recommend be changed to "...may not..."

**7.31 [415] Quantum 31) Remove 'need to' (Rejected)**

PDF page 80, page 52, clause 7.5.3, note 8

In the last sentence I would recommend that the words "...need to..." be deleted.

**Reason for rejection:**

The proposed change would alter the meaning of the sentence in an undesirable way. As currently written, the sentence suggests (weakly with 'may') that the copy manager try multiple ports to find one that does not encounter a RESERVATION CONFLICT. If the change were made, the sentence would state that the copy manager is allowed to try multiple ports to find one that does not encounter a RESERVATION CONFLICT.

**7.32 [416] Quantum 32) Add missing 'the' & replace 'indicate' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 81, page 53, clause 7.5.3, list item (h)

SEE ALSO comment 7.1 [385] Quantum 1)

An article ("the") is missing near the end of the first sentence ("...the byte in error...").

There is an opportunity to improve an occurrence of "indicate". I recommend that this sentence be change to. "If, during the processing of a segment descriptor, the copy manager detects an error in the segment descriptor, then the SENSE-KEY SPECIFIC field shall be set as described in 7.23.3, with the content of the FIELD POINTER field specifying the byte in error."

I think that, in the other occurrences of "indicate" in this list item, the way the word is used are correct.

**Editor's note:**

The missing "the" will be added. "indicating" will be changed to "specifying" and "to indicate" will be changed to "to specify".

**7.33 [417] Quantum 33) Missing preposition 'of' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 91, page 63, clause 7.5.6.8, table 33, 1st row

The second sentence in the first Description (FIXED bit = 0, STREAM BLOCK LENGTH field = 0) is missing a preposition and should be, "The number of bytes for each read or write is specified by the STREAM DEVICE TRANSFER LENGTH field in the segment descriptor."

**7.34 [418] Quantum 34) Change 'bits' to 'bit' (Rejected)**

PDF page 95, page 67, clause 7.5.7.1, 1st paragraph after table 36

Since the third sentence has a couple of issues, I recommend that it be changed to, "If so, the residue shall be handled as specified by the value in the CAT bit in the segment descriptor and the PAD bits in the source and destination target descriptors, as defined in table 37."

**Reason for rejection:**

There are two PAD bits, one in each of the source and destination target descriptors. Also, if adding the phrase "value in" is important for the CAT bit then why not increase the sentence size when describing the PAD bits? The answer is that the sentence is clear without the extra "value in" words.

**7.35 [419] Quantum 35) Missing preposition 'if' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 96, page 68, clause 7.5.7.1, 1st paragraph after table 37

The last sentence is missing a preposition and should be changed to, "For segment descriptor types 06h and 0Fh (stream→discard and stream→discard+application client, see 7.5.7.8), handling shall be as if the PAD were equal to zero for the destination target descriptor."

**7.36 [420] Quantum 36) Breakup complex sentence (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 102, page 74, clause 7.5.7.5, last paragraph in clause

The second sentence seems cumbersome to me. I would recommend changing it to something like, "A value of zero shall not be considered as an error. A value of zero shall indicate that no source blocks shall be read and no source data shall be processed. However, any residual destination data from a previous segment shall be written if possible to the destination in whole-block transfers, and any residual data shall be handled as described in 7.5.7.1."

Editor's note:

The sentence in question is overly complex because it is trying to describe all the BYTE COUNT equals 0h specifics in a single sentence to show that they are all related. This is not common practice in SCSI standards and breaking the sentence up is appropriate. However, the proposed change slices the sentence to unnecessarily small pieces. The sentence will be changed to:

A value of zero shall not be considered as an error, and shall specify that no source blocks shall be read and no source data shall be processed. However, a value of zero shall specify that any residual destination data from a previous segment shall be written if possible to the destination in whole-block transfers, and any residual data shall be handled as described in 7.5.7.1.

**7.37 [421] Quantum 37) Rewrite sentence (Rejected)**

PDF page 103, page 75, clause 7.5.7.6

I think what the first sentence of this paragraph is trying to say is something like, "The value in the INLINE DATA OFFSET field is added to the byte number of the location of the first byte of inline data in the EXTENDED COPY parameter list (see table 22). The result is the byte number of the first byte of inline data in the EXTENDED COPY parameter list to be written to the stream device."

**Reason for rejection:**

The sentence as written acknowledges the possibility address computations might be used by the copy manager. The proposed rewrite not only makes the wording more cumbersome by fails to acknowledge that an address is what's being computed.

**7.38 [422] Quantum 38) Change 'the' to 'a' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 113, page 85, clause 7.5.7.16, last paragraph on this page

Since I think the first article in the first sentence of this paragraph is incorrect, I recommend that the sentence be changed to, "A COUNT field containing a value of zero specifies that the EXTENDED COPY command shall not terminate due to any number of consecutive filemarks or setmarks."

**7.39 [423] Quantum 39) Unit Attention results in CHECK CONDITION (Rejected)**

PDF page 116, page 88, clause 7.6.1, last paragraph before note 15

The first sentence of this paragraph reads, "If the standard INQUIRY data changes for any reason, the device server shall generate a unit attention condition for all initiators (see SAM-2)." I thought it should read something like, "...report CHECK CONDITION status with the sense key set to UNIT ATTENTION...", but then I thought, "No. This has to all be described in detail in SAM-2." WRONG. The clause in SAM-2 on unit attention (5.6.5 in rev 13) goes into great detail about Unit Attention condition, but I could not find anyplace where it describes that this condition occurs when a device server, "...reports a CHECK CONDITION status with the sense key set to UNIT ATTENTION."

If SPC-2 is going to point to SAM-2 for the definition of this condition, then I think that this condition should be defined completely in SAM-2. I would even recommend that something like, "A unit attention condition occurs when a device server reports a CHECK CONDITION status with the sense key set to UNIT ATTENTION." be added to the definition of unit attention condition in clause 3.

It is interesting to note that the phrase "unit attention condition" occurs several times in the document before INQUIRY. I knew what it meant, so assumed that the documentation was complete, as well. It's interesting what you notice first thing in the morning after two cups of coffee. I wonder what else I missed during late-in-the-day, blurry-eyed review? I'm not going back now!

**Reason for rejection:**

The assumption that a unit attention condition results in a CHECK CONDITION status is absolutely wrong. If asynchronous event reporting (or asynchronous event notification) is enabled, then the unit attention condition is reported via that mechanism. This is the reason for the wording found in SPC-2. The proposed change in the glossary definition also is incorrect for the same reasons.

As for the SAM-2 wording, I can see the point that it's convoluted. However, the wording is substantially unchanged from SAM and resolution of this letter ballot will not attempt to modify it. As a side note, it is the repeated (although parenthetical) references to "... (before the logical unit establishes the auto contingent allegiance or contingent allegiance condition) ..." that lead to the CHECK CONDITION status. The requirements are present, if somewhat obscure to a first time reader.

Perhaps fewer trips to the coffee pot would be advisable.

**7.40 [424] Quantum 40) Name the 'applicable standards' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 120, page 92, clause 7.6.2, 8th paragraph on page

The first sentence of this paragraph reads, "A Multi Port (MULTIP) bit of one shall indicate that this is a multi-port (2 or more ports) device and conforms to the SCSI multi-port device requirements found in the applicable standards." The phrase "...applicable standards..." seem vague to me. I would recommend that an "... (e.g., ..." be included with at least one applicable standard listed.

**7.41 [425] Quantum 41) Restructure paragraphs (Unresolved)**

PDF page 120, page 92, clause 7.6.2, last paragraph on page

The first sentence of this paragraph begins, "ASCII data..." I think that this paragraph should be moved to be after Table 57 since that table is referenced in the previous paragraph. I would



also add an introductory sentence that reads something like, "Several of the following fields contain ASCII data."

#### **7.42 [426] Quantum 42) Change 'upto' to 'up to' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 121, page 93, clause 7.6.2, 3rd paragraph after note 16  
SEE ALSO comment 8.81 [558] Seagate 81)

The first sentence of this paragraph begins, "The VERSION DESCRIPTOR fields provide for identifying up to..." In my PDF version a space should be inserted between "up" and "to".

#### **7.43 [427] Quantum 43) Use 'Quick Arbitration and Selection' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 126, page 98, clause 7.6.3, 1st paragraph after table 61 & note 17

The first sentence of this paragraph reads, "A quick arbitrate supported (QAS) bit of one indicates that the device server supports the quick arbitrate feature." To be consistent with SPI-3 this should be changed to, "A quick arbitrate supported (QAS) bit of one indicates that the device server supports the Quick Arbitration and Selection feature (see SPI-3 or later)."

Note 17 also contains a 'quick arbitrate' that should be 'Quick Arbitration and Selection'.

#### **7.44 [428] Quantum 44) How many bytes to return when SUPPORT=001b (Unresolved)**

PDF page 127, page 99, clause 7.6.5, 2nd paragraph

I don't see anyplace where the number of bytes to be transferred when the SUPPORT field contains 001b is specified. This paragraph only indicates [correct use] that the device shall return byte 0 and byte 1. Does this mean that the device server can send as many bytes as it wants with the bytes after byte 1 being undefined (see also Table 63 - SUPPORT values and meanings)? Or should the second sentence of this paragraph read something like, "If the device server does not implement the requested SCSI operation code it shall only return the peripheral qualifier and type byte and byte 1 with 001b in the SUPPORT field."

#### **7.45 [429] Quantum 45) Delete 'primarily' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 128, page 100, clause 7.6.5, note 21

I recommend that the word "primarily" be deleted from this note.

#### **7.46 [430] Quantum 46) 'target' or 'device server'? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 133 & 134, page 105 & 106, clause 7.9 & 7.10, 1st paragraph in both clauses

The first sentence reads, "The MODE SELECT(6) command (see table 67) provides a means for the application client to specify medium, logical unit, or peripheral device parameters to the target." Yet the first sentence in the first paragraph of 7.10 MODE SELECT(10) command reads, "The MODE SELECT(10) command (see table 68) provides a means for the application client to specify medium, logical unit, or peripheral device parameters to the device server." I think that "target" in the sentence in MODE SELECT(6) should be changed to "device server".

**7.47 [431] Quantum 47) Use '(6)' to specify the mode commands (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 133, page 105, clause 7.9, 1st paragraph

The second sentence reads, "Device servers that implement the MODE SELECT command shall also implement the MODE SENSE command." This should be changed to, "Device servers that implement the MODE SELECT(6) command shall also implement the MODE SENSE(6) command." The corresponding sentence is correct in the description of the MODE SELECT(10) command.

**7.48 [432] Quantum 48) Name the specific MODE SENSE commands (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 133 &amp; 134, page 105 &amp; 106, clause 7.9 &amp; 7.10, 1st paragraph in both clauses

The third sentence reads, "Application clients should issue MODE SENSE prior to each MODE SELECT to determine supported pages, page lengths, and other parameters." This should either be changed to, "Application clients should issue MODE SENSE(6) prior to each MODE SELECT(6) to determine supported pages, page lengths, and other parameters." or, "Application clients should issue a MODE SENSE(6) or MODE SENSE(10) command prior to each MODE SELECT(6) or MODE SELECT(10) command to determine supported pages, page lengths, and other parameters." A corresponding change needs to be made in the first paragraph of 7.10 MODE SELECT(10) command, page 106 (PDF page 134).

**Editor's note:**

The change will be to use MODE SENSE(6) and MODE SENSE(10), specifically naming exact commands in all cases in both clauses. This specific change has value because the application client cannot simply pass data received via a MODE SENSE(6) command as parameter data for a MODE SELECT(10), substantial header reformatting is required and should be discouraged.

**7.49 [433] Quantum 49) Convention for command names (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 38, page 10, clause 3.4, add new text

I now see several instances in the document where COMMAND NAME is used to refer to all lengths of a particular command type. Therefore, I think a sentence something like the following should be added to 3.4 Conventions, "If there is more than one length for a particular command type (e.g., MODE SENSE(6) and MODE SENSE(10)), and the name of the command type is used in a sentence without any length descriptor (e.g., MODE SENSE), then the condition specified in the sentence applies to all commands of that type." Something like this would make the previous two comments (and many more that could follow) unnecessary.

**7.50 [434] Quantum 50) Add requirement (Unresolved)**

PDF page 135, page 107, clause 7.9, 1st paragraph

The following sentence should be added to this paragraph, "Device servers that implement the MODE SENSE(6) command shall also implement the MODE SELECT(6) command." The corresponding sentence is correct in the description of the MODE SENSE(10) command.

**7.51 [435] Quantum 51) Remove 'actual' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 139, page 211, clause 7.13.1, 1st paragraph after table 73

I would recommend removing the word "actual" from the first sentence (unless there is a "pretend" length that's available somewhere else).

**Editor's note:**

The proposed change will add to confusion because the length being described is the return data length as opposed to the allocation length value in the CDB.

**7.52 [436] Quantum 52) Missing article 'the' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 140, page 212, clause 7.13.3, 2nd paragraph after table 75

PDF page 141, page 213, clause 7.13.4.1, 2nd paragraph after table 76

There is an article missing in the second sentence. It should read, "If the allocation length specified by the PERSISTENT RESERVE IN command is not sufficient to contain the entire parameter list, then only the first portion of the list (byte 0 to the allocation length) shall be sent to the application client." See also the same sentence in the second paragraph after Table 76 - PERSISTENT RESERVE IN parameter data for READ RESERVATION.

**7.53 [437] Quantum 53) Use RESERVATION CONFLICT status (Unresolved)**

PDF page 143, page 115, clause 7.13.4.3, table 79

In six places the phrase, "...shall result in a reservation conflict." Though this may be true, I think it would be better to replace that phrase with something like, "...shall be rejected with RESERVATION CONFLICT status..." or, "...shall be terminated with RESERVATION CONFLICT status..." as this is what shall result from a reservation conflict in these cases.

**Editor's note:**

Since the object being discussed is a task, the wording '...shall be rejected...' is awkward.

**7.54 [438] Quantum 54) Change 'are' to 'is' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 146, page 118, clause 7.14.3, 1st paragraph

I believe that the subject of the first sentence is "list". Therefore, to have the verb match the subject the sentence should read, "The parameter list required to perform the PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command is defined in table 82."

**7.55 [439] Quantum 55) Add 'content of' ... field (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 146, page 118, clause 7.14.3, 2nd paragraph after table 82

I think that the second sentence should read, "The device server shall verify that the content of the RESERVATION KEY field in a PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command matches the registered reservation key for the initiator from which the task was received, except for:"

**Editor's note:**

It should be 'contents' not 'content' and the field is in the command parameter data not the command. Thus the rewritten sentence should be, "The device server shall verify that the contents of the RESERVATION KEY field in a PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command parameter data matches the registered reservation key for the initiator from which the task was received, except for:"

**7.56 [440] Quantum 56) Field needs to contain a value (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 146, page 118, clause 7.14.3, 1st paragraph after list

I think that the first sentence should read, "Except as noted above, when a PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command specifies a value in the RESERVATION KEY field other than the reservation key registered for the initiator the device server shall return a RESERVATION CONFLICT status."

**Editor's note:**

A less cumbersome way to say the same thing is, "Except as noted above, when a PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command specifies a reservation key other than the reservation key registered for the initiator the device server shall return a RESERVATION CONFLICT status."

**7.57 [441] Quantum 57) Misspelled 'Operation' (Accepted, Editorial)**PDF page 155, page 127, clause 7.17.2, table 95, first row  
SEE ALSO comments 5.185 [236] IBM 185)

In the first entry in the Meaning column I think that "Operating in progress" should be changed to "Operation in progress".

**7.58 [442] Quantum 58) 'megabytes' not 'mega-bytes' etc. (Accepted, Editorial)**PDF page 156, page 128, clause 7.17.2, table 96  
SEE ALSO comments 1.30 [30] Brocade 30), 5.186 [237] IBM 186), and 8.96 [573] Seagate 95)

None of the words in the Meaning column should be hyphenated. They should be "Kilobytes", "Megabytes", "Gigabytes", "Terabytes", and "Petabytes", respectively.

**Editor's note:**

The response to comment 1.30 [30] Brocade 30) contains the resolution for this comment.

**7.59 [443] Quantum 59) Segment descriptors don't hold data (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 157, page 129, clause 7.17.3, 1st paragraph

I think the first phrase should be changed to, "If the copy manager supports those segment descriptors that require read data to be held for transfer to the application client,..." as the segment descriptors don't hold the data.

**Editor's note:**

Actually, 00-211r2 changed the data being held from 'read data' to 'processed data' and I believe that dropping the 'read' from the text in clause 7.17.3 will be the easiest way to reflect that change here. Thus, the rewritten text would be, "If the copy manager supports those segment descriptors that require data to be held for transfer to the application client,..."

There are five other occurrences of 'read' that need correction:

- a) 2nd sentence of 1st paragraph: "If a copy manager supports any of the segment descriptor type codes that require ~~read~~-data to be held for the application client..."
- b) 2nd sentence of 2nd paragraph after list: "The oldest byte ~~read and~~-held is returned in byte 4 and the byte most recently ~~read and~~-held is returned in byte n."
- c) 2nd sentence of 3rd paragraph after list: "If the processing of segment descriptors requires more data to be held, the copy manager shall discard the oldest held data bytes to accommodate the new ~~read~~-data."
- d) 3rd sentence of 3rd paragraph after list: "When making room for new ~~read held~~ data, the copy manager may discard more old data bytes than are needed immediately, but at any one time the copy manager shall never discard more than the smaller of 64 times the HELD DATA GRANULARITY value (see 7.17.4) or one quarter of the HELD DATA LIMIT value."

**7.60 [444] Quantum 60) Use 'number of bytes' not 'length' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 158, page 130, clause 7.17.4, 5th paragraph on page

I think the sentence should be changed to something like, "The AVAILABLE DATA field shall contain the number of bytes that is the total length of the parameter data minus 4."

**Editor's note:**

The sentence identified by the comment currently reads:

The AVAILABLE DATA field shall contain the length of the total length of the parameter data minus 4.

It will be changed to:

The AVAILABLE DATA field shall contain the ~~length of the total length of~~ the number of bytes following the AVAILABLE DATA field in the parameter data (i.e., the total number of parameter data bytes minus 4).

**7.61 [445] Quantum 61) Add article 'the' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 159, page 131, clause 7.17.4, 5th paragraph on page

I think there is an article missing in the first sentence (i.e., "...the largest amount of inline data that the copy manager supports...").

**7.62 [446] Quantum 62) Questionable description of copy devices (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 161, page 133, clause 7.17.5, Note 33

SEE ALSO comments 5.198 [249] IBM 198) and 8.98 [575] Seagate 97)

I think there is something wrong with the end of the second sentence (i.e., "...and indeterminate transfer operations to source and destination copy targets device."). I think that maybe this is supposed to be, "...and indeterminate transfer operations to source and destination copy devices."

**Editor's note:**

Resolution will be as per comment 8.98 [575] Seagate 97)

**7.63 [447] Quantum 63) 'concerns' s/b 'concern' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 166, page 138, clause 7.21, 1st paragraph

I think there is something wrong with the last sentence (i.e., "Only the REPORT DEVICE IDENTIFIER operation code and service action concerns all SCSI devices.") I think, at the very least, "concerns" should be "concern".

**Editor's note:**

If the simple wording is confusing, the following more complex wording should be used, "Only the operation code and service action combination defined for REPORT DEVICE IDENTIFIER is applicable to all SCSI devices."

**7.64 [448] Quantum 64) Change 'values' to 'value' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 171, page 143, clause 7.23.2, 2nd paragraph after table 109

I think that "values" should be singular (i.e., "value").

**7.65 [449] Quantum 65) What does 'usually' mean? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 172, page 144, clause 7.23.2, 2nd paragraph on page

The sentence reads, "An incorrect length indicator (ILI) bit of one usually indicates that the requested logical block length did not match the logical block length of the data on the medium." Does an ILI bit of one "unusually" indicate anything? Does an ILI bit of one EVER indicate anything else? If this is the only meaning for an ILI bit of one, the word "usually" should be deleted. If there are other meanings, I would recommend that at least an "e.g." with one example should be included here.

**Editor's note:**

All I can say is that this wording dates to SCSI-2.

**7.66 [450] Quantum 66) Restructure SKSV sentence (Unresolved)**

PDF page 173, page 145, clause 7.23.3, 1st paragraph

I think there is at least a verb missing in the first sentence. I think that it should be changed to read, "When the value of the sense-key specific valid (SKSV) bit is one the content of the SENSE-KEY SPECIFIC field is as defined by this standard."

**7.67 [451] Quantum 67) Too many prepositional phrases (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 173, page 145, clause 7.23.3, 2nd paragraph

I think there is one too many prepositional phrases in the first sentence. I think that it should be changed to read, "If the sense key is ILLEGAL REQUEST and the SKSV bit is set to one, then the SENSE-KEY SPECIFIC field shall be as defined in table 110."

**7.68 [452] Quantum 68) Illegal parameters are always an error (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 173, page 145, clause 7.23.3, 2nd paragraph

Unless it is possible to have illegal parameters in the CDB that AREN'T in error, I would recommend that the word "illegal" be deleted.

**7.69 [453] Quantum 69) Deferred error handling unclear (Unresolved)**

PDF page 175, page 147, clause 7.23.4, 4th paragraph

I'm not sure what the first sentence is trying to say. One possibility is the following, "If the current task terminates with CHECK CONDITION status for a previous task and the subsequent sense data returns deferred error information for the previous task, the current task shall not have been executed." Another possibility is, "If a previous task terminates with CHECK CONDITION status and the subsequent sense data returns deferred error information for that previous task, the current task shall not have been executed." Another possibility is, "If the current task terminates with CHECK CONDITION status and the subsequent sense data returns deferred error information for that previous task, the previous task shall not have been executed." One way or another, the sentence should be made clearer.

**7.70 [454] Quantum 70) What is 'external system intervention'? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 175, page 147, clause 7.23.4, list item (a)

In the first sentence, I don't think the phrase "external system intervention" conveys the exact meaning desired here. I would recommend that this sentence be changed to something like, "If a device server can recover from a deferred error condition without requiring external intervention, a deferred error indication shall not be posted unless required by the error handling parameters of a MODE SELECT command."

**7.71 [455] Quantum 71) 'initiator' not 'causing initiator' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 175, page 147, clause 7.23.4, list items (b) &amp; (c)

The phrases "a causing initiator" and "the causing initiator" are used in several places in these items. I don't think the gerund adds anything to the phrase. I would recommend that "a causing initiator" should be replaced by "an initiator", and that "the causing initiator" should be replaced by something like, "...the initiator associated with the error..."

**7.72 [456] Quantum 72) Rewrite sentence (Unresolved)**

PDF page 176, page 148, clause 7.23.4, list item (c)

The last sentence should be changed to read something like, "If multiple deferred errors have accumulated for any particular initiator, only the last error for that initiator shall be returned;"

**7.73 [457] Quantum 73) Rewrite sentence (Unresolved)**

PDF page 176, page 148, clause 7.23.4, note 43

I think that the first sentence should be changed to read something like, "A deferred error may indicate that an operation was unsuccessful long after GOOD status was returned for the initiating command."

**7.74 [458] Quantum 74) Rewrite sentence (Unresolved)**

PDF page 176, page 148, clause 7.23.4, note 43

I think that the second sentence should be changed to read something like, "If a deferred error occurs while data is being written using buffered write operations and the application client is unable to replicate or recover the data from other sources, synchronization commands should be executed before data is lost."

**7.75 [459] Quantum 75) Rewrite PF bit description (Unresolved)**

PDF page 195, page 167, clause 7.26, 1st paragraph on page

I think the description of the PF bit is incomplete. I recommend that this paragraph be made into two paragraphs something like:

A page format (PF) bit of one specifies that the SEND DIAGNOSTIC parameters and any parameters returned by a following RECEIVE DIAGNOSTIC RESULTS command shall conform to the page structure as specified in this standard. See 8.1 for the definition of diagnostic pages.

A PF bit of zero indicates that all SEND DIAGNOSTIC parameters are vendor-specific. If the content of the PARAMETER LIST LENGTH field is zero and the SEND DIAGNOSTIC command will not be followed by a corresponding RECEIVE DIAGNOSTIC RESULTS command then the PF bit shall be zero. The implementation of the PF bit is optional.

**7.76 [460] Quantum 76) Opcode & service action wording (Accepted, Editorial)**PDF page 195, page 167, clause 7.27, 1st paragraph  
SEE ALSO comment 8.104 [581] Seagate 103)

I don't think that the last sentence is clear, "Only the SET DEVICE IDENTIFIER operation code and service action concerns all SCSI devices." Does this mean, "Only the SET DEVICE IDENTIFIER operation code and service action shall be supported by all SCSI devices." Or what? This needs to be clarified.

**Editor's note:**

The following more complex wording should be used, "Only the operation code and service action combination defined for SET DEVICE IDENTIFIER is applicable to all SCSI devices."

**7.77 [461] Quantum 77) Put notes in table 126 (Unresolved)**

PDF page 199, page 171, clause 7.29.1, notes after table 126

I think that the notes following table 126 are supposed to be included in the table.



**7.78 [462] Quantum 78) Reword DU bit description (Unresolved)**

PDF page 206, page 178, clause 8.2.1, 1st paragraph after note 50

The second sentence of the paragraph reads, "The device server shall ignore the value of any DU bits in a LOG SELECT command." Since there is only one bit, and it isn't defined for this command, I would recommend that the sentence be changed to something like, "The device server shall ignore bit 7, byte 2 in any log parameter data received for a LOG SELECT command (this is the DU bit in log parameter data sent during a LOG SENSE command)."

**7.79 [463] Quantum 79) Change 'LBIN' to 'LBIN bit' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 207, page 179, clause 8.2.1, 2nd paragraph after table 132

The word "bit" is missing in the first sentence. It should read, "The LBIN bit is only valid if the LP bit is set to one."

**7.80 [464] Quantum 80) Change data allowed in application client log page (Unresolved)**

PDF page 210, page 182, clause 8.2.2, 1st paragraph

Though this may be the typical use, I think that there should be no restriction on the type of information stored by the application client in this page. Therefore, I recommend that the first sentence be change to, "The application client page (see table 134) provides a place for application clients to store system or other information."

**7.81 [465] Quantum 81) Put note in table 138 (Unresolved)**

PDF page 212, page 14, clause 8.2.3, note 52

I think that this note 52 should be included in the table 138.

**7.82 [466] Quantum 82) Spellout the log page name (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 213, page 185, clause 8.2.5, 1st paragraph

PDF page 213, page 185, clause 8.2.6, 1st paragraph

The first sentence begins, "Log page (0Bh)" To be consistent, I think that this should read, "The last n deferred errors or asynchronous events page (page code 0Bh)"

Make a similar change in 8.2.6 Last n error events page.

**7.83 [467] Quantum 83) Spellout the log page name (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 214, page 186, clause 8.2.7, 1st paragraph

The first sentence begins, "This page (page code 06h)" To be consistent, I think that this should read, "The non-medium error page (page code 06h)"

**7.84 [468] Quantum 84) Rewrite sentence (Unresolved)**

PDF page 218, page 190, clause 8.2.9, 1st paragraph after table 146

I think that the second sentence is unclear and should read. "The date of manufacture shall not be modified by the device when an application client issues a LOG SELECT command."

**7.85 [469] Quantum 85) Rewrite sentence (Unresolved)**

PDF page 218, page 190, clause 8.2.9, 1st paragraph after table 147

I think that this sentence is unclear and should read, "The accounting date specified by parameter code 0002h is the date when the device was placed in service. This parameter may be saved by the device when an application client issues a LOG SELECT command."

**7.86 [470] Quantum 86) Rewrite sentence (Unresolved)**

PDF page 219, page 191, clause 8.2.9, last paragraph before table 149

I think that the second sentence should be changed to, "The specified cycle count over device lifetime parameter shall not be modified by the device when an application client issues a LOG SELECT command."

**7.87 [471] Quantum 87) Rewrite sentence (Unresolved)**

PDF page 219, page 191, clause 8.2.9, 1st paragraph after table 149

I think that the second sentence should be changed to, "The accumulated start-stop cycles parameter shall not be modified by the device when an application client issues a LOG SELECT command."

**7.88 [472] Quantum 88) Rewrite sentence (Unresolved)**

PDF page 221, page 193, clause 8.2.11, 1st paragraph after table 152

This sentence is cumbersome. I recommend that it be changed to, "The one byte binary value should reflect the maximum reported sensor temperature in degrees Celsius specified by the manufacturer of the device at which the device is capable of operating continuously without degradation to the device's operation or reliability."

**7.89 [473] Quantum 89) Rewrite sentence (Unresolved)**

PDF page 223, page 195, clause 8.3.3, 1st paragraph after table 155

The second sentence reads, "The mode data length does not include itself." I think this sentence should be deleted or modified to read something like, "The mode data length does not include the number of bytes in the MODE DATA LENGTH field."

**7.90 [474] Quantum 90) Change 'include' to 'implement' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 228, page 200, clause 8.3.6, 1st paragraph after table 160

I recommend that the word "include" be changed to "implement" such that the sentence reads, "Table 160 defines the mode pages that are applicable to all device types that implement the MODE SELECT and MODE SENSE commands."

**7.91 [475] Quantum 91) Eliminate 'actual execution' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 230, page 212, clause 8.3.7, 1st paragraph after table 163

PDF page 230, page 212, clause 8.3.7, 2nd paragraph after table 163

I recommend that the word "actual" be deleted from the first sentence (unless, of course, there are some virtual "execution sequence[s] of tasks having the SIMPLE task attribute"). [See also the first sentence in the second paragraph below the table.]

**Editor's note:**

Since 'execution' also should be removed or replaced, the sentences in question will be changed to:

"A value of zero in the QUEUE ALGORITHM MODIFIER field specifies that the device server shall order the ~~actual-execution-processing~~ sequence of tasks having the SIMPLE task attribute such that data integrity is maintained for that initiator."

A value of one in the QUEUE ALGORITHM MODIFIER field specifies that the device server may reorder the ~~actual-execution-processing~~ sequence of tasks having the SIMPLE task attribute in any manner.

**7.92 [476] Quantum 92) Units of time not specified (Unresolved)**

PDF page 233, page 205, clause 8.3.7, 1st, 2nd, &amp; 3rd paragraphs after note 60

I don't see where the definitions for BUS INACTIVITY LIMIT, DISCONNECT TIME LIMIT, or CONNECT TIME fields specify the units of time. Have I missed something, or do these need to be specified?

**7.93 [477] Quantum 93) Change 'A' to 'An' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 235, page 207, clause 8.3.8, 4th paragraph on page

"A enable warning..." should be changed to "An enable warning..."; and "A EWASC bit..." should be changed to "An EWASC bit..."

**8. Seagate Technology**

Seagate Technology principle representative Gene Milligan submitted a No individual vote with the following comments.

**8.1 [478] Seagate 1) Update NCITS e-mail address (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 2

update the secretariats address to ncits@itic.org

**8.2 [479] Seagate 2) Reword Processor usage for AER (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 13, abstract

PDF page 27, foreword

PDF page 29, scope

Several places it is stated that <<Some target SCSI devices may require a host implementation of the processor device model to support the Asynchronous Event Reporting capability defined in the SCSI-3 Architecture Model.>>

This is confusing as to whom the implementer is. I suspect the intent is "Some target SCSI devices may implement an initiator subset of the processor device model to support the Asynchronous Event Reporting capability defined in the SCSI-3 Architecture Model."

### **8.3 [480] Seagate 3) Delete redundant sentence (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 27

<<Thus, the SCSI processor device commands are defined in this standard.>> There is nothing magical or biblical about the preceding statements. This sentence should be deleted as the only factual statement is redundant to the first sentence of the paragraph.

### **8.4 [481] Seagate 4) Add 'of' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 29

<<in the SCSI family standards >> Unless birth control has slipped in, add an "of".

### **8.5 [482] Seagate 5) Reword description of Roadmap figure (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 29

SEE ALSO comments 5.3 [54] IBM 3) and 9.2 [589] TI 2)

<<The roadmap in figure 1 is intended to show the general applicability of the documents to one another. The figure is not intended to imply a relationship such as a hierarchy, protocol stack, or system architecture. It indicates the applicability of a standard to the implementation of a given transport.>>

This may have been true before the figure was appropriately generalized. I suggest changing the statement to "Figure 1 is intended to show the general relationship of the documents to one another. The figure is not intended to imply a relationship such as a hierarchy, protocol stack, or system architecture."

#### **Editor's note:**

Combining this comment and comment 5.3 [54] IBM 3), the replacement text will read:

"Figure 1 is intended to show the general relationship of the documents to one another. Figure 1 is not intended to imply a relationship such as a hierarchy, protocol stack, or system architecture."

### **8.6 [483] Seagate 6) Incorrect ISO/IEC standards numbers (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 30

Fibre Channel Arbitrated Loop FC-AL [ISO/IEC 14165-121] was never completed by T11 and is now FC-AL-2.

I am not sure that an amendment is an example of a standard. Fiber Channel Physical Amendment 1 [ANSI X3.230/AM1:1996]

SCSI Primary Commands - 2 SPC-2 [ISO/IEC 14776-312] Because of T10 giving up on SPC due to the confusion from the lost Brazil vote, this will probably end up being 14776-311.

**Editor's note:**

The following changes will be made:

- a) Remove ISO/IEC reference for FC-AL
- b) Add FC-AL-2 as T11/1133-D and ISO/IEC 14165-122
- c) Add ISO/IEC 14776-311 as international version of SPC
- d) The ISO/IEC number for SPC-2 on the front page will be set to ISO/IEC 14776-312

This text will be conditionalized to remove all ANSI references in the ISO/IEC version of the standard.

**8.7 [484] Seagate 7) Missing ISO/IEC standards numbers (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 31

<<SCSI Reduced Block Commands RBC [ANSI NCITS.330:200x]>> is also ISO/IEC 14776-326.

<<SCSI-3 Enclosure Services Commands SES [ANSI NCITS.305:1998]>> is also ISO/IEC 14776-371 assuming it's editor wakes up.

<<SCSI Common Access Method CAM [ISO/IEC 9316-421]>> published as ISO/IEC 9316-2.

**8.8 [485] Seagate 8) Why are FC-PH, AM 1, FC-PH-3, and FC-FS normative references? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 32

SEE ALSO comments 5.304 [355] IBM 304) and 5.305 [356] IBM 305)

Why are FC-PH, AM 1, FC-PH-3, and FC-FS normatively referenced rather than FCP?

**Editor's note:**

I believe that the following text in 8.4.4 (table 181) necessitates normative references to FC-PH, AM 1, FC-PH-3, and FC-FS:

The identifier field contains an FC-PH, FC-PH3 or FC-FS Name\_Identifier. Any FC-PH, FC-PH3 or FC-FS identifier may be used, including one of the four based on a Canonical form IEEE company\_id.

**8.9 [486] Seagate 9) Delete or replace 'possible' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 33, page 5, clause 3.3.1

<<shortest possible time.>> Delete "possible".

**Editor's note:**

If the proposed deletion were performed the phrase would be "...shortest time" leaving the superlative form of the irregular adjective 'short' (i.e., 'short', 'shorter', and 'shortest') with no words or phrases to compare. The proper usage is "...shortest possible time."

I have noticed that other comments (e.g., 8.28 [505] Seagate 28) and 8.30 [507] Seagate 30) propose replacing 'possible' with 'practical' and will follow that model to change "...shortest possible time." to "...shortest practical time."

**8.10 [487] Seagate 10) Change 'protocol-specific' to 'transport protocol specific' (Accepted, Editorial)**

Global & PDF page 33

Change <<The mechanism by which asynchronous event reporting works is protocol-specific.>> to "The mechanism for asynchronous event reporting is transport protocol specific." The latter portion being global.

**8.11 [488] Seagate 11) Reference SAM-2 (not SCSI-2) for CA definition (Unresolved)**

PDF page 33

Consider changing the reference <<A detailed definition of CA may be found in SCSI-2.>> to SAM-2 to eliminate the SCSI-2 reference purchase.

**8.12 [489] Seagate 12) Delete 'Although ...' uninformative text (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 34

Delete <<Although there are a few exceptions,>>

**8.13 [490] Seagate 13) Which hunt & change 'by' to 'as' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 34, page 6, clause 3.1.30

SEE ALSO comment 5.16 [67] IBM 16) 8.13 [490] Seagate 13)

Change <<executed by a single task, which>> to "executed as a single task that".

**8.14 [491] Seagate 14) Just 'exception condition' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 35, page 7, clause 3.1.47

Change <<or exceptional device condition>> to "or exception condition".

**8.15 [492] Seagate 15) Document numbers in acronyms? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 37

SEE ALSO comment 5.21 [72] IBM 21)

In the definitions of acronyms why do only SPC and SCSI-2 have numbers - or vice versa?

**8.16 [493] Seagate 16) Remove bold text (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 39

SEE ALSO comment 5.25 [76] IBM 25)

Bold seems to be used for emphasis. I understand this is not according to the ANSI or ISO/IEC style guides.

**8.17 [494] Seagate 17) Delete 'typical' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 42

In 4.3.2 consider deleting "typical" in the paragraph four places.

**Editor's note:**

Subclause 4.3 will be restructured as described in the response to 1.5 [5] Brocade 5). Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause including the changes agreed in response to this comment. Any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

**8.18 [495] Seagate 18) Change 'on...logical unit(s)' to 'of...logical unit(s)' (Unresolved)**

Global

Globally search <<on logical units> and <<on that logical unit>> and replace them with a form of "of logical units".

**8.19 [496] Seagate 19) 64-bit LBAs (Accepted, Substantive)**

PDF page 42

SEE ALSO comment 5.33 [84] IBM 33)

<<the sixteen-byte command descriptor blocks contain 32-bit LOGICAL BLOCK ADDRESS fields.>> Did this change with the 64-bit address change?

**Editor's note:**

This comment will be resolved as described in 5.33 [84] IBM 33). Subclause 4.3 will be restructured as described in the response to 1.5 [5] Brocade 5). Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause including the changes agreed in response to this comment. Any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

**8.20 [497] Seagate 20) 'transfer length' by another name (Unresolved)**

PDF page 42

Change <<For several commands the transfer length indicates the requested number of bytes to be sent as defined in the command description. For these commands the TRANSFER LENGTH field may be identified by a different name.>> to "Several commands use transfer length to indicate the requested number of bytes to be sent as defined in the command description. For lengths in bytes the TRANSFER LENGTH field may be identified by a different name."

**8.21 [498] Seagate 21) Commands go to logical units (Unresolved)**

PDF page 42

SEE ALSO comment 8.23 [500] Seagate 23)

<<This field is typically used in command descriptor blocks for parameters that are sent to a device server>>

I thought commands were sent to logical units not device servers. I think this should be "This field is typically used in command descriptor blocks for parameters that are for device server control."

**8.22 [499] Seagate 22) Is encryption allowed? (Accepted, Substantive)**

PDF page 43

SEE ALSO comment 1.8 [8] Brocade 8)

<<The ENCRYPTION IDENTIFICATION field indicates whether CDB bytes 8 through n and/or the data bytes are encrypted. The value also indicates which encryption key to use for decryption. A value of zero indicates no encryption. All other values are reserved.>>

It is not clear from this text whether no encryption is allowed and all encryption values are reserved or if a reference to where the non-reserved values are has been left out.

**Editor's note:**

Per the agreement of the September, 2000 CAP working group (minutes in 00-307), the ENCRYPTION IDENTIFICATION field will be changed to Reserved. Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause including the changes agreed in response to this comment. Any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

**8.23 [500] Seagate 23) 'logical unit' not 'device server' (Unresolved)**

Global &amp; PDF page 44

SEE ALSO comment 8.21 [498] Seagate 21)

<<This standard defines four commands that all SCSI device servers shall implement>>

I think the logical unit should have the requirement for the mandatory commands not the device server. I think consideration should be globally given as to whether the device server is singled out too often.

**8.24 [501] Seagate 24) Use TEST UNIT READY to check media status (Unresolved)**

PDF page 44

SEE ALSO comment 5.41 [92] IBM 41)

Change <<It is especially useful to check the cartridge status of logical units with removable media.>> to "TEST UNIT READY may be used to check the media status of logical units with removable media." or delete it.

**8.25 [502] Seagate 25) Delete advisory description of TEST UNIT READY (Unresolved)**

PDF page 44

Delete <<delays to achieve good status are not advisable.>>

**Editor's note:**

SCSI-2 says, "... (i.e. a target should avoid lengthy disconnections in an attempt to respond with GOOD status)."



**8.26 [503] Seagate 26) Is parameter rounding always allowed? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 45

<<The device server shall reject unsupported values unless rounding is permitted in the description of the parameter.>>

Isn't this an unwarranted restriction. As I recall rounding is always allowed unless specifically restricted by a parameter and at the moment I do not recall any where rounding is not allowed.

**8.27 [504] Seagate 27) Simplify SEND DIAGNOSTIC status description (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 45

Change <<The response is simply a GOOD status if the test is successful or a CHECK CONDITION status if the test fails.>> to "The response is GOOD status if the test detects no exceptions or a CHECK CONDITION status if the test detects exceptions."

Editor's note:

This sentence has undergone a step-wise improvement. SCSI-2 says, "...the response is simply GOOD status if all is well or CHECK CONDITION status if the test fails." SPC has the wording at issue above.

**8.28 [505] Seagate 28) Use '...as soon as practical...' instead of '...as soon as possible...' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 47

SEE ALSO comment 5.47 [98] IBM 47) regarding changing 'never' to 'not'

SEE ALSO comment 8.30 [507] Seagate 30) regarding 'practical' instead of 'possible'

Change <<Suspension of the self-test to service the command shall occur as soon as possible, but shall never take longer than two seconds.>> to "Suspension of the self-test to service the command shall occur as soon as practical and shall not take longer than two seconds."

**8.29 [506] Seagate 29) Why reference draft standards over published? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 47, table 7

SEE ALSO comment 8.76 [553] Seagate 76)

All references to other standards seem to be the latest project regardless of status. But the normative references have instructions for using later versions not earlier versions. Is it a good idea to call out non-available standards without a compelling reason?

**8.30 [507] Seagate 30) Use '...as soon as practical...' instead of '...as soon as possible...' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 47

SEE ALSO comment 8.30 [507] Seagate 30) regarding 'practical' instead of 'possible'

Change <<If one of the exception commands listed in table 6 is received, the device server shall abort the self-test, update the self-test log, and service the command as soon as possible but not longer than two seconds after the command descriptor block has been validated. >> to "If one of the exception commands listed in table 6 is received, the device server shall abort the self-test, update the self-test log, and service the command as soon as practical and not longer than two seconds after the command descriptor block has been validated."

Editor's note:

The will be made as requested. In addition, as per the resolution to comment 5.26 [77] IBM 26) the use of 'command descriptor block' in this sentence will be changed to 'CDB'.

### **8.31 [508] Seagate 31) Don't capitalize 'abort' (Rejected)**

PDF page 47

Change << (Abort background self-test function).>> to " (abort background self-test function)."

#### **Reason for rejection:**

'Abort background self-test' function is the proper name of the function as shown in Table 120.

### **8.32 [509] Seagate 32) Specifically identify subsequent command as the one terminated (Rejected)**

PDF page 48

In Table 7 change <<Otherwise, terminate with CHECK CONDITION status, [LOGI-]CAL UNIT FAILED SELF-TEST>> to "Otherwise, terminate the subsequent command with CHECK CONDITION status, [LOGI-]CAL UNIT FAILED SELF-TEST" two places.

#### **Reason for rejection:**

In the 4th column, the column heading clearly identifies the subsequent command as the one being discussed. If the proposed change were adopted, it also would be necessary to change 'If the command is INQUIRY ...' to 'If the subsequent command is INQUIRY ...' and to change 'Process the command ...' to 'Process the subsequent command ...'. Why have the column header identify 'subsequent commands' as the topic for discussion if 'subsequent command' must be repeated throughout the column text?

In the 5th column, it is not a subsequent command that is terminated, rather it is the SEND DIAGNOSTICS command itself that is terminate.

### **8.33 [510] Seagate 33) Add types of reservations overview (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 48

The reservations overview should include an overview of the types of reservations (i.e., RESERVE/RELEASE and PERSISTENT RESERVATIONS).

Editor's note:

Cross references to 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 will be added to the list near the top of PDF page 49, e.g., 'a) Reserve/Release ([see 5.3.2](#)) -' Beyond that, the editor is in no position to write such an overview. If someone else should write one and propose it for inclusion in an SPC version, then that activity could be viewed as acceptance of this comment.

### **8.34 [511] Seagate 34) Why two reservations checking requirements? (Rejected)**

PDF page 49

<<A command that explicitly writes the medium shall be checked for reservation conflicts before the device server modifies the medium or cache as a result of the command.>>

The requirement for commands that do not write the media satisfy the requirement. Why are there two versions?

### Reason for rejection:

The September, 2000 CAP working group meeting (minutes in 00-307) agreed that the two requirements allow valuable flexibility in implementations and therefore will not be changed.

### 8.35 [512] Seagate 35) Match 'queuing' description to SAM-2 (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 51

<<A reservation may apply to some or all tasks queued before>> is not stated in a SAM conformant manner.

#### Editor's note:

Replace the wording identified as being non-conformant with, "A reservation may apply to some or all of the tasks in the task set before...".

### 8.36 [513] Seagate 36) Match 'queuing' description to SAM-2 (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 52

<<Multiple reserve/release commands or persistent reserve service actions may be queued at the same time.>> What does this mean in SAM terms?

#### Editor's note:

Replace the wording identified as not matching SAM terminology with, "Multiple reserve/release commands or persistent reserve service actions may be present in the task set at the same time."

### 8.37 [514] Seagate 37) Rewrite sentence to eliminate 'most' (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 52

SEE ALSO comment 5.62 [113] IBM 62)

Change <<, so most systems require significant reinitialization after a failure that results in a hard reset.>> to ". Systems may require significant reinitialization after a failure that results in a hard reset." or delete the statement.

#### Editor's note:

The rewritten text in the resolution to comment 5.62 [113] IBM 62) does not use the word 'most' as requested by this comment.

### 8.38 [515] Seagate 38) Change 'is' to 'may be' (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 52

SEE ALSO comment 6.2 [373] LSI 2) and rejected comment 5.63 [114] IBM 63)

Change <<The Persistent Reservations management method is used among multiple initiators that require operations to be protected across initiator failures, which usually involve hard resets.>> to "The Persistent Reservations management method may be used among multiple initiators that require operations to be protected across initiator failures, which may involve hard resets."

#### Editor's note:

As agreed following the September 2000 working group, the replacement wording will be "...is the mechanism specified for use by multiple initiators..." instead of "...may be used among multiple initiators...". The rewritten text in the resolution to comment 6.2 [373] LSI 2) includes the change requested by this comment.

### **8.39 [516] Seagate 39) Change 'SCSI' to 'SCSI commands' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 52

SEE ALSO comment 6.2 [373] LSI 2)

Change <<Even though different protocols that transport SCSI>> to "Even though different protocols that transport SCSI commands"

Editor's note:

The rewritten text in the resolution to comment 6.2 [373] LSI 2) includes the change requested by this comment.

### **8.40 [517] Seagate 40) Change 'power...is lost' to 'power...is removed' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 52

SEE ALSO comment 6.2 [373] LSI 2)

Change <<Persistent reservations are optionally retained when power to the target is lost.>> to "Persistent reservations are optionally retained when power to the target is removed." or delete in favor of the redundancy in the next paragraph.

Editor's note:

The rewritten text in the resolution to comment 6.2 [373] LSI 2) includes the change requested by this comment.

### **8.41 [518] Seagate 41) You cannot provide a think but you can't remove it (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 53

Change <<but they remove the ability for the application client to uniquely>> to "but they do not provide the ability for the application client to uniquely" or delete the whole phrase.

### **8.42 [519] Seagate 42) Use APTPL acronym (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 53

SEE ALSO comments] CPQ 1B), 5.64 [115] IBM 64), and 5.65 [116] IBM 65)

Change <<Persist Through Power Loss (APTPL)>> to "APTPL" since if an acronym is defined it should be subsequently used and the definition in this subsequent instance is different than the initial definition.

**Editor's note:**

This comment is resolved by the changes described in the response to comment ] CPQ 1B).

**8.43 [520] Seagate 43) Where is 'scope-specific address' defined? (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 54

What is a <<the scope-specific address, if any.>> and where is it defined?

**Editor's note:**

A cross reference to 7.13.4.1 (Format of PERSISTENT RESERVE IN parameter data for READ RESERVATION) will be added.

**8.44 [521] Seagate 44) Persistent Reservations question (Rejected)**

PDF page 55

<<If a PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT with a REGISTER AND IGNORE EXISTING KEY service action is sent when an established registration key exists, the registration shall be superseded with the specified service action reservation key.>>

Is this the case even if for some other action the originating initiator would be in violation of the existing persistent reservation?

**Reason for rejection:**

The following discussion assumes that the word 'reservation' is replaced with the word 'registration' in the question asked, because as Table 9 shows both the REGISTER and the REGISTER AND IGNORE EXISTING KEY service actions have no conflicts with existing persistent reservations.

If a REGISTER service action is used instead of a REGISTER AND IGNORE EXISTING KEY service action when a registration already exists, the existing registration is superseded only if the reservation key in the parameter data matches the reservation key previously registered with the device server. The REGISTER AND IGNORE EXISTING KEY eliminates that test thus allowing an initiator to register a new key when it no longer knows what its old key was.

**8.45 [522] Seagate 45) Delete registration resources note (Unresolved)**

PDF page 55

<<NOTE 4 It is recommended a target have enough resources to handle a registration from each initiator known to the target.>>

Delete note 4. This is a non-sensical recommendation. For Fibre Channel known initiators could be humongous and each initiator is allowed to register an unlimited number of keys. Resources are not a rubber band. Resources are determined by target markets.

**8.46 [523] Seagate 46) Two lists with same introduction (Rejected)**

PDF page 57

In <<5.5.3.6.1 Overview of removing registrations and persistent reservations>> there are two different lists with the same introduction. Why is it two lists? Should the second list be preempt rather than remove?

**Reason for rejection:**

The two introductory statements are not the same. The two statements are shown here with the words that are different between them underlined.

"A registered initiator using the value of the initiator/logical unit pair's established reservation key may remove a persistent reservation by issuing one of the following commands:"

"A registered initiator using the value of the initiator/logical unit pair's established reservation key may remove a registration by issuing one of the following commands:"

**8.47 [524] Seagate 47) 'aptpl' should be in small caps (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 57

SEE ALSO comment 7.19 [403] Quantum 19)

<<most recent aptpl value>> ...aptpl should be small caps. In addition globally some of the items that should be small caps look like they are large caps.

**Editor's note:**

The specific change on PDF page 57 will be made as described in the comment. As for the global issue of field names being in large caps, it is very difficult to identify that error using electronic tools. In those places where the problem is brought to the editor's attention, the error will be fixed. More than that is not practical.

**8.48 [525] Seagate 48) What's difference between 'releasing' and 'removing' a reservation? (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 57, page 29, 5.5.3.6.2

What is the a difference between releasing and removing a reservation? I assume the difference is whether or not the keys remain registered. But unless I just missed it, I think this difference needs to be more blatantly provided prior to the complete discussion of the two methods.

**Editor's note:**

The phrase "removing a reservation" is shorthand for "releasing or preempting a reservation". Since the shorthand is confusing, the first sentence in 5.5.3.6.1 (PDF page 57) will be changed from:

"A registered initiator ... may remove a persistent reservation by issuing one of the following commands:"

to:

"A registered initiator ... may ~~remove~~ release or preempt a persistent reservation by issuing one of the following commands:"

Since the words 'reservation' and 'registration' are sometimes confused the following verb uses are going to be applied:

- Reservations are either **released** or **preempted**
- Registrations are **removed**

The following changes are required to make the text conform to these usage restrictions.

In the first a) on PDF page 58, change 'removing' to 'releasing'. In the second a) on PDF page 58, change 'remove' to 'release'.

At the top of PDF page 59, uses of 'preempt' need to be changed to 'remove' as shown in the response to comment 8.52 [529] Seagate 52). In figure 2 (PDF page 59) bullet b), change 'remove' to 'release'.

In the second a) on PDF page 60, change 'remove' to 'release'. On PDF page 60, the title of 5.5.3.6.3.4 needs to be changed to, "~~Preempting~~ Removing registrations" and the first sentence in the subclause needs to be changed to, "An application client may ~~clear~~ remove registrations...". Item b) in the first list in this clause needs to be changed to, "...registration being ~~cleared~~ removed."

On PDF page 61, the first sentence in 5.5.3.6.5 needs to be changed to, "Any application client may clear a persistent reservation and remove all registrations..." In the second a) on PDF page 61, change 'remove' to 'release'.

In the second a) and b) in 5.6 (PDF page), change 'remove' to 'release'. In the subsequent c) change 'removes persistent reservations and reservation keys' to 'releases persistent reservations and removes reservation keys'.

**8.49 [526] Seagate 49) What happens to the reservation? (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 58

<<The device server shall return a CHECK CONDITION status for a PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command that specifies the release of a persistent reservation held by the requesting initiator if the SCOPE and TYPE fields do not match the scope and type of the established persistent reservation. The sense key shall be set to ILLEGAL REQUEST and additional sense data shall be set to INVALID RELEASE OF PERSISTENT RESERVATION.>>

This paragraph should mention the outcome of the reservation.

**Editor's note:**

Change the first sentence from:

"The device server shall return a CHECK CONDITION..."

to:

"The established reservation shall not be altered and the device server shall return a CHECK CONDITION..."

**8.50 [527] Seagate 50) 'removed' not 'preempted'? (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 58

<<If the value in the SERVICE ACTION RESERVATION KEY field is associated with the reservation being preempted then the reservation is preempted and any matching registration(s) removed (see 5.5.3.6.3.3).>>

Removed not preempted?

**Editor's notes:**

In this case, the wording is correct. See the response to 8.48 [525] Seagate 48) for a discussion of reservations, registrations and the verbs for annulling them.

**8.51 [528] Seagate 51) SERVICE ACTION RESERVATION KEY != reservation? (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 58

<<If the value in the SERVICE ACTION RESERVATION KEY field is not associated with the reservation being preempted then any matching registration(s) are removed (see 5.5.3.6.3.4).>>

Huh? So the non-associated remains?

What are <<matching reservations>> that are removed regardless of association?

**Editor's notes:**

The last comment will be ignored since the sentence in question says 'matching registrations' not 'matching reservations'. However the remainder of the comment points out that the sentence in question needs to be rewritten as follows:

"If the value in the SERVICE ACTION RESERVATION KEY field is not associated with the reservation, the reservation shall not be preempted but any matching registration(s) shall be removed (see 5.5.3.6.3.4).>>



**8.52 [529] Seagate 52) Improper use of 'should' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 59

<<See figure 2 for a description of how a device server should interpret a PREEMPT service action to determine the actions it should take>> Should take, not shall take?

**Editor's note:**

Considering both the changes needed in response to this comment and the changes needed in response to 8.50 [527] Seagate 50), the sentence at the top of PDF page 59 will be changed from:

"See figure 2 for a description of how a device server should interpret a PREEMPT service action to determine the actions it should take (e.g., preempt persistent reservation, preempt registration or preempt both registration and persistent reservation)."

to:

"See figure 2 for a description of how a device server ~~should~~ interprets a PREEMPT service action to determine the its ~~actions it should take~~ (e.g., preempt persistent reservation, ~~preempt remove~~ registration or ~~preempt both registration and persistent reservation~~ both preempt persistent reservation and ~~preempt remove~~ reservation)."

**8.53 [530] Seagate 53) What's an inactive persistent reservation? (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 59

What is an inactive persistent reservation?

**Editor's note:**

In Figure 2, change 'Active persistent reservation' to 'Existing persistent reservation'.

**8.54 [531] Seagate 54) How can != SERVICE ACTION RESERVATION KEY point to a registration? (Rejected)**

PDF page 59

If the SERVICE ACTION RESERVATION KEY does not match, how does it point to a registration?

**Reason for rejection:**

The SERVICE ACTION RESERVATION KEY always points to a registration. If a reservation is to be preempted, then the registration is that of the initiator that holds the reservation.

**8.55 [532] Seagate 55) Figure 2 has more requirements than the text (Rejected)**

PDF page 59

Good thing figures take precedent over text since Figure 2 seems to have more requirements than the text (e.g., active persistent reservation).

**Reason for rejection:**

The correction made in response to comment 8.53 [530] Seagate 53) eliminates the sole example quoted in the comment. Since the editor is not aware of any other instances of Figure 2 containing more requirements than the text, no known additional corrections are required.

**8.56 [533] Seagate 56) Queuing restrictions time-out? (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 59

<<time-out due to queuing restrictions>> Task management restrictions? Queue blocked or task blocked?

**Editor's note:**

Change, '...time-out due to queueing restrictions or time-out due to queue blocked due to failed initiator)' to, '...transport protocol time-out or time-out due to queue blocked due to failed initiator)'.  
'...transport protocol time-out or time-out due to queue blocked due to failed initiator)'.

**8.57 [534] Seagate 57) Use 'vendor specific' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 62

SEE ALSO comment 7.24 [408] Quantum 24)

Change <<is defined by the implementation.>> to "is vendor specific."

**Editor's note:**

The change described in this comment will be made. The wording change is reflected in the resolution for comment 7.24 [408] Quantum 24).

**8.58 [535] Seagate 58) Rewrite contention resolution options for multi-port targets (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 62

SEE ALSO comment 7.24 [408] Quantum 24)

<<Above the interconnect implementation, two contention resolution options exist:>> Huh? Would be clear if the intro was deleted and the list was turned into a paragraph.

**Editor's note:**

The response to comment 7.24 [408] Quantum 24) contains wording that addresses this issue.

**8.59 [536] Seagate 59) Why 'all initiators (regardless of port)'? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 62

SEE ALSO comment 5.70 [121] IBM 70)

<<Once a device server grants a reservation, all initiators (regardless of port) except the initiator to which the reservation was granted shall be treated as different initiators.>>

I agree with this if a single device server is behind the multiple ports. But since I do not agree with all instances of the use of device server I think there is room for this statement to be misconstrued when the multiple ports have multiple LUNs with multiple device servers behind them.

On second thought, on agreement, what does different initiators have to do with it. They are treated as different initiators regardless of reservations since they are different initiators. The statement should be about reservation states.

**Editor's note:**

At a minimum, '...(regardless of port)...' will be changed to '..., regardless of service delivery port,...'.

**8.60 [537] Seagate 60) What are 'machine states'? (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 62

What are <<machine states>>? I think this should be "logical unit states".

**8.61 [538] Seagate 61) Change 'may interpret' to 'interprets' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 64

Change <<A single logical unit may also serve as a path to multiple resources if the processor device server may interpret information within the data packet and route the packet to the appropriate resource.>> to "A single logical unit may also serve as a path to multiple resources if the processor device server interprets information within the data packet and routes the packet to the appropriate resource."

**8.62 [539] Seagate 62) Change 'unusual condition' to 'exception condition' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 64

Change <<If the processor device server determines that an error or unusual condition has occurred>> to "If the processor device server determines that an exception condition has occurred" two places.

The millennium was an unusual condition and was not an error other than that it is occurring twice within a year. In SCSI context both "an error and an unusual condition" would be an error.

**Editor's note:**

The changes described in this comment will be made without alteration. In addition to those changes there is a correction that is needed shortly after the second change. Change "commandfrom" to "command from".

**8.63 [540] Seagate 63) Remove comparison of processor to communications devices (Unresolved)**

PDF page 64

I think <<The SCSI processor device is distinguished from an SCSI communications device by the fact that the primary destination of the data packets is within the target device. An SCSI

communications device, passes the data on to an ultimate destination outside the target through a network.>> be deleted since there are no longer SCSI communication devices.

**8.64 [541] Seagate 64) Change 'protocol dictated' to 'protocol specified' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 64

Change <<protocol dictated>> to "protocol specified".

**8.65 [542] Seagate 65) Add 'OB = Obsolete in table 10 (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 65

In Table 10 add an Obsolete type "OB = Obsolete"

**8.66 [543] Seagate 66) Value that matches what? (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 79

See also comment 5.90 [141] IBM 90)

<<RECEIVE COPY RESULTS commands with a matching value>> Matching what?

Editor's note:

The description of relationships between EXTENDED COPY commands and RECEIVE COPY RESULTS commands is well described in the subclause defining the RECEIVE COPY RESULTS command (no comments were made about it). Therefore, the rewording shown in the resolution for 5.90 [141] IBM 90) avoids defining that relationship in this text, relying instead on the RECEIVE COPY RESULTS command definition.

**8.67 [544] Seagate 67) What is arithmetic precedence of +16/32? (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 79

<<The index for a target descriptor is the starting byte number for the target descriptor in the parameter data minus 16 divided by 32.>>

Does that mean minus 0.5. A formula with appropriate parenthesis would be clear.

Editor's note:

Owing to the war on parentheses waged by IBM, the editor is reluctant to combine mathematical and English structures. Therefore, the sentence identified by the comment will be changed to:

The index for a target descriptor is computed by subtracting 16 from the starting byte number for the target descriptor in the parameter data ~~minus 16 and divided~~ dividing the result by 32.

**8.68 [545] Seagate 68) Remove 'sensible' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 80

<<The copy manager is assumed to employ a sensible vendor-specific policy to decide when to stop retrying.>>  
Delete "sensible". Both notes 7 and 8 are of questionable value - typical for notes.

**Editor's note:**

The sentence identified by the comment will be changed to: "The copy manager is assumed to employ a vendor specific retry policy that minimizes time consuming and/or fruitless repetition of retries."

Note the use of "vendor specific" in accordance with the resolution to 5.182 [233] IBM 182).

**8.69 [546] Seagate 69) Unclear requirement in a note 11 (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 91

See also comment 5.113 [164] IBM 113)

<<after it established how the copy manager shall process tape reads of unknown block length without error.>>  
What is "it"? Mandatory requirements are not allowed to be hidden in notes.

**Editor's note:**

Note 11 currently reads as follows:

It is anticipated that bit 1 of byte 28 in the device type specific target descriptor parameters for stream device types will be used to indicate the value of the SILI bit for read commands, after it established how the copy manager shall process tape reads of unknown block length without error.

It will be changed to read:

It is anticipated that future versions of this standard may use bit 1 of byte 28 in the device type specific target descriptor parameters for stream device types ~~will be used~~ to indicate the value of the SILI bit for read commands, after ~~it is T10 establishes~~ it is to process tape reads of unknown block length without error.

**8.70 [547] Seagate 70) Add specific reference to table 36 (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 94

Change <<general rules are described the clauses>> to "general rules are described in the subclauses referenced in Table 36"

**8.71 [548] Seagate 71) Is EXTENDED COPY residual data handling statement clear? (Rejected)**

PDF page 94

<<If residual destination data is sufficient to perform the output then no data shall be processed. Otherwise, just as much data as needed shall be processed (which may involve reading data from the source device) so that the destination data (which includes any residual destination data from the previous segment) is sufficient. >>

Is this clearer than "do what needs to be done"?

**Response:**

Yes.

**8.72 [549] Seagate 72) Add cross references (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 94

<<The specified number of bytes of inline or embedded data>>

What is "inline data"? What is "embedded data"?

**Editor's note:**

Cross references to the applicable subclauses will be added.

**8.73 [550] Seagate 73) Identify where 'processing' is described (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 95

<<The data movement shall not involve "processing" as described here.>> Where?

**Editor's note:**

The text identified by the comment will be changed to: "The data movement shall not involve processing as described ~~here~~ in this subclause."

**8.74 [551] Seagate 74) Identify where 'processing' is described (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 98

Global/Clause 7.5.7

<<The BLOCK DEVICE NUMBER OF BLOCKS field specifies the length, in source logical blocks, of data to be processed in the segment.>>

What does processed mean?

**Editor's note:**

The following steps will be taken to resolve this comment.

1) create a new subclause numbered 7.5.7.2 such that:

- 7.5.7.1 = Segment descriptors introduction <was overview>
- 7.5.7.2 = Segment descriptor processing <new subclause>
- 7.5.7.3 = Block device to stream device operations <was 7.5.7.2>

2) Place in the new 7.5.7.2 all the text marked with change bars in the current 7.5.7.1. (N.B. this is all the text added recently to clarify PAD/CAT processing.)

3) In the vacancy left by the text moved to 7.5.7.2 (where a description of the CAT bit should be, place the following paragraph/sentence: "The CAT bit is described in 7.5.7.2."

4) At the end of the sentence quoted in the comment, add "(see 7.5.7.2)". Also, add a similar cross reference to the first usage of the word "processed" in each subclause describing a segment descriptor type.

5) All cross references to 7.5.7.1 will be check and those related to the processing of data will be changed to 7.5.7.2.

### **8.75 [552] Seagate 75) How can the TUR bit be optional? (Rejected)**

PDF page 106

<<If a TUR value of one is supported and the TUR bit contains one, then a TEST UNIT READY command (see 7.28) shall be used to determine the readiness of the device. If a TUR value of one is not supported and the TUR bit contains one,>>

But the TEST UNIT READY command is mandatory. What gives?

#### **Reason for rejection:**

The TEST UNIT READY command is mandatory but support for the TUR bit in the segment descriptor is optional.

### **8.76 [553] Seagate 76) Should SPC-2 reference draft or approved standards? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 118

SEE ALSO comment 8.29 [506] Seagate 29)

Table 55 is another example of instances of bumping up the standard version (e.g., SBC-2 versus SBC) without due cause.

### **8.77 [554] Seagate 77) Would an acronym be helpful? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 119

An acronym would be just as helpful for the other standards as it is for SCSI-2.

### **8.78 [555] Seagate 78) REPORT LUNS support when HISUP=0 (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 120

Should "When the HISUP bit is zero, the device server may support the REPORT LUNS command." be added?

### **8.79 [556] Seagate 79) Use 'shall indicate' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 120

<<A Multi Port (MULTIP) bit of one shall indicate>> Should the other bits use this form rather than "indicates"?

#### **Editor's note:**

No. The 'shall' will be removed from this statement. It's fewer changes with no difference in effect and a greater probability of making all the changes correctly.

**8.80 [557] Seagate 80) Is MCHNGR embedded in device or vice versa? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 120

<<A medium changer (MCHNGR) bit of one indicates that the device is embedded within or attached to a medium transport element. See SMC-2 for details about medium changers, including a device model for an attached medium changer device. The MCHNGR bit is valid only when the RMB bit is equal to one. A MCHNGR bit of zero indicates that the device is not embedded within or attached to a medium transport element.>>

Isn't this inside out or backwards?

**8.81 [558] Seagate 81) Change 'upto' to 'up to'. (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 121

SEE ALSO comment 7.42 [426] Quantum 42)

Change <<upto> to "up to".

**8.82 [559] Seagate 82) Parameters effect initiators (Unresolved)**

PDF page 133

<<parameters in effect for the application client>>

Parameters are in effect for initiators not application clients per se.

**8.83 [560] Seagate 83) Why define the additional length field so many times? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 139

SEE ALSO comment 8.85 [562] Seagate 85)

<<If the length is not sufficient to contain the entire parameter list, the first portion of the list shall be returned. This shall not be considered an error.>>

This does not quite cover the zero length case due to using wording different than is standard for most commands. Why is it specified twice (here and with the parameter data)?

**8.84 [561] Seagate 84) Change singular to plural (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 140

I suggest changing <<persistent reservation(s), if any, that is present>> to "persistent reservations, if any, that are present".

**8.85 [562] Seagate 85) Why define the ADDITIONAL LENGTH field so many times? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 141

SEE ALSO comment 8.83 [560] Seagate 83)

Why define the ADDITIONAL LENGTH field so many times?



**8.86 [563] Seagate 86) Definition of field value of LU (Unresolved)**

PDF page 142

SEE ALSO comment 5.160 [211] IBM 160)

<<A SCOPE field value of LU shall indicate that the persistent reservation applies to the entire logical unit.>>

The acronym LU is defined only in the notes of a distant table. Ordinarily notes in a table only apply to the table in which they occur. I think LU should be defined in the abbreviations or here. Another alternative would be to use the words. Note that two paragraphs later the acronym is not used. Strive for consistency.

**8.87 [564] Seagate 86a) Use 'in an initiator' not 'on an initiator' (Unresolved)**

Global &amp; Page 143

Change <<Any application client on any initiator>> to "Any application client in any initiator".

As a global comment "on" is often used providing distorted meaning. "Sitting on" does not convey "residing in."

**8.88 [565] Seagate 87) Application clients can't execute tasks (Unresolved)**

PDF page 143

<<application client on any initiator may execute tasks that request transfers>>

In SCSI parlance I think this and any other instances should be "application client in any initiator may initiate tasks that request transfers" but may be it is not a task until it resides in the LU and so perhaps "application client in any initiator may request transfers"

**8.89 [566] Seagate 88) Delete 'if required' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 144

<<and use the PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command to preempt that reservation if required.>>

Delete "if required".

**8.90 [567] Seagate 89) PREEMPT AND ABORT definition error (Unresolved)**

PDF page 145

<<Preempts persistent reservations from another initiator and aborts the task set for the preempted initiator>>

What if the task set architecture is all initiators per LU?

Should this be "Preempts persistent reservations from another initiator and aborts the tasks for the preempted initiator"?

**8.91 [568] Seagate 90) Obsolete function in PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT (Unresolved)**

PDF page 146

<<All fields shall be sent on all PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT commands, even if the field is not required for the specified service action and scope values.>>

In this case should it be specified that if the Obsolete function is not supported Bytes 22 and 23 shall be zero? (I do not recall a prior requirement to originate an obsolete function and am not sure what the precedent should be. Perhaps the reader should be left to look in SPC to see what to put in the bytes. The latter is the position I took on another comment. But in both comments it may be OK to specify the behavior that would have applied to SCSI devices that did not support the Obsolete function.)

**8.92 [569] Seagate 91) Clarify 'zero filling' requirement (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 146

Change <<zero filled in the most significant bytes to fit the field.>> to "zero filled in the most significant bits to fit the field."

**8.93 [570] Seagate 92) Clarify APTPL bit description (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 147

Change <<The APTPL bit PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT parameter is not summarized in table 83, since it is specified above.>> to "The APTPL bit PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT parameter, specified above, is not summarized in table 83."

**8.94 [571] Seagate 93) Add MSB/LSB to BUFFER CAPACITY field (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 152

I think the BUFFER CAPACITY field should include the designations of MSB and LSB.

**8.95 [572] Seagate 94) What does 'immediately' mean? (Accepted, Substantive)**

PDF page 154

See also comment 5.180 [231] IBM 180)

**Requires SNIA-BWG Review**

In Table 93 what does <<immediately>> mean in terms of the SCSI architecture?

**Editor's notes:**

The following changes will be made to address this comment.

- 1) The heading for the fourth column of the table will be changed from "Returns Data" to "Returns Data While EXTENDED COPY Is In Progress".
- 2) The fourth column entries for codes 0h and 3h will be changed from "Immediately" to "Yes".
- 3) The fourth column entry for code 01h will be changed from "When identified command has completed" to "No".
- 4) The fourth column entry for code 04h will be changed from "Immediately" to "No". This is undoubtedly a substantive (but common sense) change.

**Notes to the SNIA-BWG:**

I feel fairly strongly that the change described in 4) above is required.

There is an optional additional change to consider. The effect of making this change is to require the device server (or copy manager) to terminate RECEIVE COPY RESULTS commands requesting data while an EXTENDED COPY is in progress. The effect of not making the change is to allow the device server to take any action it wants when RECEIVE COPY RESULTS command requests data while an EXTENDED COPY is in progress (e.g., terminate the command, stall the command until the EXTENDED COPY finishes, or stall the command for a short time and then terminate). I am unsure about the benefits of stalling RECEIVE COPY RESULTS commands and/or leaving the device server's actions unspecified, but will honor you all's wishes.

5) In 7.17.3 and 7.17.5 before the parameter data format table, add the following:

If the LIST IDENTIFIER field of a RECEIVE COPY RESULTS CDB identifies an EXTENDED COPY command that still is being processed by the copy manager, the command shall be terminated with a CHECK CONDITION status. The sense key shall be set to ILLEGAL REQUEST and the additional sense code shall be set to INVALID FIELD IN CDB.

### **8.96 [573] Seagate 95) Values => 02h conflict with ISO/IEC standards (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 156

SEE ALSO comments 1.30 [30] Brocade 30), 5.186 [237] IBM 186), and 7.58 [442] Quantum 58)

In Table 96 values => 02h are wrong according to international standards.

**Editor's notes:**

As far as the editor can tell, value 01h is wrong too. The response to comment 1.30 [30] Brocade 30) contains the resolution for this comment.

### **8.97 [574] Seagate 96) Insufficient allocation length in FAILED SEGMENT DETAILS (Rejected)**

PDF page 161

<<the AVAILABLE DATA field shall not be altered and the failed segment details shall not be discarded.>>

Does this mean the details transferred are also retained? If all the details were transferred is anything discarded?

**Reasons for rejection:**

The editor is hard pressed to see what's wrong with the identified text, particularly since very similar text describing held data (PDF page 157) caused no comment.

Regarding the question: "If all the details were transferred is anything discarded?" The answer is "yes" and the requirement is covered in list entry a) on the previous page.

Regarding the question: "Does this mean the details transferred are also retained?" The intended answer is "yes" and that might be clarified by changing: "...the failed segment details shall not be discarded" to "...none of the failed segment details shall be discarded" However, the editor believes that such a change degrades the clarity of the text because the negative has been moved several words away from the "shall" requirement. Wording changes that do not rely on the use of "discarded" might also be considered, however the concept of discarding

data was well established by the lettered list and thus abandoning it should be based on a stronger reason than this.

### **8.98 [575] Seagate 97) Note describing the 50 reserved FAILED SEGMENT DETAILS bytes (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 161

SEE ALSO comments 5.198 [249] IBM 198) and 7.62 [446] Quantum 62)

Delete <<The fields still being discussed are not good candidates for inclusion in a separate service action because they need to be created and discarded under the same circumstances as the fields already defined. The inclusion of an indefinite length sense data field is a step of significant value.>> and consider deleting <<Possible uses include indicating the number of successful, failed, and indeterminate transfer operations to source and destination copy targets device. >>

#### **Editor's note:**

The authors of the corrections to EXTENDED COPY had anticipated being required to remove note 33 in its entirety. They will be pleased to see that they get to keep the first sentence.

### **8.99 [576] Seagate 98) Handling of obsolete RELEASE bits (Unresolved)**

PDF page 165

SEE ALSO comment 8.103 [580] Seagate 102)

Delete <<Obsolete Bits 1 through 4 of Byte 1 provided a method, limited to device addresses 0 through 7, to handle third-party reservations in earlier versions of the SCSI standard. The obsolete method has been replaced by the RESERVE(10) and RELEASE(10). If Byte 1, Bit 4 is equal to one device servers not implementing the obsolete method shall terminate the command with CHECK CONDITION status and the sense key shall be set to ILLEGAL REQUEST.>> The definition of Obsolete does not provide for redefining the requirements and in fact stabilizes the definitions forever.

### **8.100 [577] Seagate 99) Information on what? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 172

<<For additional information see SSC.>>

Information on what?

### **8.101 [578] Seagate 100) Change 'is' to 'are' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 173

Change <<sense codes not explicitly required by this standard is optional.>> to "sense codes not explicitly required by this standard are optional."

But why are they optional and not vendor specific.

**Editor's note:**

'is' is correct because its number is established by 'support'. 'codes' is part of a prepositional phrase and thus cannot establish the number of the verb 'is'.

Would it be clearer to say: "Support for the additional sense codes shown in table 115 but not explicitly required elsewhere in this standard is optional."

**8.102 [579] Seagate 101) Use 'cached' not 'buffered' (Unresolved)**

PDF page 176

Note 43 discusses buffered operations. All SCSI operations are buffered. I think the intended topic is write cached operations and the text should be adjusted accordingly.

**8.103 [580] Seagate 102) Handling of obsolete RESERVE bits (Unresolved)**

PDF page 193

SEE ALSO comment 8.99 [576] Seagate 98)

<<Obsolete Bits 1 through 4 of Byte 1 provided a method, limited to device addresses 0 through 7, to handle third-party reservations in earlier versions of the SCSI standard. The obsolete method has been replaced by the RESERVE(10) and RELEASE(10). If Byte 1, Bit 4 is equal to one device servers not implementing the obsolete method shall terminate the command with CHECK CONDITION status and the sense key shall be set to ILLEGAL REQUEST.>> Also the next paragraph.

See comment 8.99 [576] Seagate 98) on obsolete functions.

**8.104 [581] Seagate 103) Concerns about 'concerns' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 195

SEE ALSO comment 7.76 [460] Quantum 76)

Change to <<and service action concerns all SCSI devices.>> to "and service action is applicable to all SCSI devices."

**Editor's note:**

Resolution will be as per comment 7.76 [460] Quantum 76).

**8.105 [582] Seagate 104) Unacceptable field names (Unresolved)**

PDF page 196

<<See SCC-2>> is not an acceptable bit name. This causes an unwarranted purchase of SCC-2.

**8.106 [583] Seagate 105) Left justify 2nd column of table 132 (Unresolved)**PDF page 207 **processed**

Left justification should be used in the second column of Table 132.

**Editor's note:**

The format of table 132 is identical to its ancestors, table 82 in SCSI-2 and table 83 in SPC. The editor can think of no justification for changing the format of the table.

**8.107 [584] Seagate 106) What does xx mean? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 211

In Table 136 what does xx mean?

**8.108 [585] Seagate 107) Too many notes (e.g., note 52) (Unresolved)**PDF page 212 **processed**

What is the compulsion of having so many notes. <<NOTE 52 The per unit of time count basis is device type specific. Direct-access devices typically use a latency period (i.e., one revolution of the medium) as the unit of time.>>

Does anyone know who determined this was typical and what the statistical requirements are for typical?

**Editor's note:**

The content of note 52 is identical to its ancestors, note 95 in SCSI-2 and note 46 in SPC.

**8.109 [586] Seagate 108) What is 'steady state'? (Unresolved)**

PDF page 221

<<while the device is operating at a steady state>>

What does this mean?

Does this mean operating without any commands for a long time?

Does this mean operating with the same command at the same exact intervals?

The above questions are asked to understand why a 3 degree Celsius tolerance is specified without specifying the accuracy of the environment.

**8.110 [587] Seagate 109) Add ISO/IEC JTC 1 web site (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 268

PDF page 300

<<possible via the NCITS world wide web site (<http://www.ncits.org>), the ANSI world wide web site (<http://www.ansi.org>), the IEC site (<http://www.iec.ch/>), or the ISO site (<http://www.iso.ch/>).>>

Another possibility is the ISO/IEC JTC 1 web site <http://www.jtc1.org/>

**9. Texas Instruments**

Texas Instruments principle representative Paul Aloisi submitted a Yes vote with the following comments.

**9.1 [588] TI 1) Old John Lohmeyer email address (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 2

John Lohmeyer's email address needs to be updated.

**9.2 [589] TI 2) Figure 1 is not a roadmap (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 29

SEE ALSO comments 5.3 [54] IBM 3) and 8.5 [482] Seagate 5)

I don't consider Figure 1 a roadmap, it is a structure of the SCSI standards, paragraph under figure 1.

**Editor's note:**

This comment will be resolved as described in comment 8.5 [482] Seagate 5).

**10. Other comments**

During the processing of the letter ballot response, several addition issues surfaced. These have been gathered in this section to be handled as if they had been made as comments on the letter ballot.

**10.1 [590] O1) Gardner - Restrict Variable Length CDB Size (Rejected)**

Marked technical by comment author

PDF page 43, page 15, clause 4.4, 2nd paragraph after table 5

The SPI (packetized) and FCP-2 Information Unit definitions effectively restrict the length of a variable length CDB to 140 bytes whereas SPC-2 has an implied restriction of 260 bytes. SPC-2 needs to be modified to reflect the tighter restrictions in the lower layer protocols.

SPC-2 defines variable length CDBs with a one byte ADDITIONAL CDB LENGTH field. The only constraint is that it contain a multiple of 4, implying a maximum CDB length of 252+8 or 260 bytes.

FCP and SPI-3/4 define an ADDITIONAL CDB LENGTH field that is the length beyond 16 bytes divided by 4. It is limited to five bits, implying a maximum CDB length of (31\*4)+16 or 140 bytes.

Reduce the maximum size of a variable length CDB by modifying the last sentence in the paragraph describing the ADDITIONAL CDB LENGTH field to read: "This value in the ADDITIONAL CDB LENGTH field shall be a multiple of 4 and shall not exceed 132."

Note: the total length of a variable length CDB is the 8 plus the value in the ADDITIONAL CDB LENGTH field.

### **Reason for rejection:**

The problem will be resolved by increasing the CDB size allowed by the protocols (FCP-2 and SPI-4).

### **10.2 [591] O2) Suhler - Change 'and etc.' to just 'etc.' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 77, page 49, clause 7.5.1, 2nd sentence after table 21

The sentence ends in "...and etc." "And" is redundant as "et cetera" means "and other." Therefore, the "and" should be deleted.

### **10.3 [592] O3) Elliott - Change 'aproved' to 'approved' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF pages 281-287, pages 253-259, table C.2, note 2

The text of table C.2 note 2 contains 'aproved' when the correct spelling is 'approved'.

### **10.4 [593] O4) Elliott - Change 'consderation' to 'consideration' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF pages 281-287, pages 253-259, table C.2, note 6

The text of table C.2 note 6 contains 'consderation' when the correct spelling is 'consideration'.

### **10.5 [594] O5) McKean - Incorrect table references (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF pages 242 - 247, pages 214 - 219, clauses 8.4.3 - 8.4.6  
SEE ALSO comment 6.12 [383] LSI 12)

The first paragraph of 8.4.3 incorrectly references table 107 instead of table 176. Note 62 contains "see table 111". probably should be "see table 177" [ed. it should be table 178 and noted in comment 6.12 [383] LSI 12)]. The first paragraph of 8.4.5 incorrectly references table 114 instead of table 184. The first paragraph of 8.4.6 incorrectly references table 115 instead of table 185.



**10.6 [595] O6) Katata - Missing MMC-2 ASC/ASCQ Assignments (Accepted, Substantive)**

PDF pages 178 - 190, pages 150 - 162, clause 7.23.6, table 115

PDF pages 258 - 280, pages 240 - 252, clause C.2, table C.1

Add the following ASC/ASCQ definitions with 'R' (C/DVD devices) as the device type:

18/08 RECOVERD DATA WITH LINKING  
 21/02 INVALID ADDRESS FOR WRITE  
 27/06 CONDITIONAL WRITE PROTECT  
 2C/06 PERSISTENT PREVENT CONFLICT  
 31/02 ZONED FORMATTING FAILED DUE TO SPARE LINKING  
 51/01 ERASE FAILURE - INCOMPLETE ERASE OPERATION DETECTED  
 5D/03 SPARE AREA EXHAUSTION PREDICTION THRESHOLD EXCEEDED

**10.7 [596] O7) Katata - Incorrect ASC/ASCQ (Accepted, Substantive)**

PDF pages 178 - 190, pages 150 - 162, clause 7.23.6, table 115

PDF pages 258 - 280, pages 240 - 252, clause C.2, table C.1

Change the description for the 73/06 ASC/ASCQ from " RMA/PMA IS FULL" to " RMA/PMA IS ALMOST FULL".

**10.8 [597] O8) Katata - ASC/ASCQ Conflict Between MMC-2 & EXTENDED COPY (Accepted, Substantive)**

PDF pages 178 - 190, pages 150 - 162, clause 7.23.6, table 115

PDF pages 258 - 280, pages 240 - 252, clause C.2, table C.1

For the following ASC/ASCQ assignments change the ASC from 2Eh to 0Dh:

2E/00 ERROR DETECTED BY THIRD PARTY TEMPORARY INITIATOR  
 2E/01 THIRD PARTY DEVICE FAILURE  
 2E/02 COPY TARGET DEVICE NOT REACHABLE  
 2E/03 INCORRECT COPY TARGET DEVICE TYPE  
 2E/04 COPY TARGET DEVICE DATA UNDERRUN  
 2E/05 COPY TARGET DEVICE DATA OVERRUN

Then make the following ASC/ASCQ assignment:

2E/00 INSUFFICIENT TIME FOR OPERATION

**10.9 [598] O9) Weber - Missing TOC entries and bookmarks (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF pages 39, 44, &amp; 248, pages 11, 16, &amp; 220, clauses 4.1, 5.1, and 9.1

There are no table of contents entries or bookmarks for subclauses 4.1, 5.1, and 9.1.

**10.10 [599] O10) Elliott - 'other' unclear (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 57, page 29, clause 5.5.3.6.1, 1st paragraph after 2nd bulleted list  
 PDF page 58, page 30, clause 5.5.3.6.2, bullet (c) in 1st bulleted list on page

The the intent of 'other' is unclear in the phrase '...the device server shall establish a unit attention condition for all the other registered initiators...' Does it mean means "other than the initiator that issued the PREEMPT AND ABORT" or "other than the initiator holding the reservation." George and I agree the former was intended.

**Editor's note:**

The text in question will be replaced with '...the device server shall establish a unit attention condition for all registered initiators other than the initiator that issued the PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command with PREEMPT AND ABORT service action...'

**10.11 [600] O11) Weber - Add 'LBA' acronym (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 36, page 8, clause 3.2

Since the acronym 'LBA' is now used in a table title, it needs to be added to the acronyms glossary.

**10.12 [601] O12) Weber - Explain field value usage (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 38, page 10, clause 3.4

In order to reduce the confusion exhibited in comment 7.16 [400] Quantum 16), add the following sentence to the end of the second paragraph: "The contents of a field or the value in a field may be referenced using the field name not in small caps."

**10.13 [602] O13) Quicksall - 'log page' not 'mode page' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 288, page 260, clause C.4, Log Page Codes

Since this clause contains the informative table of log page code assignments, change 'mode page' to 'log page' in the sentence describing the table.

**10.14 [603] O14) Weber - 'PERSISTENT RESERVE IN/OUT' not 'P... RESERVATION ...' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 50, page 22, table 8

The command is PERSISTENT RESERVE IN not PERSISTENT RESERVATION IN and likewise PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT not PERSISTENT RESERVATION OUT.

**10.15 [604] O15) Weber - APTPL s/b small caps (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 55, page 27, 3.5.3.4, 3rd a,b,c list

APTPL should be APTPL since it is a field name.

**10.16 [605] O16) Elliott- SES Amendment version descriptor (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 291, page 263, Table C.5

Add version descriptor codes as follows:

01DDh - SES T10/1212 revision 08b with SES Amendment ANSI NCITS.305/AM1:2000  
 01DEh - SES ANSI NCITS.305:1998 with SES Amendment ANSI NCITS.305/AM1:2000

**10.17 [606] O17) Elliott - 'SCSI Parallel Bus' not 'SCSI-2 ...' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 232, page 204, 8.3.7, 1st paragraph

Change "SCSI-2 parallel bus" to "SCSI parallel bus".

**10.18 [607] O18) T10 - Incorporate TASK ABORTED status (Accepted, Substantive)**

PDF page 61, page 33, 5.5.3.6.4, bullet b)

PDF page 229, page 201, 8.3.6, table 161

PDP page 230, page 202, 8.3.6, between 2nd and 3rd paragraphs after table 164

Incorporate T10 approved document Task Aborted - SAM changes (00-229r3).

**10.19 [608] O19) Elliott - 'additional sense code' usage differs from glossary (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 38, page 10, 3.4, 1st paragraph

PDF page 78, page 50, 7.5.1, 1st paragraph after note

PDF page 147, page 119, 7.14.3, 1st paragraph on page

PDF page 167, page 139, 7.21, 4th paragraph after table 105

PDF page 168, page 140, 7.22, note 37

PDF page 197, page 169, 7.28, table 124

PDF page 261, page 233, A.5.2, list entry 4) 1)

PDF page 261, page 233, A.5.3, list entry 4) 1)

In 3.4 (Conventions), change "additional sense codes, and additional sense code qualifiers" to "additional sense codes".

In 7.5.1 (EXTENDED COPY Command), 7.14.3 (PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT parameter list), 7.21 (REPORT DEVICE IDENTIFIER command), 7.22 (REPORT LUNS command), A.5.2 (Pseudocode 2), and A.5.3 (Pseudocode 3), change "additional sense data" to "additional sense code".

In table 124, change "ASC and ASCQ" heading to "Additional Sense Code".

**10.20 [609] O20) Houlder - Change SEND DIAGNOSTIC from 'O' to 'Z' (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF page 66, page 38, 7.1, table 10

Because some command sets make the SEND DIAGNOSTIC command mandatory and some make it optional, it's entry in table 10 should be changed from 'O' to 'Z'.

**10.21 [610] O21) Penokie - Two variable length CDB sizes (Accepted, Substantive)**

PDF page 43, page 15, 4.4, 4th paragraph after table 5

There are two CDB length values for the variable length CDB, one in the CDB itself and one in the protocol's information unit (aka packet). The behavior expected when these two values disagree needs to be specified.

**Editor's notes:**

The following sentences will be added at the end of the paragraph describing the ADDITIONAL CDB LENGTH field:

If the number of CDB bytes delivered by the service delivery subsystem is not sufficient to contain the number of bytes specified by the ADDITIONAL CDB LENGTH field, the command shall be terminated with a CHECK

CONDITION status. The sense key shall be set to ILLEGAL REQUEST and the additional sense code shall be set to INVALID FIELD IN CDB.

Document 00-269 contains the restructured subclause including the changes agreed in response to this comment. Any further revisions to the restructuring will be reflected solely in revisions to 00-269.

### 10.22 [611] O22) CAP WG - Don't use 'power off' (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 53, page 25, 5.5.3.2, before each of two lists that don't cross the page boundary

PDF page 57, page 29, 5.5.3.6.1, last paragraph before last list

See also comment ] CPQ 1B)

On PDF page 53, change two (2) instances of "... across any power off period:" to "... across any power cycle:"

On PDF page 57, change from:

"A persistent reservation may also be released by a power off, if the APTPL capability is not enabled. When the most recent aptpl value received by the device server is zero (see 7.14.3), a power off/on cycle:"

to:

"A persistent reservation may also be released by a loss of power off, if the persist through power loss capability is not enabled. When the most recent APTPL value received by the device server is zero (see 7.14.3), a power ~~off/on~~ cycle:"

### 10.23 [612] O23) Weber - 'valid' s/b small caps (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 81, page 53, clause 7.5.3, item d

"...and the valid bit shall be set to 1." should be "...and the VALID bit shall be set to one."

### 10.24 [613] O24) Weber - 'stream' s/b 'sequential-access' (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 91, page 63, clause 7.5.6.8

In the subclause heading replace 'stream' with 'sequential-access'.

### 10.25 [614] O25) Elliott - QAS/IU wording should match SPI (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 126, page 98, 7.6.3, last three paragraphs in clause

Change the last three paragraphs in the clause from:

A quick arbitrate supported (QAS) bit of one indicates that the device server supports the quick arbitrate feature. A value of zero indicates that the device server does not support the quick arbitrate feature.

An information unit supported (IUS) bit of one indicates that the device server supports information units. A value of zero indicates that the device server does not support information units.

NOTE 17 The acronyms ST and DT and the terms 'quick arbitrate' and 'information units' are defined in SPI-3.

to:

A quick arbitration and selection supported (QAS) bit of one indicates that the device server supports the quick arbitration and selection. A value of zero indicates that the device server does not support the quick arbitration and selection.

An information units supported (IUS) bit of one indicates that the device server supports information unit transfers. A value of zero indicates that the device server does not support information unit transfers.

NOTE 17 The acronyms ST and DT and the terms 'quick arbitration and selection' and 'information units' are defined in SPI-3, SPI-4, and possibly later revisions of the SCSI parallel interface standard.

### **10.26 [615] O26) Elliott - N\_Port means Fibre Channel (Accepted, Editorial)**

PDF pages 86-87, pages 58-59, 7.5.6.3 and 7.5.6.4, subclause and table titles

Since 7.5.6.5 is call "Parallel Interface ...", 7.5.6.3 and 7.5.6.4 should be called "Fibre Channel ...". This affects both the subclause headings and the table titles.

### 10.27 [616] O27) Elliott - World Wide Name is not just for Fibre Channel (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF page 85, page 57, 7.5.6.2

SEE ALSO comment 5.105 [156] IBM 105)

In section 7.5.6.2 the text and note 10 refers to N\_Port and FC-PH. I don't think anything in this target descriptor is Fibre Channel specific, so a generic term like "transport address" should be used instead and Fibre Channel should be an example.

Proposed rewording:

The WORLD WIDE NAME field shall contain the port World Wide Name. For Fibre Channel, this is defined by the Physical Log In (PLOGI) extended link service in FC-PH.

NOTE 10 The World Wide Name target descriptor format burdens the copy manager with translating the World Wide Name to a transport address (for Fibre Channel, the N\_Port identifier (see 7.5.6.3)).

#### Editor's Notes:

The current text reads:

The WORLD WIDE NAME field shall contain the port World Wide Name defined by the Physical Log In (PLOGI) extended link service, defined in FC-PH.

NOTE 10 The World Wide Name target descriptor format burdens the copy manager with translating the World Wide Name to an N\_Port identifier (see 7.5.6.3).

Including the changes made in response to comment 5.105 [156] IBM 105) the text will be changed to read:

The WORLD WIDE NAME field shall contain the port World Wide Name (e.g., the World Wide Name defined by the Physical Log In (PLOGI) extended link service, defined in FC-FS).

NOTE 10 The World Wide Name target descriptor format burdens the copy manager with translating the World Wide Name to a transport address. When the target device is accessed using Fibre Channel, this means translating the World Wide Name to an FC-FS port D ID.

### 10.28 [617] O??) Update Vendor Identifier List (Accepted, Editorial)

PDF pages 300-306

Insert the latest Vendor Identifier list.