

Draft Minutes

Joint T10-T11.3 Working Group Ad Hoc Meeting

January 15, 2001 – Orlando, FL 12:00 noon – 9:00 PM

A joint meeting of NCITS Technical Committee T10 and NCITS Technical Committee T11 Task Group T11.3 was held at Orlando, Florida on January 15, 2001, in conjunction with the plenary meeting of the ANSI/NCITS T10 Technical Committee. Attendance at this meeting is tabulated at the end of this document.

These minutes were prepared by Bob Nixon, secretary (bob.nixon@emulex.com). Requests for corrections should be sent to him and copied to the T10 reflector.

1. Introductions: Group

Facilitator Dave Peterson opened the meeting at 11:12 AM, thanked our host company, Adaptec, and led a round of introductions.

2. Approval of agenda [T10-01-039r0](#) or [T11-01-002v0](#): Group

The agenda was approved as presented.

3. Approval of minutes:

3.1 12/6/00 working group minutes [T10-01-017r0](#): Bob Nixon

Approved as written.

Note to secretary: T10-01-040r0 has been reserved for this meeting's minutes

4. Review of old action items: Bob Nixon

There are no open action items

5. Discussion items:

None were presented.

6. FCP-2:

6.1 Status of FCP-2 Specification [T10-fcp2r05](#)

The group intends to reach approved resolutions to all letter ballot issues at this meeting. Given that, the editor will prepare a new revision of the draft standard to submit to T10 at the March T10 plenary meeting.

6.2 FCP-2 Letter Ballot Comments [T10-00-034r1](#)

There was no discussion of the letter ballot comments separate from the discussion of the proposed resolutions reported below.

6.2.1 Added during the meeting:

Jim Coomes: An initiator logs in to an initiator. Neither has target capability. One sends the other a command. The recipient is not willing to process the command. What should be done?

6.3 FCP-2 Letter Ballot Comment Resolutions [T10-01-030r0](#): Bob Snively

6.3.1 Overview

Bob has accepted many comments that he considered uncontroversial. Only those with technical content or uncertainty to him were raised for discussion.

Unless otherwise noted, approval of a resolution was by lack of any objection from the commenter or those present at the meeting.

6.3.2 D. Peterson / Cisco

6.3.2.1 Resolution 1.2 was approved.

6.3.2.2 Resolution 1.15 was approved if modified as follows: In general references to “class-independent” will be qualified as needed to assure that they communicate that the recovery mechanism is class-independent though class-specific behavior required by FC-FS may be shown in addition for clarity.

6.3.2.3 Resolution 1.19 was approved if modified as follows: In the text at issue, change the wording “requires” to “intends to use”.

6.3.2.4 Resolution 1.20 was approved.

6.3.2.5 Resolution 1.21 was approved.

6.3.2.6 Resolution 1.22 was approved.

6.3.2.7 Resolution 1.23 seemed to suggest a technical change, so
Moved and seconded and approved by voice vote to accept the comment and resolve it by “removing the offending sentence”

6.3.2.8 Resolution 1.25 was approved.

6.3.2.9 Resolution 1.26 was approved based on prior approved resolution to 1.15.

6.3.3 R. Elliott / Compaq

6.3.3.1 Resolution 2.3 re table 6:

Moved and seconded and passed (7Y, 2N, 2A) that the action of a target on shared mode pages be unspecified upon PRLI with no other processes logged in (table 6 in FCP-2 rev 5)

Resolution 2.3 re table 4 was approved with a minor change in formatting.

Resolution 2.3 re section 6.3.4 was approved.

6.3.3.2 Resolution 2.4 was approved as follows:

Moved and seconded and passed (10Y, 0N, 3A) to make it the same as SPI section 10.1.

6.3.3.3 Resolution 2.5 was approved.

6.3.3.4 Resolution 2.6 was changed to denote the fields at issue as “restricted” and define “restricted” to indicate that the field is used in another standard but reserved in this standard.

6.3.3.5 Resolution 2.11 was approved.

6.3.4 N. Wanamaker / Crossroads

6.3.4.1 Resolution 4.4 was approved with “Common” replaced by “Common”..

6.3.4.2 Resolution 4.5 was approved.

6.3.4.3 Resolution 4.7 was approved.

6.3.4.4 Resolution 4.11 was approved.

6.3.4.5 Resolution 4.13 was approved.

6.3.4.6 Resolution 4.14 was approved.

6.3.4.7 Resolution 4.16: The questioned comment was explained and with a minor tweak, the resolution was accepted.

6.3.4.8 Resolution 4.17 was approved with a minor change to the rewording of the first sentence of paragraph 2 of 6.3.1:

Moved and seconded and passed without objection that all the bits now defined are to be documented as capabilities, not requirements.

- 6.3.4.9 Resolution 4.18 was approved with addition of an explicit reference to the definition of the Image Pair Established bit.
- 6.3.4.10 Resolution 4.20 was approved.
- 6.3.4.11 Resolution 4.22 was approved.
- 6.3.4.12 Resolution 4.23 was approved.
- 6.3.4.13 Resolution 4.25 was approved.
- 6.3.4.14 Resolution 4.26 was approved.
- 6.3.4.15 Resolution 4.27 was approved.
- 6.3.4.16 Resolution 4.29 was approved.
- 6.3.4.17 Resolution 4.31 was approved.
- 6.3.4.18 Resolution 4.32 was approved with the addition of “for different topologies” to the last sentence of note 1 table 34.
- 6.3.4.19 Resolution 4.33 was approved.
- 6.3.4.20 Resolution 4.34 was not entirely satisfactory, but the editor was given discretion to resolve the following concern: The main issue is that the original text seems to imply no other recovery action is compliant. In fact other actions are widely used, though the sequence always ends up with the specified actions.

6.3.5 R. Weber / ENDL

- 6.3.5.1 Resolution 5.2 was approved with deletion of “the” as well.
- 6.3.5.2 Resolution 5.3 was not satisfactory. The resolution suggested in the original comment was approved.
- 6.3.5.3 Resolution 5.5 was approved.
- 6.3.5.4 Resolution 5.6 was approved.
- 6.3.5.5 Resolution 5.10: Resolved by changing “execute” to “process”. The editor is given the discretion to use the terminology of [SPI-4](#) if he sees it to be superior.
- 6.3.5.6 Resolution 5.16 was approved with the additional change of “an” to “a”.

6.3.6 G. Penokie / Tivoli

- 6.3.6.1 Resolution 6.10 was approved.
- 6.3.6.2 Resolution 6.15 was approved.

- 6.3.6.3 Resolution 6.16 was approved.
- 6.3.6.4 Resolution 6.17: A new resolution was approved, reflecting that the sentence in question really was describing both a task management activity and a group of not necessarily related FC-2 management activities. The sentence was rewritten as two separate items, one in a note to table 2 and another as descriptive text before or after the table.
- 6.3.6.5 Resolution 6.18 was approved.
- 6.3.6.6 Resolution 6.22 was approved.
- 6.3.6.7 Resolution 6.24 was approved.
- 6.3.6.8 Resolution 6.27 was approved.
- 6.3.6.9 Resolution 6.28 was approved.
- 6.3.6.10 Resolution 6.32 was approved after some discussion.
- 6.3.6.11 Resolution 6.33: Issue was withdrawn.
- 6.3.6.12 Resolution 6.34: For multibit fields, use the hex value of length to fit the field. For single-bit fields, use spelled values.
- 6.3.6.13 Resolution 6.40 was approved.
- 6.3.6.14 Resolution 6.41 was approved.
- 6.3.6.15 Resolution 6.47 was unsatisfactory. The resolution suggested in the original comment was approved.
- 6.3.6.16 Resolution 6.48 was approved.
- 6.3.6.17 Resolution 6.53 was approved but need to make similar changes in annex F.4.
- 6.3.6.18 Resolution 6.54 was approved.
- 6.3.6.19 Resolution 6.55: There was disagreement.
Moved and seconded and approved (9Y, 1N, 3A) to accept the resolution as written.

6.3.6.20 Resolution 6.58 was approved.

6.3.6.21 Resolution 6.60 was approved.

6.3.6.22 Resolution 6.63 was unsatisfactory. The resolution suggested in the original request was approved.

6.3.6.23 Resolution 6.64 was approved.

6.3.6.24 Resolutions 6.65-6.67 was approved after an alternate resolution was rejected.

Moved and seconded and rejected (1Y, 7N, 1A) to remove the questionable definitional material from the acronym list.

6.3.6.25 Resolution 6.71 was approved after an alternate resolution was rejected.

Moved but not seconded to add the symbols in question to the symbols and acronyms list.

- 6.3.6.26 Resolution 6.74 was approved.
- 6.3.6.27 Resolution 6.75 was approved.
- 6.3.6.28 Resolution 6.78 was approved.
- 6.3.6.29 Resolution 6.80 was approved.
- 6.3.6.30 Resolution 6.81 was approved.
- 6.3.6.31 Resolution 6.89 was approved.
- 6.3.6.32 Resolution 6.96 was approved with addition of “, if implemented, “ before “shall”.
- 6.3.6.33 Resolution 6.108 was approved (see vote on same issue at 6.55).
- 6.3.6.34 Resolution 6.109 was approved (see vote on same issue at 6.55).
- 6.3.6.35 Resolution 6.110 was approved after being revised to take a reserved bit among the response bit flags to indicate presence of the FCP_BIDIRECTIONAL_RESID and move the latter. Need also to note that a reject based on nonsupport of bidi shall be in a non-bidi format.

6.3.7 J. Lohmeyer / LSI

- 6.3.7.1 Resolution 7.5 was approved with the understanding to format as suggested in [SPI-3](#) and obtain the list from John Lohmeyer.
- 6.3.7.2 Resolution 7.6 was approved with the understanding to format as for T10 list, and get the list from T11.
- 6.3.7.3 Resolution 7.7 was approved with the understanding to format and position as suggested in [SPI-3](#) and get the list from NCITS.

6.3.8 G. Houlder / Seagate

- 6.3.8.1 Resolution 8.6 was approved (fixed by resolution of 2.3).
- 6.3.8.2 Resolution 8.10: The section reference in the original comment was correct, not as assumed in the resolution. Given that, the resolution was approved.
- 6.3.8.3 Resolution 8.11 was approved.
- 6.3.8.4 Resolution 8.12 was approved with the addition of a specific reference to LIP(F7,xx).
- 6.3.8.5 Resolution 8.14 was approved.
- 6.3.8.6 Resolution 8.16 was approved.
- 6.3.8.7 Resolution 8.17 was approved.

6.3.8.8 Resolution 8.26 was unsatisfactory. A rewording of the referenced text to clarify that THIS STANDARD adds no restrictions was approved.

6.3.8.9 Resolution 8.27 was approved.

6.3.8.10 Resolution 8.28 was approved.

6.3.9 P. Aloisi / Texas Instruments

No issues were raised with the proposed resolutions.

6.3.10 Added during the meeting

6.3.10.1 Resolution to Coomes: Make the following clarifications to FCP-2:

- PRLI shall not be initiated by a target-only device.
- If two devices each capable of both initiator and target operation conclude a process login, either may act in either or both modes without further login.
- If an initiator-only device does a process login to another initiator-only device, the second shall accept but with a reason code which rejects establishment of an image pair. This lets it return the process login information without any implication that commands might be accepted.
- If a device receives a command from a device with which it has no image pair in which it acts as target, it shall reject the command and initiate process logout.

7. Unscheduled business:

None was presented.

8. Next meeting requirements:

4 hours will be requested at the February T11 plenary in Huntington Beach, CA.

8 hours will be requested at the March T10 plenary in Dallas TX.

9. Review new action items: Bob Nixon

9.1 Bob Snively to prepare a [new revision of the FCP-2 comment resolution document](#) incorporating the above changes (OPEN 1/15/01).

9.2 Bob Snively to prepare a [new revision of the FCP-2 specification](#) including the resolutions as documented in 01-030v0 and the above changes (OPEN 1/15/01).

10. Adjournment: Group

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 PM.

Joint T10/T11.3 Working Group Meeting Attendance - 01/15/01

Company Represented	Last Name	First Name	Email
Adaptec	Moore	Dennis	dmoore@ix.netcom.com
Amphenol Interconnect	Mable	Bill	mableaipc@aol.com
Brocade	Snively	Bob	rsnively@brocade.com
Cisco Systems	De Santi	Claudio	cds@cisco.com
Cisco Systems	Peterson	Dave	dap@cisco.com
Compaq	Elliott	Rob	robert.elliott@compaq.com
Crossroads	Wanamaker	Neil	ntw@crossroads.com
Emulex	Nixon	Bob	bob.nixon@emulex.com
ENDL	Weber	Ralph	roweber@acm.org
Exabyte	Taylor	Mike	miketa@exabyte.com
Hewlett Packard	Haagens	Randy	randy_haagens@hp.com
IBM	Basham	Rob	robby@us.ibm.com
Nishan	Monia	Charles	cmonia@nishansystems.com
Quantum	Entzel	Paul	paul.entzel@quantum.com
Seagate	Coomes	Jim	jim_coomes@seagate.com
Seagate	Suhler	Paul	Paul_A_Suhler@seagate.com
StorageTek	Oetting	Erich	
Sun	Moe	Ken	kenneth_moe@sun.com
Tivoli Systems	Penokie	George	gop@us.ibm.com
Unisys	Mathews	Ron	ronald.mathews@unisys.com