

## Draft Minutes

### Joint T10-T11.3 Working Group Ad Hoc Meeting

March 5, 2001 – Dallas, TX,

11:30 AM – 9:00 PM

A joint meeting of NCITS Technical Committee T10 and NCITS Technical Committee T11 Task Group T11.3 was held at Dallas, Texas on March 5, 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.

#### 1. Introductions: Group

Facilitator Dave Peterson opened the meeting at 10:45 AM, thanked our host company, Texas Instruments, and led a round of introductions.

#### 2. Approval of agenda [T10-01-077r0](#) / [T11-01-120v0](#): Group

The agenda was altered to replace the 2 items under section 6 with “Resolve Final Issues with FCP-2 Revision 6”.

#### 3. Approval of minutes:

##### 3.1 2/7/01 working group meeting minutes [T10-01-064r0](#) / [T11-01-082v0](#): Bob Nixon

Approved as written.

#### 4. Review of old action items: Bob Nixon

- 4.1 Bob Snively to prepare a new revision of the FCP-2 specification including the resolutions as documented in [01-030r1](#) (OPEN 1/15/01). CLOSED (see [FCP2R06](#))

#### 5. Discussion items:

##### 5.1 FCP-2 6.109 Response Needs to Change - [T10/01-072r0](#) Ralph Weber

This revives the objection to unparenthesized arithmetic expressions involving successive subtractions: He reiterated the possibility of misinterpretation and added that the parenthesized expression more closely matches the logic of the circumstance.

Bob Snively pointed out there are several instances of this structure, specifically in clauses 9.4.8, F.5.5, and F.5.6.

Ralph proposed that they all be changed as recommended in [01-072r0](#) (to parenthesize the subtracted group). There were no objections.

## 6. FCP-2:

### 6.1 Resolve Final Issues with [FCP-2 Revision 6](#) - Bob Snively

**6.1.1 The following issues were submitted via email or raised by the editor since the letter ballot on version 5 closed. Purely editorial changes are not captured here unless contentious.**

#### 6.1.2 Mode page contents “not specified” - Bob Snively

The currently documented “unspecified” behavior was an earlier agreed resolution to certain letter ballot issues.

The objection is based on a SAM requirement for mode page reset on “hard reset”. There was a good deal of discussion whether FCP-2 has the equivalent of hard reset.

The opposing argument (in favor of the currently documented behavior) is that a user of a shared mode page can not rely on knowing the state of the mode page (other than in specially controlled circumstances) and therefore specifying reset conditions other than hard reset may actually lead to unsupportable expectations.

The current documentation will be retained.

#### 6.1.3 Review of resolutions on image pair establishment - Jim Coomes

Jim Coomes pointed out resolutions 10.2 and 10.4 (in [01-030r2](#)) require P\_RJT but it can not be used in class 3. A proposed alternative was to unconditionally ignore the request and reply with a PRLO. This alternative was supported by text from FC-PLDA. (Note, 10.2 and 10.4 are actually referencing the same place for different issues.)

The alternative was accepted for incorporation into FCP-2.

#### 6.1.4 Unjustified change to SRR reject handling - Neil Wanamaker

12.4.1.7 specifies a case of LS\_RJT with reason code “command not supported” in response to SRR. This should say FCP\_RJT without any condition on the reason code.

This change was accepted.

Also, we will add that the target shall respond to this case the same way if a request is repeated after this response has once been sent as it does if the response has not yet been sent.

#### 6.1.5 Problems with PLOGI collision - J Masker

The first question related to an observation of a dialog between an initiator-only HBA and an initiator/target device. Both initiated port login. The device rejected the login properly as PLOGI collision resolution. The HBA rejected the PLOGI because it was an initiator. Neither attempted to repeat. The fact that the initiator HBA did not accept the original PLOGI was considered an FS violation by the HBA, not to be resolved in FCP-2. No change will be made to FCP-2.

The second question supposed that the HBA had accepted the PLOGI request but as before, received a reject on its own request. FCP-2 has recently clarified that a single PLOGI (the successful one) is sufficient to operate in both target and initiator mode. No change will be made to FCP-2.

#### **6.1.6 Table of Clearing Effects of Initiator Actions; Row for Open Tasks Aborted**

The third detailed case in the row has redundant information: All of the Y answers are superceded by Y answers in the more general case immediately above. In addition, in the row title, the qualification "for the initiator port..." can not exclude any cases. This makes the whole case redundant.

Agreed that the qualification will be removed and the "Y"s changed to "-s.

#### **6.1.7 Table of Clearing Effects of Link Related functions; Row for Open Tasks Aborted**

The third detailed case in the row has redundant information as above: In this table, that makes the whole case redundant.

Agreed that the case will be removed.

#### **6.1.8 Clause "Process\_Associator not supported by FCP Originator or Responder" is redundant**

It is subsumed by the first paragraph of the prior clause.

Agreed it will be removed.

#### **6.1.9 Flag bit**

There is a reference to the Flag bit in FCP\_CDB in the description of the FCP\_CMND IU. The bit is obsolete in [SAM-2](#). If it were set and interpreted by its (obsolete) [SAM](#) definition, it could not be honored.

It was agreed that simply removing the reference was sufficient.

#### **6.1.10 Initiator Discovery of Fabric-attached Targets**

The list of steps includes registration of three name server objects. The list is ordered and implies an ordering that is contrary to current thinking in [FC-MI](#) (FC-4 TYPE should be last).

The group agreed to rewrite these specific steps so that their order is not constrained (vendor-specific). This allows both existing and FC-MI-compliant implementations.

#### **6.1.11 There is a possibly relevant patent**

Notified by Crossroads, only relevant to FCP-2.

The group agreed to use a patent statement like that used in [SPI-3](#).

### **6.2 Status of FCP-2 Specification [T10-fcp2r06](#)**

It was moved by Bob Snively and seconded by Neil Wanamaker to recommend to the T10 plenary that FCP-2 revision 7, composed of [FCP-2 revision 6](#) with the changes agreed today as documented in [01-030r3](#). Passed 7Y-0N-2A

## **7. Unscheduled business:**

None was presented.

## **8. Next meeting requirements:**

No time will be requested at the April T11 plenary in Toronto, ON.

## **9. Review new action items: Bob Nixon**

Bob Snively to prepare 01-030r3 to include the changes agreed today. (OPEN 3/5/01)  
CLOSED ([01-030r3.pdf](#))

Bob Snively to prepare FCP-2 revision 7 to include the changes agreed today. (OPEN 3/5/01)  
CLOSED ([fcp2r7.pdf](#))

Dave Peterson to request T10 to accept the comment resolutions documented in [01-030r3](#)  
and to forward [FCP-2 revision 7](#) to ANSI for further processing. (OPEN 3/5/01) CLOSED  
(see minutes of T10 plenary 3/8/01. [01-091r0.pdf](#))

## **10. Adjournment: Group**

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM.

**Joint T10/T11.3 Working Group Meeting Attendance - 3/5/01**

<b>Company Represented</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Email</b>
Adaptec	Moore	Dennis	dmoore@ix.netcom.com
Brocade	Snively	Bob	rsnively@brocade.com
Cisco Systems	Peterson	Dave	dap@cisco.com
Crossroads	Tyndall	John	jtyndall@crossroads.com
Crossroads	Wanamaker	Neil	ntw@crossroads.com
Emulex	Nixon	Bob	bob.nixon@emulex.com
ENDL	Weber	Ralph	roweber@acm.org
Quantum	Entzel	Paul	paul.entzel@quantum.com
Seagate	Coomes	Jim	jim_coomes@seagate.com
Seagate	Suhler	Paul	paul_a_suhler@seagate.com
Tivoli Systems	Penokie	George	g_penokie@tivoli.com
Unisys	Mathews	Ron	ronald.mathews@unisis.com