



Confidence in a connected world.



08-279r0

SSC-3 LB Comment SYM-019

Suggested Response

Roger Cummings

July 10, 2008

- Section 4.2.21.5 should identify:
 - a) How an application client determines that a Logical Unit has the capability to act as a KCSLU or a KCDLU;
 - b) How an application client enables or disables this capability.
- Action Items 9.1.2 & 9.1.3 in the May SSC-3 WG minutes relate to this item

- Kevin Butt proposed in a reflector message on 6/19 that this comment be modified in terms of support for RAW or EXTERNAL modes, and that the text should state that a Check Condition is returned if they are not supported
- I proposed on 6/23 that a statement be included that “if one of RAW & EXTERNAL is supported, then the other SHALL be supported”
- No objections have been made to either suggestion

- Also in the 6/23 e-mail I raised two questions:
 - Do source and destination drive have to support the encryption algorithm used to create the original tape ONLY if the KAD has to be compared?
 - Do we need to separately cover the cases where either the KCSLU & KCDFLU do NOT support that algorithm?
- I'm still not sure of the answer to the first question especially in the case where the tape format uses no KAD
- But the general effect is that the ability for a drive to act as a KCSLU or a KCDFLU is dependent on the characteristics of the drive in both cases, and also on the media mounted in the KCSLU case
- (Also there's no definition for Key Associated Data – perhaps there should be one in 3.1)

1. State “that if one of RAW & EXTERNAL is supported, then the other SHALL be supported”
 2. Rename the RDMC_C field in the Data Encryption Algorithm descriptor (Table 124) in light of the above.
 3. Redefine the values and descriptions in Table 129 to cover both RAW & EXTERNAL
 4. Define Byte 4 Bit 4 of the Data Encryption Capabilities page (Table 121) as REXRC which is set to 1 if RAW & EXTERNAL are supported for any algorithm
- We should also review the RDMD bit & CEEMS field in the Data Encryption Status page (Table 132) to see if changes are necessary

- Symantec has multiple products each with different approaches to keyless copy.
- We would be willing to withdraw the request for an KC enable/disable as per SYM-019b if the following note was included in 4.2.21.5
 - “NOTE N It is expected that the ability to perform keyless copying will be a function of special a firmware load, and that it will not be available in general production devices. Some applications may choose to not mount tapes on drives that support keyless copying.”
- Some of our applications would then check for RAW & EXTERNAL support as previously, and would not utilize drives that supported that feature
 - Other applications may make this determination on a site-by-site basis

- Section 4.2.21.5 makes no mention of positioning. Should it be mentioned? Can a change to RAW or EXTERNAL only be made at BOx in some technologies?



Confidence in a connected world.

Thank You!

Roger Cummings

roger_cummings@symantec.com

THIS DOCUMENT IS PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY AND IS NOT INTENDED AS ADVERTISING. ALL WARRANTIES RELATING TO THE INFORMATION IN THIS DOCUMENT, EITHER EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, ARE DISCLAIMED TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT ALLOWED BY LAW. THE INFORMATION IN THIS DOCUMENT IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE WITHOUT NOTICE.