

## Revoking the provisional reservation of the Security Protocol value for Trusted Flash

To: T10 Technical Committee  
 From: John Geldman  
 Lexar Media  
 47300 Bayside Parkway  
 Fremont, CA 94538  
 Phone: 510 580-8715  
 Email: [jgeldman@lexar.com](mailto:jgeldman@lexar.com)  
 Date: July 14, 2008

T10/07-295r0 (June 2007) and T10/07-285r1 (July 2007) requested a provisional security protocol assignment for TrustedFlash. At the time, a provisional assignment was allowed, with the limitation that a joinable industry forum (such as IEEE, TCG, etc.) would be created to define the protocol between TrustedFlash and T10. The intention was and is not to assign standard protocol assignments in to vendor unique protocols.

This intention has not been met. Unlike TCG and IEEE, use of the Trusted Flash Protocol requires licensing with a vendor, i.e., this is vendor proprietary.

There has been no proposal or vote requesting this assignment from the SD Association, only the request from said vendor within the T10 organization.

### Current Status (3/2009):

- a) “SD Part A1 Advanced Security for SD (ASSD) 2.0” has recently been approved and is available in the Specification Matrix. This contains a list of authorized security systems and references, similar in scope to the protocol assignments and references in SPC-4. The references to TF in ASSD are as follows:
  - “The TF specification is owned and promoted by TFF<sup>3</sup>.”
  - “<sup>3</sup> The legal entity owning the TrustedFlash Security System specification is still under construction. Please contact SanDisk Corporation.”
  - As in SPC-4, there are no details of referenced protocol, only a reference to it.
- b) All details of the Trusted Flash system are in a document owned, maintained, and licensed by the SanDisk Corporation.
- c) The Trusted Flash Forum has not launched as planned. SanDisk declares that it is still committed to launch in some form, but wants to reserve the ability to request the change (in both ASSD and SPC-4) of Trusted Flash protocol references from SD and SanDisk, respectively, to the Trusted Flash Forum (when/if it exists in appropriate form)
- d) T10 still does not have an explicit rule set on assigning protocol codes for vendor specific security protocols. The initial discussion held that we did not want to assign protocol ID’s to vendor unique protocols. We accepted the non-existent Trusted Flash Forum as an acceptable non-vendor specific entity. Two years later, it still doesn’t exist.

- Note: previous discussions also included a quality of mapping metric, but since then, the T10 committee has accepted that we don't want to be responsible for the quality of the transport mapping of SPC-4 external security protocols (unless such a document is brought into T10 as a proposal).

In the year, since this started, the TrustedFlash Forum still does not exist ~~except as page holder~~ and the web site does not even have a place-holder response (<http://www.trustedflashforum.com/>). ~~Since then the~~ The TrustedFlash protocol was ~~been~~ informatively released to the SD Card Association in June 2007, and this was assumed to meet the provisional requirements. This informational document is only available to SD members. Being a member, I can report that:

- 1) The official SD documents describes the SD/TrustedFlash usage relationship and not the TrustedFlash/T10 (or T13) usage relationship,
- 2) The ownership of this IP is SanDisk and not the TrustedFlash Forum,
- 3) This IP is available for informative purposes to the SD community, but all AH derivative rights are specifically withheld from SD and it is specifically only usable for informative purposes, and
- 4) The SD Association has no active projects to map TrustedFlash commands to the T10 Security Protocol commands (or T13)

The provisional conditions have not been met, and any claim that they have been met is premature. It has been over ~~a two~~ years since this began, and there is still apparently only one vendor working on T10 (or T13) mappings of TrustedFlash to the Security Protocol.

I propose to remove and optionally reserve the provisional assignment until a TrustedFlash Forum exists as a public entity with a public forum (such as the completely independent, similarly named Trusted Computing Group, an industry association with publicly accessible membership and bylaws) with a project to map TrustedFlash to T10.

Specifically:

- 1) Revoke the assignments in Table 252 and 254 and remove ~~Remove~~ section 3.1.145, which defines the SD Card Association, or
- 2) Revoke and reserve the assignments in Table 252 and 254 and remove section 3.1.145, which defines the SD Card Association, or
- 3) If the SD Card Association authorizes the request for a Security Code then:
  - ~~Re-reserve code EDh in Table 252, SECURITY PROTOCOL field in Security Protocol In Command,~~
  - Change the description of code EDh in table 252 to: "Reserved for the SD Card Association".
  - Add this editors note to both Table 252 and 254: "Editor's Note: The reservation of Code EDh is intended to be changed to Defined on the existence of a non-vendor proprietary specification and to be completely removed (re-reserved) if a non-vendor proprietary specification is not available at the time of SPC-4 letter ballot", and

- Change the description of code EDh in table 254 to: “Reserved for the SD Card Association”~~Re-reserve code EDh in Table 254, SECURITY PROTOCOL field in Security Protocol Out Command~~