


Summary of Comments on SCSI Object-Based Storage Devices -2 (OSD-2)

Page: 5

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note


Date: 8/17/2008 5:46:55 AM

 Here you talk about a single capability while in 3.1.16 you say "not the first". In credential you may want to say also a capability or several capabilities

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note

Date: 8/17/2008 5:54:54 AM


 the use of term object is somewhat confusing here (as we talk about storage objects). You may want to consider "modules" or something else

Page: 17

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note


Date: 8/17/2008 5:59:22 AM

 LBAs are not defined here. You may want to remove the statement that reffers to LBAs (it contains no information)

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note


Date: 8/17/2008 6:02:31 AM

 This is hard to parse (can be parsed ambiguously)

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note

Date: 8/17/2008 6:14:40 AM

 has to clarify uniqueness within a partition. The "assigned by OSD LU" is a bit confusing (perhaps explain)

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note


Date: 8/17/2008 6:24:49 AM

 with

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note

Date: 8/17/2008 8:55:13 AM

 I think that this formulation is problematic. I would like to see a clause that says that at least the effected changes are reflected in results (sense?)

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note

Date: 8/18/2008 5:50:36 AM




that statement is not completely correct. I would state it that "as a result of the communications between SM and client the client should be able to build a capability and should have the cap-key. The rest of the text calls a combination of those two a credential and uses for it a data-structure similar to those used in communications with the data server for ease of illustration"

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note

Date: 8/18/2008 1:27:46 AM

 missing "is"

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note


Date: 8/18/2008 3:11:23 AM

 should mention that only cap-keys have to be confidential

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note


Date: 8/18/2008 6:14:19 AM

 A flow diagram of the checks might help a lot the reader and perhaps replace the text

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note


Date: 8/18/2008 11:46:01 AM

 should not say something about "no space" as opposed to quota exhaustion.

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note


Date: 8/18/2008 11:47:22 AM

 are all references consistently to SPC3 or SPC4

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note


Date: 9/2/2008 7:20:50 AM


 mention table at 172?

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note

Date: 9/2/2008 7:33:42 AM

 In 5.28 and others can't the error report be more specific - NOT supported xxx - or have the form major, minor with even more detail

Author: satran
Subject: Sticky Note
Date: 9/2/2008 8:36:49 AM
 be updated

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note

Date: 9/2/2008 8:57:17 AM



that is better but I would add UNSUPPORTED to all field that are illegal due to lack of a feature

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note

Date: 9/2/2008 9:02:17 AM




I would prefer this command removed

Author: satran

Subject: Sticky Note

Date: 9/2/2008 9:10:11 AM

 It should be stated explicitly that an area of an object cleared with a clear command or having as content the default value of 0 in all bytes may be reported as a data hole!
