X3T10/95-190R0

From: ljsloan

To: Bob.Snively; john.lohmeyer; lbarra; ljlamers; ljsloan

Cc: minuzzo1

Subject: Comments on x3.269:199x (SCSI3 FCP)

Date: Tuesday, March 21, 1995 2:31PM

From: ljsloan@anduin.ocf.llnl.gov (Lansing J Sloan)
Message-Id: <9503212231.AA18633@anduin.ocf.llnl.gov.ocf>

To: Bob.Snively@Eng.sun.com, john.lohmeyer@ftcollinsco.ncr.com,

lbarra@itic.nw.dc.us, ljlamers@aol.com, ljsloan@anduin.ocf.llnl.gov

Subject: Comments on x3.269:199x (SCSI3 FCP)

Cc: minuzzo1@llnl.gov

\_\_\_\_\_\_

March 21, 1995

X3 Secretariat Attn.: Lynn Barra 1250 Eye Street N.W., Suite 200 Washington, D.C. 20005-3922

Membership of X3:

Here are Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory's comments to the public review of X3.269:199x, the SCSI-3 Fibre Channel Protocol (Revision 10). We consider this to be a "yes" vote with comments.

Comments are organized as follows:

#xxx (?) Comment on y.y.y

where

xxx is the comment number,

? is the type (E: Editorial, T: Technical), and

y.y.y is the referenced section number.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

#001 (E) Comment on 2

We believe FC-PH may be listed as a normative reference now (and deleted from clause 8).

#002 (E) Comment on 3.1

Many of the definitions include the text "[SAM]". Some have "[FC-PH]" or "[FC-AL]". Such text seems helpful but should the meanings should be explained, or the text deleted. Many of the terms with "[SAM]" are also defined in SAM Revision 016, though not necessarily in SAM's "definitions" clause 4.1.

#003 (E) Comment on 3.1.3 and 3.1.4

The terms "autosense buffer pointer" and "autosense returned flag" have "[SAM]" in their definitions in the FCP document but do not appear to be defined in SAM Revision 016. (Both appear in

SAM 012 clause 9.1 but not in SAM 016 clause 6.3.)

#004 (E) Comment on 3.1.15

Since operation associators are 64 bits long, not 32, the FQXID with operation associators is a 176-bit concatenation, not 112.

#005 (E) Comment on 3.1.25

The terms "SCSI command service" has "[SAM]" in its definition in the FCP document but does not appear to be defined in SAM Revision 016. (It is in SAM 012 clause 9.1 but not in SAM 016 clause 6.3, where it appears to have been replaced by "Execute Command" or "Send SCSI Command protocol service".)

#006 (T) Comment on 4.2, 4th paragraph, 2nd sentence

This sentence states that if an unusual condition has been detected then SCSI REQUEST SENSE and FCP response information are returned. Is SCSI REQUEST SENSE supposed to be returned even if Auto-sense is not specified? (If the answer is yes, that should be made explicit in FCP, since it sort of contradicts SAM.)

Similarly, if FCP response information is supposed to be returned regardless of auto-sense, that should be stated. (SAM presumably does not cover this.) Clauses 7.4, 7.4.5, and/or 7.4.6 may be better places to clarify this.

#007 (E) Comment on 4.3, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence

The sentence says that task management functions ... are always ... the only IU in a new Exchange. According to 7.1.2.2, that's not true for "terminate task", which appears to be done only in existing Exchanges. Consider appending ", except for Terminate Task" to the end of the sentence.

#008 (E) Comment on 5.1, 1st paragraph and Table 3

Please state clearly in the paragraph what the FCP\_Port address identifiers are. Please use words that clearly say "D\_ID" and "S\_ID" in table 3 are the identifiers. (The closest words found in a quick scan are in the definitions of "target identifier" and "initiator identifier".)

#009 (E) Comment on 5.2, Table 6

In the last line of the Note (and before the Key), delete the comma after "I2". Also delete "are usable to".

#010 (E) Comment on 5.5.6

Delete the "is" that precedes "identifies".

#011 (E) Comment on 5.5.11, 2nd sentence

In "... Base Address is beginning address ...", insert "the" after "is".

#012 (E) Comment on 6.1, second paragraph, second sentence

Change "separated processes" to "separate processes"

following the third instance of "logically".

#013 (E) Comment on 6.2.2 through 6.2.4

Each of these has words "for each FC-4" that I think are inappropriate in FCP. Clause 6.2.4 has three instances of the phrase. The last paragraph before 6.1.1 certainly says the parameters for the other FC-4's are outside the scope of FCP (properly). Probably the five instances of "for each FC-4" should be replaced by "for FCP".

#014 (E) Comment on 6.2.5, first sentence

Change "effects" to "affects."

#015 (T) Comment on 6.2.5, last paragraph, last sentence

Should "default" precede "PRLI" in: "... PRLI shall be present at the completion of PLOGI"?

#016 (E) Comment on 6.2.6.9 and 6.2.6.10

In the first paragraph, fourth sentence, of each, a sentence starts with "If either the originator or the responder do not ...". Change "do" to "does" in each clause.

#017 (E) Comment on 6.3

In the second and third paragraphs, change "No further communication under the affected FC-4 ..." to "No further FCP communication ...".

#018 (T) Comment on 6.3, last paragraph

The first sentence talks about "... the referenced process image ...", and the other two sentences talk about a "PA". However, the content of this paragraph seems equally appropriate to communication between entities neither of which requires a PA. If so, the paragraph should be rewritten so that it does not seem to apply only when PAs are used. The best correction is unclear, but replacing "PA" with "image pair" may help.

#019 (E) Comment on 7.1.2.2, first paragraph

Replace the first sentence with something like: "Except for TERMINATE TASK, a Task management function shall be transmitted by the initiator (Exchange Originator) using a new Exchange. There is no response from the target for a Task Management function."

#020 (E) Comment on 7.4, first sentence

Insert "payload" after "IU" or in place of "IU".

#021 (E) Comment on C.2

In the second line below Table 43, there should be one colon (not two) following "Generalized Address."

Sincerely,

## Lansing J. Sloan

Lansing Sloan
(510) 422-4356 (phone)
(510) 423-8715 (fax)
lisloan@llnl.gov

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
M/S L-60
7000 East Avenue
Livermore, CA 94550-9900 USA