

To: X3T10 Membership  
From: Gene Milligan  
Date: January 7, 1997  
Subject: SBC X3T10 letter ballot comment resolution

Responses to George Penokie's comments:

1-(E) page ii - The box around the cautions does not enclose the entire last paragraph.

Response: It does in the Word file and with my printer.

2-(E) page 2 - The list of physical interconnects contains the 'SCSI Parallel Interface -2' in it. It should be 'SCSI-3 Parallel Interface -2'.

Response: It was my understanding that X3T10 had decided to retire the SCSI-3 nomenclature in future versions of SCSI.

3-(E) page 2 - section 2 - This section should be changed to the same structure as in 96-241r1.

Response: Agreed.

4-(E) page 3 - 3.1.1.1 - This definition is in the wrong place. It is in the 'A' spot and should be in the 'S' spot.

Response: Agreed. (It was a fallout of changing the name it the editorial session.)

5-(E) page 3 - 3.1.1.1 - This definition should be changed to the same definition as for SCSI-3 storage array in the SCC standard. And the last sentence should be changed from 'into a redundancy group.' to 'various objects (e.g., redundancy groups, volume sets, etc.).'

Response: Agreed.

6-(E) page 4 - 3.1.1.14 - The reference '(see x3.276' should be changed to '(see SCC)'.)

Response: Agreed. (But it was previously requested to change it from "see SCC" to "see X3.276.)

7-(E) page 6 - 3.4 - a) - The sentence should be change from 'commands, fields, and' to 'commands, and'. Fields are defined in c).

Response: Agreed.

8-(E) page 6 - 3.4 - c) - The 'CAPS' in the sentences is half small caps and half really small caps.

Response: Agreed.

9-(G) Many places throughout the standard the fields and bits have not been changed from normal caps to small caps. I have marked all cases in my copy of SBC.

Response: Specific identification is needed. Agreed if identified. Some of those marked are small caps but a different font size. The font size of all small caps will be changed to a font size of 9.

10-(G) Many places throughout the standard the mode page names are either small caps or capitalized. Mode page names should not be small caps or capitalized. I have marked all cases in my copy of SBC.

Response: Agreed on small caps. Unfortunate on capitalized. In any case the identification is needed.

11-(G) The sleep condition, standby condition, idle condition, and active condition should not be capitalized.

Response: The convention is lower case is used for words having the normal English meaning. These words do not have the conventional English meaning. They will be left with initial caps.

12-(T) page 10 - figure 3 - a) - The sentence 'Path 1: An idle time out or a START STOP UNIT command with a power condition code of 2h.' should be changed to 'Path 1: A START STOP UNIT command with a power condition code of 2h.'

Response: Agreed.

13-(E) page 15 - 5.1.14.2 - The second to the last sentence states 'As a result, the SEEK command often...'. Does the SEEK here refer to SEEK(6) or SEEK(10) or both?

Response: SBC does not define a SEEK(6) command. Therefore it refers to SEEK(10). See SCSI-2 to learn about SEEK(6).

14-(E) page 16 - 5.1.15 - The first sentence states 'storage devices into a redundancy group.' it should be changed to 'storage devices into objects. The type of object used by this model is the redundancy group.'

Response: Agreed.

15-(E) page 23 - 5.1.15.4.3.1 - There is a hard carriage return in the last sentence of the first paragraph after the 'command,'.

Response: Agreed.

16-(E) page 24 - 5.1.15.4.3.1.2 - Note 1: - Every line in this note seems to be centered rather justified.

Response: Agreed.

17-(E) page 24 - 5.1.15.4.4 - The messages target reset, clear task set, abort task and abort task set should be all caps.

Response: Agreed, except for the term message.

18-(E) page 28 - 6.1 - table 1 - The table boundary overflows onto page 29.

Response: Agreed.

19-(G) Some of the bit names are capitalized (example on page 37 - Security Initialize should be security initialize.) and they should not be. I have marked all cases in my copy of SBC.

Response: Reluctantly accepted if identified.

20-(E) page 37 - table 11 - The table boundary chops off two sentences on the right side.

Response: Agreed. (In word it is not chopped off but was very tight.)

21-(E) page 37 - 6.1.1.2 - paragraph above table 11 - The first sentence states 'need not rewrite (format)' should be 'need not rewrite the (format)'.

Response: Rejected.

22-(G) - In many places in the document the following sentence occurs: 'See 6.1.2 for a definition of the RELADR bit and the LOGICAL BLOCK ADDRESS field.' this is not correct. The sentence should read 'See 6.1.2 for a definition of the RELADR bit and see 6.1.4 for a definition of the LOGICAL BLOCK ADDRESS field.' I have marked all cases in my copy of the standard.

Response: The definition of LOGICAL BLOCK ADDRESS will be made a paragraph in 6.1.4.

23-(E) - page 39 - 6.1.3 - last three paragraphs - The link bit should be small caps.

Response: Agreed on link and bit will remain as lower normal case.

24-(E) - page 44 - 6.1.7 - note 9 - The sentence '..that sensibly defines the meaning..' should be '...that defines the meaning...'

Response: The note will be changed to "The use of the block format is not recommended. There is no standard model that defines the meaning of the logical block address of a defect. In the usual case, a defect that has been reassigned no longer has a logical block address."

25-(E) - page 45 - 6.1.8 - the second to the last paragraph starts with '11Any other' this should be changed to 'Any other'.

Response: Agreed. (Seems to be one of the spurious cross references that pop up and get deleted from time to time - Word artifacts or finger faults.)

26-(E) - page 47 - 6.1.9 - paragraph before note 13 - Field in INFORMATION FIELD should not be small caps or caps.

Response: Agreed.

27-(E) - page 47-54 - 6.1.10-6.1.12 - There are several page breaks in places where there should be no page breaks.

Response: Agreed. (These are either an artifact of past life as a WordPerfect file, of Word, or the editor's inability to understand the root cause. They mysteriously appear in the middle of a cross reference and are hopefully deleted somewhat more often than they appear.)

28-(E) - page 55 - 6.1.13 - In the first paragraph after table 29 the 4th sentence has two periods.

Response: Agreed.

29-(E) - page 63 - 6.1.21 - There is not definition of the zero value for the PBDATA and LBDATA bits.

Response: Agreed. It has been changed to "A logical block data (LBDATA) bit of zero and a physical block data (PBDATA) bit of zero indicates that the single block of data transferred by the application client shall be used without modification. A logical block data (LBDATA) bit of one requests that the device server replace the first four bytes of the data to be written to the current logical block with the logical block address of the block currently being written.

A PBDATA bit of one requests that the device server replace the first eight bytes of the data to be written to the current physical sector with the physical address of the sector currently being written using the physical sector format (see 6.1.1.1)."

30-(E) - page 28, 29, 68, 69, 83, and 84 - table notes - All the sentences that contain 'Optional ... if implemented shall...' should be changed to '... if implemented shall...'

Response: Rejected. If implemented is not an appropriate method for identifying a requirement as optional.

31-(E) - page 69 - table 44 - This table overflows onto the next page. This should be fixed.

Response: Agreed.

32-(E) - page 74 - table 49 - The Allocation length has an extra space between the lls in allocation.

Response: Agreed.

33-(E) - page 89 - 7.1.2 - In the first paragraph Logging Operations should not be capitalized.

Response: Agreed.

34-(E) - page 93 - table 75 - In the title of the table 'Write' should not be capitalized.

Response: Perhaps. But I think most of the title should be changed to small caps.

35-(E) - page 104 - figure 4 - This figure (at least in my printout) needs some formatting work.

Response: Word contributions will be accepted.

36-(E) - page 111 - b) after table 91 - The term 'Task' should not be capitalized.

Response: Agreed.

Additional response: Thank you for your comments.

Response to Gene Milligan's comments:

1) The scope has a typo "The term SCSI-3 in this standard refers to versions of defined since SCSI-2." This should be "The term SCSI-3 in this standard refers to versions of SCSI defined since SCSI-2."

Response: Agreed.

2) The flexible disk page parameters for control and reporting of flexible disk device parameters in SCSI-2 and SBC failed to define Pin 2. I suggest adding a definition that the use of the Pin 2 field is vendor specific.

Response: A notice will be sent out on the reflector for the following alternatives by 1/13/97:  
X3T10 has authorized Digital to provide a decision on which of the three alternatives below to address the remaining deficiency in the FDD page parameters:

a) Make the page obsolete.

b) The FDD I/O standard X3.80 will be checked to determine the usages for Pin 2. Assuming the standard yields the usage, a definition will be added per X3.80. Reflector responses will be scanned for implementors of SCSI FDD controller supplying the field values corresponding to the definition. In the absence of a prompt and definitive response, the Pin 2 field value will be stated as vendor specific.

c) The Pin 2 field definition and field value will be mad vendor specific.

If you have a definitive input to assist the decision, please state the input in a response to the SCSI reflector by 1/27/97. Charles Monia of Digital will forward the decision to the technical editor of SBC by 1/31/97.

Additional response: Thank you for your comments.

Response to Jeffrey L Williams' comments:

Western Digital requests that the Read Defect Data (12) command, described in the optical section, be added to the direct access block command set as an optional command. We feel this is required as devices get larger and the potential size of the defect lists grow to over 64 KBytes (8K entries on the list). We also feel that this is an editorial issue since the Standard does not prevent us from supporting the command as it is defined today.

Response: Agreed. The READ DEFECT DATA (12) command will be added as optional to Table 1.

Additional response: Thank you for your comments.