

Accredited Standards Committee\*  
**NCITS, Information Technology**

**Doc. No.:** T10/97-283r0  
**Date:** November 5, 1997  
**Project:**  
**Ref. Doc.:**  
**Reply to:** Rob Basham

To: Membership of T10  
From: Rob Basham  
IBM Tucson  
Subject: End to End CRC Proposal

---

## **1. Why End-To-End CRC?**

### **1.1 Data Integrity Issues**

- Number of bits detected better than Parity
- Depends, usually > 3 bits
- Intermediate box/adapter
- A customer adds in a box that hasn't been tested.
- Testing criteria for permanent errors vs. data integrity errors is lower, for faster time to market.

### **1.2 Additional Utility**

- External systems with no other protection may use
- Intermediate "checkpoints" possible for further isolation

### **1.3 Managing Complexity**

- Allows data assurance in multi-protocol systems

## **2. Where Does CRC Belong?**

### **2.1 At the SAM layer**

- Given bus bit error rates, data integrity errors are more likely because of microcode, intermediate boxes. A CRC that starts on one end of the bus and ends at the other is less useful.
- It would be nice to allow the CRC to propagate through all the various protocols and still be there at the very ends of the system.
- The option to generate or check is needed at multiple places in the system to account pieces that don't have CRC generation capability.

## **3. IBM's Experience**

### **3.1 IBM Tucson uses end-to-end CRC**

- We've seen a data integrity problem caused by bus bit errors
- Card and microcode designs have yielded data integrity problems.
- Overall, end-to-end CRC is viewed as positive
- Would be more useful if it were standard