Voting Results on T10 Letter Ballot 99-010r0 on Forwarding SSC to first public review

Organization	Name	S	Vote	Add'l Info
Adaptec, Inc.	Lawrence J. Lamers	P	Yes	
AMP, Inc.	Elwood Parsons	P	Yes	
Amphenol Interconnect	Bill Mable	P	Yes	
Ancot Corp.	Bart Raudebaugh	P	Yes	
Apple Computer	Ron Roberts	A	Yes	
Berg Electronics	Douglas Wagner	P	Yes	
BREA Technologies, Inc.	Bill Galloway	P	Yes	
Circuit Assembly Corp.	Ian Morrell	P	Yes	
CMD Technology	Edward Haske	P	Yes	
Compaq Computer Corp.	Robert C Elliott	P	YesC	Cmnts
Crossroads Systems, Inc.	Stephen Wilson	A	Yes	
Dallas Semiconductor	Charles Tashbook	P	Yes	
Distributed Processing Tech.			DNV	
ENDL	I D Allan	P	Yes	
Exabyte Corp.	Tom Jackson	P	Yes	
Fujitsu (FCPA)	Ben-Koon Lin	P	Yes	
Harting, Inc. of N. America			DNV	
Hewlett Packard Co.	J. R. Sims, III	P	No	Cmnts
Hitachi Cable Manchester,Inc	Zane Daggett	P	Yes	
Hitachi Storage Products	Anthony Yang	P	Yes	
Honda Connectors	Thomas J. Kulesza	P	Yes	
IBM Corp.	George Penokie	P	No	Cmnts
Iomega Corp.	Tim Bradshaw	P	Yes	
KnowledgeTek, Inc.	Dennis P. Moore	P	Yes	
Lasercard Systems Corp.	Hayden Smith	P	Yes	
Linfinity Micro	Louis Grantham	P	Yes	
LSI Logic Corp.	John Lohmeyer	P	Yes	
Madison Cable Corp.	Jie Fan	P	Yes	
Maxtor Corp.	Pete McLean	P	Yes	
Methode Electronics, Inc.	John J Daly	A	Yes	
Molex Inc.	Joe Dambach	P	Yes	
Mylex Corp.	Brian McKean	P	Yes	
Ophidian Designs	Edward A. Gardner	P	Yes	IV
Panasonic Technologies, Inc	Han Zou	P	Yes	
Philips Electronics	Bill McFerrin	P	Yes	
QLogic Corp.	Skip Jones	P	Yes	
Quantum Corp.	Mark S. Evans	P	Yes	
Seagate Technology	Gene Milligan	P	YesC	Cmnts
Silicon Systems, Inc.	Robert Morris	P	Yes	
Storage Technology Corp.	Erich Oetting	P	YesC	Cmnts
Sun Microsystems Computer Co	Robert Snively	P	No	Cmnts
The JPM Company	Bob Gannon (new JPM	A	Yes	
Toshiba America Elec. Comp.	Tasuku Kasebayashi	P	Yes	
UNISYS Corporation	Ken Hallam	P	Yes	
Unitrode Corporation	Paul D. Aloisi	P	YesC	Cmnts
Western Digital Corporation	Jeffrey L Williams	P	Yes	
Woven Electronics	Doug Piper	P	Yes	

Key:

P	Voter indicated he/she is principal member
A	Voter indicated he/she is alternate member
O	Voter indicated he/she is observer member
?	Voter indicated he/she is not member or does not know status
YesC	Yes with comments vote
Abs	Abstain vote
DNV	Organization did not vote
IV	Individual vote (not organizational vote)
Cmnts	Comments were included with ballot
NoCmnts	No comments were included with a vote that requires comments
DUP	Duplicate ballot (last ballot received from org. is counted)

PSWD   The password was not correct (vote not counted)
ORG?   Organization is not voting member of T10 (vote not counted)

Ballot totals:
 42 Yes
  3 No
  0 Abstain
  2 Organization(s) did not vote
 47 Total voting organizations
  7 Ballot(s) included comments

This 2/3rds majority ballot passed.

****

Comments attached to YesC ballot from Robert C Elliott of
Compaq Computer Corp.:

(CPQ 000)
See 99-208 for some differences between SPC-2 and SSC regarding
MRIE behavior while the TEST bit is asserted.

(CPQ 001)
Page i. Should this be "SCSI-3 ..." or "SCSI ..."? Other standards
like SAM-2, SPC-2, and SPI-3 have dropped the "-3". However, SCSI-3
is useful when differentiation from SCSI-2 is needed. This would need
to be a global change, including the footer.

(CPQ 002)
Page i. Should this be "Stream Device Commands" or "Stream Commands"?
SBC used "Block Commands". Keeping "Device" out matches the acronym.
This would need to be a global change, including the footer.

(CPQ 003)
Page i. No zip code for the editor.

(CPQ 004)
Page ii. Update John's company name and email. List the
new T10 web site name.

(CPQ 005)
Page iii. Change "Steam" to "Stream".

(CPQ 006)
Page ix. Several places. Change "Stream Commands (SSC)" to "Stream
Device Commands (SSC)" to match the title of the document (unless
the title is changed).

(CPQ 007)
Page ix. Foreward. Remove comma from "Sequential-access device, or
a Printer".

(CPQ 008)
Page ix. Introduction. Remove comma from "Sequential-access, and
Printer"

(CPQ 009)
Page ix. Introduction. Should "initiator" be "application client"
in line 2?

(CPQ 010)
Page 1. Scope. Upgrade "SCSI-3 Primary Commands" to "ANSI NCITS
301-1997 SCSI-3 Primary Commands (SPC)", or a reference to SPC-2.

(CPQ 011)

Page 1. a). Remove command from "device, or printer device"

(CPQ 012)
Page 1. a). Move "over a SCSI service delivery subsystem" after "communicate" so it's not dangling at the end.

(CPQ 013)
Page 1. Remove extra blank line after b).

(CPQ 014)
Page 1/2. Caption on different page from figure.

(CPQ 015)
Page 3. Section 2.1. Change "contact ANSI" to "contact the ANSI"

(CPQ 016)
Page 3. Sections 2.1.x. SPC and SMC are both approved. This should refer to SAM-2 and SPC-2 which are under development. Maybe FC-TAPE should be referenced too? Also, the list on page 2 needs updating. A lot of documents have become standards or been obsoleted.

(CPQ 017)
Page 4. Section 3.1. This has "object" references which are no longer in SAM-2. Consider updating the definitions.

(CPQ 018)
Page 5. Section 3.3. Change "optionally" to "optionality" (this wording must be from SBC).

(CPQ 019)
Page 5. Section 3.3.9 "reserved". Change the definition to that in SPC-2:

> **3.3.9 reserved: A keyword referring to bits, bytes, words, fields and code values that are set aside for future standardization. A reserved bit, byte, word or field shall be set to zero, or in accordance with a future extension to this standard. Recipients are not required to check reserved bits, bytes, words or fields for zero values. Receipt of reserved code values in defined fields shall be reported as error.**

(CPQ 020)
Page 5. Add definitions of "may" and "may not" like in SPC-2.

> **3.3.5 may: A keyword that indicated flexibility of choice with no implied preference (equivalent to "may or may not").**
> **3.3.6 may not: A keyword that indicated flexibility of choice with no implied preference (equivalent to "may or may not").**

(CPQ 021)
Page 8. Section 4.1. Change "access, and printerdevices. All" to "access and printer devices. Both".

(CPQ 022)
Page 9. Section 5.1.14 partition. Change "If there is" to "If there are".

(CPQ 023)
Page 9. Section 5.1.16 setmark. Change "based on a" to "based on the RSMK".

(CPQ 024)
Page 10. Section 5.2.1. Change "Out, Persistent" to "Out, and Persistent".

(CPQ 025)

Page 25. Table 5. These commands should be listed as "Yes/May" - WRITE BUFFER, MODE SELECT (both), and SEND DIAGNOSTIC. Section 5.2.6 makes them required in certain cases for those commands.

(CPQ 026)
Page 39. Table 19. Byte 0. Remove extra spaces around 44h.

(CPQ 027)
Page 47. Table 25. Byte 5. Control should be in small caps.

(CPQ 028)
Page 58. "ASOCWP" didn't fit in byte 15 - try a smaller font.

(CPQ 029)
Page 80. Table 58. Caption. Remove D from "SYNCHRONIZED"

(CPQ 030)
Page 88. Above Table 74. "Command, a clear to send" doesn't make sense.

(CPQ 031)
Page 91. Table 75. There is no reference to note 3.

(CPQ 032)
Page 91. Table 75. The "?" references should be fixed in codes 22h and 23h. The "?" densities for code 2Bh should be fixed. Something should be listed for code 2Ah.

(CPQ 033)
Page 25. Table 5. There are several differences from SPC-2 Table B.2 Operation Codes table that need to be resolved, either here or in SPC-2.

a) CHANGE DEFINITION is obsolete in SPC-2.

b) READ should be READ(6), WRITE should be WRITE(6), and VERIFY should be VERIFY(6) to match SPC-2 Table B.2.

c) SPC-2 lists these as mandatory but they are listed as optional here:
- **RESERVE(6)**
- **RESERVE(10)**
- **RELEASE(6)**
- **RELEASE(10)**

d) "READ POSITION" is mandatory here, but listed as optional in SPC-2.

e) SPC-2 lists these as optional for sequential access devices, but they are not mentioned here:
- **A3h MAINTENANCE (IN)(for report device identifier)**
- **A4h MAINTENANCE (OUT)(for set device identifier)**
- **A5h MOVE MEDIUM**
- **B8h READ ELEMENT STATUS**
- **BAh REDUNDANCY GROUP (IN)**
- **BBh REDUNDANCY GROUP (OUT)**
- **BCh SPARE (IN)**
- **BDh SPARE (OUT)**
- **BEh VOLUME SET (IN)**
- **BFh VOLUME SET (OUT)**

f) Text after Table 5. SPC-2 also lists 0Dh as vendor-specific for SSC.

g) SPC-2 also lists A5h "MOVE MEDIUM" as optional for SSC. It is not mentioned here.

(CPQ 034)
Page 51. Table 29. There are several differences from SPC-2 Table B.3 Log Page Codes table that need to be resolved, either here or in SPC-2.

a) SPC-2 names some log pages differently:
    06h Non-medium error page
    0Ch Sequential-access [D]evice page
    0Bh Last n deferred error events page

b) SPC-2 also lists these log pages for sequential access devices:
    08h Format status page
    0Dh Temperature page
    0Eh Start-stop cycle counter page
This table lists them in the Reserved sections 08h-0Ah and 0Dh-2Dh.

c) SPC-2 does not list this log page yet:
    2Eh TapeAlert log page

d) SPC-2 labels 30h - 3Eh as (does not require page format) but this table does not mention that.

(CPQ 035)
Page 55. Table 36. There are several differences from SPC-2 Table B.4 Mode Page Codes table that need to be resolved, either here or in SPC-2.

a) SPC-2 has different names for these mode pages:
    10h Device configuration [mode] page
    1Ch Informational exceptions control [mode] page
    11h Medium partition [mode page (1)
    12h Medium partition [mode page (2)
    13h Medium partition [mode page (3)
    14h Medium partition [mode page (4)
    1Ah Power Condition [mode] page (s removed)
        (SPC-2 should probably uncapitalize Condition)

b) SPC-2 lists these mode pages for sequential access devices:
    18h Protocol specific LUN mode page
    19h Protocol specific port mode page

c) SPC-2 and this table disagree when page format is required.
SPC-2 says these do not: 00, 20-29, 2A, 2B-3E.
Table 36 says these do not: 00 and these do: 20-3E.

d) SPC-2 does not yet list:
    0Fh Data compression page

(CPQ 036)
Page 76. Table 51. There are several differences from SPC-2 Table B.2 Operation Codes table that need to be resolved, either here or in SPC-2.

a) SPC-2 lists this command as optional for printer devices, but it is not listed here:
    A0h REPORT LUNS

b) SPC-2 lists these commands as mandatory but they are listed as optional here:
    RESERVE(6)
    RESERVE(10)

RELEASE(6)
RELEASE(10)

c) SPC-2 uses "RELEASE" and "RESERVE" instead of "RELEASE UNIT" and "RESERVE UNIT"

d) Reference for STOP PRINT should be 6.2.5, not 0.

(CPQ 037)
Page 81. Table 60. There are several differences from SPC-2 Table B.3 Log Page Codes table that need to be resolved, either here or in SPC-2.

a) SPC-2 names some log pages differently:
06h Non-medium error page
0Bh Last n deferred error events page

b) SPC-2 also lists these log pages for printer devices:
0Dh Temperature page
0Eh Start-stop cycle counter page
This table lists them in the Reserved section 0Ch-2Fh.

(CPQ 038)
Page 82. Table 62. There are several differences from SPC-2 Table B.4 Mode Page Codes table that need to be resolved, either here or in SPC-2.

a) SPC-2 has different names for these mode pages:
1Ch [Informational exceptions control mode] page
03h Parallel printer interface [mode] page
1Ah Power Condition [mode] page (s removed)
(SPC-2 should probably uncapitalize Condition)
05h Printer options [mode] page
04h Serial printer interface [mode] page

b) SPC-2 lists these mode pages for printer devices:
18h Protocol specific LUN mode page
19h Protocol specific port mode page

c) SPC-2 and this table disagree when page format is required.
SPC-2 says these do not: 00, 20-29, 2A, 2B-3E.
Table 62 says these do not: 00 and these do: 20-3E.

****

Comments attached to No ballot from J. R. Sims, III of Hewlett Packard Co.:

Hewlett Packard CPB SSC Letter Ballot Comments
(Submitted by Stewart Wyatt)

1. Drive initialisation should be in the loaded state

5.2.5 Device initialisation
A device shall be in the uninitialised and unloaded state after power-up.'

This behaviour is very uncommon in existing tape drives and is typically limited to very high end or legacy drives (e.g. 1/2" tape). Most tape drives now automatically load a tape if it is present at power on. These include:

- DDS
- DLT
- 8mm
- QIC/Travan

There is significant danger of this change breaking existing applications as well as forcing changes to most existing drives. This phrase should be removed from the document.

2. TapeAlert for multi-initiator environments

Changes to Section 5.2.12.1

Modify the clearing criteria for TapeAlert flags to cover multi-initiator environments by changing

b) When the TapeAlert Log page is read

to

b) When the TapeAlert Log page is read - note that in multi-initiator environments the TapeAlert flags should be cleared on read on a per-initiator basis such that set flags are still visible to other initiators"

Changes to Section 5.4.2.2

Add the following after Table 31:
"where the value of n is from 1 to 64"

3. Please add a footnote to Table 29 - Log page codes, stating that the "Log page '0A' and inquiry page '84' are being proposed for use by Media Auxiliary Memory as documented in T10/99-148."

4. 4.1 line 2 - space omitted from 'printerdevices'

5. Abstract (page iii) includes communication devices, these are not in the Scope section 1 a) or the list of clauses in the Introduction (page ix)

6. 4.2, Physical model. Delete first sentence " The physical model is similar....." it is contradictory with the rest of the section. Also change fourth sentence to " As media is taken out of one pool, it passes by..... and into the other pool" this is equally appropriate to helical scan and linear tape devices unlike present wording.

7. Page numbers are bold on even number pages, normal on odd number pages. Also some in different font size

8. Page 18 'Conditions list' this would be better presented as a table even though it is presented here in the same manner as the SCSI-2 standard. Also 'ABORTED command' should be fully capitalised.

9. Page 19, remove extra line space between 5.2.10 b) and c)

10. Page 20 section 5.2.10.1, list would be more readable presented as a table

11. Table 31 - borders inconsistent. Should be double underline above Byte 0 line, RH end of Byte 0 line different to rest. Border above 5n-1 should this be single?

12. Table 76. Use same border weights as for rest of document, also remove unused blank rows.

13. Subsection numbers and heading should be bold. Currently 5.1.1 onwards are normal, headings are difficult to find.

14. Delete blank page 7

15. Page 14, spacing between 5.2.3 a) and c)

16. 5.4.2.2 needs explanation, field definitions, byte numbering jump from 3 to (5n-1), meaning of 140h in parameter length etc.

****

Comments attached to No ballot from George Penokie of
IBM Corp.:

IBM letter ballot comments on ssc-r17

Page 1
Annotation 1;
General comment on pdf format - The bookmarks do not have any section numbers which makes them almost impossible to use when trying to navigate the document. When generating make sure the section numbers appear in the pdfs bookmarks list.

Page 9
Annotation 1;
Section Introduction, 1st paragraph, last sentence; The last sentence should be removed.

Page 14
Annotation 1;
3.1.13 There are two periods and the end of the sentence.

Page 18
Annotation 1;
4.1, first paragraph, 2nd sentence. There is no space between printer and device.

Page 20
Annotation 1;
5.2.1 - 3rd paragraph from bottom, last sentence: SET CAPACITY should be removed.

Page 24
Annotation 1;
abc list under figure 10: Remove spaces between (a) paragraph and (b) paragraph, and between (b) paragraph and (c) paragraph. This should be changed anywhere there is a list.

Page 25
Annotation 1;
5.2.4 - All these references to 'American National Standards' will have to change when this standard becomes an ISO standard.

Page 26
Annotation 1;
5.2.6 - 5th paragraph - 'asynchronous event notification' should be 'asynchronous event reporting'.
Annotation 2;
5.2.7 This section looks like a SAM thing that is not specific to SSC. It should be removed. Of replaced with a reference to SAM.

Page 27

Annotation 1;
5.2.9.1 - 1st paragraph - The sentence 'The appropriate sense key and additional sense code and an additional sense code should be set.' makes no sense. The words additional sense code appear twice when once would be enough.

Page 28
Annotation 1;
5.2.9.1 - 2nd paragraph after error list. Contains 'sense data valid' bit in multiple places. 'sense data.valid' should be in small caps.
Annotation 2;
5.2.9.1 - 3rd paragraph after error list. Contains 'information' field in multiple places. 'information' should be in small caps.
Annotation 3;
5.2.9.1 - 2rd paragraph after error list. Contains 'information' field in multiple places. 'information' should be in small caps.
Annotation 4;
5.2.9.1 - paragraphs after error list. The fixed bit, sense data valid bit and information field are talked about but there is no reference to where these bits belong. Is it a mode page and command or what.

Page 29
Annotation 1;
5.2.9.1 - 2nd from last paragraph - 'asynchronous event notification' should be 'asynchronous event reporting'. Do a global change on this.

Page 31
Annotation 1;
5.2.11 - 2nd paragraph - sense-key specific as in sense-key specific field should be small caps.
Annotation 2;
5.2.11 - 4th paragraph - sense-key specific as in sense-key specific field should be small caps.

Page 32
Annotation 1;
5.2.12 - 1st paragraph - SMART is a marketing term and is not used in SCSI standards. If you mean the 'information exception conditions' mode page controls then say that.
Annotation 2;
5.2.12 - abc list - This list is formatted incorrectly. An abc list should be like this:
a) First thing;
b) next thing;
c) next to last thing; and
d) last thing.
The 'and' in the next to last thing could be an 'or'.
Annotation 3;
5.2.12.1 - 3rd paragraph - This sentence should read; Each flag shall be cleared in the .... And see above comment as to how the list should be formatted.
Annotation 4;
General - All note should be number from 1 to n with the first note of the standard being 1 and the last note of the standards being n.

Page 33
Annotation 1;
5.2.12.2 - table 4 - 1st row - The statement '(this flag is set as an 5, or 6)' I think should be' (this flag is set as in 5, or 6)'.
Annotation 2;
5.2.12.2 - abc list after table 4 - This would be better if placed into a table.

Page 35
Annotation 1;
5.3 - table 5 - You should not reference both SPC and SPC-2. I suggest you

only reference SPC-2. So change all references to SPC to SPC-2 in this standard.
Annotation 2;
5.3 - table 5 key - SPC should be SPC-2 = SCSI Primary Commands-2 standard.

Page 38
Annotation 1;
5.3.2 - last paragraph - FORMAT should be small caps not large caps.

Page 43
Annotation 1;
5.3.7 - 2nd paragraph - Total Current Logical Position should not be capitalized.

Page 44
Annotation 1;
5.3.7 - 3rd paragraph -Long Format should not be capitalized.
Annotation 2;
5.3.7 - 4th paragraph - Block Identifier Type should not be capitalized.
Annotation 3;
5.3.7 - 1st paragraph after table 15 - A '-of-partition' should be 'beginning-of-partition', I think.

Page 45
Annotation 1;
5.3.7 - 5th and 6th paragraphs after table 15 - There is no space between these two paragraphs.
Annotation 2;
5.3.7 - 1st paragraph before table 16 - TCLP and LONG should be small caps not large caps.

Page 46
Annotation 1;
5.3.7 - 4th paragraph after table 16 - MPU and BPU should be small caps not large caps.

Page 49
Annotation 1;
5.3.10 - table 19 - bytes 7-8 - The name of this field should be on one line not two. (i.e., ALLOCATION LENGTH)
Annotation 2;
5.3.10 - table 20 - bytes 0-1 AND 4-n - The name of these fieldS should be on one line not two. (i.e., AVAILABLE DENSITY SUPPORT LENGTH and DENSITY SUPPORT DATA BLOCK DESCRIPTORS))
Annotation 3;
5.3.10 - table 20 - bytes 4-n - The name of these this field should in small caps.

Page 50
Annotation 1;
5.3.10 - table 21 - bytes 8-9 - The name of this field should be on one line not two. (i.e., MEDIA WIDTH)
Annotation 2;
5.3.10 - 3rd paragraph after table 21 - The name 'density support data block descriptors' should be in small caps.
Annotation 3;
5.3.10 - 3rd paragraph after table 21 - The name 'density support data block descriptors' should be in small caps.
Annotation 4;
5.3.10 - 3rd paragraph after table 21 - The name 'density support data block descriptors' should be in small caps.
Annotation 5;
5.3.10 - 4th paragraph after table 21 - The name 'density support data block descriptors' should be in small caps.

Page 52
Annotation 1;
5.3.10 - 1st paragraph above note 14 - This sentence: 'Thus, if vendor X defines a density and format, another vendor may use X in the ASSIGNING ORGANIZATION field. If exactly the same density and format construction later becomes known by another name, both X and the new assigning organization may be used for the density code. This is one condition that may result in multiple density support data blocks for a single density code value.' should be removed or at least put in a note.

Page 53
Annotation 1;
5.3.12 - 1st paragraph after table 24 - The statement 'if they exist' is used in multiple places in this section. A better way to say it would be 'if they are implemented' .
Annotation 2;
5.3.12 - 1st paragraph after table 24 - The statement 'if they exist' is used in multiple places in this section. A better way to say it would be 'if they are implemented' .

Page 54
Annotation 1;
5.3.12 - 3rd paragraph after table 24 - the information in Information field should be small caps.
Annotation 2;
5.3.12 -4th paragraph after table 24 - the information in Information field should be small caps.
Annotation 3;
5.3.12 - 5th paragraph after table 24 - the information in Information field should be small caps.
Annotation 4;
5.3.12 - 6th paragraph after table 24 - the information in Information field should be small caps.
Annotation 5;
5.3.12 - 7th paragraph after table 24 - the information in Information field should be small caps.
Annotation 6;
5.3.12 - 8th paragraph after table 24 - the information in Information field should be small caps.
Annotation 7;
5.3.12 - 3rd paragraph from bottom. Medium position should be defined when end-of-data is encountered while spacing over blocks, filemarks, or setmarks. Recommendation: Medium shall be positioned such that a subsequent write operation would append to the last record, filemark, or setmark.

Page 55
Annotation 1;
5.3.12 - abc list after the 11th paragraph after table 24 - There is a space between the (a) and (b) entries in the list. This should be removed.

Page 56
Annotation 1;
5.3.13 - 6th paragraph after table 25 - the information in Information field should be small caps.
Annotation 2;
5.3.13 - 6th paragraph after table 25 - the information in Information field should be small caps.

Page 57
Annotation 1;
5.3.14 - 6th paragraph after table 26 - the information in Information field should be small caps.
Annotation 2;
5.3.13 - abc list after 6th paragraph after table 25 -There should not be any spaces between (a) and (b), (b) and (c), etc. This comment applies other abc

lists in this section.

Page 58
Annotation 1;
5.3.14 - 1st paragraph after abcd list - the information in Information field should be small caps.

Page 59
Annotation 1;
5.3.15 -5th paragraph after table 27 - the information in Information field should be small caps.

Page 60
Annotation 1;
5.3.15 -last paragraph - the information in Information field should be small caps.

Page 62
Annotation 1;
5.4.2.2 - Entire section - All the field names in this section need to be made small caps.
Annotation 2;
5.4.2.2 - Why is the description of the fields in this log page not with the log page?
Annotation 3;
5.4.3 - 3rd paragraph - 'medium-type code' needs to be small caps.

Page 63
Annotation 1;
5.4.3 - table 33 - In at least 3 places write command should be WRITE command.
Annotation 2;
5.4.3 - ABC/abc lists under table 34 - Remove all line spacing in the ABC and abc lists.
Annotation 3;
5.4.3 - ABC/abc list under table 34 - 1st abc list - There should be an 'or' between the last 2 entries in both abc lists.

Page 64
Annotation 1;
General - In some places names like beginning-of-medium are capitalized in other places they are not. The correct way is to not have any capitals in that type of name. Any capitals should be made into small letters.

Page 67
Annotation 1;
5.4.3.1 - 6th paragraph after table 38 - The word 'beset' should be 'be set'.
Annotation 2;
5.4.3.1 - 7th paragraph after table 38 - information should be in small caps.

Page 71
Annotation 1;
5.4.3.2 - note 32 - This note contains a shall requirement. Notes cannot contain requirements. Either remove the requirement or make the note part of the text.

Page 73
Annotation 1;
5.4.3.3 - 2nd paragraph above table 43 - The statement 'The device server shall set only one and only one of the IDP, FDP or SDP fields set to one in the MODE SENSE data.' Makes no sense and I have no idea how it should be reworded.
Annotation 2;
5.4.3.3 - 2nd paragraph above table 43 - At the end of the 3rd sentence the words 'set to one' are in small caps and they should not be.
Annotation 3;

5.4.3.3 - note 35 - The end of the sentence should read '... or IDP are set to one.'.

Page 74
Annotation 1;
5.4.3.3 - abc list above table 44. There should be a ':' after the partition size if. a ';' after (a), and a '; or' after (b). The first the in (b) and (c) should not be capitalized.

Page 75
Annotation 1;

Page 76
Annotation 1;
5.4.3.4 - table 45 - The partition size descriptor(s) should be in small caps.
Annotation 2;
5.4.3.4 - table 45 - bytes +0 and +1 - This field name should be on one line.
Annotation 3;
5.4.3.4 - table 45 - What does +0 and +1 mean? I have never seen that notation before. It should be 2
and 3 for the first descriptor then a ... with another field entry to represent the last descriptor. That
would be labeled n-1 and n.
Annotation 4;
5.4.3.4 - abc list after table 45 - Should be no spaces between a and b.
Annotation 5;
5.4.3.4 - note 38 - 1st note under table 45 - This looks like a requirement (i.e., are's are thinly disguised shalls) and should be made part of the main text.
Annotation 6;
5.4.3.4 - Note 38 - 2nd note under table 45 - The statement 'recommended, but not required' is redundant and should be changed to 'recommended'.
Annotation 7;
5.4.3.4 - 2nd abc list under table 45 - The end of (a) should be '; or' and 'or' at the start of (b) removed.

Page 77
Annotation 1;
5.4.3.4 - note 40 - 3rd note under table 45 - This looks like a requirement and should be made part of the main text.
Annotation 2;
5.4.3.4 - 3rd abc list under table 45 - The end of (a) should be '; or' and the 'If' and the start of (b) should be 'if'.

Page 78
Annotation 1;
5.4.3.6 - Table 47 - byte 2 - The DExcpt and LOGerr bits should be in small caps. (note; only the xcpt part of DExcpt and the err of LOGerr need be in small caps.
Annotation 2;
5.4.3.6 - Many all of the fields in this section are large caps. They all need to be made into small caps.

Page 79
Annotation 1;
5.4.3.6 - 1st paragraph after table 47- DExcpt should be in small caps. (note; only the xcpt part of.DExcpt need be in small caps.
Annotation 2;
5.4.3.6 - 2nd paragraph after table 47 - LOGerr should be in small caps. (note; only the err of LOGerr need be in small caps.
Annotation 3;
5.4.3.6 - 5th and 6th paragraphs are not lined up correctly with the other paragraphs.
Annotation 4;
5.4.3.6 - The abc list under table 47 - Make that list into a table.

Annotation 5;
5.4.3.6 - The interval time description and the report count field descriptions should go after the MRIE field description.
Annotation 6;
(T) - 5.4.3.6 - interval timer description - The following statement -' An INTERVAL TIMER value of zero indicates that the target shall only report the informational exception condition one time.' Is a technical change from how the interval timer works in SPC-2 and SBC. It should be changed to match those other standards which state that zero indicates a vendor-specific timer interval.
Annotation 7;
5.4.3.6 - The interval timer description should be copied word-for-word from SPC-2. This wording is not only incorrect but the 3rd sentence makes no sense.

Page 80
Annotation 1;
5.4.3.6 - 2nd paragraph above table 48 - Illegal request and invalid field in parameter list need to be capitalized.
Annotation 2;
5.4.3.6 - The 2nd and 3rd paragraphs above table 48 are not aligned with the other paragraphs.
Annotation 3;
5.4.3.6 - table 48 - This table is difficult to read in it's present format. The mode column is to fat (and doesn't really even need to be there) and the description is too skinny. It should also be confined to one page. It would also be a good idea to make the sense key sentence into it's own paragraph. (Too see what I mean look at this same table in SPC-2)
Annotation 4;
(T) - 5.4.3.6 - report count description - The statement: '(assuming that INTERVAL TIMER is set to non-zero).' Is not correct in that it does not match the report count behavior as defined in SPC-2 and SPC. It should be removed.
Annotation 5;
(T) - 5.4.3.6 - report count/test flag number field description - I believe adding in the test flag number into this field is a mistake. he test flag number should be a new field added onto the end of this mode page. If this comment is rejected then the paragraphs describing the MODE SELECT vs. MODE SENSE behaviors need to be separated so someone can understand what is going on. Right now the combining of all this makes it very difficult to understand what is supposed to be done.
Annotation 6;
5.4.3.6 - table 48 - all rows - The statement; ' (which is 5Dh/00h for a TapeAlert event)' should be removed from all the rows in this table. If the tapealert causes the reporting of a specific ASC/ASCQ then indicate that under the tapealert description. This table is a general description of how the MRIE field works. Also, the name of the ASC/ASCQ should be listed not the hex code (which only machines understand).
Annotation 7;
(T) - 5.4.3.6 - table 48 - The statement: '...on the next SCSI command (excluding Inquiry and Request Sense) after an informational exception condition was detected.' is a technical change from the way this is defined in SPC-2 and SBC and should be removed. There is no requirement that the check condition be returned on the next command and even if this requirement was here there is no way to test compliance.

Page 81
Annotation 1;
5.4.3.6 - table 48 - all rows - The statement; (and thus does not need to be repeated). Should be removed from this row and others in this table as it adds no useful information.
Annotation 2;
(T) - 5.4.3.6 - table 48 - The statement: '...on the next SCSI command (excluding Inquiry and Request Sense) after an informational exception condition was detected.' is a technical change from the way this is defined in SPC-2 and SBC and should be removed. There is no requirement that the check

condition be returned on the next command and even if this requirement was here there is no way to test compliance.
Annotation 3;
(T) - 5.4.3.6 - table 48 - The statement: '...on the next SCSI command (excluding Inquiry and Request Sense) after an informational exception condition was detected.' should be 'on any command.' As defined in SPC-2 and SBC. There is no requirement that the check condition be returned on the next command and even if this requirement was here there is no way to test compliance.
Annotation 4;
(T) - 5.4.3.6 - table 48 - The statement: '...on the next SCSI command (excluding Inquiry and Request Sense) after an informational exception condition was detected.' is a technical change from the way this is defined in SPC-2 and SBC and should be removed. There is no requirement that the check condition be returned on the next command and even if this requirement was here there is no way to test compliance.

Page 82
Annotation 1;
5.4.3.6 - 1 paragraph after table 48 - The name of the ASC/ASCQ should be listed not the hex code
(which only machines understand).
Annotation 2;
5.4.3.6 - Everything below table 48 in section 5.4.3.6 - None of this information belongs here. It is specific to tapealert not this mode page and should be described in the part of the standard that defines how tapealert works (i.e., the model).

Page 83
Annotation 1;
5.5 - table 50 - Do not allow this table to split across pages.
Annotation 2;
5.5 - This entire section should be move to the front model section of this standard.

Page 91
Annotation 1;
6.3.3 - 3rd paragraph - medium-type code should be in small caps.
Annotation 2;
6.3.3 - 4rd paragraph - device-specific parameter should be in small caps.

Page 92
Annotation 1;
6.3.3.1 - 2nd paragraph under table 64 - VFU should be in small caps not large caps in multiple places throughout the next several paragraphs and tables.

Page 103
Annotation 1;
Annex B - table 76 - In some cases the paragraph style used in the flag column is 'justified' which causes large spaces between words. It should be made 'left'. The same is true for the clause column only it appears that all paragraphs in this column are set to 'justified'.
Annotation 2;
Annex B - heading - Why is there and 8 in front of this heading? It should be removed.
Annotation 3;
Annex B - There is not description of what the codes mean in the type and flag type columns.
Annotation 4;
Annex B - table 76 - I do not believe this standard can make requirements on the host (what ever that is). I assume you mean application client. Host should be change to application client and required changed to recommended.
Annotation 5;
Annex B - table 76 - I would suggest the column cause be retitled to 'Possible Cause'.

Annotation 6;
Annex B - table 76 - The parameter codes should be in hex format.
Annotation 7;
Annex B - table 76 - Flag 8 "Not Data Grade" includes comments on MRS stripes. This sounds specific to a certain drive. Explain better what "data grade" and "MRS stripes" mean, and make this more generic.

Page 106
Annotation 1;
Annex B - table 76 - 3rd paragraph from bottom. Medium position should be defined when end-of-data is encountered while spacing over blocks, filemarks, or setmarks. Recommendation: Medium shall be positioned such that a subsequent write operation would append to the last record, filemark, or setmark.

****

Comments attached to YesC ballot from Gene Milligan of Seagate Technology:

GEM 1:
Procedural:
A document indicating the net resolution of comments from the first letter ballot to forwards should be provided.

GEM 2:
Helpful:
Boilerplate:
In this draft and future drafts please add the instructions for unsusbcribing from the reflector.

GEM 3:
Helpful:
Boilerplate:
In this draft and future drafts please add the URLs for ANSI, NCITS, and Globa Engineering documents.

GEM 4:
Nit-picky:
Abstract:
Delete the second standard from the first sentence.

GEM 5:
Nit-picky:
Abstract, Forward, and Introduction:
Stating that "No service delivery subsystem dependencies are included in this standard." In three of the boilerplate clauses seems like overkill.

GEM 6:
Nit-picky:
Introduction:
"Annex A provides the historical density code list for sequential-access devices." Is it only historical? Are none current?

GEM 7:
Editorial:
Introduction:
TapeAlert should be defined in Clause 3 and probably a forward reference given in the Introduction.

GEM 8:
Nit-picky:
Scope:
The title of Figure 1 should be on the same page as the figure.

GEM 9:
Editorial:
Scope:
<< Figure 1 is intended to shows the general structure of SCSI standards.>>
Change to "Figure 1 shows the general structure of SCSI standards."

GEM 10:
Editorial:
Scope:
<< It indicates the applicability of a standard to the implementation of a given transport.>> I don't think so. This appears to be wording left over fro an earlier version of the standard. Use instead the wording that goes with the generic figure.

GEM 11:
Editorial:
Scope:
<< SCSI-3 Serial Bus Protocol [X3.268]>> I thought this was withdrawn. I think it should be deleted.

GEM 12:
Editorial:
Scope:
<< The term SCSI is used whenever it is not necessary to distinguish between the versions of SCSI. The Small Computer System Interface - 2 standard (X3.131-1994) and its architecture are referred to herein as SCSI-2.>> Is it ever necessary to distinguish between SCSI-2 and a later version? If so what i it called in SSC?

GEM 13:
Editorial:
Clause 2:
The normative references are not up to date. Update them.

GEM 14:
Editorial:
Clause 2:
The informative references are not up to date. SCSI-2 is not 9316-1:1996. It i 9316:1995.

GEM 15:
Nearly technical:
Clause 3.1.7:
The definition of information field seems incorrect. Rather than a definition it appears to be an example.

GEM 16:
Nit-picky:
Clause 3.1.9:
The definition of "one" is obsolete. I suggest deleting the signal portions especially in view of the many denials that SSC relates to transports with signals. Apply the analogous version of this comment to 3.1.15 as well.

GEM 17:
Editorial:
Clause 3.1.11:
<<The device may support other application protocols as well.>> seems to confuse the meaning of SCSI device rather than defining it. Pending explanatio of why this is included, I suggest deleting the sentence.

GEM 18:
Nit-picky:
Clause 3.2:
Some of the acronyms for the standards include the word standard at the end of

the definition. Others do not. Be consistent.

GEM 19:
Technical:
Clause 3.3.2:
<< invalid: used to describe an illegal or unsupported bit, byte, word, field or code value. Receipt
of an invalid bit, byte, word, field or code value shall be reported as error.>> The definition and mandatory requirement are appropriate for field or code values but not for bits, bytes, or words. This mandatory requirement is contrary to the nearly appropriate requirement for reserved bits, bytes, or words. SPC-2 also has this issue.

GEM 20:
Editorial:
Clause 3.3.9
<<The recipient may not check reserved bits, bytes, words or fields. Receipt o reserved code values in defined fields shall be treated as an error.>> While I favor the misunderstanding these words may produce, to be fair they should be replaced with the SPC-2 wording "Recipients are not required to check reserved bits, bytes, words or fields for zero values. Receipt of reserved code values defined fields shall be reported as error."

GEM 21:
Editorial:
Clause 3.3.10
<<vendor-specific: items(e.g., a bit, field, code value, etc.) that are not defined by this standard
and may be defined differently by each vendor.>> Replace the last phrase with the SPC-2 version "and may be vendor defined."

GEM 22:
Editorial:
Clause 4.1
<< However, the physical model defined for each of these device types indicate whether random-access operations are possible or just inefficient.>> Odd wording. I suspect something like "However, the physical model defined for eac of these device types indicates whether random-access operations are impossibl or just inefficient." or maybe "However, the physical model defined for each o these device types indicates whether random-access operations are possible or impossible."

Gem 23
Nit picking:
Same clause:
<< (see SBC for a description of a random-access device).>> SBC is not a referenced standard. Delete the phrase or add the reference.

Gem 24
Nit picking:
Clause 4.2
<< Thus, transferring data as a stream is most efficient, since the media may traverse the read/write mechanism as a flow of data.>> I doubt it. Perhaps "Transferring data as a stream is most efficient, since the media may traverse the read/write mechanism producing a flow of data." In addition search on and replace usually with a deletion "thus". Thus is a good biblical term but of no benefit in a standard.

Gem 25
Derision:
Clause 4.2:
<< Therefore, a printer device class is not a strict subset of a sequential-access device class.>>
It certainly sounds like a subset. It seems doubtful that it is a superset. Bu then who knows what a strict subset is?

GEM 26
Slightly technical:
Clause 5.1.9:
<< gap: A non-data element recorded on the medium.>> Does the gap have to be recorded?

GEM 27
Editorial:
Clause 5.1.14.
<<partition: The entire usable region for recording and reading in a volume or in a portion of a volume, defined in a vendor-specific manner. If there is more than one partition, they shall be numbered starting with zero (i.e. beginning-of-partition 0).>> It is not correct to define it as defined in a vendor-specific manner and then specify standard requirements. A clearer distinction is needed between what is vendor-specific and what is required.

GEM 28
Editorial:
Clause 5.1.21
<< indicated by 0h in the BUFFER MODE field in the mode parameter header (see 5.4.3), the opposite of buffered mode>> 0h is not the opposite of BUFFER MODE. At least to this point a code was not mentioned for BUFFER MODE.

Gem 29
Nit picking:
Clause 5.2.1:
<< Sequential-access devices (called devices below)>> Actually several other terms were used below.

GEM 30
Technical:
Clause 5.2.1 << The logical unit is not ready when no volume is mounted or, from the initiator's perspective, whenever all medium access commands report CHECK CONDITION status and a NOT READY sense key.>> Why does the initiator hav to try all medium access commands before determining that the logical unit is not ready?

GEM 31
Technical:
<< The Reserve, Release, Persistent Reserve Out, Persistent Reserve In command (see SPC) are optional for sequential-access devices. Element reservations are not supported by this model.>> Persistent Reservations have undergone significant technical changes since SPC. I suggest changing the reference to SPC-2.

GEM 32
Editorial:
<< As shown in Figure 2, the entire physical length of medium is not usable fo recording data.>>
That is unfortunate. I hope it does not cost much. For better pricing I suggest changing it to "As shown in Figure 2, a portion of the physical length of medium is not usable for recording data."

GEM 33
Nit picky:
The reference to Figure 7 should be moved to the prior sentence. It really doe not relate to the sentence it is in.

GEM 34
Editorial:
Clause 5.2.3
Partition was previously defined. What is a mini-volume?

GEM 35
Editorial:
Clause 5.2.4
<< The filemark format is defined in some American National Standards.>> This is not a helpful reference. Delete it or be specific. << At least one American National Standard specifically defines filemark use for this purpose.>> Nor is this. << The setmark format is defined in some American National Standards.>> Another useless reference. << Certain American National Standards define gap lengths which,>> No better.

GEM 34
Editorial:
Clause 5.2.5
<< 5.2.5 Device initialization A device shall be in the uninitialized and unloaded state after power-up.>> In spite of the title the clause deals with uninitialization and leaves out initialization. Perhaps if devices do not beco initialized the clause should be titled "Device initial state".

GEM 34
Editorial:
Clause 5.2.6
<< A device with read-ahead data blocks in the data buffer does not report an unrecovered read error until the data block in error is requested by an application client.>> Since an unrecovered error may cause the data blocks to not be in the data buffer, I think this should be changed to "A device that encounters an unrecoverable error during a read-ahead operation shall not repo the error unless the data block in error is requested by an application client."

GEM 35
Editorial:
Clause 5.2.6
<< The WRITE BUFFER command shall ensure transfer of buffered data for modes 4 through 7 (firmware downloads).>> Specifically what does this mean? Does it me the command should be completed?

GEM 36
Technical:
Clause 5.2.7
<< Issuing tagged write commands with the immediate bit not set provides the functional equivalent of issuing untagged write commands with the immediate bi set and data buffering enabled.>> This is not correct. An immediate write command with a deferred error may result in ambiguity of which command resulte in a deferred error. A tagged write command error does not have the potential ambiguity.

GEM 37
Editorial:
Clause 5.2.8
<< has an unique>> Contaminated by an SCSI. This should be "has a unique".

GEM 38
Editorial:
Clause 5.2.8
<< If supported, the end-of-data block identifier representing the position past the last logical element in a partition shall be unique for the medium.>> What does "unique for the medium" mean to the design engineer?

GEM 39
Editorial:
Clause 5.2.9
<< For sequential-access devices, positioning has the connotation of logically being in, at, before, or after some defined place within a volume.>> I think t definition would be clearer if "in" were deleted. But then << The orientation

usage for the four words (in, at, before, or after) is in
one direction, from BOP x toward EOP x.>> leaves me numb. And what could be more numbing than << All positioning defined below is worded from this perspective. Devices without buffers have some physical position that relates these logical positions. However, these definitions do not require the medium have a physical position equivalent to the logical position
unless explicitly stated.>> But then what about the text before it as recorded in GEM 40.

GEM 40
Editorial:
Clause 5.2.9
<< This definition means the position is capable of being repeated under the same circumstances.>> I don't think so. Replace with "Positioning requires tha the position is capable of being repeated under the same circumstances."

GEM 41
Editorial for technical content:
Clause 5.2.9.1
<< The appropriate sense key and additional sense code and an additional sense code should be set.>> Distinguish the last item by making it "additional sense code qualifier".

GEM 42
Editorial:
Clause 5.2.9.1
<< In the case of an unrecovered read error, if the FIXED bit is one, the sens data valid bit shall be set to one and the information field shall be set to t requested transfer length minus the actual number of blocks read (not includin the unrecovered block).>>

GEM 43
Technical:
Clause 5.2.12
<< The MODE SENSE/SELECT configuration of the TapeAlert interface is compatibl with the SMART diagnostic standard for disk drives.>> There is no such standar What is the reference to? The ATA/ATAPI-4 and 5 standards include requirements for S.M.A.R.T. "SMART" is understood to be trade marked.

GEM 44
Editorial:
Clause 5.2.12
<< b) Immediately after a fatal error during the write/read job.>> What is a fatal error? I want to avoid such an error.

GEM 45
Editorial:
Clause 5.2.12.1
<<The specific conditions for any one flag to be set and cleared are
device-specific,
and shall be defined by the device vendor implementing them.>> Change to "The specific conditions for any one flag to be set and cleared are
vendor-specific."

GEM 46
Editorial:
Clause 5.2.12.1
<< Each flag shall be cleared to zero in the following circumstances:
a) At drive power on.
b) When the TapeAlert log page is read.>> Change to "Each flag shall be cleare to zero in the following circumstances:
a) At drive power on.
b) After the TapeAlert log page is read."

GEM 47

Editorial:
Clause 5.2.12.1
<< e) On LOG SELECT reset (note the recommended action on receiving LOG SELECT for the TapeAlert log page is to reject the command with an error).>> The relationship between the requirement and the parenthetical statement is not clear. Also below notes are not numbered. Prior notes are numbered.

GEM 48
Editorial:
Clause 5.2.12.2
<< (i.e. an autoloader),>> I think this should be "(e.g., an autoloader),"

GEM 49
Editorial:
Clause 5.2.12.2
It is confusing whether the flag definitions apply or the statement that they are device-specific apply. I had assumed device-specific meant they were vendor-specific.

GEM 50
Editorial:
Clause 5.2.12.2
<< This flag is set when the tape drive fails its internal Power-On-Self-Tests (POST), and is not internally cleared until the drive is powered off.>> This appears to be in conflict with the earlier requirement for clearing flags.

GEM 51
Editorial:
In 5.4.3.4 and perhaps global the * should be replaced with the centered * symbol to make it clear whether it is a footnote or multiplication.

GEM 52
Editorial:
Table 52 is split between two pages and the second page is mainly blank. Fix the pagination or reformat the table as a continued/concluded table.

GEM 53
Editorial:
Annex A
<< The addition of the REPORT DENSITY SUPPORT command has removed the requirement that density codes be specifically named in this standard.>> Sound like an editorial progress report. I suggest changing it to "The following cod may be used with the REPORT DENSITY SUPPORT command." If that is what is meant

GEM 54
Technical:
Annex A
Replace the ? marks in Table 75 with the appropriate value.

GEM 55
Editorial:
Table 75 is split between two pages. Reformat the table as a continued/concluded table without so much blank space on the first page of the annex.

GEM 56
Editorial
Annex B
In table 76 change the justification in the Cause column to eliminate the awkward spaces between words.

The following additional comments have been provided by Seagate's tape operation and account for the ballot not being an individual's ballot:

#1

Editorial
Clause 4.1
PDF page 18
Para 1, line 2 "printerdevices"
Change to "printer devices"

#2
Editorial
PDF page 19
"5.1.3. buffered mode: A mode of data transfer in write operations which facilitates tape streaming
(see 5.1.5),"
Section 5.1.5 defines end-of-data, not tape streaming. Either add a definitio for tape streaming and point this cross reference to it, or delete the reference.

#3
Editorial
Clause 5.2.1
PDF page 20
"The logical unit is not ready during the transition between mounted and not mounted, or not mounted to mounted."
Grammatical quibble: non-parallel phrases. Change "between" to "from" and "and" to "to":
"The logical unit is not ready during the transition from mounted to not mounted, or not mounted to mounted."

#4
Editorial
PDF page 21
Fig. 2
Horizontal line to the right of "Usable" is not straight.
All descenders ('g', 'p', and 'y') in this figure are clipped.

#5
Editorial
Bookmarks do not have section numbers.
Please add them.

#6
Editorial
Clause 5.2.6
PDF page 26
4th para.
"If an unrecoverable write error occur ..."
Change "occur" to "occurs"

#7
Editorial
Clause 5.2.10
PDF page 29
There is an extra linefeed between numbered paragraphs b) and c).
Please remove.

#8
Editorial
Bookmarks, clauses 5 - 6
There is a stray bookmark, labelled only "P" immediately before the first bookmark of section. 6.
Please remove.

#9
Editorial
Bookmarks, general.
Clicking on a bookmark changes the zoom of the page to an unreadably small

size.
Please change so that the current zoom size is maintained when moving to the selected section.

****

Comments attached to YesC ballot from Erich Oetting of
Storage Technology Corp.:

StorageTek letter ballot comments on SSC revision 17.

1(E) p iii - Title should be Stream Devices, not Steam.

2(E) p 1 - Remove extra blank line after b) define commands ...

3(E) p 1 - Figure caption for fig. 1 should be on this page.

4(E) p 3 - SPC should be X3.301:1997

5(E) p 3 - Add SPC-2 to list after SPC.

6(E) p 2 - SBC should be NCITS.306:1998

7(E) p 2 - SMC should be NCITS.314:1998

8(E) p 2 - SCC is obsolete and should be removed from the list

9(E) p 2 - MMC should be NCITS.304:1997

10(E) p 3 - SPC and SMC should be moved to approved references and delete clause 2.1.2 and note 1.

11(E) p 3 - SPC should be X3.301:1997

12(E) p 3 - SMC should be NCITS.314:1998

13(E) p 4 - Missing space after items in 3.3.10

14(E) p 16 - Clause 5.2.7, The WRITE command does not have an immediate bit. Also the problems of using tagged commands should be explainged here. Replace second sentence with: Provided the initiator does not limit the number of oustanding tagged commands, issuing tagged write commands with data buffering disabled provides the functional equivalent of issuing untagged write commands with data buffering enabled.

15(T) p 16 - Clause 5.2.8, This clause is referenced by the Read Position and Locate commands in describing a BT bit of zero. Reading this clause, it is not clear what block identifier to return. Replace the second paragraph of this clause with:
"The block identifier value algorithm may be defined by the applicable format standard for the media. When not specified by the format standard, the block identifier value shall be an sequential increasing number assigned to each logical block, filemark and setmark recorded in the partition starting with zero for the recorded element at BOP."

16(E) p 17, paragraph 2. Change "real physical location" to "physical location".

17(E) p 18, paragraph following Condition table should be reworded for clarity. The read-write error recovery page (see 5.4.3.5) current values

specify behaviour when an unrecoverable read or write error is encountered. If this page is not implemented, the behaviour is vendor-specific.

18(E) p 19, Remove extra blank line after b) associated write protect near bottom of page.

19(T) p 21, table 1. Remove Write Filemarks command from table 1. The Immed bit in Write Filemarks specifies that filemarks are put in the buffer the same as Write data. The function is thus complete when status is returned, unlike the other commands in the table.

20(E) p 25, Table 5. Remove obsolete Change Definition command.

21(E) p 30, paragraph 5. Sense DATA EOM, data should not be small caps.

22(E) p 34, following table 15. Sentence should start "A beginning-of-partition (BOP) bit".

23(T) p 35, second paragraph. After an error, block position may be unknown, BPU should be set in this case. Delete sentence starting "If the BIS bit set...".

24(E) p 35, second paragraph. Add blank line after paragraph.

25(E) p 76, Table 31. Remove obsolete Change Definition command.

26(E) p 76, Table 31. Add Report Luns command.

27(E) p 76, Table 31. Remove blank lines in table.

28(E) p 76, Table 31. Remove SMC from key list, it does not appear in table.

29(E) p 76, Table 31. Add SPC-2 to key list as ref. for Report Luns command.

Further comments on SSC Rev 17.

p 22 - Clause 5.2.12.1 note c)
This should read (note the recommended action on receiving LOG SELECT is to reject the command with CHECK CONDITION and the sense key shall be ILLEGAL REQUEST)
p 23 - Clause5.2.12.2 bottom of page add:
d) Flags 40 - 49 For tape autoloader errors
e) Flags 50 - 64 Further tape errors
p 94 Remove blank box between flag 19 and 20
p 95 Remove blank box between flag 28 and 29
p 95 Remove blank box between flag 35 and 36
p 96 Remove blank box between flags 39 and 40 and 46 and 50
p 97 Remove blank box after flag 54.

****

Comments attached to No ballot from Robert Snively of
Sun Microsystems Computer Co:

Dear Mr. Lohmeyer:

I regret that I must vote no on the document for the following reason:

Section 5.2.12.1, Tape Alert not reset correctly

The following agreement on the proper resetting of the tape alert bits is not included in section 5.2.12.1.

> **X-Unix-From: StephenG@hpcpbla.bri.hp.com Mon Jun 7 05:35:44 1999**
> **X-BadHeader: Mon Jun 7 05:35:44 1999**
> **From: "Gold, Stephen" <StephenG@hpcpbla.bri.hp.com>**
> **To: T10@Symbios.COM**
> **Subject: SSC: TapeAlert behavior with multiple initiators**
> **Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 13:25:56 +0100**
> **Mime-Version: 1.0**
>
> *** From the T10 Reflector (t10@symbios.com), posted by:**
> *** "Gold, Stephen" <StephenG@hpcpbla.bri.hp.com>**
> *****
> **Hi all,**
>
> **Due to the concerns with TapeAlert error flags in multi-initiator environments, here is a suggestion for improved wording of the TapeAlert log page definition to cover this case.**
>
> **The suggested change is in the clearing criteria for TapeAlert flags, changing**
> **"When the TapeAlert Log page is read"**
> **to**
> **"When the TapeAlert Log page is read - note that in multi-initiator environments the TapeAlert flags should be cleared on read on a per-initiator basis such that set flags are still visible to other initiators"**
>
> **Comments?**
>
> **Regards,**
> **Stephen Gold**
> **Hewlett-Packard**
> *****
> *** For T10 Reflector information, send a message with**
> *** 'info t10' (no quotes) in the message body to majordomo@symbios.com**

Thank you very much,

Bob Snively

--
Bob Snively   Phone: (510) 574-9051
Sun Microsystems Computer Company
Mail Stop NWK 04-104
901 San Antonio Road   E-mail: bob.snively@sun.com
Palo Alto, CA 94303
--

****

Comments attached to YesC ballot from Paul D. Aloisi of Unitrode Corporation:

Points of Contact has several errors; John Lohmeyer - Company & Email

WWW wrong address   /T10 not X3T10
FTP wrong address

The scope has several errors where X3T10 is used for T10 documents.

2 versions of the document were on the web site without a different version number. The first version had several formating errors. No Notification to the change in the web site document or Rev Change, there should have been at least a letter added to the end to notify people the document they downloaded for review changed.

********** End of Ballot Report **********