

**IT/99-0164r**

---

Accredited Standards Committee, NCITS, Information Technology  
NCITS Secretariat, Information Technology Industry Council (ITI)  
1250 Eye St. NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20005

Telephone 202-737-8888; Fax 202-638-4922; Email: [ncits@itic.org](mailto:ncits@itic.org)

Date: June 6, 1999

Project: 1240-D

Ref. Doc: None

Reply to: Deborah J. Donovan, NCITS Secretariat

Phone: 202/626-5746

Email: [ddonovan@itic.org](mailto:ddonovan@itic.org)

---

Register of Public Review Comments on NCITS 330:199x, Information Technology - Reduced Block Commands. The public review period is **April 23, 1999 to June 6, 1999**.

---

If the Technical Committee action is to accept in whole or in part a proposal contained in the comment, the changes should be sent to the Coordinator of Standards Processing together with any TC comments supporting the change. If the TC action is to reject in whole or in part proposals contained in the comment, the response should provide the rationale for the rejection.

The comment should be discussed at the next TC meeting, and if not definitively responded to at once, an interim acknowledgment should be sent along with an estimated date of action.

The final response to the commentor must include the provision that the commentor has twenty working days from the postmark of the technical committees response to indicate, in a written statement, acceptance or rejection of the TC response.

---

### **Public Review Comment #1:**

From: Ralph Weber

Reply To: [roweber@acm.org](mailto:roweber@acm.org)

Sent: Sunday, June 6, 1999 9:16 AM

To: Deborah Donovan

Cc: Lohmeyer, John; McLean, Pete; Roberts, Ron

Subject: Public review comments on RBC (NCITS.330)

Dear Ms. Donovan:

On behalf of LSI Logic and myself, I submit the comments below for the public review of RBC (NCITS 330).

Thanks.

Ralph Weber  
LSI Logic

cc: Pete McLean RBC Project Leader  
cc: Ron Roberts RBC Technical Editor  
cc: John Lohmeyer T10 Chair

All PDF pg references are to rbc-r08a.pdf.

LSI #1 In 3.1.6, "one or more logical units" should be replaced with "more than one logical unit"

LSI #2 In 3.1.8, "status" should be at the start of a new clause.

LSI #3 3.3 should be at the top of a page.

LSI #4 In the last sentence of clause 4, the term 'controller' is not a SCSI term defined in SAM or SPC (or the RBC glossary). I recommend replacing 'controller' with 'device server' or 'target'.

LSI #5 In 4.1 and other locations listed below, the usage of 'set' as a synonym for 'set to 1' is not consistent with standard English nor is 'set' defined to have this meaning as a keyword. On correction would be to define 'set' as a keyword, but since numerous locations in RBC already use 'set' in accordance with its common English meaning, I would prefer to see all non-English uses of 'set' changed. The following locations use 'set' in a manner needing change:

PDF pg 19 bullet c) - 'If the READD bit is set,'

PDF pg 19 bullet c) - 'If the WRITED bit is set,'

PDF pg 21 last paragraph before 4.2.5 - 'If the RMB bit in the standard INQUIRY command data is not set,'

PDF pg 35 last sentence on page - 'If the RMB bit in the standard INQUIRY command data is not set, then the LOCKD bit shall be set.'

PDF pg 39 6.4 - 'if the REMOVABLE MEDIUM BIT (RMB) bit is set in the INQUIRY command standard data.'

PDF pg 53 first note on the page - 'bit that is to be set'

The usage of 'clear' as a synonym for 'set to zero' has the same problem of non-English usage. However, not so many occurrences of this problem are present in RBC. The following locations use 'clear' in a manner needing change:

PDF pg 53 first note on the page - 'or cleared if a Status\_Block'

LSI #7 In the first sentence of 4.2, the phrase "Unlike the SPC-2 specification," is not correct and should be removed. SPC-2 specifies the REQUEST SENSE command as 'Z' (Command implementation is device type specific) and SEND DIAGNOSTIC as 'O' (Command implementation is optional). T10 made these changes in SPC-2 so that RBC usage would not have to conflict with statements in SPC-2. RBC should at least do SPC-2 and T10 the courtesy of accepting the efforts made in its behalf.

LSI #8 In 4.2.3, the following sentence is vague:

"Initiators may determine the progress of the remaining command execution in several ways."

Since the 'command execution' under discussion is a format operation, the following is recommended:

"Initiators may determine the progress of the format operation in several ways."

LSI #9 In 4.2.3, the following sentence should have the space removed between 'methods' and the period.

"RBC devices may provide format progress information using one of three methods ."

LSI #10 In 4.4, the following statement is unclear (and may contain a requirement that is unacceptable to LSI):

"For the requirements of this standard, reservations and releases made by the use of the PERSISTANT RESERVATION IN and PERSISTANT RESERVATION OUT commands are the same as those using the RESERVE and RELEASE commands."

If the following statement is a non-substantive substitute for the above, then LSI has no objections (otherwise, LSI reserves the right to object to the publication of RBC):

"Statements made in this standard regarding reserve and release operations apply equally to the PERSISTANT RESERVATION IN, PERSISTANT RESERVATION OUT, RESERVE and RELEASE commands."

It is unacceptable to LSI for RBC to specify that reservations made with the PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT command function identically to reservations made by the RESERVE command, which is one possible interpretation of the RBC sentence questioned above.

LSI #11 In 4.4.1, the following paragraph should be removed as extent reservations are no longer defined in SPC-2.

"If an initiator has an extent reservation on a device, and another initiator attempts a MODE SELECT command, a reservation

conflict occurs if the command affects the manner of accessing the extent by the first initiator. If the command does not affect access to the extent, or parameters are saved for each initiator, then a reservation conflict does not occur."

LSI #12 If persistent reservations are being included in RBC, then it would be best to model 4.4.1 after the SBC information in SPC-2 Annex B.

LSI #13 In table 1, PERSISTENT RESERVE IN, PERSISTENT RESERVE OUT, RELEASE(6), and RESERVE(6) do not need the footnote reference on SPC-2 since they are not mentioned in clause 6.

LSI #14 In 5.1 the first sentence, 'FORMAT UNIT' should be full caps, not small caps.

LSI #15 In 5.1 second paragraph after table 2 in the following text 'values of the PERCENT/TIME and the INCREMENT bit', 'bit' should be 'bits'.

LSI #16 In 5.1 second paragraph after table 2, 'Refer to clause 4.2' should be 'Refer to 4.2'.

LSI #17 In 5.1 third paragraph after table 2, the first occurrence of 'Increment' should not be capitalized, i.e., 'increment' in small caps, not 'Increment' in small caps.

LSI #18 5.1 fourth paragraph after table 2, two instances of 'will' need to be changed to 'shall'. This suggests that a global search and replace needs to be undertaken for words such as 'will', 'can', 'must', 'would', 'should', and 'might'.

LSI #19 5.1 first paragraph after the note, 'information' should be in lower case small caps.

LSI #20 5.1 second and third paragraphs after the note, there is no FORMAT REMOVABLE MEDIA command. The command is FORMAT UNIT. Also, if the statements in these paragraphs are specific to the formatting of removable media, then that fact needs to be stated somehow after the command name has been corrected to FORMAT UNIT.

LSI #21 In 5.2 the last sentence before 5.3, the sentence seems redundant and probably should be removed. The same problem appears in 5.6 regarding the last sentence before 5.7, and in 5.7 the last sentence of the second paragraph after table 11.

LSI #22 In 5.3, removed the double quote from the beginning of the first sentence table 4.

LSI #23 In 5.4 the first sentence, 'table 6' should not be bold.

LSI #24 In 5.4, add the following sentence immediately before 5.4.1:

"The other fields in the START STOP UNIT command are described in the clauses below."

LSI #25 In 5.4.1 table 7, change the key to read:

"M = Support for this power condition is mandatory."

"O = Support for this power condition is optional."

LSI #26 In 5.4.1 the description of device control, change 'RBC mode page 6' to 'RBC mode page (see 5.8.2)'. This suggests that a global search should be made to find references to the RBC mode page. All references to the mode page should be give the same content and the content should include '(see 5.8.2)'.

LSI #27 In 5.7 third paragraph after table 11, change 'them media' to 'the media'.

LSI #28 In 5.8.1 first sentence, 'XXXXX' should be replaced with a reference to table 12.

LSI #29 In 5.8.1 after table 12, a description of the mode parameter header is required here. The following description would be adequate:

"The mode parameter header is described in SPC-2. For RBC devices the MEDIUM TYPE, DEVICE-SPECIFIC PARAMETER and BLOCK DESCRIPTOR LENGTH fields shall contain zero."

LSI #30 In 5.8.2 first paragraph after table 13, the 'WCD' in the first line should be in lower case small caps.

LSI #31 In 6.1 forth and fifth paragraphs after table 15, remove the double quote marks at the beginning of these paragraphs. Also remove the double quote mark at the end of the fifth paragraph after table 15.

LSI #32 In 6.1 fifth paragraph after table 15, the reference should be to 'table 15' not to 'table 14'.

LSI #33 In 6.2 second paragraph after table 16. A period is required at the end of the first sentence in the paragraph.

LSI #34 In 6.2.1 first sentence, 'SP' should be in lower case small caps.

LSI #35 In 7.4.4 second sentence after table 31, 'For EVENT field values other than 02hThe TIME field' should be 'For

EVENT field values other than 02h, the TIME field'.

LSI #36 There is no text in A.5. Either some text should appear in the clause, or it should be removed.

LSI #37 Annex B is not listed in the table of contents.

LSI #38 In Annex B, '(Informative' should be '(Informative)'.

LSI #39 In Annex B, should SPC-2 be listed? The purpose of the Bibliography and its relationship to clause 2 is unclear.

LSI 40# It appears that the GET EVENT STATUS NOTIFICATION command is not defined in RBC. The several references to GET EVENT STATUS NOTIFICATION need to have pointers to the place of definition.

LSI 41# SBP-2 can be moved from 'under development' clause 2.2 to 'approved references' clause 2.1. Note the ANSI standard number also should replace the T10 project number.