BROCADE

August 21, 2001   T10/01-263r0

To: John Lohmeyer, chairperson, T10
From: Bob Snively
Date: August 21, 2001
Subject: Draft minutes of SRP teleconference

1 PROPOSED AGENDA:

Documents to be considered:

01-227r1   (Buffer Descriptor Formats) Now included in R8.

01-250r0   (operation overview)

01-230r1   (buffer descriptor rewrite) Minutes did not include inclusion in R8, so still a sepa-
                rate document. Ed wants agreement to put it in R8.

01-177r2   (model for RDMA Communication Services) Now included in R8.

SRP-r8   (Actual SRP document)

01-233r1   (minutes from Co Springs)

01-172r4   (SAM to SRP mapping) Now included in R8.

2 ACTIONS:

1) Approval of minutes

George Penokie had made a comment. The minutes (Document T10/01-233r1) are accepted as
corrected.

2) Consideration of operation overview document (01-250r0)

The new revision was not yet prepared. It is significant enough that no consideration should be
made of it at this time. The new revision will be a complete rewrite.
Cris had a few questions:

Editor's Note 1) was deleted by the group at the last meeting. No other change was made in editor's
note.

Ed was instructed by the teleconferees to install 01-250r0 as modified in SRP revision 9. Ed
will create a 01-250r1 for reference.

3) Consideration of buffer descriptor rewrite (01-230r1)

Table 2 & 3: Cris asks if it needs to be in binary.

This needs to be clarified and mapped back to table 2 correctly. It was suggested that short names be used on table 2.

After extensive discussion, table 2 was modified to indicate that format code 0 was reserved for Buffer Descriptor not present. Format code 1 is reserved for direct buffer descriptor. Format code 2 is reserved for indirect data buffer descriptors. The third line is deleted. Zero is a valid value for n for the indirect buffer descriptor.

Sizes are specified as required to transmit, optional to verify. This was thought of as a potential interoperability testing issue.

The discussion went on to consider the possibility of using length versus a count of indirect memory descriptors. At present, most agree that the length (in words) is appropriate. In most cases, lengths are displaced by two bits so that it can be used as a byte count if preferred. At present, 62 pointers can be counted. Note that this overlaps with the fetch of the more complete list, so that 62 pointers is probably adequate. The count is intended to be independent of descriptor size.

After much discussion, it was decided to discuss this on the reflector. In general, people felt that the "size" should become a "count" field. See the e-mail discussion for the final conclusion.

A new column for "format name" was provided. The size column was removed. The length column was retained.

Ed will fix up all the rest of the related issues.

Ed was instructed by the teleconferees to insert 230r1 as modified in SRP revision 9 for the meeting in September.

Ed will create a 230r2 for reference.

4) Consideration of SRP rev 8, editorial issues

3.1.16	The definition seems a bit vague. Cris will attempt to provide an improved definition. The words "sending consumer" and "receiving consumer" would be a big help.
4.1, line 12	"could" should be "may". A global search for similar problems should be made.
4.1, line 21	"TBD" should be corrected. TBD should be globally searched.
4.1, line 18	"exact" should be deleted.
4.1, figure 2	The definition of RDMA channels needs to be clarified, perhaps using color or other techniques. A key could be used.
4.1, and others:	InfiniBand TM is an adjective and must be used as one in all locations. This particular location should read "the InfiniBand TM architecture".
4.2, page 20, line 1 and 2:	"new" should be deleted.
4.2, page 20:	The word "server address" should probably be something like "server identifier". This caused the request for a global search for "address" in that context.
6.1, table 2:	The fourth column needs to be corrected.
6.1, table 3:	"C2h\" should be "C2h"
4.2, figure 3:	Notes should be labeled a/b/c in figures and tables.
4.2, figure 3:	Provide a key for dotted lines vs. solid lines.
4.2, page 21, line 4:	"actual" should be deleted. A global search for actual should be made.
6.3, page 32, line 37:	This text is replaced by 01-230.
6.5,	explanatory text is being rewritten

6.9, page 44, line 2 or 3

6.9, page 44, line 35. The equation needs an explanation.

4.2, page 21, line 14-15, line numbering failed. This is a universal problem.

4.2, page 21, line 15 This appears to require information about three things afterwards, but doesn't distinguish them. George suggests these be structured as an a/b/c list or as sub-clauses.

4.2, page 21, line 18 "could not" should be "was not"

4.2, page 21, line 42-43 "if necessary" should be deleted.

4.2, page 21, line 46-47 should be clarified and simplified. This also applies to line 1-2 on page 22.

4.2, page 21, line 48-49 "new" should be deleted.

4.2, page 22, line 5-6 "itself" should be deleted.

4.2, page 22, line 7 "them" should be "consumers"

Generic searches for similar editorial problems should be made where possible.

5) Review of SRP revision 8, Technical Issues

Section 6.9:   It was decided to include text that requires that the response code be provided for task management functions.

Section 6.9:   It was decided to mandate that the RSPVALID bit be set to 0 if there are no response code type errors encountered during execution of a normal command.

Section 7.3, 7.4: The proper error code for requesting these should be specified. The proposed error code is ILLEGAL REQUEST: ILLEGAL PARAMETER IN COMMAND. The pages should be specified as reserved in SRP.

Annex A: On page 52, it was quite unclear that the 4-step and 2-step operations related only to SAM operations and not login and connection management. The solution is to provide a clearer title for Annex A.

6) Next steps

Revision 9 should be available by August 31. It should be fully ready for review as far as the editor knows.

The document will be discussed at the next SRP working group. The working group will recommend to the SCSI chair person that the SRP rev 10 should be balloted if normal revisions can complete any problems with it.

All going well, ballot comment resolution will begin in the November meeting.

7) I/O Controller profile

Cris Simpson is preparing an I/O Controller profile for the device management function of the IBTA specification volume 1. He will investigate how that can be made available for study by T10 members.

3   ACTION ITEMS:

1) Ed Gardner will:
       a) Create 01-230r2 for reference.
       b) Create 01-250r1 for reference.
       c) Include 01-230r2 and 01-250r1 in SRP rev 9.

d) Include the suggested editorial corrections in SRP rev 9.

e) Include the agreed upon resolutions to the technical issues above.

2) Cris Simpson will verify the proper usage of InfiniBand and the accompanying noun words for InfiniBand TM and make it known to Ed Gardner.

3) Cris Simpson will investigate how the I/O controller profile can be made available for the study of T10.

4 ATTENDEES:

Cris Simpson	Intel
John Tyndall	Crossroads
Ralph Weber	ENDL Texas
Bob Snively	Brocade
Ed Gardner	Editor (Ophideon for Maxtor)
John Carrier	Adaptec
George Penokie	Tivoli