<div align="center">

Draft Minutes
Automation/Drive Interface (ADI) Working Group
Ad Hoc Teleconference
T10/07-431r0
26 September 2007
8:00 AM – 10:00 AM PDT

</div>

1 Introductions:

Paul Suhler called the teleconference to order at 8:00 AM PDT. He thanked Quantum for hosting the teleconference.

2 Approval of the agenda:

Paul Suhler reviewed the agenda with the group. No one requested additions or changes.

3 Attendance and Membership:

The listing below captures the attendance at this teleconference:

```
            Name                      S           Organization
----------------------------------- -- -------------------------------------
Mr. Noud Snelder                     V  BDT
Mr. Curtis Ballard                   V  Hewlett Packard Co.
Mr. Michael Banther                  A  Hewlett Packard Co.
Mr. Kevin Butt                       A  IBM Corp.
Mr. Geoffrey Barton                  V  Overland Storage
Dr. Paul Suhler                      A  Quantum Corp.
Mr. Paul Entzel                      P  Quantum Corp.
Mr. Rod Wideman                      V  Quantum Corp.

8 People Present

Status Key:  P    -  Principal
             A,A# -  Alternate
             AV   -  Advisory Member
             E    -  Emeritus
             L    -  Liaison
             V    -  Visitor
```

4 Review of action items:

07-052   Michael Banther will revise 07-321r2 per old business item 8.2 of 07-405r0. *Closed*, 07-321r3.

07-053   Paul Entzel will incorporate 07-321r2 as revised into ADT-2. *Carryover*.

07-054   Paul Suhler will revise 06-060r5 to show the work on the Link Negotiation state machine complete. *Closed*, 06-060r6.

07-055   Paul Suhler will revise 06-425r6 per old business item 8.4 of 07-405r0. *Closed*, 06-425r7.

07-056   Curtis Ballard will revise 07-164r0 per new business item 9.2 of 07-405r0. *Closed*, 07-164r3.

5   Old business:

5.1   *ADC-3: Automation control of encryption ([07-164r3](#)) [Ballard]*

Curtis discussed the changes in the latest revision with the working group.

Paul Entzel questioned whether the proposal was bringing the concept of I_T nexus into the physical device now. He suggested that control be the RMC device server or the management interface.

We considered that control lie with either with RMC device server, the ADC device server, or management interface. The standard should not include the I_T nexus or port when discussing control.

Paul Entzel, Kevin Butt, Curtis Ballard, and Paul Suhler discussed the definition of management interface, whether it's needed, can it be referenced, etc.

Curtis Ballard discussed the definition of 'service requirement.' The group agreed that the remote SMC device server doesn't belong in this definition. Paul Entzel indicated that the definition may want to indicate the automation application client as the entity that needs to respond; however he isn't sure if the definition becomes too narrow. Rod Wideman and Kevin Butt questioned the name of the definition. Why isn't it 'service notification' or something similar? Paul Entzel suggested that 4.10.3.2 already defines the concept and that the definition in 3.1.40 should go away. Rod countered that a more general definition of 'data encryption service request' might be useful.

Curtis Ballard moved the discussion on to consideration of 4.10.2.1. He explained the rational for staying with the different verbs rather than changing all three options to 'disable'. If the group agrees to the changes in 4.10.2.3.3, Curtis wants to re-word item c) in 4.10.2.1 in terms of exclusive control.

Curtis Ballard discussed the changes in 4.10.2.3.3. He has re-worded this clause from 'prevention' to 'exclusive control.' Paul Entzel asked 'if an encryption algorithm is disabled is it disabled for all device servers?' Curtis replied that it was. Paul followed on with the question, 'if an encryption algorithm is removed, is it removed for all device servers or only for the RMC device server?' Curtis replied that removal is only for the RMC device server, and Paul found the proposed text that clarifies this point.

Kevin Butt asked if the ability to disable an encryption algorithm should be placed in a separate proposal. Rod Wideman asked if there is a way to layer the proposal into multiple proposals to make it easier for everyone to reach consensus. Paul Entzel noted that the current proposal addresses two closely related concepts: who gets to control setting the encryption algorithms and what encryption algorithms are visible in the device capabilities list.

Paul Entzel complained that the combination of an enabled encryption algorithm for which an application client cannot view the description (because it has been removed from the RMC's encryption algorithm list) is a bad idea. He argued that an application client should at least be able to verify that the data is being handled in an expected way, even if the application client is not in control of the encryption algorithm in use. Kevin Butt noted that IBM wants to have a mechanism where an encryption algorithm is available for use but it cannot be viewed as available for use by the primary port application client.

The group moved on to a discussion of the security parameters, where do they reside, where should they reside, and what options we have to keep any encryption algorithm available to

the ADC device server but shield the RMC device server from selecting some of them. Rod Wideman brought the group back to a concrete discussion.

Curtis Ballard re-stated that the only purpose of the remove bit is to hide the associated encryption algorithm from the list presented by the RMC device server. Kevin Butt noted that the restriction on viewing an encryption algorithm should only apply if the ADC device server has exclusive control.

Curtis Ballard agreed to remove the remove bit.

The group moved on to a discussion of the term, 'disable' and particularly the closeness of the terms disable bit (ADC-x) and disabled bit (SSC-x). We agreed on some wording to make it blatantly clear how the disable bit affects the RMC device server without actually laying a requirement on that device server.

Curtis Ballard requested comments in general and for 4.10.3 in particular.

Paul Entzel suggested moving away from the exclusive/allow terms for control to a model of exclusive only. Paul's comment opened up a discussion of whether non-exclusive control should ever happen.

Curtis Ballard agreed to bring back a revision.

6   New business:

No one brought new business before the meeting.

7   Next meeting requirements:

The group will hold a teleconference on 10 October 2007 beginning at 8:00 AM PDT and concluding at 10:00 AM PDT.

The group will hold a teleconference on 31 October 2007 beginning at 8:00 AM PDT and concluding at 10:00 AM PDT.

The group will hold a meeting on 5 November 2007 during T10 plenary week in Las Vegas, Nevada beginning at 9:00 AM PST and concluding at 1:00 PM PST.

8   Review new action items:

07-057   Curtis Ballard will revise 07-164r3 per Old Business item 7.1.

9   Adjournment:

Rod Wideman motion for adjournment. Kevin Butt seconded the motion. The group passed the motion unanimously. Paul Suhler adjourned the group at 9:56 AM PDT.