Minutes Oct 3, 2008
Date: Oct 3, 2008
Time 12:00 pm – 2:00 pm EDT
Location Phone Conference

Agenda:
1) Opening remarks
2) Attendance and Membership
3) Discussion of Document T10/08-149r3

1) Opening Remarks:

- Fred Knight called the meeting to order and indicated that the Webex would be used for the attendance list (Ralph Weber indicated he would not be on the Webex).
- Attendees were instructed by Bob Nixon to view the INCITS patent policy at the INCITS www site (http://www.incits.org/pat_slides.pdf).

2) Attendance

Attendance at working group meetings does not count toward minimum attendance requirements for T10 membership. Working group meetings are open to any person or organization directly and materially affected by T10's scope of work. The following people attended the meeting:

Attendees:
Mr. Bob Nixon	Emulex
Mr. Chris Fore	NetApp
Mr. Dave Landsman	SanDisk
Mr. David Black	EMC
Mr. David Woodhouse	
Mr. George Penokie	LSI
Mr. Jim Hatfield	Seagate
Mr. John Sheehy	
Mr. Matthew Wilcox	
Mr. Ross Zwisler	
Mr. Sean Dolan	EMC
Mr. Tom Coughlan	
Mr. Frederick Knight	NetApp
Mr. John Geldman	Lexar Media
Mr. Ralph Weber	ENDL Texas
Mr. Kevin Marks	Dell

16 in Attendance

3) Discussion

- Fred Knight led the group through a discussion of a pending revision of 08-149 (which incorporates feedback from the September T10 SCSI CAP meeting).
- Major changes suggested by the group included:
    1. Change state names to "Mapped" and "Unmapped". Also add glossary entries, and search SBC-3 to make sure the terms are not already in use
    2. change "will" to "shall" in the model clause. Also change "do not" to "shall not" in the model clause.
    3. Consider changing "may occur" to "occurs" in the model clause.
    4. Section 4.4-Logical Blocks : first sentence. Re: "may be ..." -- consider alternate wording.
    5. 4.4.1.1 (Overview)
        1. Re: Figure (a) -- Change "PB" to "Mapped" and "Hole" to "Unmapped" in this figure.
        2. Suggested language: A mapped logical block has a known relationship to a physical block, an unmapped logical block has no specified relationship to a physical block (or some refinement thereof).
    6. 4.4.1.2 -- Allocated (Mapped) State
        1. add language covering the initial condition for arriving at the Allocated State.
        2. Proposal should allow for the transition to occur for vendor specific reasons.
    7. 4.4.1.3 Hole (Unmapped) State
        1. It was noted that as currently proposed, the requirements for READ behavior in the Unmapped state do not allow T10 punch operations to be mapped to T13 trim operations. It was also noted that anyone intending to bring new proposals into T13 for ACS-2 should bring them in no later than the December meeting.
        2. Consider if the proposal should specify behavior across a power cycle. The underlying concern is to prevent the data from changing without notifying the application client. Reporting a Unit Attention (29/00) or possibly a medium error was determined to be sufficient
        3. 4.4.1.3.1 (Transitions) : Change the language to say "This transition occurs when..."
    8. 4.4.1.5.2 Punch operation
        1. Suggest that "punched" be replaced with "unmapped" across the proposal.
        2. Author to change the language to say "... one or more extents" (assuming a search of SBC confirms that the term extent is already in use).
    9. Discussion side tracked for a short time on the TP management operations (including the possible presence of a 3rd state that would need to be added) – should the management commands use mapped/unmapped like the I/O

path or should it use present/not present (it was ultimately deferred to the management proposal). The goal should be to use common language.
10. A question about a hole (unmapped block) that returned choice "a" (the previous contents) being mapped vs. unmapped took the remaining discussion time; and concluded with the punch command being a hint, and not a "shall" operation.

3) The conference call ended at 2:00PM EDT.