

## Minutes of T10/SBP-2 working group meeting, 17 March 1998

## Attendees:

Larry Lamers	Adaptec	Georgio Chrysanthakopoulos	Microsoft
Kent Manabe	America Kotobuki	Devon Worrell	Microsoft
Peter Johansson	Congruent	Neil MacLean	Oak
Goeffrey Hoese	Crossroads	Don Smith	Oak
Michael Nguyen	Fujitsu	Randy Hines	Philips
Greg Shue	HP	Mark Evans	Quantum
Dan Colegrove	IBM	Mike Bryan	Seagate
Tim Bradshaw	lomega	James Hsu	SGS-Thom
Gary Brandvold	Maxtor	Steve Finch	SSI
Pete McLean	Maxtor	Dave Evans	Symbios
		Tokuyuki Totani	Toshiba

1. Pete McLean thanked Skip Jones of QLogic for hosting the meeting.

As usual, those present introduced themselves.

Pete McLean explained that this meeting was authorized by and would operate under the ANSI NCITS T10 rules.

2. Pete McLean reviewed the agenda.

It was decided that the letter ballot comments and suggested resolutions for SBP-2 would be discussed before the issue of removing isochronous elements from the document.

An agenda item was added: 98-121r0, Programmable Reconnect Interval Extension proposal from Greg Shue of H-P.

3. Pete McLean asked for comments on the minutes from the last meeting. They were accepted as written.
4. Pete McLean said that the Tailgate document went through letter ballot with no comments and is now at ANSI edit.
5. Peter Johansson began review of his responses to the technical letter ballot comments for SBP-2 in document T10/98-117r0. Peter took an action to document all resolutions. Editorial comments and isochronous elements were deferred until the discussion took place regarding whether isochronous elements be included. The following additional discussion and items occurred during the review:

Steve Finch moved that a value for the management function field be assigned as Vendor Specific. Gary Granville seconded the motion. The motion failed 3:5:3.

Steve Finch moved that the names of Command Block Agents be identified specifically as to whether they are normal or stream agents throughout the document. George Chrysanthakopoulos seconded the motion. The motion was deferred until after lunch. After lunch Peter Johansson agreed to make the necessary change, so the motion carried unanimously.

The following is discussion based on T10/98-120r0. This is Peter Johansson's response to Steve Finch's suggestion to remove all isochronous elements of SBP-2 and potentially initiate a separate proposal to include this:

Peter Johansson said he thought, though these elements were not complete, they were "not broken" and made a good framework for further development.

Steve Finch said that A/V work was occurring in other forums and that he would like to see the work of all of the groups on isochronous merged in to one effort, hopefully under the aegis of T10.

Georgio Chrysanthakopoulos said that if this was not in SBP-2 that this might not ever happen.

Peter Johansson responded that this would work for devices that had no knowledge of their file structures and that this was not exclusively for A/V devices, but other types of isochronous devices, like printers.

Devon Worrell said that taking this out would send a bad message to the industry as to the support from T10 for isochronous.

Mark Evans said that, no, if a new project was initiated this would send a stronger positive message to the community that there was a focus for this development.

Larry Lamers said that this should be a separate project in T10.

Greg Shue said that work for printers was ongoing and would continue. However, it was not clear that this needed to be SBP-2 and might be FCP.

Mark Evans moved that the working group recommend to the plenary that the isochronous portions be removed from SBP-2 and that a new project be proposed to develop a standard for these elements. Steve Finch seconded the motion.

Devon Worrell said that Microsoft wanted a solid standard to which they could point, regardless of its maturity.

Steve Finch said that he thought that if we did not pull this element out, that it would send a bad message to the CE folks because we had not addressed their concerns.

After several more comments, Steve Finch called the question. The motion passed 11:5.

Neil MacLean said that there were a lot of “mays” and annexes and that isochronous could be moved to be an annex.

Devon Worrell said it would take several months to regain isochronous momentum for SBP-2 and that he would probably have to support 61883.

Pete McLean said that we needed a new draft of the project proposal to remove isochronous. He took the action item to do so.

Pete McLean said that we needed a project proposal for the isochronous elements. He took the action item to do so with Steve Finch.

Peter Johansson asked us to discuss how we would feel about moving all of the isochronous portions into the annex.

Mark Evans asked if there were any volunteers for editing the new document.

Steve Finch said that, in the absence of Peter Johansson volunteering, that he had the charter to be the document’s editor.

A straw pole was taken for moving the isochronous elements to an annex in SBP-2. The vote was 4:6:6.

Pete McLean said that if the plenary accepted the recommendation, Peter Johansson would have to turn the document, and that there would have to be another meeting of the working group to review of the modified document.

Greg Shue presented a proposal to extend the length of the reconnect window (see T10/98-121r0). Pete McLean said that if this was to be included, that there might have to be a new letter ballot.

Peter Johansson reviewed the accepted changes from rev 3 to rev 3a of SBP-2.

Pete McLean said the patent statement needed to be changed based on a response to a call for patents. Peter Johansson agreed to include this change.

Pete McLean and Steve Finch had some minor editorial comments. Peter Johansson agreed to make the changes as discussed.

Peter Johansson reviewed the rejected SBP-2 letter ballot comments as in T10/98-109r0 and the controversial comments in T10/98-117R0. These two documents were accepted as modified without objection.

Pete McLean agreed to make the working group presentation at the plenary. This would include: Presenting the proposal to remove isochrony.

6. Pete McLean reviewed the action items:

1. It was identified while discussing letter ballot comments SF145 and SF146 that there was an issue with the description of task sets. Steve Finch thought, based on his reading of the draft standard, that all tasks from all initiators were one task set. So, if a task set was aborted, all tasks from all initiators would be aborted by a target. However, it was agreed by the group that only all of the tasks from ONE initiator comprised a task set. Thus a Clear Task Set from one initiator would only clear the tasks for that initiator and not from any other initiators logged in to the target. Peter Johansson volunteered to bring in a proposal tomorrow morning to address this issue. It was further agreed that this would be addressed before the RBC working group meeting.
2. If the plenary agrees to remove isochrony, Pete McLean will work with Steve Finch to develop a proposal to draft a project proposal for isochrony.
3. If the plenary agrees to remove isochrony, Peter Johansson will turn a rev of the document including all resolved and proposed letter ballot resolutions.
4. If the plenary agrees to remove isochrony, Peter Johansson will turn a rev of the document with isochrony removed.
5. If the plenary does not agree to remove isochrony, Peter Johansson will turn a rev of his letter ballot comment documents including the unresolved issues for isochrony.
6. Greg Shue will make a revision of his reconnect proposal.

7. Pete McLean made the traditional call for patents. There were no responses.

8. Pete McLean reviewed the meeting schedule. He will request a working group meeting for Wednesday morning, May 6, during T10 week at Colorado Springs.

9. Pete McLean adjourned the meeting.