

To: Bob Snively
Sun Microsystems

Date: 5/4/89

From: Mike Eneboe
Seagate Technology

Subject: Proposed changes to the SCSI-2, Rev. 8 regarding queuing

Bob,

I don't have problems with any of the wording on queuing except in the areas where the document allows, or does not specifically prohibit, the mixing of tagged and untagged commands.

I would like to propose the following changes:

1. Change the last sentence in paragraph 3 of section 6.5.2 from "These may consist of one untagged and several tagged I/O processes." to "Each I_T_x nexus may consist of either one untagged or several tagged I/O processes."
2. Section 6.5.2 should specifically state which process(es) will get aborted if an I_T_x command is attempted when I_T_x_Q processes are pending. The suggested rewording of the final paragraph might be:

"If a soft reset condition has not occurred and:

 - a) an initiator attempts to initiate an I_T_x I/O process for an already active I_T_x_y nexus, the target shall abort all pending I/O processes for that I_T_x_y nexus and shall return CHECK CONDITION status.
 - b) an initiator attempts to initiate an I_T_x_Q I/O process for an already active I_T_x_y nexus, the target shall abort the I/O process for that I_T_x_y nexus and shall return CHECK CONDITION status.

In either case, the sense key shall be set to ABORTED COMMAND and the additional sense code shall be set to OVERLAPPED COMMANDS ATTEMPTED. Only one status is returned."
3. As a general comment, many of the 'logical' ambiguities could be eliminated if the definition of I_T_x was "Any I_T_L, I_T_R, OR I_T_x_Q nexus." This would help to show the conflict between having both I_T_x and I_T_x_Q commands pending.

Let me know what you think,

Mike

438 439-2406

P.S. I now have much more respect for the editors efforts; just trying to find the appropriate few words here took me over 6 hours!