

Accredited Standards Committee
NCITS, National Committee for Information Technology Standards

Doc: T11/00-227v0
Date: April 3, 2000
Project: AL-3
Ref Doc.:
Reply to: John Scheible

To: T11.3 Membership
From: John Scheible

Subject: AL-3 WG minutes 04/03/2000

1. Opening remarks and Introductions

John Scheible called the meeting to order at 9:00. Brocade was thanked for hosting the meeting and introductions were made.

Attendance at working group meetings does not count toward minimum attendance requirements for T11 membership. Working group meetings are open to any person or organization directly and materially affected by T11's scope of work. The following attendees signed up as attending the meeting. If any of this information is incorrect, please contact George Penokie to update the T11.3 database.

Company	Last Name	First Name	Email
Adaptec	Cummings	Roger	cummings_roger@dpt.com
Ancor	Carlson	Craig	cwc@ancor.com
CMD	O'Neil	Stephen	Oneil@cmd.com
Compaq	Zeitler	Carl	carl.zeitler@compaq.com
Crossroads Systems	Wanamaker	Neil	ntw@crossroads.com
ENDL	Allan	Dal	endlcom@acm.org
Fujitsu	Fitzpatrick	Mike	mfitzpatrick@fcpa.fujitsu.com
Gadzoox	Martin	William R.	bmartin@gadzoox.com
HP/Agilent	Wakeley	Matt	Matt_wakeley@agilent.com
IBM	Penokie	George	gop@us.ibm.com
IBM	Scheible	John	jpscheible@aol.com
Interphase	Schuring	Edward	dschurig@iphase.com
JNI	Stuber	Craig	Cstuber@jni.com
LSI Logic	Binford	Charles	Charles.Binford@lsil.com
McData	Fredericks	Kenneth J.	fredericks@mcdata.com
Mylex/IBM	Schaffer	Colin	Cschaffer@mylex.boulder.com
Northrop Grumman	Nelson	James	nelsoja5@mail.northgrum.com
Quantum	Seto	Pak	pseto@tdh.qntm.com
Seagate	Coomes	James	jim_coomes@notes.seagate.com
Seagate	Milligan	Gene	gene_milligan@notes.seagate.com
Sun Microsystems	Snively	Robert N.	bob.snively@ebay.sun.com
Unisys	Stone	Arlan	arlan.stone@unisis.com

2. Call for changes to minutes and report

A call was made for changes to any of the following documents, and since none were made, they should be considered approved.

- AL-3 minutes 02/14/00 00-114v0 George Penokie
- T11.3 report 02/10/99 see T11.3 minutes George Penokie

3. Approval of the agenda (00-212v0)

The agenda was approved unchanged.

4. Review of old AL-3 action items:

- 1) Write a proposal or initiate reflector traffic related to open handling with limited circuits [Penokie]. This action item is **DROPPED** since it is obsolete (MCM was removed).
- 2) Will write a proposal to show how a second FL_Port or a new FL_Port will be detected so that an F/NL_Port can retire from its fabric functions. [Trustedt]. This action item is **CARRIED OVER**. Reflector traffic is ongoing, and has not been fully responded to.
- 3) Will write a proposal to show that F/NL_Port concept is not required and that a device choosing to support fabric services can become a normal FL_Port and perform identically. [TBD]. This action item is **DROPPED** since no one has signed up for it.

5. Old AL-3 Business: (none)

6. Scheduled New Business FC-AL-3

6.1 Call for new AL-3 editor

Jeff Williams is no longer able to be the editor of the AL-3 document. George Penokie is also not able to be the AL-3 editor.

Bill Martin (Gadzoox) has volunteered to be AL-3 editor. He said he would also be willing to edit AL-2R if the T11.3 committee wanted to replace AL-3 with AL-2R (see 6.2). He did not volunteer to edit both AL-3 and AL-2R. Since the T11.3 chair assigns the editor, John Scheible will request Jeff Stai (T11.3 chair) to assign an editor for AL-3.

6.2 What to do with the AL-3 project

Now that MCM was removed from AL-3 (see February minutes), the question was raised as to how AL-3 differed from AL-2. John Scheible took an action item to review the minutes to report on all approved proposals for AL-3. The group remembered a Jim Coomes proposal on neutral checking, and some state table discrepancies with the AL-2 text that may have never been documented as a separate proposal.

The group had a concern that AL-3 will confuse the AL-2 market. If MCM was killed to avoid AL-2 market confusion, then AL-3 should be withdrawn for the same reasons. If AL-3 does not have significant enhancements, the project proposal should be withdrawn and a new proposal for a revised AL-2 document be generated (AL-2R with the same BSR number as AL-2) which would replace AL-2 if approved. This would require a new project proposal. John Scheible took an action item to generate a new project proposal for AL-2R. Jeff Stai suggested we use the PI-2 (10 Gb FC) work rather than the NCITS template.

Dal Allen (ENDL) proposed a motion to "The AL-3 WG recommends T11.3 withdrawal the AL-3 project and approve a revision to the AL-2 project (AL-2R)". The motion was seconded by Thomas Raeughle of Ancor. It was suggested that the group continue with AL-3 and change the project proposal to AL-2R later if desired. John Scheible stated that a tighter project proposal allows the facilitator to control the meetings by ruling that new features with a large technical impact could be ruled out of order if the project proposal forbid them. It was also brought up that keeping AL-3 confused the AL-2 market. Jeff Stai mentioned that we should raise this issue with the FCA (no action item). Bill Martin (Gadzoox) has volunteered to be AL-3 or AL-2R editor. He stated he is not volunteering to do both projects. Jim Coomes stated he wanted to see the project proposal before voting. He wondered whether changes to improve error isolation or changes to facilitate cheaper switches would be admissible. Dal Allen wanted AL-3 replaced with AL-2R.

Carl Zeitler moved that we defer consideration of this motion, and Jim Coomes seconded the defer request. The vote was 14:1 (14 for deferral, 1 against). John Scheible has an action item to add consideration of AL-2R and the withdrawal of AL-3 to next meetings agenda.

6.3 Status of the AL-3 document

George Penokie will take an action item to get the status of the AL-3 document. Specifically, do we have a framemaker version of AL-2 without any AL-3 changes? John Scheible stated that he remembered that the review of the AL-2 frame document with the AL-2 WordPerfect document was based on a version of AL-2 that did not match the version that went to ANSI for publication. He asked if the AL-2 changes were placed in the frame AL-2 document or into the AL-3 document which already included AL-3 enhancements.

John Scheible mentioned that Jeff Williams found discrepancies between the state tables and the text (text takes priority) when the psuedocode was being generated and considered for AL-3 inclusion. However, he did not remember if these discrepancies were ever documented, or were simply changed in the ongoing AL-3 document.

Jim Coomes remembered that a proposal was approved with Neutral error checking. John Scheible takes an action item to check for any other approved proposals.

6.4 Proposed changes for FC-AL-3 (00-189v0)

Horst Truedtedt presented three items that were considered for AL-2, but were not put in AL-2 in order to speed publication of the document. Horst requested direction from the group to determine if he should proceed with a more detailed proposal.

The first item was a cleanup to remove the ARBITRATION WON state. This state is no longer used since fairness obsoleted it. ARBITATING now goes directly to OPEN. The group thought this was reasonable, but was undecided if there should be minimal change to AL-2 (AL-2R proposal to minimize market confusion) or changes were allowed (AL-3 remains intact).

The second item was related to an L_Port today might ignore the received CLS, quickly transmit CLS, then recognize the CLS and transmit OPN for the new circuit. Although this works, it is not good architecture to "hide" the OPN, it is hereby recommended that the TRANSFER state be removed and the function added to RECEIVED CLOSE and XMITTED CLOSE in FC-AL-3. This optimization may break the spec in principle, but may be undetectable (who knows when the CLS was processed? It was raised that the impact to the silicon may be considerable (and Dal raised the question that the amount of change was not determined). There was a discussion that we could modify 2-3 states and text, or add an informative annex, or add a note. The discussion led toward adding a note on how to optimize the state transitions to get around the problem.

The third item was that in FC-AL, when an L_Port was opened while it was arbitrating, the L_Port forgot that it was arbitrating. Since when an arbitrating L_Port receives an OPN, it continues to arbitrate, we should also allow an L_Port which receives the OPN, to begin arbitrating as soon as possible (or it could miss its opportunity in this access fairness window). It was hereby recommended that an L_Port which receives OPN can begin arbitrating in the OPNED, XMITTED CLOSE, or RECEIVED CLOSE states. Although the group was receptive to this optimization, there was a concern raised as to the impact to the AL-2 documentation. The question of AL-3 vs. AL-2R will again impact the decision.

It will be up to Horst to make the effort to document the detailed changes so that the group can consider them. The decision whether or not to minimize the changes to AL-2 will play a large part in if the effort is made to detail the changes needed.

7. Unscheduled new AL-3 business (none)

8. Review of AL-3 action items

- 1) Will write a proposal to show how a second FL_Port or a new FL_Port will be detected so that an F/NL_Port can retire from its fabric functions. **[Horst Truedtedt]**
- 2) Report on the status of the framemaker AL-2 and AL-3 documents. Specifically, is there a framemaker document (without MCM) equivalent to AL-2? **[George Penokie]**
- 3) Review the AL-3 minutes to determine all proposals approved for inclusion in AL-3. **[John Scheible]**

- 4) Request Jeff Stai (T11.3 chair) get an AL-3 editor (assign a volunteer or call for volunteers) **[John Scheible]**
- 5) Generate a project proposal for AL-2R and request reflector feedback. **[John Scheible]**
- 6) Add agenda items for AL-2R consideration and AL-3 withdrawal for the next meeting **[John Scheible]**

9. Future meeting plans

No meeting time was requested in May at the T10 meetings. Three hours (at least two hours) were requested at the next T11 week in June. The group requested avoiding conflicts with SB-2, 10 Gb work. Overlap with BB, AE, SL is OK (although there was some question as to SL overlap). Members should expect reflector traffic on an AL-2R project proposal. Please respond with any concerns over the reflector, so that the two-week rule may be met to allow the possibility of forwarding AL-2R in June.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25.

Sincerely,

John Scheible

Email: jpscheible@aol.com