

APPROVED MINUTES OF THE 9TH FAIS AD HOC MEETING

The ninth meeting of the T11.5 FAIS Ad Hoc group took place at the Marriot Laguna Cliffs in Dana Point, CA, on March 9, 2004.

The following people were present:

AAROHI	Parag Bhide	parag@aarohi.net
AMCC	Neil Wanamaker	nwanamaker@amcc.com
ASTUTE NETWORKS	Tanjore Suresh	tsuresh@astutenetworks.com
BROCADE	Ed McClanahan	edmc@brocade.com
BROCADE	Bob Snively	rsnively@brocade.com
BROCADE	Steve Wilson	swilson@brocade.com
CISCO	Claudio DeSanti	cds@cisco.com
CISCO	Silvano Gai	sgai@cisco.com
CNT	David Peterson	dap@cnt.com
CROSSROADS	Dexter Anderson	danderson@crossroads.com
DOT HILL	Randy Brown	randy.brown@dothill.com
DOT HILL	Joseph Powell	joseph.powell@dothill.com
DOT HILL	Elizabeth Rodriguez	Elizabeth.Rodriguez@dothill.com
EMC	Fred Oliveira	oliveira_fred@emc.com
IVIVITY	Eddy Quicksall	eddyquicksall@ivivity.com
SUN	Steve Sletten	steven.sletten@sun.com
TROIKA NETWORKS	William Chow	wchow@troikanetworks.com
VERITAS	Roger Cummings	roger.cummings@veritas.com

A total of 18 people from 13 organizations.

1. Opening remarks and introductions

The Chairman of FAIS, Claudio DeSanti of Andiamo, called the meeting to order and welcomed the attenders, and led a round of introductions.

2. Administrivia

2.1 Approval of minutes

The minutes of the February 3-4 FAIS Ad Hoc meeting had been uploaded to www.t11.org by William Chow of Troika Networks as 04-156v0.

The review of the minutes was deferred until the next FAIS Ad Hoc meeting in April.

2.2 Approval of this agenda

Claudio proposed that this meeting only focused on reviewing the letter ballot comments for the requirements document. In the absence of any objections, this was unanimously accepted.

3. Call for Patents

Claudio stated that amongst rules and policies under which this Working Group operates are the T11, INCITS, and ANSI patent policies. He directed persons wishing to make statements relevant to those policies to do so at the T11.5 or T11 plenary meetings.

4. Review of old FAIS action items

The review of old action items was deferred until the next FAIS Ad Hoc meeting.

5. Old business

There was no old business at this meeting.

6. Scheduled FAIS business

6.1 Letter Ballot Comments

04-171v1

Claudio asked whether anyone had a preference for how to proceed. Ed suggested that we start with the terminology section. Ed proposed that we drop the section completely and their respective comments as well. Elizabeth agreed that we need to decide on this first. Randy said that we need these terms/definitions, regardless of which document they belong in, so we might as well discuss them first. which category of letter ballots comments. Claudio suggested that we keep a subset of the terms/definitions within the document as they are useful.

Roger indicated that he didn't like the term "processing domain" for the DPC definition; relatedly, he also suggested removing "CPP". He accepted replacing this with "computational entities" in these definitions.

There was some discussion about the distinction between front/back entities. Ed and Fred were actioned to construct a terms and definitions to clarify this. William suggested standalone definitions for "front" and "back" that are generally applicable. Ed noted that this doesn't address the issue of inter-client layering.

R-4:

Silvano moved that this be changed to "may". William seconded. Vote: y=3, n=4, a=5. Motion failed.

Ed moved that this be kept as "shall". Silvano seconded. Vote: y=4, n=3, a=4. Motion carried.

Dave moved that this requirement be completely removed. Tanjore seconded. Vote: y=6, n=5, a=0. Motion carried.

R-5:

Silvano moved that the requirement apply only "whenever possible". WC seconded. William suggested a friendly amendment, which was accepted. Vote: y=10, n=0, a=3. Motion carried.

R-6:

Randy suggested adding a new requirement to cancel an async operation. Ed moved for a new requirement. Roger seconded. Vote: y=9, n=1, a=2. Motion carried.

Silvano moved to remove the requirement for a timeout. Randy seconded. Vote: y=5, n=5, a=1. Motion failed.

Ed moved for a reworded requirement for a timeout specified by the FAIS_client. Silvano seconded. William proposed a friendly amendment which was accepted. Vote: y=7, n=1, a=3. Motion carries.

R-7:

Silvano moved to remove it. Ed seconded. Vote: y=6, n=4, a=2. Motion carries.

R-8:

Fred moved to remove it. Silvano seconded. Roger proposed amending it to "support just one client". Ed responded that this is essentially a negatively oriented requirement. Fred declined the amendment. Vote: y=5, n=2, a=4. Motion carried.

R-11:

Ed moved to remove it. Fred seconded. Vote: y=4, n=7, a=0. Motions failed.

Fred moved to reword it to "capabilities shall be determined by a vendor-unique identifier and an opaque string". Silvano seconded. Randy proposed a friendly amendment of "specify which capabilities are required and a way to determine which optional capabilities are supported". Fred declined the amendment. Vote: y=3, n=7, a=2. Motion failed.

Ed moved to reword it for "a coarse degree of granularity". Fred seconded. Vote: y=5, n=3, a=3. Motion carried.

R-13:

William moved to remove it. Roger seconded. Vote: y=8, n=1, a=1. Motion carried.

R-14:

Silvano moved to delete the part “and may support other transports”. Dave proposed to amend it to “support just FCP”, which Silvano declined. Silvano modified his motion to “and iSCSI if possible”. No seconds. Motion failed.

Randy moved for a reworded version which said “and may support other transports”. Roger proposed amending it to say “shall be architected to support multiple SCSI transports”. Randy accepted. Dave seconded. Vote: y=8, n=0, a=1. Motion carried.

R-15:

Elizabeth moved to reword for “relationships” instead of “associations”. Silvano seconded. Vote: y=7, n=0, a=1. Motion carried.

R-16:

It was suggest that this be updated to reflect the new version of R-15. In the absence of any objections, this was unanimously accepted.

7. **Unscheduled FAIS business**

There was no unscheduled FAIS business.

8. **Review of FAIS action items**

The outstanding action items for the meeting were not reviewed. The current action items carried forward from the previous meeting are as follows:

AI 1: Ed McClanahan to review the required operation if an i/o crosses a boundary and the second extent is “held”. (Opened 7/9/2003)

Open.

AI 2: Tanjore Suresh to investigate methods of generating WWNs. (Opened 7/9/2003)

Open.

AI 3: Robert Mulcahy to propose support for journaling. (Opened 7/9/2003)

Open.

AI 4: Roger Cummings to provide requirements for statistics gathering in FAIS and present proposals (Opened 9/10/2003)

Tabled until object model finalized.

AI 5: Mike O'Donnell to post updated terminology/glossary document for review at the next meeting. (Opened 10/7/2003)

Open.

AI 6: Mike O'Donnell to look at wording of HBA API and determine how linkage independency and thread safety/reentrancy is treated. (Opened 10/7/2003)

Open.

AI 7: William Chow to post revisions to the requirements document to address specifics of "error" cases - I/O faults, backside I/O errors, timeouts. (Opened 10/7/2003)

Open.

AI 8: Silvano Gai will work on a draft of Chapter 6. (Opened 11/9/2003)

Open.

AI 9: Roger will work with Claudio on a draft of Chapter 4. (Opened 11/9/2003)

Open.

AI 10: Ed McClanahan and William Chow will work on a draft of Chapter 5. (Opened 11/9/2003)

Open.

AI 11: Roger Cummings to check on possible restrictions for upcall context. (Opened 12/9/2003)

Open.

AI 12: Tanjore Suresh will cross-reference names/types of capabilities against existing standards/prior work. (Opened 1/13/2004)

Open.

AI 13: Roger Cummings/Fred Oliveira/Bob Mulcahy will each provide a list of capabilities that they must be able to query support for. (Opened 1/13/2004)

Open.

AI 14: Ed McClanahan will propose an approach for supporting failover in the event of CPP failure. (Opened 1/13/2004)

Open.

AI 15: George Penokie will produce a UML conventions section for inclusion in the standard.

New.

AI 16: Roger Cummings will provide specific requirements for DPC pass-thru support.

New.

AI 17: William Chow will collect ballot comments for the requirements document.

New.

18. Next meeting schedule

The next meeting of the FAIS group will be at the T11 Plenary week in Seaside, California, on April 6, 6pm-9pm.

Roger suggested a conference call prior to the next plenary. William indicated that this makes voting more difficult. Claudio will try to secure additional time to ensure we can cover for the remaining letter ballot comments. Claudio was actioned to notify folks that the deadline for initial drafts of specification chapters has been postponed indefinitely from the deadline of 2 weeks before the April T11 Plenary week.

19. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting was passed unanimously.