

APPROVED MINUTES OF THE FAIS 5/2/2005 CONFERENCE CALL

The following people were in attendance:

BROCADE	Ed McClanahan	edmc@brocade.com
CISCO	Claudio DeSanti	cds@cisco.com
CISCO	Maurilio Cometto	maurilio@cisco.com
EMC	Anshul Chadda	chadda_anshul@emc.com
EMC	Greg Golubski	golubski_greg@emc.com
EMC	William Whalen	whalen_william@emc.com
IVIVITY	Eddy Quicksall	eddyquicksall@ivivity.com
MCDATA	Larry Hofer	larry.hofer@mcddata.com
TROIKA NETWORKS	William Chow	wchow@troikanetworks.com

A total of 9 people from 6 organizations.

FAIS Naming Conventions Update (05-310v1) Ed McClanahan (Brocade)

Ed asked whether anything was missed. None noted.

Ed noted the updated "function" convention. No objections.

Eddy asked whether struct member names may conflict with types. Ed noted that types have a FAIS_ prefix.

Review of API Proposal (05-008v0) Anshul Chadda (EMC)

William introduced the new 1.4 Port Services section. He noted that there remains two primary areas that need to be merged. First, there are functions that directly overlap in functionality between those for FAIS_SCSI_Ports and those for FTs and BIs. Second, there are related structures that currently reference FTs/BIs that could/should use FSPs instead.

Ed noted that IN/OUT is an exception to the naming convention. He will add a note to 05-310.

Ed noted that enums need to be _E suffix. Anshu will change.

Ed asked whether there needs to be a discovery port mode for 1.4.2.2. William asked whether this can be sufficiently supported by a target-mode FAIS_SCSI_Port. Eddy will investigate. Ed noted that it might be a bitmask if "discovery" needs to be a mode concurrent with initiator/target. Ed

suggested a note to 1.4.2.2.2 saying that a FAIS_SCSI_Port can be used for transport-specific activity, e.g. iSCSI "discovery" session.

Eddy asked how SendTargets would even be received; he noted that these differ from commands since they aren't directed to a LUN. William noted that no interface has been defined for handling iSCSI text messages since discussion of events has been deferred to FAIS v2, but he suggested that such messages would simply indicate which Transport_Port received the message. Ed responded that this suggests that the more appropriate place for the aforementioned note on iSCSI discovery would fit more appropriately with the Transport_port. It was agreed that Anshul will add this to 1.4.2.10 (instead of 1.4.2.2.2).

Anshul asked about filling out 1.4.2.10. William said this is at least IPAddr/TCPport. Ed asked about MAC addr. William suggested that this ties the type to Ethernet, so it precludes other iSCSI transport. It was agreed that Anshul will define ip-address and tcp-port as the members for 1.4.2.10.

Eddy asked about uint64 (i.e. on platforms that don't have this type). Ed noted that this (and any other types not natively available) would need to be provided by the Provider (via headers).

Claudio asked for elaboration on creating FAIS_SCSI_Ports. Maurilio asked how a Client would support zoning FSPs with remote port WWNs. William said that the Provider would typically have a Region for each distinct zone/vfabric. He then asked whether the Client can provide a CPort parameter to indicate the particular DPC for that exposure. Anshul said this would allow his Client to manage failure domains for the exposures of the FSPs. Ed responded that this is an appropriate use of the Region; instead he suggested that the Provider would have a Region for each DPC. Maurilio responded that this might work, as long as he can activate an FSP multiple times, i.e. in multiple regions. For example, he said he would do this in a layered fashion, activating the FSP for a DPC-specific region, before activating the FSP for a zone/vfabric-specific region. Ed noted "activation" directly exposed the FSP so this would not work as expected since the first activation would need to correlate to a particular zone/vfabric. Ed suggested that the provider should instead assign a Region to the tuple <DPC, CPorts, zone/vfabric>; this way, there would be a distinct Region for each DPC-specific instance of a zone/vfabric. Anshul asked whether Regions can represent different "failure domains". William responded that the Provider was free to define Regions with any Provider resources, including arbitrarily grouping DPCs based on the failure characteristics.

Claudio indicated that there remains the issue of how to complete the integration. He said that we can either remove the FT/BI versions of structures/functions that are handled by the FAIS_SCSI_Port, or vice versa (drop FSP structures/functions in 1.4 that are covered by the FT/BI versions). William said that it isn't clear what the latter would look like. William was actioned to post a version that used FSP structures/functions (instead of FT/BI). Anshul were actioned to post a version that used FT/BI structures/functions (instead of FSP).

Adjournement

Claudio said the goal was to complete the review of 05-008 in the June meeting. This would allow for a first draft that can enter letter ballot in August.

New Action Items

AI 61: Anshul Chadda will post a version of 05-008 with the changes from this meeting and resolves Port Services functional overlap in favor of FT/BI structures/functions.

New.

AI 62: William Chow will post a version of 05-008 that resolves Port Services functional overlap in favor of FAIS_SCSI_Port structures/functions.

New.