

All comments are relative to draft-ietf-ips-iscsi-16.pdf

| # | Type | Section | Paragraph | Page | Comment |
|----|------|---------|-------------------------|------|---|
| 1 | T | 4.3.1 | last | 73 | The use of MUST in the final sentence is untestable and should probably be lower-case "should" |
| 2 | T | 9.16.5 | 2 nd | 195 | "has to" → "MUST"? |
| 3 | E | 1.1 | Portal Group Tag | 18 | "identifies the" → "identifies a" since there are multiple groups |
| 4 | E | 1.2 | ITN | 22 | The definition given here disagrees with the one used in section 9.13.5 |
| 5 | E | 2.2.3 | 3 rd on page | 33 | To help introduce the concept of phases, suggest changing "the initiator may" to something like "the session transitions to Full Feature Phase and the initiator may" |
| 6 | E | 2.2.4.2 | last on page | 35 | The 1 st sentence of this paragraph may mislead the reader because it appears to enumerate all possible initiator choices but doesn't; e.g. it doesn't cover the case of immediate data followed by an unsolicited sequence, or the case where the actual data length < FirstBurstLength. It might be simplest to omit the 1 st sentence altogether |
| 7 | E | 2.2.4.3 | 1 st on page | 37 | "values are" → "values that are" |
| 8 | E | 2.4.1 | last on page | 47 | "Section Section" |
| 9 | E | 2.5 | 2 nd | 52 | Clarity: suggest "may each be followed" instead of "may be followed" |
| 10 | E | 2.5.1.2 | 2 nd | 52 | Suggest changing "and an" to "an" |
| 11 | E | 2.5.1.5 | 3 rd | 54 | Terminology: the phrase "a complete payload" is incorrect here, e.g. a payload is part of a PDU as mentioned in an earlier paragraph. Suggest simply omitting the phrase |
| 12 | E | 2.5.1.6 | 2 nd | 55 | Clarity: suggest changing the start of the 1 st sentence: "To help the SCSI target associate resulting Data-out with an R2T, the R2T carries a Target Transfer Tag that will be copied..." |
| 13 | E | 2.5.3.1 | top of page | 56 | Unreadable English. Perhaps something like "In the data segment, Text Requests/Responses carry text information using a simple 'key=value' syntax" |

| # | Type | Section | Paragraph | Page | Comment |
|----|------|---------|---------------------------|------|--|
| 14 | E | 2.5.3.2 | 3 rd on page | 57 | “Status counting” → “Status counting (StatSN)” |
| 15 | E | 4.1 | base64-constant | 63 | Should “(encoded a A)” be “(encoded as A)”? |
| 16 | E | 4.1 | regular-binary-value | 64 | Missing article: “is implicit” → “is the implicit” |
| 17 | E | 4.1 | large-binary-value | 64 | Missing article: “is implicit” → “is the implicit” |
| 18 | E | 4.2 | last on page | 64 | This is still not an English sentence; missing something after “respectively” |
| 19 | E | 4.3 | last on page | 69 | It would help the reader to explicitly reference CSG and NSG instead of the euphemism “a field that indicates the negotiation stage” |
| 20 | E | 4.4 | 2 nd | 77 | Consistency: “Text request” is capitalized here but not, for example, in the 3 rd paragraph |
| 21 | E | 4.4 | 2 nd from last | 78 | Spelling: “TargetAddress” → “TargetAddress” |
| 22 | E | 5.4.1 | 1 st | 84 | Grammar: perhaps “informing of the fact” → “informing the end points of the fact”? |
| 23 | E | 5.7 | last bullet on page | 86 | Punctuation: “PDU or, reject” → “PDU or reject” |
| 24 | E | 5.8 | 1 st on page | 88 | Suggest “interested” → “relevant”, or omit “interested” altogether |
| 25 | E | 6.1.2 | T7 | 99 | “evens” → “events” |
| 26 | E | 7.2.1 | 2 nd | 117 | “128 bits” → “128 bit” |
| 27 | E | 8.1.2 | 2 nd | 122 | “Section Section” |
| 28 | | 8.1.3 | 3 rd | 124 | “SCSI will recovery will” → “SCSI recovery will” |
| 29 | E | 9.3.6 | 1 st | 137 | The last sentence (“These data are governed...”) still isn’t useful. There aren’t ‘general’ rules; immediate data is treated differently than an unsolicited sequence. It would be more useful to refer to the sections defining the rules for immediate and unsolicited data. |
| 30 | T | 9.3.6 | 1 st | 137 | This might be the place to define the implied Buffer Offset value for immediate data. |
| 31 | E | 9.5.6 | 1 st | 149 | Punctuation: omit comma after “retransmitted PDUs” |

| # | Type | Section | Paragraph | Page | Comment |
|----|------|---------|---|------|--|
| 32 | E | 9.6.2 | last; bullet 'b' | 152 | "responded" → "responded to" |
| 33 | E | 9.7.4 | heading | 156 | Suggest changing heading to "Target Transfer Tag and LUN" since both are covered |
| 34 | E | 9.13.5 | Code 0101 | 182 | The definition of "ITN" disagrees with that in 1.2; occurs multiple times in this table |
| 35 | E | 9.17.1 | 3 rd on page | 198 | Grammar: the parenthetical phrase in the last sentence isn't comprehensible; how about "(the command PDU did not contain all the data and the target has not received a Data-out PDU with the Final bit 1 either for unsolicited data or for all outstanding R2Ts)"? |
| 36 | E | 9.18 | 1 st and 3 rd on page | 200 | These paragraphs deal in detail with ITT; it would be better to move them into 9.18.1 |
| 37 | E | B.3 | 1 st after table | 241 | Spelling: "sequential" → "sequentially" |
| 38 | E | D | A SendTargets response... | 254 | "MUST NOT not" → "MUST NOT" |
| 39 | E | F.1 | 1 st on page | 277 | "for ex." → "for example" or "e.g." |
| | | | | | |