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 - release readiness

 - testing and test coverage

 - test automation

 - completion

 - provider selection – still having some issues here

 - review the Github issues list and pick out some key ones to be resolved f-2-f

 - support for non-Linux systems, at least for development purposes (OS 10 in particular)

 - looking ahead beyond the first release – captured as Github issues

 - Topology deep dive – exposing topology information of where the NIC is located in the server and where the endpoints connect to the fabric.

Release Readiness

- release readiness is defined to include:

 - complete functionality

 - at least one provider

 - thoroughly documented

 - tested

- Cisco needs a release by MPI 1.9 (sometime “later this year”)

- Want to set expectations appropriately

- Maybe release as 0.8 instead of 1.0?

- One possibility is to go out at 1.0 with only one provider; the issue is that we don’t have a single provider (e.g. sockets).

- is the current documentation paradigm sufficient?

 - we may need a higher level document – the ‘Zen Document’

 - may also need a provider-by-provider description

 - can we rely on man pages as the basis for describing OFI?

- current state of the sockets provider is ‘buggy’

- we’re lacking unit testing for it. It works well enough to run under certain applications

- there isn’t necessarily consistency between the behavior of the various providers – lacking the unit testing to demonstrate that consistency.

- would like to have some method to know if we’ve reached ‘release readiness’. Classically, this is done by writing a test plan, but that’s not appropriate in this case.

- as a minimum, we need to be able to say what does, and what does not work for any given release, as a function of the sockets provider.

- summarized concerns re; 1.0

 - concern about sockets provider

 -inconsistency between providers

 - lack of a zen documents

 - man page audit

 - don’t want to give the enemy bullets to shoot us with.

- Strawman proposal

 - proceed with a release 0.8 on 3/31, accompanied by an honest list of what does and doesn’t work

 - each provider provider needs to deliver release notes for his provider.

 - plan for release 1.0 + 1qtr (6/30/15)

- At present we have no way to define an adequate level of quality.

- Any test should work with any provider that claims support for it (answers FI\_GETINFO call); all tests should work with the sockets provider. The sockets provider, as a development vehicle, should support all the features.

- Release criteria for Release 1.0

 - Any test should work with any provider that claims support for it (answers FI\_GETINFO call);

 - any test that fails is documented

- all tests should work with the sockets provider.

- the sockets provider, as a development vehicle, should support all the features.

 - man pages must be complete and accurate for each released provider.

 - a current version of the Zen document must exist

 - Sean’s test matrix for unit tests must be completely covered

 - an agreed on list of functional tests must be completely covered

Completion discussion

- Currently, Sean has defined three levels of completion:

 1. local (base) completion

 1a. the resource can be reused

 1b. the operation has been successfully injected into the fabric

 2. remote complete (reliable service only) - a downstream entity has acknowledged receiving the data.

 3. remote commit (reliable service only) – data has been received at the remote end and is committed to memory.

- 2. (remote complete) is the required minimum behavior for reliable service

- it isn’t currently clear what the minimum is for unreliable service.

- not clear if we want to keep both 1a and 1b.

- we need to argue on the wording for 1b (and maybe 1a)
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- Conclude the Release Readiness Discussion

Three key questions to answer:

1. Do we want to ‘release’ something on schedule on 3/31

 Consensus: Yes

2. If yes, what is included, and what is ‘opt-in’?

 Consensus: At this point, we believe we should include all four currently planned providers

3. What do we call it?

 Consensus: Release 1.0 rc3