**OFI WG Data Storage / Data Access Subteam Weekly telecom – 05/12/2015**

**OFIWG Download Site:** [www.openfabrics.org](http://www.openfabrics.org) 🡪OFED/OFA Resources 🡪 OpenFabrics Interfaces WG

**Agenda**

* roll call, agenda bashing
* kOFI as a name
* GIThub update

**Naming**

- marketing vs engineering?

- kOFI was intended to be the kernel implementation of OFI

- Currently, libfabric is the user space library underneath the OFI framework

- Using a term that includes ‘lib’ in the kernel context raises hackles

- Suggestion: what about ‘kfabric’. Hence all kernel calls would be “kfi\_”

- Frank created a GitHub repo last week, that uses “kfi\_”. This could be changed if the group desires, since we are still in the very early phases.

- the name of the repo can be easily changed, but

- What do we call the “library”? How about “kfabric” as a juxtaposition with “libfabric”?

- Part of the problem is that “libfabric” doesn’t explicitly define an interface. In fact there is no definition for the interface.

- kfabric (singular) or kfabrics (plural)

- “library” means it’s a loadable module, loadable by users. This is different from a loadable kernel module, which when loaded becomes part of the kernel.

- Agreed: “kfabric”, kOFI is no longer in use.

**GIThub update**

- Frank has created a repo, has a couple of header files coded and some source code in place.

- Includes the license files from OFI.

- People can clone it and begin working on it.

- Directory structure:

- RDMA directory? not yet, not sure if we need this.

- providers directory? Planning to have this. In libfabric, the provider directory is at the same level as the source directory.

- suggest eliminating the source directory.

- at the top level would be include, providers, kfabric, tests

- under ‘tests’ would be a series of tests, one series for each provider

- Stan to send out some notes on the existing libfabric directory structure.

- If this is planned to be upstream, does that impact the directory structure?

- Assumption is that this would fit under the ‘net’ structure.

- Want to have the new kernel maintainers come in next week to talk about how our directory structure should be organized, on the assumption that we will eventually want to try to push this upstream.

- An important question: What is kfabric’s relationship to existing kverbs? This will inevitably be a part of the discussion.

- Opinion – kfabric should be distinct and unique, and not integrated as part of kverbs. But we need to have a clear and rational justification for why.

- Which maintainer? Dave Miller (kernel network maintainer)? Or Doug Ledford/Jason Gunthorpe (RDMA stack maintainers)?

- Doug O – some guidance from the Lustre experience: maintainers tend to be very fussy. Want to do things correctly right up front. e.g. tabs and spaces, how memory allocation routines are called, don’t use indirections, avoid callbacks whenever possible.

**Agenda for next meeting**

* Review GitHub plans

**Next regular telecom**

Next meeting: Tuesday, 5/19/15.

8am-9am Pacific daylight time

**NOTE:** We have switched over to using Webex (courtesy of Cisco). The URL for joining meetings is:

<https://cisco.webex.com/cisco/j.php?J=200935598&PW=67935ad6df07030d5f05044a5b0f>