**OFI WG Monterey F-2-F – 03/15/2015**

**Agenda**

- 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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**Agenda**

- 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