**OFI WG Weekly telecom – 12/02/2014**

**Agenda:**

* Follow up to last week’s Compliance and Interoperability discussion

**Future Agenda Topics:**

* Detailed inventory of the current state of the generic sockets provider
* End-to-end flow control – someone volunteered to try to capture a table of possible options
* Credit discussion – we discussed this two weeks running – conclusion?
* Release process – this discussion produced several ARs:
	+ Investigate using github to publish man pages
	+ Look into applying mechanisms used by OpenMPI to our release process
* Interfaces and structures for reporting topology data

**OFIWG Download Site:** [www.openfabrics.org/downloads/OFIWG](http://www.openfabrics.org/downloads/OFIWG)

See slides titled “Compliance\_interop\_2014-1125.pptx”

Follow up to C&I discussion

- at present, the OFA doesn’t have a compliance component.

- the question is, what does compliance mean in the context of libfabrics?

- suggestion is to form a smaller working group to do a little deeper dive, based on last week’s presentation.

Re-opened the discussion of standards vs non-standards

- compared to MPI Forum, there is no functional difference (MPI Forum publishes a .pdf, OFI WG publishes Man pages).

- but documenting the API may not be sufficient to count as a “specification” to which a provider could claim compliance.

- there may be two provider implementations, both running over the same wire and both conforming to the libfabrics API, but that implement the provider layer functions differently.

- again, it was pointed out that following a vigorous discussion during the adoption of iWARP as an OFA project the OFA decided that it does not wish to be a standards body. There are a number of reasons for this:

1. the concept of OFA as a standards body seems to be at odds with the concept of OFA as an open source community. For example, in general, developing standards requires a bit more rigor in reaching conclusions and documenting those conclusions than is customary in an open source environment.

2. the OFA’s bylaws are not currently structured to support a standards-development activity.

- this decision on the part of the OFA is certainly subject to change, but was the position as of the last time the question was raised.

- avoiding the expression ‘standards’ for the moment, the question for the group is whether some sort of ‘compliance’ testing is desirable.

 - yes, in the sense that we have already agreed that there should be a test suite.

 - but once you have offered a ‘seal of approval’ based on compliance to a test suite, you’re really into ‘standards’ territory.

Agenda for next week:

- continue C&I discussion – (see Patrick MacArthur’s email dated 12/5 titled “[ofiwg][RFC] libfabric provider interoperability”)

- Credits proposal (see Reese Faucette’s email dated 12/8/14 titled “credits proposal”)

- update on flow control proposal (Sean Hefty)

**Next regular telecom**

Next meeting: Tuesday, 12/9/14

9am-10am Pacific daylight time