**OFI WG Bi-Weekly telecom – 06/28/2016**

**Agenda:**

* Roll call, agenda bashing
* Enterprise Cloud
* GitHub Issues

**News**

* Sean on sabbatical starting next week, gone for July and August
* Jianxin Xiong will be filling in for Sean as maintainer. Currently PSM maintainer, so very familiar with the code.

**Enterprise Cloud**

* Extending the C++ discussion from last week.
* Start by looking at the cloud requirements.
* May not want to take the existing APIs and dump them into C++ because the APIs for the cloud may be significantly different.
* The same thing is probably true for not only Cloud, but also Data Analytics.
* How to identify representative consumers?
* AR – Paul – take this question to the XWG, possibly the MWG?
* Possible basis for an SC16 BoF?

**Quick review of current GitHub issues**

* #1975 – How to expose loopback only devices? Some devices, e.g. USNic, don’t support loopback. Would be good if there is a way for such devices to report that they don’t support loopback. Same issue for devices that support only loopback.
	+ Non-loopback devices – a Cisco issue
	+ Loopback devices – Intel, for shared memory provider
* #1890 – Resizing FI\_CONTEXT. Today, defined as exactly four pointers. Should we define a larger context size, or allow the provider to specify its size? The question is if there is a reasonably sized context that would be useful, but without being so large that you might just as well allocate from the stack. For PSM, for example, the existing context size is useful, but for something like Atomics, a fairly large context space would be needed anyway. Would be helpful if for USNic could come up with a reasonable estimate. At present, it is pretty large. Consensus trend is that we don’t want dynamic allocation, which seems like it is likely to complicate things on both sides of the API.
	+ Intel - Sayatan Sur
* #1394 – Deals with FI\_CONTEXT, but from the perspective of completions. No way at present for the consumer to know how the CQ is going to be used. Need to be able to specify when it is created, how a CQ is going to be used. Could be done with a capability field. A bit more difficult is to be able to specify the attributes an endpoint will attach to. Likely to impact any provider.
	+ All provider vendors
* #1218 – FI\_MORE – is there a way to chain together multiple requests? As above, this one needs more focus. Probably less critical since it’s a potential API impact, not an ABI impact, but nevertheless…
	+ Cray - Sung
* Would be highly desirable to address these changes for the possible ABI change release coming toward the end of the year. Suggest adding these to upcoming meeting agendas.

**SC16**

* Probably should sign up for a BOF. Paul will drive this.

**Next Agenda:**

**Webex link:** <https://cisco.webex.com/ciscosales/j.php?MTID=m9389b0513c9ae643d57e2381e254dcf5>
Webex password: ofi

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

**Github:** <https://github.com/ofiwg/libfabric>

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

**Link to WebEx Recording** –

|  |
| --- |
| [**Play recording**](https://cisco.webex.com/ciscosales/lsr.php?RCID=595bbe6be00d44bcaedbc45283a0150c) (58 min 30 sec) |
| Recording password: 3YbAe5Jr |  |

**Next regular telecon**

Next meeting: Tuesday, 7/12/16I

9am – 10am Pacific daylight time