

# OFA-IWG Interoperability Test Plan: Suggested Modifications for RoCE

---

The following notes are based on v1.46 of the OFA-IWG Interoperability Test Plan. This is by no means a complete and fully specified list of changes, but rather a set of discussion points (along with some questions) which I hope to use to drive appropriate modifications & enhancements to the RoCE test portions.

## **Page 19: RDMA stress**

I think that we need to simultaneously stress RoCE/IB traffic and IP level Ethernet traffic. This will ensure that the Ethernet and IB/RDMA portions of the hardware, drivers & libraries work properly together. Perhaps we can use something such as `uperf` ([www.uperf.org](http://www.uperf.org)) to generate standard Enet traffic in conjunction with various RDMA traffic generators; perhaps `dapltest`? or just various tests from the `perftest` and `librdmacm-utils` rpms?

## **Page 24, Table 21**

For clarification, how is IPoCE different from just standard IP over the RCA? Or is this referring specifically to IP traffic over a CEE fabric?

## **Page 26, 1.2 Homogeneous vs. Heterogeneous**

We need to add and allow mixed system architectures for x86\_64 and ppc64 interoperability. This also implies mixed endianness between those systems.

## **Section 9.2, Operating System**

For the IBM Power system, RHEL6.x will have to be used. There are no CentOS, Scientific Linux or Ubuntu distributions for Power platforms.

## **Section 13.1.3, TI testing (iSER)**

I don't foresee any iSER or RDS testing over RoCE. And maybe this point is already moot given the discussion of reduced ULP testing.

## General Enhancements

- RDMA\_CM  
We would like to see explicit rdma\_cm tests, particularly for processor-heterogeneous (x86\_64/ppc64) setups.
- For heterogeneous testing, it would be good to use tests that are network byte order aware and the results of data transfers are subsequently validated.
- Test rsockets over RoCE
- Test IPv6
- Test bonding over RoCE Enet interfaces

## Future Considerations

- RoCE & VLANs. In the Mellanox implementation, a VLAN ID is stored as the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> bytes of the GID. Is that compatible across vendors?
- Validating Priority Flow Control (802.1Qbb)