**Agenda**

* Agenda bashing
* OFA Workshop f-2-f agenda items
* Complete sockets discussion (Sean, Bob R, Patrick M (UNH))
* Review Sean’s summary of MPI requirements
* Distro requirements

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

**Bin List for Montere**y

Mapping the framework onto a service provider (Cray)

User mode TCP (Liran)

Approaches for APIs for storage (Liran)

Preliminary discussion on Structured Data applications (Oracle)

Begin mapping requirements onto the APIs

Library structure (what goes in the API, what goes in the provider layer)

OFA EWG – backwards compatibility with verbs, are we going to include new verbs stuff?

(Do we need to schedule a f-2-f?)

**Monterey F-2-F**

Monday, 3/31/14, 7:00 – 9:00PM

Dial-in logistics to be provided.

Minutes will be taken and distributed as per normal after the meeting.

This is an OPTIONAL meeting, meaning that attendance (or not) DOES NOT count for working group participation.

**Continuing the Rsockets discussion– see slide deck 2014-03-04-ofwg-sockets.pptx**

Resuming at slide 12

How big should the immediate value be? Ideal range between 8 – 32 bytes. Practical range may be 16-24 bytes. This may not be enough for MPI

Slide 12

* Programmatic detection of memory alignment

Slide 13

* Number of SGEs, immediate data size, CM private data length

Slide 15

* Ensure that asynchronous interfaces are not a source of race conditions. This led to a lively discussion of whether this is carried out at the API or the provider layer.
* A test suite to verify provider conformance, including example programs

**Summarizing MPI Requirements – see slide deck 2014-03-19-ofiwg-mpi-req.pptx**

A summary from the OFI WG fed back to MPI

Slide 2

* Request: Messages
* Response: OFI is defining messaging and taggle message APIs
* Request: Efficient API
* Response: direct access to provider, calls are associated with an object (e.g. endpoint, event queue), function pointers can be dynamically adjusted based on object configuration
* Request: zero copy
* Response: provided. TBD: whether a provider is obligated to provide this, even if not in h/w.
	+ There are a number of these ‘nice to have’ vs ‘mandatory’ issues.
* Request: Atomics
* Response: well supported in OfI proposal
* Request: no requirement for communication buffer alignment for atomics
* Response: Atomics must be naturally aligned based on their type

Slide 4

* Request: asynch progress of independent API calls
* Response: needs more discussion
* Request:
* Response: abstracting QPs into ‘endpoint’ objects. Endpoint type includes ‘reliable datagram ‘ Introduce ‘address vector’.

Slide 6

* Request: modes of communication
* Response: Endpoint exposes generic type, protocol capabilities (e.g. RDMA support). Vendor-specific protocols are exposed. Even though we support vendor-specific protocols today (e.g. PSM), this may lead to increased splintering of the API. The important point is to expose to the user where this introduces interoperability issues.

Resume at this point next week.

**Next meeting**

Complete summary of MPI requirements

Bin list:

* Steps forward beyond requirements gathering.

Logistics

Tuesday, 3/25/14

9am-10am Pacific time

<<https://meet.intel.com/sean.hefty/D14C7J10>>
<https://meet.intel.com/sean.hefty/D14C7J10>

Join by Phone
1-888-875-9370
+1(916)356-2663 (or your local bridge access #) Choose bridge 5.
Find a local number<<https://dial.intel.com>>

Conference ID: 746347966