**OFI WG Weekly telecom – 04/21/2015**

**Agenda:**

* Memory Registration changes – see Pull request
* More details about how to extend the framework to extend to include providers who don’t support everything
* Did we close on the Completion discussion?

**Completion discussion**

- Summary: two types of completions from the target side:

- Discuss this in terms of data being available to the remote (target) side.

- What is currently defined is the definition for persistence has been removed, but can be added back.

- Need to work out the persistence model. Is it simply a completion, or is it an additional operation (i.e. an fsync type call that guarantees that previous operations are also persistent)?

**Memory Registration Changes**

- New approach is to keep local memory registration mode bit – the provider requires send and receive memory to be registered.

- Added domain attributes to indicate the type of memory registration that the provider supports. Currently two modes defined:

 - ‘basic’ – means the memory registration that current devices use.

 - ‘scalable’ – the app can select the memory registration keys, and uses zero-based offsets to identify a buffer on the remote side, rather than a key.

- There is a pull request open for this, people are encouraged to look at the details.

**How to extend the framework**

- How to support providers that don’t support the full range of operations. It’s considered desirable to set the bar fairly low on the set of required operations, probably those functions that can be most easily optimized in a given provider.

- The idea is to fill in the Venn diagram of functions that are supported given that most providers support a relatively narrow slice of the available features of OFI. The idea is not to discourage providers from adding functions, but rather to enable applications to be more easily portable.

- Q: is anybody anticipating supporting multiple providers simultaneously?

- A: the framework should support multiple providers simultaneously, but not within the same domain.

- The advantage to this is that it avoids multiple implementations of common/redundant work.

- Today, there are some existing interfaces that providers use that are not exposed through the API, e.g. some helper functions. It’s expected that this would use a similar, or the same, set of interfaces.

- Request to the group is to keep thinking about the priorities for the various functions.

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

**Future Agenda Topics:**

* Interfaces and structures for reporting topology data
* Technical issues
	+ AV table insert/remove behavior

**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=bbe48f45c8c2465891bedf3c28466f7b)

**Next regular telecon**

Next meeting: Tuesday, 4/7/15

9am-10am Pacific daylight time