

2015-12-11 - Fedora API Extensions Meeting

Dial In Details

Date: Friday December 11, 2pm EST (-5 UTC)

- Dial-in Number: (712) 775-7035
 - Participant Code: 479307#
 - International numbers: [Conference Call Information](#)
 - You may also call in using the [VoIP dialer](#) from a web browser, or Android/iOS apps
- IRC:
 - [Join the #fcrepo chat room via Freenode Web IRC](#) (enter a unique nick)
 - Or point your IRC client to #fcrepo on [irc.freenode.net](#)

Meeting Goals

1. Review/prioritize API-X requirements
2. Agree on first concrete development steps

Attendees

- [Aaron Birkland](#)
- [Unknown User \(acoburn\)](#)
- [Stefano Cossu](#)
- [William G. Cowan](#)
- [Ruth Duerr](#)
- [Elliot Metsger](#)
- [Joshua Westgard](#)
- [Andrew Woods](#)
- Peter Gorman
- Brian Sheppard
- Bruce Barton

Agenda

1. Discuss/prioritize initial list of [High-level Requirements](#)
 - a. Pick a list of requirements that could potentially drive first sprint(s)
 - b. See [comments](#) on high-level requirements page:
 - i. Are deployment-related issues appropriate as requirements, or are they goals?
 1. If they are goals, do we have other items that are also goals, but not requirements?
 - ii. Is it appropriate for an API-X extension to use native java APIs such as [fcrepo-kernel-api](#), or should they use standardized and codified fedora HTTP APIs?
2. Discuss list of potential [Proof of Concept ideas](#). Do we want to pursue one or more of these as a team? Individually?
3. Rough implementation timeline

Related Resources

[Design Page \(with use cases outline\)](#)

[Use Cases Parent Page](#)

[2015-11-13 - Fedora API Extensions Meeting](#)

Minutes

Agenda Item 1: Review of proposed High Level Requirements

High Level Requirements 1a-e

- A.B. enumerated requirements, acknowledging the wiki comment thread suggesting that some of them don't belong as a high-level requirements
- R.D. agreed, pointed out that the "-ilities" are acceptable, but specific technologies (e.g. OSGi) weren't
- A.W. direction of Fedora is to clearly specify RESTful APIs (defining what Fedora `_is_`) and allows development of additional Fedora `_implementations_` (emphasis added)
- A.W. posed the question: Do we want an API that is bound to a reference implementation of Fedora (or any Fedora implementation for that matter)?
- S.C. API-X should be deployable anywhere, be able to execute extensions written in various languages (e.g. python or another non-java impl). The requirements are too implementation specific.

- A.C. 1a, 1d, OK. Rest of them seem to be limiting implementation choices.
- A.W. Proposed that 1b, 1c, 1e be considered as design considerations.
- A.B. proposed keeping 1a and 1d as requirements, move the rest to design considerations.
- A.W. proposed new requirement that API-X explicitly be required to support HTTP
 - (point of clarification: HTTP on the client side or HTTP on the Fedora side?)
- All: discussion of a API-X framework client abstraction layer it would use to communicate with Fedora.
 - A.W./E.M. use of HTTP vs other transports is abstracted
 - E.M. allows individual deployment decisions regarding risks/benefits of using HTTP or other transports
 - A.B. is this abstraction layer a design goal or requirement
 - S.C. need hard, concrete basic requirements
 - R.D. supports no abstraction, use existing (robust, tested) Fedora HTTP API
 - A.B. consider extensions not written in Java, HTTP becomes the abstraction layer
- ACTION ITEM: codify comments, revise section 1, distribute for comment

High Level Requirements 2a-d

- A.B. enumerated requirements. based on discussion of requirements 1a-e, proposed dropping 2a, 2c, 2d.
- E.M. proposed re-phrasing 2b to place the requirement of supporting hot deployment (removal, etc) on the API-X Framework, not the Extension.
- A.C. commented that Zookeeper is another possible implementation technology, agreeing that OSGi-related requirements should be removed
- ACTION ITEM: codify comments, revise section 2, distribute for comment

High Level Requirements 3a-d

- A.B. enumerated requirements
- E.M. proposed a requirement that API-X Framework comport with RFC 2616 and identify if or how it deviates
- All: concurred
- A.C. commented that at least service discovery should be HTTP

High Level Requirements 4a-f

- A.W. clarify the distinctions between 4b, 4c, 4d
- A.B. Short on time, proposal to amend high level requirements, distribute, and get comments. Revisit the high level requirements.
- ACTION ITEM: E.M. Send out a Doodle poll for next Wed, Thur, Fri