

2016-02-05 Fedora API Extensions Meeting

Date: Friday February 05, 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. Move forward on architecture/design discussions
2. Understand proof-of-concept process

Attendees

- [Aaron Birkland](#)
- [Daniel Davis](#)
- [Ruth Duerr](#)
- [Elliot Metsger](#)
- [Bethany Seeger](#)
- [A. Soroka](#)
- [Joshua Westgard](#)
- [Stefano Cossu](#)
- [Randall Floyd](#) (Indiana University)
- [William G. Cowan](#)
- [Jared Whiklo](#)
- [Kevin S. Clarke](#)
- [Yinlin Chen](#)

Agenda

(see [last meeting's minutes](#))

1. PoC implementation (carried over from last week)
 - a. [Unknown User \(acoburn\)](#) wrote a wireframe POC demonstrating service discovery, binding, and proxying ([git repo](#), [discussion on irc](#))
2. Review [initial workflow graphs](#)
 - a. [Provenance stream](#)
 - b. [Validation \(async\)](#)
 - c. [Validation \(sync\)](#)
3. Revisit Service Discovery & Binding
 - a. "descriptive binding" beyond rdf:type
 - b. SSWAP
4. OR '16 submission

Minutes

- POC implementation
 - Please look at [Unknown User \(acoburn\)](#)'s repository. Not many people on call have had a chance to do so
 - If we agree in broad terms to the initial workflow graphs, we could start implementing proof of concepts - graphs will be a concrete starting point.
 - Josh: Code & diagrams are helpful for putting these abstract conversations into concrete, understandable terms
 - Which one(s) we implement first would depend on development time
 - Diagrams from Stefano have broad interest and applicability
 - Elliot: Agree with the approach of code & diagrams. At this point diagrams have been most helpful
 - Proposes a discoverability workflow diagram, maybe based on Aaron C's POC
 - Shall we put diagram source(s) and code in github? Has been a good pattern for PCDM effort
 - Shall we use personal/institutional repos, or request a repo in fcrepo-labs?
 - Broad agreement that fcrepo-labs make sense
 - Action item: [Aaron Birkland](#) to contact [Andrew Woods](#), see what's necessary to make this happen
 - Use this github repo for POC code and diagrams
- Review initial workflow graphs
 - API-X would establish which extensions apply to a given request, then determine which conditions apply
 - Stefano: Could be based on payload of request (e.g. headers), URI, object properties
 - Discussion of "validation pass" workflow in API-X core column
 - Stefano: Ideally, business logic in an extension would be enacted mostly through configuration, specialized code in validation service
 - Therefore, SD&B should describe response from validation service, which API-X core can then interpret for pass/fail

- Elliot: Other option on the table is for validation extension to make the decision.
 - Do we really want API-X core to understand a domain-specific response?
- Aaron: Focusing on this specific area of workflow would make sense as an activity in the next couple weeks, to understand and weigh consequences of the two approaches
 - Maybe write some code and/or create illustrations of what kind of information SD&B may provide, and how API-X would use it
- Stefano: The two approaches may not be that different fundamentally
- Dan: May be able to list how each approach conceptualizes the services in the core (router, means to execute services, etc)
- Elliot: It would be useful to depict representations of incoming requests, like essential parts of URIs and HTTP bodies
- Aaron: We should also focus on diagramming contents of "verify conditions" box
 - This will touch upon how "descriptive binding" discussed on the last call will play into the big picture
- Jared: We have similar use cases, like the concrete examples and diagrams to understand how API-X works
- Activities for the next two weeks:
 - Exploration into "validation pass," illustrate the two approaches discussed to help further discussion
 - Be more explicit about contents of requests
 - Diagram contents of "verify conditions" box
- Revisit SD&B
 - Activities identified from "review initial workflow graphs" will touch upon this topic
 - Dan "Find, bind, and execute", can't discuss find and bind without execute
 - SSWAP defines invocation model, describes input and output types
 - Aaron: SSWAP may be relevant to the "validation pass" option where API-X core introspects into validation response. where S D&B would need to describe responses so that API-X can act on them in some way
 - the other option doesn't necessarily have API-X core needing to understand response at all
 - Activities for next two weeks will help make needs more concrete
- OR '16 [Aaron Birkland](#) to incorporate comments, submit API-X entry

Next meeting

Fri. Feb 19, same time (in two weeks)