2017-06-21 - API Spec Meeting

Time/Place

- Time: 2:30pm Eastern Time US
- Dial-in Number: (712) 775-7035
    - Participant Code: 479307#
    - International numbers: Conference Call Information
    - Web Access: https://www.freeconferencecallhd.com/wp-content/themes/responsive/flashphone/flash-phone.php

Attendees

➕ (facilitator)
⭐ (notetaker)

- Andrew Woods ➕
- Esmé Cowles
- Daniel Lamb
- Simeon Warner
- Benjamin Armintor

Agenda

1. What needs to be done for "initial public working draft"
    a. Open milestone issues
2. How do we want to handle published versions of the spec and ontology
    a. Example: http://fedora.info/definitions/v4/repository# http://fedora.info/definitions/v4/2016/10/18/repository#
3. Follow-up on: https://github.com/fcrepo/fcrepo-specification/issues/111
4. Branding as Core Specification https://github.com/fcrepo/fcrepo-specification/issues/122
5. Deletion-related issues

Minutes

1. What needs to be done for "initial public working draft"
    - What do we do with the 4 month window for revision starting from public draft announcement
        - Andrew proposes the editors group continues to meet during this period
        - Ben - does this include test suite and implementations?
        - Agreement that it should certainly include the test suite (editorial group will be engaged with this), there will be a community effort to work on the community Fedora implementation but we can't rely on this
        - Ben - is 4 month realistic?
        - Andrew - how can we plan organize and adjust goals if necessary to get engagement to complete?
        - How many implementations are necessary for the specification to progress? Would it be OK to say that a test suite must be ready for the spec to got to candidate recommendation, but then multiple (2+) implementations would be necessary to progress to a recommendation?
            - Agreement on this (Ben, Danny, Simeon, Andrew – Esme not on call)
            - Expectation to continue monthly updates, perhaps to community not just FLG, if process goes on beyond 4 months
        - What are our expectations about the implementation of the test suite?
            - Ben - experience with LDP test suite suggests that Java is not the easiest approach
            - Ben - perhaps suggest Python as implemented widely and won't affect class loading implementations with Java
            - Danny - possible use of Selenium (or similar), can do HTTP level tests, will follow up at Discovery garden
        - Andrew - perhaps question is less about language of test suite than about library for interpreting and generating test results and doing comparison – agreement that something like that output would be good
            - Ben - want way to have tests clearly tied to sections of spec and that to be reported in output
            - Example LDP conformance reports: https://dvcs.w3.org/hg/ldpwg/raw-file/default/tests/reports/ldp.html
            - Tooling and format used to generate the above report: https://github.com/gkellogg/earl-report
            - Additionally, we will need documentation that explains the test suite approach and usage:
              - Example usage documentation: http://w3c.github.io/ldp-testsuite/
              - Example high-level description of test expectations: https://dvcs.w3.org/hg/ldpwg/raw-file/default/tests/ldp-testsuite.html
            - Andrew to starting tracking requirements for test suite (e.g. Earl report;)
            - Ben - if non-Java then will lead LDP conformance test
            - Andrew/Danny - do we need this if it could be covered by separate LDP test suite?
            - Ben - would need to ensure LDP compliance (at least parts) as pre-req for Fedora tests
            - Andrew - could use some LDP tests as "warm up" exercise... Danny - quite a scope expansion, is it necessary?
    - Open milestone issues
        - Do we want to keep #129 and #130 as requirement for release of the initial draft?
        - #130 - agreement that it is intended that servers be able to create versions with the client specifically indicating, text needs work – change milestone to Candidate recommendation

- #129 - important distinction between containment and ldp:contains triples, needs fixes to 3.1.1, 3.7.1 and 5.3. Agreement on the need to make this distinction. Question of when this could be addressed vs. managing expectations around progress on spec. Will try to get a PR done by Sunday, otherwise we'll remove the milestone from this issue and Andrew will go ahead and announce current state for OR
2. How do we want to handle published versions of the spec and ontology
   - Example: http://fedora.info/definitions/v4/repository# http://fedora.info/definitions/v4/2016/10/18/repository#
   - Agreement (Danny, Simeon, Andrew) OK with the date redirect

Previous Action Items

- ☐ Danny: will move 111 forward, and create a separate ticket for async failures

New Action Items

- ☐ Ben will move 129 forward