



Fig. 1



Fig. 2

1. TAP Evolution with the Notes

(cf. Fig. 1)

Markus Demleitner
msdemlei@ari.uni-heidelberg.de

(cf. Fig. 2)

2011 Pune interop: “Whither ADQL”, UWS enhancements, etc: How do we evolve the TAP stack?

2012 São Paulo Interop: The TAP Implementation Notes.

Briefly, here’s how this is supposed to (and partially has) worked.

2. Technics

The document is maintained in Volute:

<https://volute.googlecode.com/svn/trunk/projects/dal/TAPNotes>

It’s ivoadoc, but don’t sweat the toolchain.

Current builds are at

<http://volute.googlecode.com/svn/trunk/projects/dal/TAPNotes/TAPNotes-fmt.html>

Contact me (or some others) for commit privileges unless you can commit to volute anyway.

“Snapshots” in the IVOA doc repo: 1.0, 2013-12-13, next version planned after the interop

3. Structure

Each of

- ADQL
- UWS
- TAP
- (TAPRegExt)

has one section each of

- Clarifications, Errata, and Recommendations and
- Proposed New Feature

The intention is that *something* on the points raised in the clarifications part *must* be in the next version, as they concern misleading, confusing, or contradictory items in the standards.

The proposed new features are actual evolutions, and if they don’t get addressed, nothing is wrong.

4. Style

Part of the note’s function should be to **concisely document** past exchanges about features so we don’t have to rehash the same arguments over and over.

Example: 4.2.4 “Making the async Endpoint Optional” .

In such discussions, be brief and pretend you’re **neutral** as far as possible.

Be concrete – ideally, write diffs to the existing standards. In the TAP notes, it’s considered good style to edit other people’s text (VCS helps when authors disagree).

5. Rough Consensus, Running Code

If you’re a TAP implementor:

Please have a look at the document and try to implement what you like.

TAPNote 1.2 should have implementation boxes, as in:

-
- Serverside: DaCHS, CADC
 - Clientside: TOPCAT, TAPHandle
-

Proposal: Only things with ≥ 3 entries here get considered for inclusion in the next standards.

6. Go forth

... and implement.

May I draw your esteemed attention to 4.2.1, “Examples”?

Thanks!

7. In Case of Silence

Here's my my private top 8 points to quarrel about from the current Note:

1. TAP_SCHEMA optional
2. async endpoint optional
3. auth and aut
4. ADQL cast to unit
5. ADQL UCD column references
6. scaleable VOSI table endpoint
7. DATETIME instead of TIMESTAMP
8. format of uws quote

8. In Case on Consensus

- Data model metadata in TAP metadata
- Object queries ("data models in TAP")
- Authentication, Authorisation, VOSpace, persistent uploads, oh my.