

P3T - Summary and Discussion

IVOA Malta, Nov 2024 Protocol Transitioning Tiger Team



National Research Conseil national de Council Canada recherches Canada

Summary of Talks

Lots of prototyping and experimenting with code and documents since Sydney

- Joshua
 - Adding OpenAPI to UWS options for different levels of adoption
 - Cool things to look forward to, and simple example of doc review (Pet Shop)
- Pat
 - What TAP-next, 1.2 or 2.0–persistent table uploads, with OpenAPI adoption, would incur for TAP and associated base standards UWS (Joshua), and VOSI.
- Russ/Stelios
 - Example of what layering standards could look like, illustrating reduced complexity
 - Matching document granularity with associated implementations and dependency chains
- Dave
 - Experience with full adoption of OpenAPI in an IVOA working draft for a potential new standard

What we learned

There are a number of factors at play when looking at OpenAPI...

- The amount of change incurred to a given REST-based VO standard depends on:
 - The specifics of the REST specs in the standard
 - How deep we choose to go with OpenAPI adoption (and associated modernization)
- Adoption means either a minor (non-breaking) or major (breaking) version update
 - How these updates are executed is a problem faced with any standard update and is not particular to the P3T investigation

Points of consensus?

We have been engaging with clients/applications and listening to feedback

1. [Generally Agreed?] The inclusion of OpenAPI to REST-based standards is seen as a positive.

2. [Generally Agreed?] If a standard is going through a major version change from a science driver, OpenAPI may be added at that time, and additional REST modernization improvements can accompany it.

3. [Generally Agreed?] If there are no breaking changes from the addition of OpenAPI to a specification, a minor version may be created, to improve its clarity and enable tooling, without a science driver.

4. [???] If there are breaking changes resulting from the addition of OpenAPI to a specification, should a major version update be allowed without an accompanying science driver?

* "science driver": a CSP Priority and/or meets the working group science objectives

Potential Next Steps

1. TAP-next: Persistent table uploads and OpenAPI

• Option for either minor or major version updates

2. TAP-next: Only OpenAPI additions

O Minor version, Persistent table upload functionality the version afterward

3. Execution Broker

- Experiment with a new Working Draft with OpenAPI
- 4. another idea?

Leverage existing IVOA Document Standards review process

- Working Group Review of Working Draft
- TCG Review

Discussion