

P3T - Summary and Discussion

IVOA Malta, Nov 2024

Protocol Transitioning Tiger Team



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
 - Issue: How does the registry assist in version transitioning?

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
 - 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