

Core Working Group 4-Jun-2020

Participants (12)

Search

Initials	Name	Video	Audio
TC	Trevor Conn (me)	On	Muted
JW	Jim White	Off	Muted
LG	Lenny Goodell (Intel)	Off	Muted
RH	Rodney Hess	Off	On
t	tonyespy	Off	Muted
M(	Mike (Intel)	Off	Muted
CT	Cloud Tsai	Off	Muted
JG	James Gregg (Intel)	Off	Muted
JW	Jim Wang (Intel)	Off	Muted
LR	Lisa Rashidi-Ranjbar	Off	Muted
	Walt (Intel)	Off	Muted
MJ	Michael Johanson	Off	Muted

## Agenda

- PR for API V2 DTOs
  - <https://github.com/edgexfoundry/go-mod-core-contracts/pull/236>
- Discussion of dependent pkg usage
  - Use of translation/annotations for validation
    - Existing pattern in v1 versus annotation-based validation
    - Latter requires externalizing the action of validation from type rather than encapsulating
    - Annotation is more lightweight from a coding perspective. The type declares its valid state through metadata (struct tags)
      - *#1 Consensus is that this approach is desirable but aspects of current implementation can be refined. (Will differ from V1)*
  - Regarding use of translation, what is the default message that was considered unsuitable?
    - *#2 Explore using validator without translator*
  - Depth of paper studies
    - Primary imports or include transitives
      - Comprehensive list can be found in go.sum for PR branch
    - Licensing compliance appears to be the primary concern
      - Known security issues as well
    - Definition of dependent package maturity not complete
  - Solicitation of feedback
    - Tony → Ubuntu SnapD
    - Jim → CNCF
- Tony → Should we link to the OpenAPI spec from the V2 related packages in go-mod-core-contracts?
  - Sounds good
  - This will suffice for fields but does not apply to method types. The latter still need to be done inline.
- Tony → “models” in go-mod-core-contracts is confusing, overloaded with service internal models. Should this be renamed?
  - Suggested – contracts, common...? Sounds like “contracts” but Lenny and Tony to follow up and send recommendation to Cloud.