

Current Decisions (3-Mar-2020)

- * There is flexibility w/r/t V2 longevity—could leave V2 as “experimental” for some time.
- * Add incremental pub/sub going forward as use cases require
- * Implement OpenAPI V2 REST/HTTP endpoints using defined DTOs
 - Request DTOs for GET/DELETE do not exist for REST, these are needed for incremental pub/sub use cases
- * V2 Implementation will be beta until further notice, must co-exist with and not impede V1
 - Awareness of separate persistence, previous effort had decided we would have separate V1/V2 persistence.
 - Open discussion item (see below)
- * Security requirements
 - Utilize Option 2 from [security slide](#) for REST and pub/sub.
 - Deck was reviewed in Security WG (4-Mar-2020)
 - Continued need for ability to enable/disable security

Topics for today (16-Mar-2020)

- Review of current decisions
(see <https://wiki.edgexfoundry.org/display/FA/Monthly+Architects%27+Meeting?preview=/37912817/43581510/API%20V2%20Follow-up%20Meeting%20Notes.pdf>)
- Device Service / App Functions committing to their own OpenAPI docs using the principles from the V2 ADR
 - *AppFunctions has common endpoints (ping, metrics, etc) so those would be duplicates of what's already defined.*
 - *“trigger” endpoint, unsure how DTOs play into this definition*
 - *Device Services have endpoints defined from device profile (dynamic). How to capture in a specification doc?*
 - *Route segments come from device profile*
 - *Request/Response payloads also come from device profile*
 - **AGREED:** *DS / AppFunctions teams will define OpenAPI spec docs*
 - *Follow-up, should V2 impl in the Core wait until DS/AppFunctions OpenAPI specs are defined?*
 - *Estimated 2 weeks for DS to create spec and allow for community review.*
 - *Review Core V2 impl for internal work that could start independently of platform-wide OpenAPI specs (for example, V1/V2 coexistence)*
- Depth of “common implementation” across sub domain applications. Does this end at the bootstrapping or are there additional layers to align? How do we know when it's enough?
 - *Assumed that DTOs Request/Responses will be shared.*
 - *Lenny would like common impl of basic routes (metrics, ping, config) so they don't need to be copied from service to service.*
 - *For example, we could have a go-mod-handlers module that contains the impl for these routes.*
 - *Jim W. – “That which is user-facing” is “common implementation”*
 - *DTOs, handler signatures, DI and bootstrapping*
 - **AGREED:** *DTOs, OpenAPI spec definition, DI and bootstrapping*

- *Also security concerns – security module, injected via go-mod-bootstrap for standardized implementation*
 - *Get/validate tokens, fetch certs, refresh tokens/certs based on expiration time*
 - *Responsibility for full specificity falls on Security WG. Community would like to see an ADR for V2 security.*
 - *Security WG to follow up at meeting this week (18-Mar)*
- *Follow-up planning for Hanoi to discuss API alignment, aside from REST/DTOs*
- For Core/Support services, do we support separate V1 and V2 persistence?
 - The project officially does not support a schema migration path. However commercial partners may want to do so.
 - **AGREED:** *V1/V2 persistence will be separated*
 - *Possibility to revisit project's responsibility for data migration after LTS is released*
- Start to think about which use cases would benefit from the addition of pub/sub
 - Publication of events from Device Service directly to App-Functions
 - Handling of Domain Events (see recent discussions on Kuiper in Core WG)
 - *Add as agenda items for Hanoi F2F*
- Do we consider Support services optional? Should we approach Core-Data as Support-Data for V2?
 - Should "optional" support services be considered for certification?
 - *Also punted to official Hanoi planning*