## **API TECHSPEC PROJECT**

MEETING #10, DATE 2022-05-31 @ 10:00 BERLIN-TIME

Attendance
Present:
WALTHER, Jörg (project leader)
HEEMSKERK, Gerhard
HERTZFELDT, Jenny
LASKOWSKI, Marek
LICCIARDELLO, Piergiorgio
PALASKAS, Zisis
PELEKIES, Andreas
PROBERT, Sue
SUGAMATA, Hisanao
BISHOP, Kevin (UN secretariat)

## Details of the discussion

- 1. Andreas presented a new document comparing JSON schema with JSON-LD:
  - a. Should be part of the API town-hall plan
  - b. To be reviewed also by the JSON-LD team
  - c. JW to contact / invite Nis and David
- 2. Pierre feels 2.3 and 2.4 are too restrictive will provide a proposal for wording
- The JSON-LD vocabulary, the JSON Schemas and the CCL must contain consistent 272
- 273 definitions and ABIE representations. Else, the goal of global interoperability between
- 274 conformant API implementations based on UN/CEFACT Technical Specifications is lost.
- The bundle of UN/CEFACT specification for JSON Schema, JSON-LD and OpenAPI 275
- 276 assure consistency by defining Naming and Design rules from the CCL and its reference
- data models to JSON Schema and from JSON Schema to JSON-LD. It cannot be done the 2.77
- other way around, as JSON-LD contains less information from the business requirement 278
- 279 perspective and does not (and should not) support business document centric data exchange.
- 280 Thus, the JSON Schema export SHALL contain all information needed to create the JSON-LD vocabulary publication in an automatable and streamlined way. 281

Piergiorgio Licciardello Donnerstag Hi, as discussed in the team I've tried to think about the formulation and I've also checked internally with colleagues working on JSON-LD implementations. I continue to feel uncomfortable with the considerations like the ones in this sentence. Actually, we don't see this kind of distinction between JSON and JSON-LD. Conversely our perception is that JSON-LD, with SHACL and multiple namespaces, can not only support document-based processes but, also, provide additional opportunities than JSON. Rather than searching for a different wording I'd suggest to omit the full sentence.¶ different wording I'd suggest to omit the full sentence.¶

- 3. Since GitHub is available to the project, all links to official sources in the document should point to GitHub
- 4. A disclaimer of sorts is missing, JW to provide a draft
- 5. Next steps:
  - a. Next meeting: 14.6.2022
  - b. Feedback on Andreas' draft comparison document
  - c. Andreas to complete first draft of the API NDR document for review until 14.6.

Minutes: Jörg Walther