



Fig. 1



Fig. 2

1. RegTAP: Towards PR

(vgl. Fig. 1)

Markus Demleitner
msdemlei@ari.uni-heidelberg.de

(vgl. Fig. 2)

- A brief history
- Current status
- Open questions

2. The Story so Far

2006-2009: Development of Registry Interfaces 1:

1. Publishing/searchable registries
2. OAI-PMH interface for both with some extra rules
3. SOAP/ADQL1-based interface for searchable registries
4. Registries in the Registry

2008: ADQL 2.0; 2010: TAP 1.0 – so, we now have fairly good IVOA standards to cover (3)

2012: Proposal for RI2 in Urbana, agreement to postpone RI reform and do RegTAP separately in Sao Paulo

3. What's there?

There's a RegTAP WD out as of 2013-04-11, giving

- a schema with 13 tables,
- rules to fill them from VOResource,
- a data model id to locate the services,
- three UDFs to match ADQL with registry needs,
- and use cases and their respective queries

There's now

- two DaCHS/Postgres-based implementations harvesting OAI-PMH in Heidelberg and Potsdam,
- and a VODance/MySQL-based implementation in Trieste harvesting another relational registry

4. Changes from Sao Paulo

- great utypes reform
- consequently, `res_role.base_ctype` is now called `res_role.base_role`
- `intf_index` is now unique within resource instead of capability (for StandardsRegExt)
- footprint, data_url, facility, instrument went to `res.details`
- No STC material anymore
- Appendix with recommended field sizes
- Quite a bit of redaction

5. Open Questions: DB Schema

- Is "rr" a good schema name or should this stuff live in "ivoa" as obscure does? Or "ivo_rr"?
- Add strict non-null conditions (rather than the milder conditions on primary and foreign keys)?
- Is `resource.creator_seq` too funky?
- Should we have an in-db table with (prefix, namespace URI) pairs?
- Some `res_detail` values must be lowercased (e.g., IVORNs), some must not (e.g., test-Query) – oh, my

6. Open Questions: The Environment

- Do we want an interface to retrieve multiple RRs? (OAI-PMH is fine for single RRs)
- Should we keep calling "our utypes" "atypes"? Or should we rather just admit we'd really like to use something like xpaths?
- STC, in particular the space part (there used to be material on this in the draft, but see joint Reg/Apps session)
- Can we have a validation suite?

7. Open Questions: Yours

Well...

... let me know!