Version 0.2

Link Relations Proposal

Proposal for how link relations should be named for CMIS

Versions

Version	Authors	Date	Changes
0.1	Cornelia Davis, EMC	05/09/2009	document created
0.2	Al Brown, IBM	05/15/2009	Updated from WG call

The following lays out a proposal for naming of the currently proposed link relations. These suggestions are motivated by several things:

- First, to use existing, registered names wherever possible. This will aid in interoperability, simplifies client development and offers the potential that existing clients do something meaningful with CMIS generated Atom feeds.
- Identify those concepts that are not specific to CMIS for registration in the IANA. Again, the goal is interoperability. Just as CMIS is stronger through the leverage of existing link relations, future work can leverage the relations that CMIS brought if they are expressed with sufficient generality.
- Link relations are about defining semantics for a relationship, NOT about dictating how a client behaves with respect to it, nor do link relations prescribe a media type for the resource that is the target of the link.

Hierarchy I-D:

CMIS link relation	**Naming Suggestion**	**Comments**
parent	Up	While "up" is described as a URI that refers to "a" parent document in a hierarchy, singular vs. plural is the only deviation from what we need for "parents". Since a media type is not defined with a link relation, I say we use it. We can post a discussion to the atom mailing lists to see what that community thinks. Singular or plural will be specified by the [media] type attribute on the link element. The I-D will be split into a basic navigation I-D. Upcollection will be specified by media type of feed. How will clients tell the different between up<plural> and up<collection>?
children	Down	New IANA registration. Suggested name is to be more generic and consistent with "up".
descendants	downall downtree? since the client can specify depth, all might be misleading.	New IANA registration. Suggested name is to be more generic and consistent with "up". Downtree is the tentative name. This will be included in the navigation I-D draft

Versioning I-D:

CMIS link relation	Naming Suggestion	Comments
allversions	all-versions	New IANA registration. I think that the general notion of resource versions would be a great one to add to the list of registered Atom link relation.
latestversion	current-version	New IANA registration. I think that the general notion of resource versions would be a great one to add to the list of registered Atom link relation. Switching latestversion to currentversion as a better name for branching
pwc	Workingcopy Or http://docs.oasis-open.org/ns/cmis/link/200901/pwc	Latestversion + allversions will be registered. At least some part of versioning domain is being registered. IMO, registering 'workingcopy', 'reservation', or similar to represent concept seems reasonable. This feels very focused on content management to me – perhaps not generic enough? Let's discuss.

Re-use existing

CMIS link relation	Naming Suggestion	Comments
repository	Service	While I realize that a repository corresponds to a, I cannot find anything in the current CMIS spec that addresses how the workspace element will be addressed with a URI. Please correct me if I am wrong but near as I can tell there is no standard for fragment identifiers for XML (there is a Sept 03 W3C Working Group Note on the subject). If the plan was to have resources for each of the workspaces independently (and URIs for them), and the media type for those URIs be service

		documents containing only that single workgroup, this will work just as well with the "service" name as with the "repository" name. I say we go with what is already defined.
type	describedby	The Atom link registry already has a value of "describedby" which states that the resource found at the URI provides a description of resource A.
source	via	For use cases not using up (non-heirarchy), use via to express the relationship back to the original atom entry
stream	edit-media	I think from issue #153 that we are suggesting to remove "stream" – I agree.

CMIS Namespace link relations

CMIS link relation	**Naming Suggestion**	**Comments**
allowableactions	http://docs.oasis-open.org/ns/cmis/link/200901/allowableactions	I feel this is very specific to CMIS. The information provided in the "allowableactions" resource are specific to the user context that accessed the resource. So one GET on the resource may not yield the same results as the next GET on the resource – hmm, I think we need to talk about this some more.
relationships	http://docs.oasis-open.org/ns/cmis/link/200901/relationships	I generally feel that the way that we are dealing with relationships in CMIS is specific to CMIS itself. Really, when you think about it, the Atom mechanism for defining relationships is the atom link relation itself. Therefore I believe adding values to the atom link relation registry that deal with relationships that are specified another way will cause confusion, and is an indication to me that these should be defined specific to CMIS.
source	http://docs.oasis-open.org/ns/cmis/link/200901/source	
target	http://docs.oasis-open.org/ns/cmis/link/200901/target	
stream	edit-media	I think from issue #153 that

		we are suggesting to remove “stream” – I agree.
policies	http://docs.oasis-open.org/ns/cmis/link/200901/policies	When it comes to atom link relations, I think there is a fine line between being generic and too vague. The former is good in that it keeps the registry from becoming bloated by having multiple values all with slightly different meanings, however the latter makes it difficult for clients to have any clue what they can do with it. The existing registered link relation that suffers from this is “related” – yeah, duh, of course the thing at the other end is related, that’s why it has a link *relation* to it. I fear that “policies” is similarly vague.