

VOQL1 Session minutes

Welcome & presentation

P. Osuna new chairman

Y. Shirashaki vice-chairman

PO presentation starts

Skynode separation from VOQL and probably the transference to another working group

F.Genova: Similar problem to PLASTIC. PLASTIC belongs to the applications WG, but, as it implies language too, it is needed to find specific places

D. Tody: Different problem. Skynode is very similar to TAP. It contains the crossmatch protocol specific problems but it also has a query system.

P. Osuna: SkyPortal query system is a client implementation. The way SkyNode works is clearly separated from the language

How to handle the “execution plan” will be probably included in a future TAP version

TAP should not mandate a TAP service to understand XML

J. Taylor: Why to use the XML version? If only the String version is going to be the one to be used in the query why to convert it to XML if we can send it directly in XML?

D. Tody: There are libraries to parse SQL-> XML and viceversa. You can easily convert from one to the other. You can write S and translate to X

P.O.: This process could be difficult

D.T. agrees region definition in XML could be difficult as it could include external references

About the use of bi-univocal use of utypes

D.T.: In the jonathan approach the utype is the field name and the UCD is a value

P.O. explain more in the detail the line data model approach and after discussion D.T. agrees that a change of name could be a good solution sometimes to specify better the field

D.T. propose to include the column name as a way to identify the field

J.S. said that is server dependent. Sending queries across should be server independent (this is why we use utypes)

D.T.: the utype name change will imply very long lists in some cases. This could be a solution for the LDM, but not for a more complex case

P.O.: The way the LDM was implemented to prevent these problems is not a proposal but an example of how the problem was solved in a data model and to rise the problem to the community

Ivan (?) What are the reasons why the community says Metadata queries are a bad idea

N. Whinstanley (?) Because this information should be stored and queried into the registry

Ivan (?) Why offset and top is proposed to be out of the language?

P.O.: Because they are client implementation dependent

Ivan:..... to relegate offset is a same just because some RDBMS implements it different

P.O.: People could argue this because it is difficult or whatever reason. This point is to be discussed in the Tiger Team

F. Genova: Decisions from the Tiger Team should be reported and well documented, and the results should be fast enough (not to maintain discussions forever)
Community could push in a different solution so it has to be *very* well documented

P.O. Some decisions could be only “semantics” (no major implications) but technicalities will be documented. The result of some decisions could be not popular but they have to be taken

F.G: Be prepared to change your mind if community have different ideas