CMIS Unified Search

Proposal to TC – 23 March, 2009

Attendees:
   CMIS TC

Topics:

1. Greg described the proposal
2. Comments/Questions
   a. David Choy: Is this a required service? Yes, but note that the repository can still answer “none” as the enumCapabilityChanges value and thereby signal it cannot answer changes
   b. David Pitfield: Why do we overlap the last member of a page of changes with the first member of the next? This was intended to allow the caller to know if an item has not been skipped. Suggestion was to signal this in a more formal way
   c. Nicolas Pombourcq:
      • Is it allowed that this not be a complete set of changes (for example, an implementation could be smart enough to treat multiple updates as a single update)? Yes, and we should make that tolerance clear.
      • Do we need both create/update (do search engines even care)? It would be possible to collapse them into a single update (see above) but we will should still keep both change types.
      • The REST binding example implies that a single entry would have multiple change types. That is not what was intended in the example (missing some skipped for brevity notes)
      • Suggest that, instead of having cmisChangedObjectType extend cmisObjectObject, suggest the schema be changed to have cmisChangedObjectType contain an element of cmisObjectObjectType and two new elements for change type and change date (or attributes, see below)
      • Suggest the elements in cmisChangedObjectType be attributes instead of elements
3. Decided to open Jira issues for any proposed changed to the proposal
4. Decided to vote next week.