



Report of MaaS-API working group

*18/09/2019, session #9
10:00-12:00, Radiuz, Stadsplateau 11 (WTC), Utrecht*

Attended by (9):

Marijn Rovers (Pon)
Martijn van der Linden (mobieleitsfabrik)
Eddy Borremans (Nazza)
Roberto Reyes Garcia (UTwente)
Pim van der Toolen (Intraffic)
Robert Baart (Paxx)
Edwin van den Belt (DAT Mobility)
Stefan Bollars (Innovactory)

Tim Cooper (Skedgo) – *via teleconference*

1. Summary of decision points & feedback from actions from previous working session

All points from the Report of session #8 have been approved by the attendees.

The following tasks were defined during the previous sessions:

<i>No.</i>	<i>Context</i>	<i>Task</i>	<i>Status</i>
3.1	In NETEX stop definitions are standardized. It is important that Accept uses this as well in their base code tables, as NETEX will be mandatory starting Dec 1 st	Edoardo will refer this to Accept	Done
3.2	Ross brought up GDPR issues related to fraudulent customers. The obligation to remove end	Edoardo will refer this issue to the End user data working group to address	To-do, will start again in Sep.

	user data might allow misuse, as customers can sign up again without blacklisting. Stefan mentioned that GDPR does allow exceptions to prevent fraud, but this asks for a central organization to keep track of the blacklist on behalf of MSPs/TOs.		
3.9 3.10	Ross put forward different methods for implementing webhooks. Different options were discussed. Himanshu mentioned that Accept already has authorization keys implemented which can be re-used.	Ross will summarize these options on Github, so WG members can start looking into their preferences. (3.9) Edoardo will check possible re-use of Accept authorization processes (3.10)	Work-in-progress Done, see issue #7
5.1	As homework for all it was decided that we should have an overview of business models that TOs use, as a check that we are incorporating all the necessary scenarios in the API specifications	See issue #46 on Github	To-do
6.4	Roberto asked for the release of the documents <i>MaaS Base Code Tables</i> and <i>Connecting a MaaS Service Provider to the MaaS-NL-Router version draft, 0.1 Date: 21 March 2019</i> and <i>Woordenboek Reizigerskenmerken</i> .	Edoardo will ask if these documents can be released.	To-do
7.1	Edoardo will make a suggestion to modify the Booking State sequence diagram and update this to a state transition diagram	Roberto has offered to work on updated the flow diagrams	Done
7.2	Eddy brought forward the risk of possible malicious intent during the booking process. Stefan added that this brings forward	Edoardo will add this to the Github as a backlog item (7.2) for further development after v1.2.	Done

	the discussion about the need for historical logging. Who is going to log what? Can a MSP retrieve historical logging on all transactions from a TO?		
8.1	New booking states do not match with booking specs in swagger	Edwin will work on updating the booking specs	Done
8.2	Define webhook schemas. See issue #12	Edwin and Ross will work on a webhook proposal	Work-in-progress
8.3	Define a (generic) message header for all calls. See issue #48	Tjalle to make a proposal for the headers	To-do
8.4	a TOMP-API-for-Dummies guide would be of great value for stakeholders interested in understanding what the TO-MP API is and how it works. See issue #52	Tim to make JSON-code samples for the TOMP-API-for-Dummies guide based on the spec updates.	To-do

2. Approval of report of previous working session

The report of the previous working session has been approved without comments and will be added to Github.

3. Walkthrough list of current pull requests & issues

Using <https://github.com/efel85/TOMP-API/>

Approved during the meeting:

- Pull request "[Consistent planning & booking, also reizigerskenmerken](#)" made by Edwin. Edoardo to approve in github (9.1).

Issues discussed during the meeting:

- Clarification was made regarding the purpose of the TO-MP API, which is to provide a standard for the communication between TOs and MPs. Therefore in the API we refer to the reservation of assets and not to the reservation of rides/journeys. One reservation corresponds to one asset.
- Clarification is needed regarding authentication methods. Pim to clarify the original goal of issue #7 and see whether the authentication methods by Accept can be used for the authentication between MPs and TOs.
- Edwin has updated all endpoints in swaggerhub regarding the booking process and trip execution process. Some STDs are available for reference in github and

the operational flows for the booking and trip execution processes have also been updated by Roberto. Thus, Swaggerhub endpoints and operational flows are sync and up-to-date.

- Yaml file available [here](#) ← Edoardo to make this new version of the API in swaggerhub open for everyone (9.2)
- Roberto will update list of API calls in the blueprint and attach it to the operational flows for a better overview (9.3)
- Edwin mentions that the allocation of a specific asset to the user, prior the actual start of the trip, is missing in the operational flow and STD. The group agreed on the assumption that TOs are responsible for guarantying that users will get a specific asset, provided that a reservation has been confirmed, and the attributes or digital key of such asset will be provided prior the start of the trip (as described in the reservation confirmation).
 - The allocation of a specific asset will be made explicit in the Trip Execution process, prior the start of the trip (propably as part of the “preparing state”) ← Roberto will integrate it to the TE operational flow (9.4)
- Decision on dealing with versioning via the messages’ header.
 - Pim proposes to include the TO-MP API name in it ← Pim to follow up with Tjalle in [issue #48](#)
- Tim suggested to reconsider the formatting of (lat-lon) coordinates. Unanimous decision is to keep it as previously agreed and close the discussion (see (closed) [issue #32](#)).
- Suggestion to change the format of the TO-MP API to REST API standard ← Robert and Edwin will work on the changes (see [issue #54](#)) (9.5)

4. Determine tasks for next meeting

- See numbered tasks above
- Everyone is requested to check [all issues in github](#) and contribute where possible.
- What are the next steps towards implementation?
- 2 October: draft proposal for v1.1 ready for review
- 16 October: definitive document v1.1

5. Any other business

- Edoardo will be back to chair next meeting. Location and agenda will be sent by him.