FDC3 - January 9th, 2018 Minutes

Attendees:

> John Lin, Alliance Bernstein
> Alexei Samonov, BGC Partners
> Terry Thorsen,   ChartIQ
> Christopher McGuire, Citadel
> Alan Cenkus, FactSet
> Johan Sandersson, Factset
> Dan Riley, FactSet
> Peter Smulovics, Morgan Stanley
> David Serfozo, Morgan Stanley
> Nick Kolba, OpenFin
> Chuck Danielsson, OpenFin
> Espen Overbye, OpenFin
> Mazy Dar, OpenFin
> Mathieu Lorentz, T. Rowe Price
> Saori Fotenos, Thomson Reuters
> Jorge Santos, Thomson Reuters
> Benoit Muller, Thomson Reuters
> Tom Sugden, UBS
> Edward Broach, Wellington
> David George Carlson, Wellington

Proposal - Update Context Envelope

New Context Envelope:

```
{
        object: (string),              //object type
        definition: (string),          //url
        version: (string),             //version #
        data: (array)                  //the context payload
}
```

For examples using this context envelope to start chats & passing non-FDC3 objects, please see the meeting slides.

The context envelope would be passed along when launching an application with an intent. A resolution workflow was proposed ot the group - for a visual representation of the resolution workflow, please see the meeting slides.

Symphony Contexts

Johann, chair of the Symphony Working Group, described the current workflow in Symphony using the Client Extension API. The Client Extension API allows for inline rendering of context objects.

Inline rendering, would this be limited by the Symphony UI?

A: I can't say for sure but I do know there are limitations to what you can do within that conversation. But they (Symphony) are open to accommodating requests from customers. But certainly not all the possibilities. I.e. - rather than using divs & spans you need to build tables, etc. - it's very restrictive

Johann will be reaching out to the product managers to share these thoughts directly.

Should FDC3 be prescriptive about context formats or should it take more of a hands off approach?

Current approach is more hands off. If you want to send FDC3 standard, that works. If you want to send proprietary format, just put it in the envelope.

Terry: this is what we'd be looking for
Saori: Agree, we want a prescriptive format but be able to send the proprietary ones as well

How much effort are we going to put into defining the format? Safe the for ones we started (see below), are there other ones in your list?

Security
Industry
Geography
Person
Organization

The way Nick was picturing it, he was putting things out there as a first step & if we want to create more object definitions with detail people in this group should create those context proposals

If everyone is creating their own contexts, are they really FDC3 ones or are they more like OpenFin ones?

A: It has to be an FDC3 thing, not OpenFin thing, they are not relevant to OpenFin & these should be defined by the group.

It may be time to start forming some greater focus around this so we can have a draft we can start vetting more. Saori & Johann are interested in contributing

Johann would argue we already have this collaborative structure built. They have a bunch of objects in various stages that they're discussing in the Symphony WG. This will be discussed in the contexts breakout session.

Intents Proposal

The idea around intents is to create common verbs for apps that can be recognized across a wide range of applications, not full RPC.

How would these intents be resolved on the desktop @ runtime?

For launching by intent, we would still use the 'open' API either passing in null or another method that only takes the app name as an arg.

There would be some need for app resolution when there are multiple possibilities. Proposed resolution workflows are:

1) Apps query the Runtime Environment Manager to build their own workflows
2) There's a desktop layer that can provide its own resolver

The initial proposal was very resolver heavy. As an alternative approach, we could have a resolver that lives in the environment so if you send an open ended intent it would be passed along to the resolver which would present a resolver dialog

So you're saying the intents get declared separately from the apps. So does the app need to declare their intents or is a common set?

A: The idea is there is a common set of intents defined by FDC3 and those would hopefully gain traction

What about app types and using app types for service discovery?

A: Concerned about being able to define app types @ an industry level. If app types are pointing to a collection of intents how needed will they be?

It's more for outbound -> if you have a cashtag and want to hover it would be good to see the apps that can consume it. But how is this different from just resolving on the intent?

But what if you had multiple applications that support a given intent and you want to group them - would this be a reason to have a type?

So app type a contract about what intents you support? Yes, exactly

Fundamental concern - it's one thing to make those definitions within an org, but another to do that across an industry. In the end it wouldn't be a requirement, but only if you want to.

It makes sense to start the way we've proposed, with grouping as something you can maybe layer on top. It's certainly a powerful model for companies that have app stores to organize that way.

Action Items

- The Context Data WG will have breakout sessions between this week and next, please volunteer to participate if interested.
- The App Intents WG will also be meeting to discuss the proposals shared with the group today. Please volunteer to participate if interested.