JMAP for Tasks

What's new in JMAP for Tasks

https://www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-ietf-jmap-tasks-02.html

Change from last discussion at CalConnect interim:

- assignee is now part of JSCalendar.Participant.role

Tasks Survey

- Observation: While email/contact/calendar functionality is (mostly) relatively similar across systems, there is **more heterogeneity regarding tasks**
  - Within the groupware/Webmail scope (e.g., support of task recurrence → not in Google Tasks)
  - When considering a larger scope of task-related systems (e.g., kanban-style)

- Core question regarding general **goal of JMAP** standards: **is it desired that JMAP is adopted by existing systems** for the sake of interoperability and/or data portability (similar to CardDAV/CalDAV)?
  - Discussion at last IETF JMAP WG meeting: is it desirable for JMAP for Tasks to support a broader set of task models for interop / data portability? → survey existing systems

Tasks Survey

- Initial scope: Groupware, Kanban-style as well as Issue Tracking systems

- Goals
  - Identify potential gaps in JSCalendar to support fit most systems
  - Identify potential capabilities via common/distinct features between systems

- Approach: Focus on UI features
  - Categorize
  - Document values
  - Count usage

Tasks Survey - First results

see https://gist.github.com/jaudriga/cd323fa75397c76b1dd30861ef590302

Observations

- Task systems are **heterogeneous regarding some features**
  - No system supports all features of JMAP for Tasks
  - Implementors will probably not want to implement the whole spec
  - Especially more complex features could be optional (e.g., Recurrences)
- Task systems are **homogeneous regarding most core features**
  - Core features of surveyed Kanban-style systems and issue trackers overlap with existing JMAP for Tasks spec

Task Survey - Discussion (1)

- Features within JMAP for Tasks, which are not supported by all systems:
  - alerts
  - assignee (participant)
  - attachments
  - recurrence
  - relation (incl. subtask)

- Suggestion: model as capabilities in spec

Task Survey - Discussion (2)

- Features, which are **not yet in JMAP for Tasks**, but found in survey
  - Complex
    - "Checklists"
    - Comment list / discussion attached to a task
    - (History) ($\rightarrow$ audit trail?)
  - Plus all sorts of more simple key-value-style properties

- Suggestion: model as JMAP for Tasks extensions

Task Survey - Next steps

- Continue and refine survey
- Reach out to developers/vendors
- Update JMAP for Tasks spec