## Recommendations from the API Subcommittee

**Participants:** The subcommittee met virtually on October 12, 2021. Attended to the meeting: Stefano Paris, Jonathan Garro, Shiomi Yumi, Julio Serje

### Introduction

Two active users of the API provided the subcommittee a good starting point for discussions.

In both cases the READ API was being used and no major problems or suggestions. The Write API user (Stefano) reported technical problems with the WRITE API, which are actively looked at.

The main conclusion of the subcommittee was that the API in general fulfills the needs of current users and the limitations seen, and thus the recommendations proposed are not connected itself with the API but rather to the SOP’s, rules and sets of codes upon which the GLIDEnumbers are constructed.

These recommendations are relevant to the site globally as they include the API, the UI and the administration and public sections of the website. Therefore, they are passed to the Product Development

Some of the recommendations can, be implemented only for the API without affecting the underlying data, especially for the READ interface (for the search function), keeping in mind that the ideal implementation plan would be to adjust the API taking advantage of as many implementations of this and Product Development subcommittees suggestions.

### Recommendation 1: More powerful Hazard management

Currently the rules allow only one hazard to be associated to each record. This makes searches difficult for certain types of disasters that can be reported as different hazards depending, for example, on the resolution of the observation.

Examples:

* floods and landslides caused by storms can be reported by either one
* Tsunami, ocean contamination
* Droughts and connected epidemics
* etc.

It was identified the need to expand the use hazards in two different ways:

1. Multi-hazard capabilities: this is a ‘horizontal’ view of hazards in which each hazard can be connected to others simultaneously. It would be extremely useful for searches
2. Connected hazards: this is a hierarchical view of the hazards. Cyclone, storm, floods, for example, across countries.

### Recommendation 2: more flexible Extension of GLIDEnumbers

Connected to the previous points, it could be useful to ‘extend’ one GLIDE to another with a different hazard. This can be split in two parts, the first one and most important, the case of extending to another hazard in the same family in a different country (for example a cyclone that becomes a tropical storm).

Example:

TC-2021-000854-CUB Cyclone (hurricane) in Cuba, tropical storm in the US.

TS-2021-000854-USA

The second part, which would require very clear rules and SOP’s would be the case of extending a GLIDE in the same country to indicate their parental relationship:

Example:

DR-2021-000162-MOZ a drought that could be extended (and therefore linking it ‘hard way’) to:

EP-2021-000162-MOZ an epidemic that was later found to be caused by the drought.

In the current system they would have different serial numbers making them very hard to link.

### Recommendation 3: improve documentation with beginner’s sections and text

It was suggested by several participants that the documentation of the API could be improved by adding more information for novice users, making it accessible to more, and as well by simplifying and breaking down some of the more complex sections.

### Recommendation 4: Review the API after all features and changes have been implemented

Depending on the changes made in the future to the Web Application product, parallel changes to the API should be made based on a systematic review of new features.