# High Performance XML/XSLT Transformation Server Fall 2016 Progress Report

Zixun Lu (luzi), Shuai Peng (pengs), Elijah Voigt (voigte)

CS 461 | CS Senior Capstone | Fall 2016

June 1, 2017

#### **Abstract**

A progress report for development during the Fall 2016 term the high-throughput XML/XSLT transformation server project. Outlining the development progress, stumbling blocks, and solutions during the planning stage of development.



Figure 1: Source: Wikimedia Commons [2]



Figure 2: Source: Apache Software Foundation [1]

#### 1 PROGRAM PURPOSE AND GOALS

The XZES40-Transformer project is a collaboration between the Oregon State University Computer Science Capstone course and Steven Hathaway in affiliation with the Apache Software Foundation.

#### 1.1 Purpose

The purpose of the XZES40-Transformer is to perform high throughput XML/XSLT document transformations. Given an XML 1.0 and XSLT 1.0 input document our application will return a transformed XML 1.0 formatted document. In addition to transforming the document we are adding key optimization to the transformation pipeline to increase throughput, allowing for users of the system to accomplish more in a day.

#### 1.2 Goals

The goal of the project is to create an Open Source application which performs faster XML/XSLT transformations than older XML/XSLT document transformers. In theory the application would be competitive with paid proprietary applications, but will at the very least it will be more performer than Open Source alternatives.

We will achieve increased performance by adding a caching layer and parallel transformations to our application. Caching will be added in key areas like the compilation stage and the transformation stage. Parallel computation will be implemented in the parsing stage as that is computationally heavy but should not create race-conditions.

The application will be exposed over a Web API for remote use of the application. This will make the application convenient to use as anybody with a web-browser and connection to the host server, and will ensure users do not need to install the package locally. Exposing the application over a remote client helps users maximize the use of the application as the Caching layer will be collective for all users, making the massive cache a problem for "the cloud" instead of a burden on local systems.

The application will, as a stretch goal, compile on and be packaged for multiple platforms including Linux, Berkeley Software Distribution (BSD), and Windows.

The following technologies will be used in the process of development:

- The Apache Xalan-C++ and Xerces-C++ libraries will be used in transforming XML documents.
- The International Components of Unicode (ICU) C++ library will be used to convert files to and from Unicode.
- The **Apache webserver** and a **Python Common Gateway Interface (CGI) script** will be used to provide the service over the internet to web-browser and command-line interface (CLI) clients.
- Python will be used to create and distribute the CLI.
- Bootstrap will be used to create the web interface so it is aesthetically appealing and usable.
- FPM and WIX will be used to package the application on Unix-like and Windows systems respectively.

#### 2 PROJECT STATE

Although we have not yet begun developing code for our project, we have begun working with our client to create a Development Virtual Machine which will be used for C/C++ code development. The VM will be used as soon as development begins and should reflect the production environment as it will look when the project is being used *for real*.

The VM is a 25+GiB Debian Linux VM with the following packages, libraries, and tools:

- The Xerces, Xalan, and ICU libraries we are required to use.
- Common C/C++ Build Dependencies.
- Git, Text Editors, Gnome and common VM tools.
- The TeXLive series of packages.

Although big it should will no doubt be feature rich enough for us to carry out development.

#### 3 PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

Although we have did the technology reviews, there is still problem about the XZS40-Transformer.

- Early on in the term our team had a hard time staying on the same page understanding the project as a whole. This has mostly been resolved as we worked together regularly on document writing.
- Our team confused about the format of some documents, including the Design Document. After we speaking with our TA we re-structured our documents to fit the requirements and gain a better understanding of the assignment goals.
- Toward the end of the term our client (Steven Hathaway) became less highly available and was too busy to have in-person meetings with us. This was not necessarily a show stopper, and was expected with the holiday season, but it did prove problematic in our turnaround.

#### 4 RETROSPECTIVE

| Weeks | Positives                               | Deltas                              | Actions                              |
|-------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Week3 | We met with our client to discuss       | We needed to start working on the   | Next we needed to meet with our      |
|       | his vision for the application, initial | problem statement for the project.  | sponsor to obtain a development      |
|       | requirements, and any resources we      |                                     | virtual machine and finish the Prob- |
|       | would need.                             |                                     | lem Statement                        |
| Week4 | We met with our sponsor to obtain       | The Client Requirements document    | We needed to complete the Client     |
|       | a Debian Linux development vir-         | needed to be written and signed. We | requirement documents and contact    |
|       | tual machine (which was 25+GiB!)        | also needed to stat thinking about  | our sponsor to sign our revised      |
|       | and ask further clarifying questions    | how best to use the VM our sponsor  | Problem Statement document.          |
|       | about how best to move forward          | provide to us.                      |                                      |
|       | with our Problem Statement and          |                                     |                                      |
|       | Client Requirements document.           |                                     |                                      |
| Week5 | We spent this week clearing up a        | We didn't truly understand what     | We needed to re-factor the Client    |
|       | lot of fundamental confusion about      | we should be doing for our pro-     | Requirements documents next          |
|       | what our project is, what problem       | gram, so we need to spend a lot of  | week after getting caught up.        |
|       | we were fixing, and how we were         | time getting caught up.             |                                      |
|       | going to create a solution for that     |                                     |                                      |
|       | problem.                                |                                     |                                      |

REFERENCES 4

| Week6 We got into the habit of working together on our documents, scheduling almost daily meetings to work on and complete projects. This was effective in helping us complete a good Client Requirements document.  Week7 We partitioned our project into roughly 12 equally sized parts for the first size of the first size | to talk   |
|--|-----------|
| ing almost daily meetings to work on and complete projects. This was effective in helping us complete a good Client Requirements document.  Week7 We partitioned our project into roughly 12 equally sized parts for work on and complete projects. This was able to get signed digitally, but we needed to keep our client's schedule in mind going forward.  We got trouble with our technology review as some elements we did about the technology review.  | to talk   |
| on and complete projects. This was effective in helping us complete a good Client Requirements document.  Week7 We partitioned our project into roughly 12 equally sized parts for able to get signed digitally, but we needed to keep our client's schedule in mind going forward.  We got trouble with our technology review as some elements we did about the technology review.  | to cor-   |
| effective in helping us complete a good Client Requirements document.  Week7 We partitioned our project into roughly 12 equally sized parts for needed to keep our client's schedule in mind going forward.  We got trouble with our technology review as some elements we did about the technology review.  | to cor-   |
| a good Client Requirements document.  Week7 We partitioned our project into roughly 12 equally sized parts for review as some elements we did about the technology review.   | to cor-   |
| ment.  Week7 We partitioned our project into roughly 12 equally sized parts for review as some elements we did about the technology review.  | to cor-   |
| Week7 We partitioned our project into We got trouble with our technology We later met with our TA roughly 12 equally sized parts for review as some elements we did about the technology review  | to cor-   |
| roughly 12 equally sized parts for review as some elements we did about the technology review  | to cor-   |
|  |           |
|  | ng out-   |
| the Technology Review and started   not fully understand. To fix this we   rect formatting and learning  |           |
| work on that document. needed to do further research. come misunderstandings.  |           |
| Week8 We completed the Technology re- Unfortunately not as much work We would try finish the rough   | sh draft  |
| view at the deadline and began was done on the Design Document of the design document the  | follow-   |
| working on the Design Document. as we had hoped because we as a ling week.   |           |
| group did not understand the inten-  |           |
| tion of the IEEE format prescribed   |           |
| for the assignment. We had to re-  |           |
| write a lot of the design document   |           |
| to organize it correctly.  |           |
| Week9 This week was Thanksgiving, so We finished the rough draft for our We would finish the design  | ı docu-   |
| that got in the way of much getting design documents, but had to talk ments next week after meeti  | ng with   |
| done. with our TA to see if we were struc- our TA and get ready for t  | ne final  |
| turing it correctly. presentation/report.  |           |
| Week10 We completely restructured our De- We need contact our client, and re- We needed to completely with   | ite, fin- |
| sign Document and turned in an quest the sign document as soon as ish, and record the programment and turned in an quest the sign document as soon as  | ess re-   |
| unsigned draft because our client possible. port/presentation, hopeful   | y dur-    |
| did not get back to us before the ling the weekend of Fall v   | eek 10    |
| deadline. before finals.   |           |

### 5 CONCLUSION

Looking to the future we are excited to work on the application. There are a few holes in our design document that may influence the implementation time-line, but for the most part our application is coming together nicely. In designing the application we were not met with any surprises, so what initially seemed like a simple application continues to look straight-forward.

All in all our project has not encountered many problems and if we are able to hit our deadlines the final product should work well. In practice this will be harder to achieve than just writing the code the design document lays out, just as so many horror stories regale. We will start early, work often, and stay focused.

## REFERENCES

- [1] ASF Press Kit: Apache Software Foundation Logo. URL: https://www.apache.org/foundation/press/kit/.
- [2] Wikimedia Commons: Oregon State University Logo. URL: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Oregon\_State\_University\_logo.