TeamRoom Plus

This OPEN document will not be filed. It is being kept active.

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	**DFDL 1.0**
Meeting Date	**22-Nov-11 (Tues)**
Meeting Time	**15:00 - 16:00**

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Mar-11
Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 24-Nov-11

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , 22 November 2011

Agenda

Prepare for your meeting by describing the objectives (both immediate and long-term, if appropriate) of the meeting; and describe key details.

1. Further spec issues

As implementation has progressed, a number of issues have been spotted in the DFDL 1.0 spec by the IBM implementation team and others. Remaining items for resolution:

13.13. Spec does not state what it means to have xs:time or xs:date with binaryCalendarRep set to 'binaryMilliseconds' or 'binarySeconds'. When parsing, you can create an xs:dateTime from the milliseconds or seconds value in conjunction with binaryCalendarEpoch, then create xs:time or xs:date from that..
But what about unparsing? How do you get the milliseconds or seconds value from just an xs:time or xs:date and the epoch.

For the record, there is an existing errata in this area but it doesn't cover this:

2.53. Section 13.13. Property binaryCalendarEpoch is used when the binaryCalendarRep is either binarySeconds or binaryMilliseconds, and is of type xs:dateTime. It is possible to omit the time zone component from the property value, and if this occurs UTC is used.

13.13. Spec doesn't state whether binaryCalendarRep 'binarySeconds' and 'binaryMilliseconds' types are signed or unsigned. *"binarySeconds' means represented as a 4 byte integer that is the number of seconds since the epoch. 'binaryMilliseconds' means represented as an 8 byte integer that is the number of seconds since the epoch."*

The IBM implementation has them signed. , and POSIX/Unix times are allowed to be negative.

2. AOB

Minutes

Meeting Minutes

Reflect on your meeting as you record all topics and issues discussed , and any tabled conversations. What went well, or what would you do differently next time? Document those so others can take advantage of your learning .

Attendees
Steve Hanson (IBM) (co-chair)
Mike Beckerle (co-chair)
Tim Kimber (IBM)

Apologies

Minutes

1. Further spec issues
The following were discussed

13.13. Spec does not state what it means to have xs:time or xs:date with binaryCalendarRep set to 'binaryMilliseconds' or 'binarySeconds'. When parsing, you can create an xs:dateTime from the milliseconds or seconds value in conjunction with binaryCalendarEpoch , then create xs:time or xs:date from that.. But what about unparsing? How do you get the milliseconds or seconds value from just an xs:time or xs:date and the epoch.

Agreed that the use of xs:date and xs:time with binarySeconds and binaryMilliseconds is problematic. Take errata to limit use to xs:dateTime only.

Noted that if DFDL ever supports xs:duration, then binarySeconds and binaryMilliseconds are applicable.

13.13. Spec doesn't state whether binaryCalendarRep 'binarySeconds' and 'binaryMilliseconds' types are signed or unsigned. *"binarySeconds' means represented as a 4 byte integer that is the number of seconds since the epoch.'binaryMilliseconds' means represented as an 8 byte integer that is the number of seconds since the epoch."*

The IBM implementation has them signed. , and POSIX/Unix times are allowed to be negative.

Agreed to treat the values as signed. Take errata to change the wording. Plus correct "...*8 byte integer that is the number of seconds...*" to "...*8 byte integer that is the number of **milli**seconds...*"

2. AOB

Meeting closed
15:50 UK

Next call
Tues 29th Nov 2011

Create Action Items

Record the to-do's and individuals assigned by entering the appropriate information in the form below . Press the "Create Action Items" button to create specific to do's that can be tracked in the assignee 's Work for Me views. " All Action Items will be tracked in the Action Items and Other Meeting Documents tab .

Action Items and Other Meeting Documents

View: ResultDocs

Next action: **158**

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
123	DFDL tutorial (Steve) 13/10: Draft of first 3 chapters has been written and will be distributed to WG 10/11: Posted to grid forge here (http://forge.gridforum.org/sf/go/doc16106?nav=1), work continuing at IBM to define a standard example-based chapter framework and to author additional chapters. Contributors welcome! 17/11: Steve, Stephanie and Alan had a meeting to discuss the best structure for the tutorial and decide which examples to use throughout. The meeting raised more questions. Further discussions will be held. 24:11: The list of topics to be covered in the remaining lessons has been produced and a lesson template. Alan will write lesson 4 01/12: Alan has started lesson 4 which covers fixed and variable fields and arrays. 08/12: Alan has almost completed lesson 4. Will send out for review. 15/12: First draft of lesson 4 is available for review. Alan to send to Bob and Joe. 22/12: Alan has distributed drafts for tutorials on Basic Structure and Optional/Repeating elements. Please review 12/01: Alan distributed a tutorial for choices and updated the others. Alan and Steve reviewed them and updated versions will be sent soon. Should start on the 'representation' tutorials soon. 19/01: The tutorials for basic structure, optional/arrays and choices have be updated. Please review. The tutorial for text elements should be available soon. 26/01: No comments received about 3 tuorials distributed last week. Alan is still working on Text representation.

	02/02: Steve has sent comments on three tutorials. Alan to send updated versions by the end of the week. Alan has also distributed the first part of the tutorial on text representation and would like feedback. 09/02: Steve had reviewed tutorials 3,4,5 and updated versions have been distributed. Joe reviewed lesson on text elements. Main points. Using 'represented as text' is confusing. Examples are too cluttered. Suggest simple targeted examples but still build up to final complete schema 23/02: New versions distributed and Steve has commented. 02/03: Alan has published the final versions of tutorials 4,5,6 and is working on text respresentations. There was some discussion about the detail that needs to be covered. Should limit it to 'common usage' and refer to the spec for details of edge cases. 09/03: Alan distributed an update to the text tutorial. Please review. 30/03: Steve has spent half a day tidying up lessons 1 to 6 and has uploaded them as pdfs to gridforge. They are now more coherent, and many inconsistencies and errors fixed. Ownership of draft lessons (text properties, binary properties, advanced features) has been passed to Steve. Also need to make a schema available for the examples. 13/04: Steve is working on the text properties tutorial. 04/05: No progress 18/05: No progress 01/06: No progress 08/06: No progress 15/06: This is on hold until Steve clears up spec issues and other workload. Steph has looked at the later lessons, and noted that they are more direct compared to the more wordy earlier lessons. 28/06: On hold. ... 22/11: On hold
132	**Publishing DFDL xsd (Suman)** 08/12: Agreed that it should be made available. Suman has started the approval process in IBM 15/12: no progress 22/12: no update 12/01: Suman is getting approval from IBM to publish. 19/01: Waiting to get IBM approval to publish 26/01: no update 02/02: No update 09/02: no update 23/02: no update 02/03: Suman is working through the IBM process to permit publication. There was discussion about what licence the XSD would be published under and how that would effect use in products. Suman to investigate 09/03: No update 30/03: Suman has sent information to IBM legal. Reminded him about the license issue. 13/04: No update. 04/05: IBM has permission to release the DFDL model xsds to WG members only, Suman has a couple more changes to make and will send to Steve for review. License clarification needed. 18/05: Awaiting response from IBM legal. Suman will send Steve the model xsd for review. 01/06: 08/06. Awaiting response from IBM legal. Suman will send Steve the model xsd for review. 15/06: Steve has received the xsds (there are three of them) and will review. 28/06: Not reviewed yet 05/07: Need to fully understand what WG members are able to do with it. The real usefulness is in other implementers being able to use the xsds to validate DFDL xsds so the license needs to reflect this. 12/07: No further progress 19/07: Suman will talk to IBM legal and make it clear that the license must allow users to actively use the xsds. 26/07: No update 16/08: Steve has reviewed and sent comments to Suman. Suman has asked legal to clarify re-distribution rules, taking into account OGF licensing terms and patent filing.

23/08: No update

30/08: Steve has reviewed words from IBM legal. It looks like that once the xsds are published by OGF then they are free to be used under the normal OGF licensing terms. Steve needs to clear all this with IBM legal in Hursley, as the DFDL mission is owned by Hursley in UK.

20/09: Steve has mailed IBM Hursley legal

27/09: Steve to meet with IBM Hursley legal

4/10: No further progress

18/10: Steve has met with legal, can publish the xsds after tidy up. Will create OGF info document.

1/11: No further progress

...

22/11: Waiting for Steve to find time to do this

133	**Make a set of default formats available (Suman)**
	19/01: Suman expects some default formats to be ready by Feb 9th. Will need approval to publish
	26/01: Stephanie sent the defaults used by test cases to Suman
	02/02: no update
	09/02: no update
	23/02: no update
	02/03: Same as 132
	09/03: No update. Same license issue apply though.
	13/04: No update.
	04/05: IBM will make one default format available. Suman is working through the IBM process to permit publication.
	18/05: Awaiting response from IBM legal.
	01/06:
	08/06: Awaiting response from IBM legal. IBM also want to prove that the default format has the properties sensibly defined to plans to include in internal testing.
	15/06: No change.
	...
	19/07: 19/07: Suman will talk to IBM legal and make it clear that the license must allow users to actively use the format xsd(s).
	26/07: No update
	16/08: Same issue as action 132
	23/08: No update
	30/08: As action 132
	20/09: Steve has mailed IBM Hursley legal
	27/09: Steve to meet with IBM Hursley legal
	4/10: No further progress
	18/10: Steve has met with legal, can publish the xsds after tidy up. Will create OGF info document.
	1/11: No further progress.
	...
	22/11: Waiting for Steve to find time to do this

140	**Spec issue: Parsing: 'missing' v 'empty', role of initiators, default values (All)**
	01/06: See minutes.
	08/06: Still under discussion. Tim has sent Mike a selection of data formats to guide the discussion.
	15/06: Not discussed - an extra call has been scheduled to go through this.
	28/06: A series of extra calls are being held between Mike, Steve, Tim and Steph.
	05/07: Next extra call is Wed 6th July - Steve to send invite
	12/07: Two more calls held. Next call is Wed 13th July.
	19/07: More calls held, next call is Fri 22nd July.
	26/07: More calls held, good progress
	16/08: Steve will set up next call for when Tim has returned from holiday
	23/08: Two more calls scheduled for this week, remaining issues: separator suppression, empty strings, sparse arrays (see action 136)
	30/08: Call held earlier today. Still remaining - separator suppression (matrix); sparse arrays; empty strings; empty value delimiter policy. Steve to summarise where we have got

		so far before remaining items are tackled. 20/09: Steve has summarised where we are with action 140, which Tim and Mike have reviewed. 2 hours call planned for Thursday. 27/09: Calls held, progressing the separator suppression behaviour 4/10: More calls held, progressing separator suppression, sparse arrays (see action 136) and emptyValueDelimiterPolicy behaviour 18/10: All issues now in a single document, call held earlier today. Next call Thursday. 1/11: Extra calls still ongoing 8/11: Extra calls still going, when action 140 document complete will send to Steph for review 15/11: Mike is verifying the action 140 conclusions by writing an algorithm in SCALA which can be ultimately be used in Daffodil 22/11: Call to be held next week
145		**Provide a 'dispatch' way of discriminating a choice for better performance of the envelope/payload use case (Steve, Mike, Suman)** 12/7: See minutes. Need to choose a proposal and flesh out. 19/07: Waiting for proposals 26/07: Waiting for proposals 16/08: Waiting for proposals. Suman added to action. ... 1/11: Steve to send a proposal ... 22/11: Waiting for Steve to find time to do this
146		**Model NRL's bit-oriented format where complex repeating element carries a 'last' indicator (Steve, Mike)** 19/07: 26/07: Steve/Tim put forward a proposal that used a discriminator that looked at the previous item's repeatBit in the array and failed if it was 0. This looks like it will work . Mike to add the correct DFDL annotations to take into account both repeatBit and presentBit in a single discriminator, and auto-set them using outputValueCalc. A more usable solution to the 'last indicator' problem is desirable though. Noted that this has a 'repeat..until' semantic. 16/08: Adam and Ryan to evaluate Steve/Tim proposal as it is potentially fragile relying as it does on backtracking. 23/08: Adam and Ryan had meeting with Boyd Fletcher and others, still evaluating to see whether change to spec is needed to handle this better. 30/08: No update 20/09: Looking like a spec change would be beneficial. Adam will provide details within the next month. 27/09: Waiting to hear from NRL. Mike to find out how they are progressing. 4/10: Mike will contact NRL to see how things are progressing. 18/10: No update - Steve & Mike to chase 1/11: No update 8/11: Update on NRL via Mike - staffing the team to carry forward the DFDL work 15/11: No update 22/11: No update
153		**Decide which TZ schema to adopt to extend dfdl :calendarTimeZone (Steve)** 18/10: Need to keep as close to ICU as possible as an aid to implementers. 1/11: No progress ... 22/11: Waiting for Steve to find time to do this
154		**Redistribute the IBM test cases (Steve)** 8/11: Investigate the T&C from the original distribution. 15/11: Steve has received the IBM legal information 22/11: Steve now has approval to redistribute
155		**Errata: Timing of validation on unparsing (All)** 8/11. Next step is to talk to XML Schema WG. 15/11: Steve was a call with Sandy Gao on Fri 25th. 22/11: Call on Nov 25th delayed until Dec 2nd
156		**Errata: Investigate ICU fallback mappings when converting from Unicode (Mike)**

	8/11: Need more information before errata can be taken 15/11: Action assigned to Mike 22/11: Mike making good progress - will send update by email. Unicode Character Mapping Markup Language might be able to help here.
157	**Errata: Should nilValueDelimiterPolicy apply to nilKind 'logicalValue' (Mike)** 8/11. If an errata is to be taken, need to identify why this combination does not make sense or is problematic in some way. 15/11: Action assigned to Mike. One issue is with the value space of the nilValue overlapping with the value space of the initiator. Need to provide greedy rules that allow this to be resolved. Mike concerned that logicalValue being sensitive to nilValueDelimiterPolicy does make implementations more complicated. Can be argued that with logicalValue the nil value must be in-band, so why allow such a value to appear with a different delimiter policy? Mike to write up why this should be changed. 22/11: Mike has distributed a proposal to the WG, discuss next week

Closed actions

No	Action

Deferred actions

No	Action
129	**Press release to publicise DFDL (Steve)** Steve is pulling together a press release at IBM. Want to include as many contributors and interested parties as possible.NCSA are keen to be included. Also likely that US National Archive will want to be included. Mike has indicated OCO are too. 17/11: no progress ... 08/12: Still no response from IBM press office 15/12: no progress .... 09/03: No progress 30/03: Making this action deferred until IBM is in a position to say something more concrete about any implementation.
131	**Transformation of DFDL properties to a canonical form (Joe)** 08/12: Joe has produced a XSLT to transform a DFDL schema to a canonical element form. When tested it should be made available on the WG gidforge site. 15/12: Alan tested against test dfdl schema which worked correctly (after fixing some errors in the schema) 22/12: no update 12/01: Joe has some defects to fix before making available on gridforge. 19/01: There is a difficult problem to solve before Joe make the style sheet public 26/01: Working on problems 02/02: no progress 09/02: As it wasn't a simple as exoected this will be treated as a low priority action 23/02: Low prioity 09/03: Low priority 30/03: Deferring for now
066	**Investigate format for defining test cases (All)** 25/11:IBM to see if it is possible to publish its test case format. 04/12: no update ... 17/02: IBM is willing in principle to publish the test case format and some of the test cases. May need some time to build a 'compliance suite' 24/03: No progress 03/03: Discussions have been taking place on the subset of tests that will be provided.

10/03: work is progressing
17/03: work is progressing
31/03: work is progressing
14/04: And XML test case format has been defined and is being tested.
21/04. Schema for TDML defined. Need to define how this and the test cases will be made public
05/05: Work still progressing
12/05: Work still progressing
02/06: Work still progressing on technical and legal considerations
...
25/08: Will chase to allow Daffodil access to test cases.   The WG should define how implementation confirm that they 'conform to DFDL v1'
01/09: IBM still progressing the legal aspect. Intends to publish 100 or so tests as soon as it can, ahead of a full compliance suite.
08/09: IBM still progressing
15/09: IBM still progressing, expect tests to be available within a few weeks
22/09: IBM still progressing, expect tests to be available within a few weeks
29/09:Test cases are being prepared.
06/10: Some test cases should be available next week. Steve would like to be able to show the test case information at OGF 30.
13/10: Still progressing
10/11: Legal issues cleared, IBM in process of collecting 100 example test cases, ideally ones that fit the 'extended conformance' of NCSA Daffodil
17/11: Work is progressing on verifying the test cases. It should be possible to distribute to the WG in 2 weeks.
24/11: About half the test cases have been completed and are being reviewed internally.
01/12: Test cases should be available shortly
08/12: The test cases are in internal IBM review. Probably need a bit of reorganising before publication
Stephanie gave a brief overview of the format of the test cases.
15/12: Ruth joined the call to provide the latest status. The test cases have been updated and a draft read.me produced. Although not ready for public distribution Ruth will send them to Joe for feedback.
22/12: Test cases were sent to Joe for initial testing which found some problems in the Daffodil parser
12/01: All current tests use a default format whih Daffodil doesn't currently support. Joe suggested that there should be test that defined the same function using different definition forms. Also suggested that default formats should be provided by the WG. This had always been the intention. Action 133 raised to track.
19/01: There is currently no resource available in IBM to make more tests available. IBM to discuss how/if it can make a 'minimal compliance test suite' available.
26/01: Action kicked off within IBM. There was a brief discussion abot naming and organisation of test cases but no preferences were expressed
02/02: IBM will not have the resources to develop a full test suite in the near future. Steve suggested that we produce a list of required test cases so that anyone could supply them.
09/02: Steve had previously sent a list of areas to be tested. Please review.
23/02: Please review Steve's list of areas to be tested
02/03: Alan had reviewed Steve's list and we went through his comments. Agreed there is no need for separate tests for the infoset or for dfdl: property lists, unions etc but comment will be added that these should be exercised during property testing.
09/03: Alan updated the test document. Need more introduction and perhaps adopting the OGF template.
30/03. Ownership of test document passed to Steve. This action is merged with 112 and will cover all aspects of compliance suite.
13/04: IBM will not have time to create a compliance suite in the near future. Probably best to make this action deferred for now.

Work items:

No	Item	Owner	Target	Status

043	Track errata list for 1.0 of the spec. http://forge.gridforum.org/sf/go/doc16280?nav=1	Steve	N/A	Draft 0006 on grid forge.
044	Incorporate errata list into DFDL spec.	Steve	TBD	