

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	23-Dec-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	13:00 - 15:00
Meeting Editors	Alan Powell

Created by Alan Powell on 23-Dec-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 23-Dec-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , December-23-2009

Agenda

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

1. **045 - Discriminators**

Continue discussion of WTX semantics.

2. **Does the parser/serializer have to start on a global element ?**

Agree removal of dfdl:documentRoot property

Need Stephanie and Suman to agree.

3. **LengthUnits = 'bits'**

Review Mike's proposal

4. **Semantics of length =0**

Need to go through each of the lengthKinds to understand the interaction of length=0, nil handling and defaults.

ACTION

5. **Byte Order Mark and Unicode signature**

Tim has investigated ICU behavior and it looks OK

Before we conclude that the spec is OK as it stands, we should consider whether it is correct to treat a BOM as a character. The Unicode standard makes a clear distinction between characters and BOMs:

<http://www.unicode.org/versions/Unicode5.0.0/ch02.pdf> section 2.13 (don't skip the first couple of paragraphs)

http://unicode.org/faq/utf_bom.html#bom1

6. Go through remaining actions

7. Draft 037 review

Please submit comments by Monday 21st Dec

Agree terminology

Agreed that:

-A schema has **components** which have dfdl **annotations**

.- Dfdl **annotations** have **properties** (same as XSDL) but need to distinguish between format/representation properties and other properties such as name, ref, selector.

Not discussed.

-The ~~data/data stream/message~~ has **elements/fields**

-The info set has **items**

8. Plan to finish DFDL v 1 Schedule

Activity		Schedule	Who
Complete Action items		- 18 Dec 2009	WG
Complete Spec	Write up work items	– 23 Dec 2009	AP
	Restructure and complete specification	- 23 Dec 2009	AP
	Issue Draft 038	23 Dec 2009	
WG review	WG review	7 Dec – 08 Jan 2010	WG
	Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
	Issue Draft 039	15 Jan 2010	
	Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
	Issue Draft 040	29 Jan 2010	
Initial OGF Editor Review	Initial Editor review	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	OGF
	Initial GFSG review	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	
	Issue Draft 041	1 Mar 2010	
OGF Public Comment period (60 days)		1 Mar - 30 Apr 2010	OGF
OGF 28 Munich		15-19 March 2010	
Incorporate comments	Incorporate comments	28 May 2010	
	Issue Draft 042	28 May 2010	
Final OGF Editor Review	Final Editor review	June 2010	OGF
	final GFSG review	June 2010	
	Issue Final specification	30 June 2010	
Publish proposed recommendation		1 July 2010	

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group**OGF DFDL Working Group Call , December-23-2009****Attendees**

Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Marting (Progeny)
Stephanie Fetzner (IBM)
Peter Lambros (IBM)

Apologies

Suman Kalia (IBM)
Tim Kimber (IBM)

1. 045 - Discriminators

Briefly discussed WTX. Stephanie will provide more documentation and invite Bob Connelly to Jan 6 WG call

2. Does the parser/serializer have to start on a global element ?

Confirmed agreement to remove of dfdl:documentRoot property
Alan will send Suman a separate note to alert him.

3. LengthUnits = 'bits'

Reviewed Mike's proposal and general agreement.

Items to add

- Clarification of lengthKinds permitted.
- Noted dfdl:lengthKind implicit does not use dfdl:lengthUnits as currently stated in the spec
- LengthUnits='bits' could be allowed for other schema types so long as the number of bits is a multiple of 8
- Clarification of how bits are mapped from logical to physical on parsing and unparsing when the lengths are different
- dfdl:binaryBooleanxxxRep should be unsignedInt rather than integer

Mike will update the proposal

4. Semantics of length =0

Steve H to investigate

5. Byte Order Mark and Unicode signature

Tim has investigated ICU behavior and it looks OK. Agreed that BOM will be treated as a unicode code point and part on the content

6. Go through remaining actions

Updated below

7. Draft 037 review

IBM implementation team and Steve H have submitted comments. Next draft will be issued In January when more comments have been received.

Agree terminology

Agreed that:

-A schema has **components** which have dfdl **annotations**

- Dfdl **annotations** have **properties** (same as XSDL) but need to distinguish between format/representation properties and other properties such as name, ref, selector.

-The **data stream**-has **elements** (which is consistent with the grammar)

-The info set has **items**

Noted we are behind schedule

Activity		Schedule	Who
Complete Action items		- 18 Dec 2009	WG
Complete Spec	Write up work items	- 23 Dec 2009	AP
	Restructure and complete specification	- 23 Dec 2009	AP
	Issue Draft 038	23 Dec 2009	
WG review	WG review	7 Dec – 08 Jan 2010	WG
	Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
	Issue Draft 039	15 Jan 2010	
	Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
	Issue Draft 040	29 Jan 2010	
Initial OGF Editor Review	Initial Editor review	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	OGF
	Initial GFSG review	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	
	Issue Draft 041	1 Mar 2010	
OGF Public Comment period (60 days)		1 Mar - 30 Apr 2010	OGF
OGF 28 Munich		15-19 March 2010	
Incorporate comments	Incorporate comments	28 May 2010	
	Issue Draft 042	28 May 2010	
Final OGF Editor Review	Final Editor review	June 2010	OGF
	final GFSG review	June 2010	
	Issue Final specification	30 June 2010	
Publish proposed recommendation		1 July 2010	
Grid recommendation process		1 Jan - 1 April 2011	

Meeting closed, 15:00

Next call 06 January 2010 13:00 UK

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: 073

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing 27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call 03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated 09/06: Progress but not discussed 17/06: Discussed briefly 24/06: No Progress 01/07: No Progress 15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way. 29/07: No Progress 05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules. 12/08: No Progress ... 16/09: no progress 30/09: AP distributed proposal and others commented. Brief discussion AP to incorporate update and reissue 07/10: Updated proposal was discussed. Comments will be incorporated into the next version. 14/10: Alan to update proposal to include array scenario where minOccurs > 0 21/10: Updated proposal reviewed 28/10: Updated proposal reviewed see minutes 04/11: Discussed semantics of discriminators on arrays. MB to produce examples 11/11: Absorbing action 033 into 045. Maybe decorated discriminator kinds are needed after all. MB and SF to continue with examples. 18/11: Went through WTX implementation of example. SF to gather more documentation about WTX discriminator rules. 25/11: Further discussion. Will get more WTX documentation. Need to confirm that no changes need to Resolving Uncertainty doc. 04/12: Further discussion about arrays. 09/12: Reviewed proposed discriminator semantic. 16/12: Reviewed discriminator examples and WTX semantic. 23/12: SF to provide better description of WTX behaviour and invite B Connolley to next call</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas 03/06: not discussed 24/06: No Progress 24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases) 15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide. ... 14/10: no progress 21/10: Discussed the real need for this being in the specification. It seemed that the main value is it define a schema location for downloading 'known' defaults from the web. 28/10: no progress 04/11: no progress 11/11: no update 18/11: no update 25/11: Agreed to try to produce for CSV and fixed formats 04/12: no update 09/12: no update 16/12: no update 23/12: no update</p>
056	<p>MB Resolve lengthUnits=bits including fillbytes 12/08: No Progress ... 28/10: no progress</p>

	04/11: MB to look at lengthUnits = bits 11/11: no update 18/11: no update 25/11: no update 04/12: no update. ALan will set up a separate call to progress this action. 09/12: no update. ALan will set up a separate call to progress this action. 16/12: MB, SH and AP had a separate call. MB to distribute proposal 23/12: Discussed proposal. MB will updated
064	MB/SH Request WG presentation at OGF 28 25/11: Session requested 04/12: no update 09/12: no update 16/12: SH has changed request to a general session rather tha WG in the hope of attracting more people. 23/12: no update
066	Investigate format for defining test cases 25/11: IBM to see if it is possible to publish its test case format. 04/12: no update 09/12: no update 16/12: reminded dent to project manager 23/12: SH will send another reminder.
068	Should the roots of messages be designated.? 09/12: Yes. New dfdl:documentRoot property Closed 16/12: reopened and decided to drop property subject to agreement from SKK and SF 23/12: SKK review decision to drop dfdl:documentRoot
071	Semantics of length=0, nil handling and defaults. 23/12: SH no update
072	Byte Order Mark and Unicode signature 23/12: Confirm BOM will be treated and part of the content.

Closed actions

No	Action

Work items:

No	Item	target version	status
005	Improvements on property descriptions		not
011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
012	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
0	Update dfdl schema with change properties	ongoing	

3 6			
0 3 8	Improve length section including bit handling		son
0 4 2	Mapping of the DFDL info set to XDM	none	not
0 6 9	ICU fractional seconds		
0 7 0	Write DFDL primer		
0 7 1	Write test cases.		
0 7 2	it is a processing error if the number of occurrences in the data does not match the value of the expression or prefix		
0 7 3	Rename dfdl:separatorPolicy="required" to "always".		
0 7 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Last 'postFix' separator is not optional - Terminators are mandatory. - dfdl:documentFinalTerminatorCanBeMissing - dfdl:documentFinalSeparatorCanBeMissing (Action (70)) 		
0 7 5	Remove occursCountKind="useAvailableSpace".		
0 7 6	<p>dfdl:documentRoot, will be defined that can only be on global elements.</p> <p>The DFDL spec does not have to define the format of parameters to the DFDL processor but will indicate that it must be possible to address any element.</p> <p>Agreed that ANY element within the schema can be the starting point for parsing or unparsing.</p>		
0 7 7	<p><i>'delimited' means the item is delimited by the item's terminator (if specified) or an enclosing construct's separator or end of the enclosing construct designated by its known length or its terminator.</i></p> <p>The definition of EndOfParent also needs improving.</p>		
0 7 8	document UPA checks		

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	16-Dec-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	13:00 - 15:00
Meeting Editors	Alan Powell

Created by Alan Powell on 17-Dec-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 17-Dec-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , December-16-2009

Agenda

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

1. 045 - Discriminators

Continued discussion of semantics of discriminators and arrays. Review Examples

2. Clarification of postfix separators , terminators ,finalTerminatorCanBeMissing

Confirm Proposal:

- Last 'postFix' separator is not optional
- Terminators are mandatory.
- dfdl:documentFinalTerminatorCanBeMissing - the last terminator in the data stream may be missing. Is only examined when processing the root element a global element is a child of xs:schema-
- dfdl:documentFinalSeparatorCanBeMissing - the last separator in the data stream may be missing. Is only examined when processing the root element a global element is a child of xs:schema-

3. Does the parser/serializer have to start on a global element ?

- Confirm

It was agreed that it would be helpful for tooling, importers, etc to know which elements are possible 'root' elements even though doesn't have this capability.

A new property, dfdl:documentRoot, will be defined that can only be on global elements.

The property is optional, it does not prevent the DFDL processor from starting at any other element.

A DFDL processor or tooling may choose to optimise based on this property.

4. LengthKind = 'bits'

Review Mike's draft

5. Semantics of length =0

Should a field length of 0 , from expression or prefix for example, mean the element is present but length zero or not present?

Should occurrence be used to control existence and length to control length?

6. Go through remaining actions

7. Draft 037 review

Agree terminology

- A schema has **components** which have dfdl **annotations**
- Dfdl **annotations** have **properties** (attributes)
- The **data/data stream/message** has **elements/fields**
- The infoset has **items**

8. Plan to finish DFDL v 1 Schedule

Activity		Schedule	Who
Complete Action items		- 18 Dec 2009	WG
Complete Spec	Write up work items	- 23 Dec 2009	AP
	Restructure and complete specification	- 23 Dec 2009	AP
	Issue Draft 038	23 Dec 2009	
WG review	WG review	7 Dec – 08 Jan 2010	WG
	Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
	Issue Draft 039	15 Jan 2010	
	Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
	Issue Draft 040	29 Jan 2010	
Initial OGF Editor Review	Initial Editor review	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	OGF
	Initial GFSG review	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	
	Issue Draft 041	1 Mar 2010	
OGF Public Comment period (60 days)		1 Mar - 30 Apr 2010	OGF
OGF 28 Munich		15-19 March 2010	
Incorporate comments	Incorporate comments	28 May 2010	
	Issue Draft 042	28 May 2010	
Final OGF Editor Review	Final Editor review	June 2010	OGF
	final GFSG review	June 2010	
	Issue Final specification	30 June 2010	
Publish proposed recommendation		1 July 2010	
Grid recommendation process		1 Jan - 1 April 2011	

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , December-16-2009

Attendees

Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Marting (Progeny)
Stephanie Fetzer (IBM)
Tim Kimber (IBM)

Apologies

Suman Kalia (IBM)
Peter Lambros (IBM)

1. 045 - Discriminators

We went through the examples of discriminator on resolving choices and optional element that Alan had produced in some detail.

Noted that all the elements on choice branches should have discriminators to resolve the parent choice not just the simple element.

Stephanie explained some of the WTX semantics.

- an identifier must be mandatory (later question: how do you make something mandatory in WTX?)
- An identifier has an implicit rule (exists()) is no other rule is specified.
- identifier is not used on the branches of a choice, but is on a partitioned group.

It was suggested that DFDL should adopt the WTX identifier flag with separate rule model rather than assert rules and discriminator rules.

Stephanie had to leave so discussion postponed until next call

2. Clarification of postfix separators , terminators ,finalTerminatorCanBeMissing

Discussion to clarify where dfdl:documentFinalTerminatorCanBeMissing and dfdl:documentFinalSeparatorCanBeMissing apply.

It was agreed that they apply on the root element passed to the parser which may not be a global element.

3. Does the parser/serializer have to start on a global element ?

As part of the discussion of 2 above it was decided after all not to introduce a property to designate global root elements as it was felt that the only sensible options would be for the property to be enforced. ie a specified element MUST have the property, or don't have the property..

But need Stephanie and Suman to agree.

4. LengthKind = 'bits'

Mike will distribute his proposal

5. Semantics of length =0

Need to go through each of the lengthKinds to understand the interaction of length=0, nil handling and defaults.
ACTION

6. Go through remaining actions

Updated below

7. Draft 037 review

Please submit comments by Monday 21st Dec

Agree terminology

Agreed that:

-A schema has **components** which have dfdl **annotations**

.- Dfdl **annotations** have **properties** (same as XSDL) but need to distinguish between format/representation properties and other properties such as name, ref, selector.

Not discussed.

-The ~~data/data stream/message~~ has **elements/fields**

-The infoset has **items**

7a. Byte Order Mark and Unicode signature

Tim stated that the statement that BOM is treated as data is not implementable consistently with ICU. Would prefer it to say that BOM are not allowed.

Tim will investigate further ICU behaviour. ACTION

8. Plan to finish DFDL v 1 Schedule

Activity		Schedule	Who
Complete Action items		- 18 Dec 2009	WG
Complete Spec	Write up work items	- 23 Dec 2009	AP
	Restructure and complete specification	- 23 Dec 2009	AP
	Issue Draft 038	23 Dec 2009	
WG review	WG review	7 Dec – 08 Jan 2010	WG
	Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
	Issue Draft 039	15 Jan 2010	
	Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
	Issue Draft 040	29 Jan 2010	
Initial OGF Editor Review	Initial Editor review	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	OGF
	Initial GFSG review	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	
	Issue Draft 041	1 Mar 2010	
OGF Public Comment period (60 days)		1 Mar - 30 Apr 2010	OGF
OGF 28 Munich		15-19 March 2010	

Incorporate comments	Incorporate comments	28 May 2010	OGF
	Issue Draft 042	28 May 2010	
Final OGF Editor Review	Final Editor review	June 2010	
	final GFSG review	June 2010	
	Issue Final specification	30 June 2010	
Publish proposed recommendation		1 July 2010	
Grid recommendation process		1 Jan - 1 April 2011	

Meeting closed, 15:00

Next call 23 December 13:00 UK

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: **073**

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
071	Semantics of length=0, nil handling and defaults.
072	Byte Order Mark and Unicode signature

Current Actions :

No	Action
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p> <p>09/06: Progress but not discussed</p> <p>17/06: Discussed briefly</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: No Progress</p> <p>15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: AP distributed proposal and others commented. Brief discussion AP to incorporate update and reissue</p> <p>07/10: Updated proposal was discussed. Comments will be incorporated into the next version.</p> <p>14/10: Alan to update proposal to include array scenario where minOccurs > 0</p> <p>21/10: Updated proposal reviewed</p> <p>28/10: Updated proposal reviewed see minutes</p> <p>04/11: Discussed semantics of discriminators on arrays. MB to produce examples</p> <p>11/11: Absorbing action 033 into 045. Maybe decorated discriminator kinds are needed after all. MB and SF to continue with examples.</p> <p>18/11: Went through WTX implementation of example. SF to gather more documentation about WTX discriminator rules.</p> <p>25/11: Further discussion. Will get more WTX documentation. Need to confirm that no changes need to Resolving Uncertainty doc.</p> <p>04/11: Further discussion about arrays.</p> <p>09/12: Reviewed proposed discriminator semantic.</p> <p>16/12: Reviewed discriminator examples and WTX semantic.</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases)</p> <p>15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide.</p> <p>...</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: Discussed the real need for this being in the specification. It seemed that the main value is it define a schema location for downloading 'known' defaults from the web.</p> <p>28/10: no progress</p> <p>04/11: no progress</p>

	11/11: no update 18/11: no update 25/11: Agreed to try to produce for CSV and fixed formats 04/12: no update 09/12: no update 16/12: no update
056	MB Resolve lengthUnits=bits including fillbytes 12/08: No Progress ... 28/10: no progress 04/11: MB to look at lengthUnits = bits 11/11: no update 18/11: no update 25/11: no update 04/12: no update. ALan will set up a separate call to progress this action. 09/12: no update. ALan will set up a separate call to progress this action. 16/12: MB, SH and AP had a separate call. MB to distribute proposal
064	MB/SH Request WG presentation at OGF 28 25/11: Session requested 04/12: no update 09/12: no update 16/12: SH has changed request to a general session rather than WG in the hope of attracting more people.
066	Investigate format for defining test cases 25/11: IBM to see if it is possible to publish its test case format. 04/12: no update 09/12: no update 16/12: reminded dent to project manager
068	Should the roots of messages be designated? 09/12: Yes. New dfdl:documentRoot property Closed 16/12: reopened and decided to drop property subject to agreement from SKK and SF
071	Semantics of length=0, nil handling and defaults.
072	Byte Order Mark and Unicode signature

Closed actions

No	Action

Work items:

No	Item	target version	status
005	Improvements on property descriptions		not
011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa

0 1 2	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
0 3 6	Update dfdl schema with change properties	ongoing	
0 3 8	Improve length section including bit handling		son
0 4 2	Mapping of the DFDL info set to XDM	none	not
0 6 9	ICU fractional seconds		
0 7 0	Write DFDL primer		
0 7 1	Write test cases.		
0 7 2	it is a processing error if the number of occurrences in the data does not match the value of the expression or prefix		
0 7 3	Rename dfdl:separatorPolicy="required" to "always".		
0 7 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Last 'postFix' separator is not optional - Terminators are mandatory. - dfdl:documentFinalTerminatorCanBeMissing - dfdl:documentFinalSeparatorCanBeMissing (Action (70)) 		
0 7 5	Remove occursCountKind="useAvailableSpace".		
0 7 6	<p>dfdl:documentRoot, will be defined that can only be on global elements.</p> <p>The DFDL spec does not have to define the format of parameters to the DFDL processor but will indicate that it must be possible to address any element.</p> <p>Agreed that ANY element within the schema can be the starting point for parsing or unparsing.</p>		
0 7 7	<p><i>'delimited' means the item is delimited by the item's terminator (if specified) or an enclosing construct's separator or end of the enclosing construct designated by its known length or its terminator.</i></p> <p>The definition of EndOfParent also needs improving.</p>		
0 7 8	document UPA checks		

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	09-Dec-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	13:00 - 15:00
Meeting Editors	Alan Powell

Created by Alan Powell on 10-Dec-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 10-Dec-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , December-09-2009

Agenda

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

1. 045 - Discriminators

Continued discussion of semantics of discriminators and arrays.

2. Clarification of postfix separators , terminators ,finalTerminatorCanBeMissing

Agree semantics

3. Arrays

occursCountKind="useAvailableSpace". On unparsing, unused space should be padded with dfdl:fillByte ([added below](#)). But number in the info set is a lot less than the box can hold, how do you know when re-parsing how many are in the box? Also, if we are trying to fit things into a box, matter if items are left over? I suggested this was an error below. Need Mike's input as he has seen the use cases for this.

Additional thoughts on occursCountKind="useAvailableSpace".

I had been thinking that occursCountKind="useAvailableSpace" was for all 'box' use cases but during discussions with Steve that it does not cover the 2 use cases I had in mind.

1. COBOL occurs depending on with maximum occurrences allocated.

Array complex element dfdl:lengthKind='explicit' dfdl:length='{MaxOccur * Length(row)}'

Sequence dfdl:occursCountKind = 'expression' dfdl:occursCount = '{./NoOfOccurs}'

Row dfdl:lengthKind='.....'

2. StopValue

Array complex element dfdl:lengthKind='explicit' dfdl:length='{MaxOccur * Length(Row)}'
Sequence dfdl:occursCountKind = 'StopValue'
Row dfdl:lengthKind='.....'

We need to articulate the use case for occursCountKind="useAvailableSpace".

4. **Does the parser/serializer have to start on a global element ?**

- Should the root global elements be designated in DFDL?
- Is the SCD syntax usable to indicate 'starting' element to dfdl processor
- Does the 'starting' element need to be a global element

5. **Semantics of dfdl:lengthKind 'delimited'**

Current definition: *'delimited' means the item is delimited by the item's terminator (if specified) or an enclosing construct's separator terminator.*

Does it need to be extended to cover 'infix' separators where last item can also be delimited by the end of the bitstream or the fixed-length parent element

6. **UPA checks**

Discuss Steve H email

7. **Go through remaining actions**

8. **Plan to finish DFDL v 1**

Agree terminology

Reworked plan

Activity		Schedule	Who
Complete Action items		- 18 Dec 2009	WG
Complete Spec	Write up work items	- 23 Dec 2009	AP
	Restructure and complete specification	- 23 Dec 2009	AP
	Issue Draft 038	23 Dec 2009	
WG review	WG review	7 Dec – 08 Jan 2010	WG
	Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
	Issue Draft 039	15 Jan 2010	
	Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
	Issue Draft 040	29 Jan 2010	
Initial OGF Editor Review	Initial Editor review	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	OGF
	Initial GFSG review	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	
	Issue Draft 041	1 Mar 2010	
OGF Public Comment period (60 days)		1 Mar - 30 Apr 2010	OGF

OGF 28 Munich		15-19 March 2010	
Incorporate comments	Incorporate comments	28 May 2010	
	Issue Draft 042	28 May 2010	
Final OGF Editor Review	Final Editor review	June 2010	OGF
	final GFSG review	June 2010	
	Issue Final specification	30 June 2010	
Publish proposed recommendation		1 July 2010	
Grid recommendation process		1 Jan - 1 April 2011	

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , December-09-2009

Attendees

Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Marting (Progeny)
Peter Lambros (IBM)
Stephanie Fetzer (IBM)
Tim Kimber (IBM)

Apologies

1. 045 - Discriminators

Steve H, Tim and Alan had done some investigation of applying WTX component rules semantic to DFDL and developed the following rules

- A dfdl:discriminator resolves the presence of its parent group (sequence or choice). Note this isn't necessarily a point of uncertainty
- If the parent group is the content model for a complex types then the instance of the element of the complex type also exists (that is: if the group is only defining the content of a complex element then the discriminator propagates from the group to the element automatically)

That is discriminators apply to parents rather than points of uncertainty. Discriminations must be explicitly propagated upward.

Alan will document some examples.

2. Clarification of postfix separators , terminators ,finalTerminatorCanBeMissing

Discussed last weeks suggested solution and decided that a single property was not sufficient as a sequence could have a separator and terminator. Also the separator is on the sequence but the terminator is on the element.

Most didn't like the new entity as with would have to be put on multiple optional elements at the end of a sequence.

Given that the main use case is missing CR LF at the end of a file it was agreed that it should really be a 'global' flag that means 'the last 'terminator/separator in the data stream' can be missing. DFDL doesn't have any way to set 'global' properties. Decide to have 2 new properties that only apply to 'root' global elements.

Proposal:

- Last 'postFix' separator is not optional
- Terminators are mandatory.
- dfdl:documentFinalTerminatorCanBeMissing - the last terminator in the data stream may be missing. Is only examined when a global element is a child of xs:schema
- dfdl:documentFinalSeparatorCanBeMissing - the last separator in the data stream may be missing. Is only examined when a global element is a child of xs:schema

3. Arrays

The use case for occursCountKind="useAvailableSpace" is when the length of the parent is set to match the space taken by repeating elements. Therefore the length of the parent always matches the length of the children. For fixed length elements this can be easily calculated. For variable length elements this is not possible. Agreed that it was not a common use case so will drop occursCountKind="useAvailableSpace".

4. Does the parser/serializer have to start on a global element ?

- Should the root global elements be designated in DFDL?

It was agreed that it would be helpful for tooling, importers, etc to know which elements are possible 'root' elements even though XML doesn't have this capability.

A new property, dfdl:documentRoot, will be defined that can only be on global elements.

- Is the SCD syntax usable to indicate 'starting' element to dfdl processor

The DFDL spec does not have to define the format of parameters to the DFDL processor but will indicate that it must be possible to address any element.

- Does the 'starting' element need to be a global element

Agreed that ANY element within the schema can be the starting point for parsing or unparsing.

5. Semantics of dfdl:lengthKind 'delimited'

The definition of delimited does need extending to cover the last element being terminated by the parent 'box'

'delimited' means the item is delimited by the item's terminator (if specified) or an enclosing construct's separator or the end of the enclosing construct designated by its known length or its terminator.

The definition of EndOfParent also needs improving.

6. UPA checks

Steve H took us through his investigation of UPA checks. Only 2 apply to DFDL

- Choice branches
- Element declarations where minOccurs <> maxOccurs

These can be fixed by making element names unique.
DFDL will treat UPA failures as schema definition errors.

7. Go through remaining actions

Updated below

8. Plan to finish DFDL v 1

Discussed terminology briefly.

Reworked plan

Activity		Schedule	Who
Complete Action items		- 18 Dec 2009	WG
Complete Spec	Write up work items	- 23 Dec 2009	AP
	Restructure and complete specification	- 23 Dec 2009	AP
	Issue Draft 038	23 Dec 2009	
WG review	WG review	7 Dec – 08 Jan 2010	WG
	Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
	Issue Draft 039	15 Jan 2010	
	Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
	Issue Draft 040	29 Jan 2010	
Initial OGF Editor Review	Initial Editor review	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	OGF
	Initial GFSG review	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	
	Issue Draft 041	1 Mar 2010	
OGF Public Comment period (60 days)		1 Mar - 30 Apr 2010	OGF
OGF 28 Munich		15-19 March 2010	
Incorporate comments	Incorporate comments	28 May 2010	
	Issue Draft 042	28 May 2010	
Final OGF Editor Review	Final Editor review	June 2010	OGF
	final GFSG review	June 2010	
	Issue Final specification	30 June 2010	
Publish proposed recommendation		1 July 2010	
Grid recommendation process		1 Jan - 1 April 2011	

Meeting closed, 15:00

Next call 16 December 13:00 UK

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: 071

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
045	20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing 27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call 03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated

	<p>09/06: Progress but not discussed 17/06: Discussed briefly 24/06: No Progress 01/07: No Progress 15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way. 29/07: No Progress 05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules. 12/08: No Progress ... 16/09: no progress 30/09: AP distributed proposal and others commented. Brief discussion AP to incorporate update and reissue 07/10: Updated proposal was discussed. Comments will be incorporated into the next version. 14/10: Alan to update proposal to include array scenario where minOccurs > 0 21/10: Updated proposal reviewed 28/10: Updated proposal reviewed see minutes 04/11: Discussed semantics of discriminators on arrays. MB to produce examples 11/11: Absorbing action 033 into 045. Maybe decorated discriminator kinds are needed after all. MB and SF to continue with examples. 18/11: Went through WTX implementation of example. SF to gather more documentation about WTX discriminator rules. 25/11: Further discussion. Will get more WTX documentation. Need to confirm that no changes need to Resolving Uncertainty doc. 04/11: Further discussion about arrays. 09/12: Reviewed proposed discriminator semantic.</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas 03/06: not discussed 24/06: No Progress 24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases) 15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide. ... 14/10: no progress 21/10: Discussed the real need for this being in the specification. It seemed that the main value is it define a schema location for downloading 'known' defaults from the web. 28/10: no progress 04/11: no progress 11/11: no update 18/11: no update 25/11: Agreed to try to produce for CSV and fixed formats 04/12: no update 09/12: no update</p>
056	<p>MB Resolve lengthUnits=bits including fillbytes 12/08: No Progress ... 28/10: no progress 04/11: MB to look at lengthUnits = bits 11/11: no update 18/11: no update 25/11: no update 04/12: no update. ALan will set up a separate call to progress this action. 09/12: no update. ALan will set up a separate call to progress this action.</p>
064	<p>MB/SH Request WG presentation at OGF 28 25/11: Session requested 04/12: no update</p>

	09/12: no update
066	Investigate format for defining test cases 25/11: IBM to see if it is possible to publish its test case format. 04/12: no update 09/12: no update

Closed actions

No	Action
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p> <p>17/06: no change</p> <p>24/06: no change</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>12/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>19/08: Clarify that this action is to go through the XML UPA checks to assess impact on dfdl schemas and advice best practice. Name clashes is just one example. SH or SKK</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>04/11: no progress</p> <p>11/11: Steve has started to look at this. He has requested a 'consumable' definition of the UPA rules from the XSD WG members. Even non-normative Appendix H in the XSD 1.0 spec is hard to consume.</p> <p>18/11: no update</p> <p>25/11: Steve H has not found simpler definition so may just go through them.</p> <p>04/12: Steve has received a simpler description from S Gao and will go through each check.</p> <p>09/12: Only 2 UPA apply to DFDL. These will be treated as errors</p> <p>Closed</p>
070	<p>Clarification of postfix separators, terminators, final Terminator Can Be Missing</p> <p>09/12: - Last 'postFix' separator is not optional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Terminators are mandatory. - dfdl:documentFinalTerminatorCanBeMissing - dfdl:documentFinalSeparatorCanBeMissing

	Closed
068	Should the roots of messages be designated.? 09/12: Yes. New dfdl:documentRoot property Closed
069	Is the SCD syntax usable as a DFDL external. 09/12: DFDL does not need to define the syntax of processor properies Closed

Work items:

N o	Item	target version	stat
005	Improvements on property descriptions		not
011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
012	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties	ongoing	
038	Improve length section including bit handling		son
042	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM	none	not
069	ICU fractional seconds		
070	Write DFDL primer		
071	Write test cases.		
072	it is a processing error if the number of occurrences in the data does not match the value of the expression or prefix		
073	Rename dfdl:separatorPolicy="required" to "always".		
074	- Last 'postFix' separator is not optional - Terminators are mandatory. - dfdl:documentFinalTerminatorCanBeMissing - dfdl:documentFinalSeparatorCanBeMissing (Action (70))		
075	Remove occursCountKind="useAvailableSpace".		
0	dfdl:documentRoot, will be defined that can only be on global elements.		

7 6	The DFDL spec does not have to define the format of parameters to the DFDL processor but will indicate that it must be possible to adresss any element. Agreed that ANY element within the schema cane be the starting point for parsing or unparsing.		
0 7 7	<i>'delimited' means the item is delimited by the item's terminator (if specified) or an enclosing construct's separator or end of the enclosing construct designated by its known length or its terminator.</i> The definition of EndOfParent also needs improving.		
0 7 8	document UPA checks		

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	04-Dec-09 (Fri)
Meeting Time	13:30 - 15:30
Meeting Editors	Alan Powell

Created by Alan Powell on 07-Dec-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 07-Dec-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , December-04-2009

Agenda

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

1. 045 - Discriminators

Resolve confusion from last call whether discriminator only apply to choices .

2. Clarification of postfix separators , terminators ,finalTerminatorCanBeMissing

Discussion postponed from last WG call

3. 045 - parsing rules for determining length

The last WG call agreed that dfdl:legnthKind determines if an item is scanned or not but we didn't discuss the effect on escaping. It is suggested that dfdl:escapeSchemeRef should control if escaping occurs for text fields independently from dfdl:lengthkind allows escaping even when data is not scanned

4. Arrays

From Steve H email

Further discussion on array processing:

4) occursCountKind="expression". Is it a processing error if the number of occurrences in the data does not match the value of expression?

It was noted that the dfdl:outputValueCalc expression of a count field should use the dfdl:countWithDefault() function to ensure values are taken into account.

5) occursCountKind="useAvailableSpace". On unparsing, unused space should be padded with dfdl:fillByte (added below). number in the infoSet is a lot less than the box can hold, how do you know when re-parsing how many are in the box? Also, if trying to fit things into a box, does it matter if items are left over? I suggested this was an error below. Need Mike's input as he's seen the use cases for this.

6) Rename dfdl:separatorPolicy="required" to "always".

7) Noted that dfdl:separatorPolicy="suppress" and "suppressAtEnd" have the same behaviour for an array.

5. Does the parser/serializer have to start on a global element ?

The spec says that one of the external parameters to the DFDL processor is a global element name to start from. Broker allow serialization of any subtree within a schema.

6. **Go through remaining actions**

7. **Test suite for DFDL**

Discuss test case format.

8. **Plan to finish DFDL v 1**

Updated straw man schedule

Activity	Schedule	Who
Resolve Action items	- 23 Nov 2009	WG
Write up work items	16 Nov - 4 Dec 2009	AP
Restructure and complete specification	23 Nov - 4 Dec 2009	AP
WG review	7 Dec - 18 Dec 2009	WG
Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
OGF Editor Review / Incorporate changes	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	OGF
OGF Public Comment period (60 days)	1 Mar - 30 Apr 2010	OGF
OGF 28 Munich	15-19 March 2010	

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , December-04-2009

Attendees

Suman Kalia (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Marting (Progeny)
Peter Lambros (IBM)
Stephanie Fetzer (IBM)

Apologies

Mike Beckerle (Oco)

1. **045 Resolving points of uncertainty - Discriminators**

Continued discussion of semantics of discriminators and arrays.

Agreed that discriminator do apply to all points of uncertainty not just choices.

Further discussion on applying to arrays. It was suggested that discriminators on a repeating element resolves just that existence of the element not the existence of the array.

We need a fully worked proposal to progress.

2. **Clarification of postfix separators , terminators ,finalTerminatorCanBeMissing**

Tim pointed out an inconsistency between the terminators and separators even though they are very similar. The last terminator can be missing if dfdl:finalTerminatorCanBeMissing is set. The last separator is optional for dfdl:separatorPolicy='postfix'

Proposal:

- Last 'postFix' separator is not optional
- Terminators are mandatory.
- A new property allows the final terminator or separator to be missing. FinalDelimiterCanBeMissing was suggested. Or define a new entity '%#EoD' end of data which could be used as an alternative terminator/separator.

Further discussion is needed. Action raised

3. **045 - parsing rules for determining length**

It was agreed that escaping is enabled by dfdl:escapeSchemeRef irrespective of dfdl:lengthKind.

4. **Arrays**

From Steve H email

Further discussion on array processing:

4) occursCountKind="expression". Is it a processing error if the number of occurrences in the data does not match the value of the expression? **Agreed**: it is a processing error.

5) occursCountKind="useAvailableSpace". On unparsing, unused space should be padded with dfdl:fillByte ([added below](#)). But if the number in the infoSet is a lot less than the box can hold, how do you know when re-parsing how many are in the box? Also, if we are trying to fit things into a box, does it matter if items are left over? I suggested this was an error below. Need Mike's input as he has seen the use cases for this.

Needs more discussion

6) Rename dfdl:separatorPolicy="required" to "always".

Agreed

5. **Does the parser/serializer have to start on a global element ?**

Discussed whether it should be possible to start the DFDL processor at any element within a schema rather than just a global element. This would be helpful for tooling to, for example, create examples data for parts of the schema.

It was also noted that it would be helpful to tooling, especially importers, if the global elements that could be roots of messages were known. This had been discussed during scoping discussions. **ACTION**

It was also questioned whether the SCD syntax was usable as an external root designator.

6. **Go through remaining actions**

Updated below

7. Test suite for DFDL

IBM still investigating if its test case format can be made public .

8. Plan to finish DFDL v 1

Draft 037 will be available today or Monday

Alan has received a document defining the OGF approval process . There are two stages

1. to bring a document to proposed recommendation
2. At least 6 months later, to bring it to approved recommendation.

The schedule will be updated with both stages and when new drafts will be available .

Updated straw man schedule

Activity	Schedule	Who
Resolve Action items	- 23 Nov 2009	WG
Write up work items	16 Nov - 4 Dec 2009	AP
Restructure and complete specification	23 Nov - 4 Dec 2009	AP
WG review	7 Dec - 18 Dec 2009	WG
Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
OGF Editor Review / Incorporate changes	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	OGF
OGF Public Comment period (60 days)	1 Mar - 30 Apr 2010	OGF
OGF 28 Munich	15-19 March 2010	

Meeting closed, 15:30

Next call 09 December 13:00 UK

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: **071**

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
068	Should the roots of messages be designated.?
069	Is the SCD syntax usable as a DFDL external.
070	Clarification of postfix separators, terminators,finalTerminatorCanBeMissing

Current Actions :

No	Action
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a)DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd)b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL modelsc) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p>

	<p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p> <p>17/06: no change</p> <p>24/06: no change</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>12/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>19/08: Clarify that this action is to go through the XML UPA checks to assess impact on dfdl schemas and advice best practice. Name clashes is just one example. SH or SKK</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>04/11: no progress</p> <p>11/11: Steve has started to look at this. He has requested a 'consumable' definition of the UPA rules from the XSD WG members. Even non-normative Appendix H in the XSD 1.0 spec is hard to consume.</p> <p>18/11: no update</p> <p>25/11: Steve H has not found simpler definition so may just go through them.</p> <p>04/12: Steve has received a simpler description from S Gao and will go through each check.</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p> <p>09/06: Progress but not discussed</p> <p>17/06: Discussed briefly</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: No Progress</p> <p>15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: AP distributed proposal and others commented. Brief discussion AP to incorporate update and reissue</p> <p>07/10: Updated proposal was discussed. Comments will be incorporated into the next version.</p> <p>14/10: Alan to update proposal to include array scenario where minOccurs > 0</p> <p>21/10: Updated proposal reviewed</p> <p>28/10: Updated proposal reviewed see minutes</p> <p>04/11: Discussed semantics of discriminators on arrays. MB to produce examples</p> <p>11/11: Absorbing action 033 into 045. Maybe decorated discriminator kinds are needed after all. MB and SF to continue with examples.</p> <p>18/11: Went through WTX implementation of example. SF to gather more documentation about WTX discriminator rules.</p> <p>25/11: Further discussion. Will get more WTX documentation. Need to confirm that no changes need to Resolving Uncertainty doc.</p> <p>04/11: Further discussion about arrays.</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases)</p> <p>15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide.</p> <p>...</p>

	14/10: no progress 21/10: Discussed the real need for this being in the specification. It seemed that the main value is it define a schema location for downloading 'known' defaults from the web. 28/10: no progress 04/11: no progress 11/11: no update 18/11: no update 25/11: Agreed to try to produce for CSV and fixed formats 04/12: no update
056	MB Resolve lengthUnits=bits including fillbytes 12/08: No Progress ... 28/10: no progress 04/11: MB to look at lengthUnits = bits 11/11: no update 18/11: no update 25/11: no update 04/12: no update. ALan will set up a separate call to progress this action.
064	MB/SH Request WG presentation at OGF 28 25/11: Session requested 04/12: no update
065	Resolve parsing rules for various lengthKinds 25/11: Agreed dfdl:lengthKind define how to extract the data. Didn't discuss if this changes escaping. 04/12: Closed
066	Investigate format for defining test cases 25/11: IBM to see if it is possible to publish its test case format. 04/12: no update
068	Should the roots of messages be designated.?
069	Is the SCD syntax usable as a DFDL external.
070	Clarification of postfix separators, terminators, finalTerminatorCanBeMissing

Closed actions

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify. 20/05: No Progress ... 09/06: No Progress (low priority) 17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour 24/06: no progress ...

	<p>12/08: no progress</p> <p>19/08: Inconsistencies are being found in ICU behaviour so Calendars need reviewing again.</p> <p>26/08: Specific three character short time zones may not be maintained during round tripping when there is more than one short form for a time zone offset. Because dates and datetimes in the infoset only maintain a time zone offset so on unparsing it isn't possible to say which short form will be selected for a particular offset when there is more than one possible. Need to document.</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: Will produce a list of known issues.</p> <p>28/10: Discussed ICU fractional seconds behaviour. SF to send latest understanding.</p> <p>04/11: no progress</p> <p>11/11: no update</p> <p>18/11: no update</p> <p>25/11: no update</p> <p>04/12: Steve and Alan have been through the known problems.</p> <p>One issue is how many digits fractional second should support. ICU only supports milliseconds but allows up to 6 S pattern characters to be specified. DFDL will follow this approach but will document the behaviour of rounding etc... Closed</p>
063	<p>Write DFDL primer and test cases.</p> <p>11/11: no update</p> <p>25/11: no update</p> <p>04/12: Should become a work item</p>
067	<p>25/11: Investigate problem tracking tools.</p> <p>04/12: Agreed to use the gridforge Tracker tool. Closed</p>

Work items:

N o	Item	target version	stat
005	Improvements on property descriptions		not
011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
012	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
033	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	037	don
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties	ongoing	
038	Improve length section including bit handling		son
042	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM	none	not
051	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	037	don

058	textPadCharacter %#rxx limitation and split to textxxxxPadCharacter	037	don
059	limit terminatorCanBeMissing to last element in schema. Ignore elsewhere.	037	don
060	New empty string semantic for dfdl:binaryBooleanTrueRep	037	don
061	Change maxOccurs violations from processing error to validation error (if not 'fixed')	037	don
062	Drop calendarUseZForUTC. describe zU, IU and TU symbols	037	don
063	DefineFormat can contain only one active format. Drop baseFormat	037	don
064	Define how encoding, byteorder and floating point format externally	037	don
065	Refactor dfdl:textNumberFormat to remove dfdl:numberBase.	037	don
066	document scope of selectors	037	don
067	document floating evaluation order	037	don
068	change dfdl:length to dfdl:representationLength and dfdl:lengthWithoutPadding to RepresentationLengthWithoutParsing		don
069	ICU fractional seconds		
070	Write DFDL primer		
071	Write test cases.		
072	it is a processing error if the number of occurrences in the data does not match the value of the expression or prefix		
073	Rename dfdl:separatorPolicy="required" to "always".		

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	25-Nov-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	13:00 - 15:00
Meeting Editors	Alan Powell

Created by Alan Powell on 26-Nov-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 26-Nov-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Nov-25-2009

Agenda

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

1. 045 Resolving points of uncertainty - Discriminators

Continue discussion of semantics of discriminators and arrays. See email from Alan

2. 045 - parsing rules for determining length

Continue discussion on how to 'turn off scanning' for text elements.

3. SeparatorPolicy=require and defaulting arrays and sequences

Tim has asked for clarification of the rules for when elements are missing and separator policy is required. See email

4. Clarification of postfix separators , terminators ,finalTerminatorCanBeMissing

see email from Tim

5. Go through remaining actions

6. Test suite for DFDL

Discuss Mike's e-mail and what IBM is doing as part of its implementation work

7. OGF28 Call for papers

8. Plan to finish DFDL v 1

How to track spec issues.

Updated straw man schedule

Activity	Schedule	Who
Resolve Action items	- 23 Nov 2009	WG
Write up work items	16 Nov - 4 Dec 2009	AP
Restructure and complete specification	23 Nov - 4 Dec 2009	AP

WG review	7 Dec - 18 Dec 2009	WG
Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
OGF Editor Review / Incorporate changes	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	OGF
OGF Public Comment period (60 days)	1 Mar - 30 Apr 2010	OGF
OGF 28 Munich	15-19 March 2010	

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , November-25-2009

Attendees

Suman Kalia (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Marting (Progeny)
Peter Lambros (IBM)
Tim Kimber(IBM)

Apologies

Stephanie Fetzer (IBM)

1. 045 Resolving points of uncertainty - Discriminators

Continued discussion of semantics of discriminators and arrays .

Briefly reviewed Alan's update of the example to show discriminators only propagating to their parent. Flet that following WTX example was the best approach. IBM will more fully document WTX behaviour.

Discussed whether discriminators should only resolve choices but decided against as they are valuable to , for example, find an optional element that subsequently has a parsing error.

Also discussed that discriminators should only resolve the element they are defined on and whether that meant paths were not needed. Decided paths were needed for other purposes anyway.

Alan noted that the order of evaluation had not been defined for floating elements. Agreed this should be

- the element in that position
- followed by the floating elements in the order they are defined in the schema.

2. 045 - parsing rules for determining length

Discussed Tim's suggestion that dfdl:lengthKind alone should indicate how an item is extracted from the data

explicit

The parser extracts a fixed number of characters/bytes from the input document as directed by dfdl:length (which may be a DFDL expression, and may resolve to the value of the previous sibling)

prefixed

The parser extracts a fixed number of characters/bytes from the input document as directed by the prefix length. Note the similarity with the DFDL expression scenario above.

implicit

The parser extracts a fixed number of characters/bytes from the input document as directed by the implicit length of the element.

delimited

The parser extracts from the input document all characters between the current buffer position and the next unescaped item of in-scope terminating markup.

pattern

The parser extracts from the input document all characters which match the specified pattern

endOfParent

The parser extracts from the input document all remaining characters/bytes allowed by the representation properties of its parent groups/elements.

The terminating markup is only scanned for when lengthKind is 'delimited' and 'EndOfParent' when the end of the parent is delineated by markup.

This means that for formats such as the Swift 52A segment that distinguishes fields according to the length of data found, the lengthKind is delimited rather than explicit and a dfdl:assert is needed to test the length.

dfdl:length is only examined when lengthKind is explicit.

It was agreed to change the function names of dfdl:length to dfdl:representationLength and dfdl:lengthWithoutPadding to RepresentationLengthWithoutParsing to avoid confusion with the XPATH length function.

Didn't discuss if this changes escaping rules.

3. **SeparatorPolicy =require and defaulting arrays and sequences**

Discussed the semantics of dfdl:separatorPolicy with variable length arrays. Agreed that the behaviour should be the same for arrays as for sequences.

'suppressAtEnd' - separators must be output up to the last required item. That is up to the xs:minOccurs of a variable array. For simple items a default value will be output for missing required items.

'required' - separators must be output for all items. That is up to xs:maxOccurs. It is a schema definition error if required and xs:maxOccurs= unbounded is specified.

'suppress' - separators are not output for missing items but for arrays there are no missing items so this is the same as dfdl:suppressAtEnd.

Note: a group is always 'required' so at least one member must be present. However a group could be wrapped in an element which could be optional.

4. **Clarification of postfix separators , terminators ,finalTerminatorCanBeMissing**

Agreed to postpone to next call due to lack of time.

5. **Go through remaining actions**

Updated below

6. **Test suite for DFDL**

DFDL will be much more usable if it is accompanied by a set of tests that provide dfdl schema , sample data and expected results. IBM will investigate whether it will be possible to publish the format of the test cases that it is developing.

7. OGF28 Call for papers

Steve H has sent a request for a slot in the agenda

8. Plan to finish DFDL v 1

MB agreed to investigate the tool available on gridforge for tracking problems with the spec. Agreed to start using this after version 37.

Meeting closed, 15:10

Next call 02 December 13:00 UK

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: 068

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
066	Investigate format for defining test cases IBM to see if it is possible to publish its test case format.
067	Investigate problem tracking tools.

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	<p>AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme</p> <p>10/9: Not allocated yet</p> <p>17/9: No update</p> <p>24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions</p> <p>22/10: No progress</p> <p>16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed</p> <p>21/1: add locale,</p> <p>04/02: changed from locale to specific properties</p> <p>18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour.</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify.</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour</p> <p>24/06: no progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>12/08: no progress</p> <p>19/08: Inconsistencies are being found in ICU behaviour so Calendars need reviewing again.</p> <p>26/08: Specific three character short time zones may not be maintained during round tripping when there is more than one short form for a time zone offset. Because dates and datetimes in the infoset only maintain a time zone offset so on unparsing it isn't possible to say which short form will be selected for a particular offset when there is more than one possible. Need to document.</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: Will produce a list of known issues.</p> <p>28/10: Discussed ICU fractional seconds behaviour. SF to send latest understanding.</p> <p>04/11: no progress</p> <p>11/11: no update</p> <p>18/11: no update</p> <p>25/11: no update</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <p>a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd)</p> <p>b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models</p>

	<p>c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) Ongoing in case another solution can be found. 29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing 06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl. 20/05: SH or SKK to investigate 27/05: No Progress 03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice. 17/06: no change 24/06: no change 01/07: no progress ... 12/08: No Progress (lower priority) 19/08: Clarify that this action is to go through the XML UPA checks to assess impact on dfdl schemas and advice best practice. Name clashes is just one example. SH or SKK 26/08: No Progress (lower priority) 09/09: no progress ... 04/11: no progress 11/11: Steve has started to look at this. He has requested a 'consumable' definition of the UPA rules from the XSD WG members. Even non-normative Appendix H in the XSD 1.0 spec is hard to consume. 18/11: no update 25/11: Steve H has not found simpler definition so may just go through them.</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing 27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call 03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated 09/06: Progress but not discussed 17/06: Discussed briefly 24/06: No Progress 01/07: No Progress 15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way. 29/07: No Progress 05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules. 12/08: No Progress ... 16/09: no progress 30/09: AP distributed proposal and others commented. Brief discussion AP to incorporate update and reissue 07/10: Updated proposal was discussed. Comments will be incorporated into the next version. 14/10: Alan to update proposal to include array scenario where minOccurs > 0 21/10: Updated proposal reviewed 28/10: Updated proposal reviewed see minutes 04/11: Discussed semantics of discriminators on arrays. MB to produce examples 11/11: Absorbing action 033 into 045. Maybe decorated discriminator kinds are needed after all. MB and SF to continue with examples. 18/11: Went through WTX implementation of example. SF to gather more documentation about WTX discriminator rules. 25/11: Further discussion. Will get more WTX documentation. Need to confirm that no changes need to Resolving Uncertainty doc.</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas 03/06: not discussed</p>

	24/06: No Progress 24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases) 15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide. ... 14/10: no progress 21/10: Discussed the real need for this being in the specification . It seemed that the main value is it define a schema location for downloading 'known' defaults from the web. 28/10: no progress 04/11: no progress 11/11: no update 18/11: no update 25/11: Agreed to try to produce for CSV and fixed formats
056	MB Resolve lengthUnits=bits including fillbytes 12/08: No Progress ... 28/10: no progress 04/11: MB to look at lengthUnits = bits 11/11: no update 18/11: no update 25/11: no update
063	Write DFDL primer and test cases. 11/11: no update 25/11: no update
064	MB/SH Request WG presentation at OGF 28 25/11: Session requested
065	Resolve parsing rules for various lengthKinds 25/11: Agreed dfdl:lengthKind define how to extract the data. Didn't discuss if this changes escaping.
066	Investigate format for defining test cases 25/11: IBM to see if it is possible to publish its test case format.
067	25/11: Investigate problem tracking tools.

Closed actions

No	Action
----	--------

Work items:

No	Item	target version	status
005	Improvements on property descriptions		not
011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
012	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
033	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	037	ens
033	Update dfdl schema with change properties	ongoing	

6			
038	Improve length section including bit handling		son
042	Mapping of the DFDL info set to XDM	none	not
051	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	037	
058	textPadCharacter %#rxx limitation and split to textxxxxPadCharacter	037	
059	limit terminatorCanBeMissing to last element in schema. Ignore elsewhere.	037	
060	New empty string semantic for dfdl:binaryBooleanTrueRep	037	
061	Change maxOccurs violations from processing error to validation error (if not 'fixed')	037	
062	Drop calendarUseZForUTC. describe zU, IU and TU symbols	037	
063	DefineFormat can contain only one active format. Drop baseFormat	037	
064	Define how encoding, byteorder and floating point format externally	037	
065	Refactor dfdl:textNumberFormat to remove dfdl:numberBase.	037	
066	document scope of selectors	037	
067	document floating evaluation order	037	
068	change dfdl:length to dfdl:representationLength and dfdl:lengthWithoutPadding to RepresentationLengthWithoutParsing		

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	18-Nov-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	13:00 - 15:00
Meeting Editors	Alan Powell

Created by Alan Powell on 19-Nov-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 26-Nov-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Nov-18-2009

Agenda

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

1. 051 Scoping Rules

Quick review of draft 8 (see e-mail)

2. 061 Refactor dfdl:textNumberFormat to remove dfdl:numberBase.

Review Alan's updated spec fragment (see e-mail)

3. 059: External specification of encoding , byte order

Update from Steve

4. 045 Resolving points of uncertainty - Discriminators

Continue discussion of semantics of discriminators and arrays

5. 045 Resolving points of uncertainty - parsing rules

Discuss emails from Tim and Alan

6. Go through remaining actions

7. Test suite for DFDL

Discuss Mike's e-mail and what IBM is doing as part of its implementation work

8. OGF28 Call for papers

9. Plan to finish DFDL v 1

How to track spec issues.

Updated straw man schedule

Activity	Schedule	Who
Resolve Action items	- 23 Nov 2009	WG
Write up work items	16 Nov - 4 Dec 2009	AP

Restructure and complete specification	23 Nov - 4 Dec 2009	AP
WG review	7 Dec - 18 Dec 2009	WG
Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
OGF Editor Review / Incorporate changes	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	OGF
OGF Public Comment period (60 days)	1 Mar - 30 Apr 2010	OGF
OGF 28 Munich	15-19 March 2010	

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , November-18-2009

Attendees

Suman Kalia (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Marting (Progeny)
Stephanie Fetzner (IBM)
Tim Kimber(IBM)

Apologies

Peter Lambros (IBM)

1.051 Scoping Rules

Reviewed of draft 8. Comments made by Suman and Stephanie will be incorporated. Action Closed

2.061 Refactor dfdl:textNumberFormat to remove dfdl:numberBase.

Reviewed updated spec fragment and approved. Action Closed

3.059: External specification of encoding , byte order

This was largely agreed on last week's call but additional discussion about whether additional properties should have predefined variables. Agreed to add dfdl:binaryFloatRepresentation and dfdl:OutputNewLine. Action closed

4.045 Resolving points of uncertainty - Discriminators

Continue discussion of semantics of discriminators and arrays
Stephanie took us through Mike's example implemented in WTX and number of points emerged.
WTX discriminators (component rules) only resolve an immediate parent.

If one instance on an array is found then the array is said to be found even if minOccurs are not found. An explicit discriminator would be needed to enforce minOccurs.
There was also a discussion of the forward referencing permitted which is only to children.

SF agreed to get documentation about WTX discrimination.

5.045 Resolving points of uncertainty - parsing rules

Tim and Alan had sent emails about the rules for scanning or skipping of text fields during parsing. Tim pointed out there was no way to force skipping of text fields and it was agreed that this was an omission. Tim suggested that lengthKind should be used to specify whether to scan or skip and that dfdl:length should be examined when lengthKind=delimited to decide if it is a fixed/known length delimited field. There was no agreement and we ran out of time. To be continued.

Action 65 raised

8. OGF28 Call for papers

Mike and/or Steve will make a request to a WG presentation

Meeting closed, 15:10

Next call 25 November 13:00 UK

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: **066**

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
064	MB/SH Request WG presentation at OGF 28
065	Resolve parsing rules for various lengthKinds

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify. 20/05: No Progress ... 09/06: No Progress (low priority)

	<p>17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour 24/06: no progress ... 12/08: no progress 19/08: Inconsistencies are being found in ICU behaviour so Calendars need reviewing again. 26/08: Specific three character short time zones may not be maintained during round tripping when there is more than one short form for a time zone offset. Because dates and datetimes in the infoset only maintain a time zone offset so on unparsing it isn't possible to say which short form will be selected for a particular offset when there is more than one possible. Need to document. 09/09: no progress ... 14/10: no progress 21/10: Will produce a list of known issues. 28/10: Discussed ICU fractional seconds behaviour. SF to send latest understanding. 04/11: no progress 11/11: no update 18/11: no update</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks. 22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that: a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks TBD) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) Ongoing in case another solution can be found. 29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing 06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl. 20/05: SH or SKK to investigate 27/05: No Progress 03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice. 17/06: no change 24/06: no change 01/07: no progress ... 12/08: No Progress (lower priority) 19/08: Clarify that this action is to go through the XML UPA checks to assess impact on dfdl schemas and advice best practice. Name clashes is just one example. SH or SKK 26/08: No Progress (lower priority) 09/09: no progress ... 04/11: no progress 11/11: Steve has started to look at this. He has requested a 'consumable' definition of the UPA rules from the XSD WG members. Even non-normative Appendix H in the XSD 1.0 spec is hard to consume. 18/11: no update</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing 27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call 03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p>

	<p>09/06: Progress but not discussed 17/06: Discussed briefly 24/06: No Progress 01/07: No Progress 15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way. 29/07: No Progress 05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules. 12/08: No Progress ... 16/09: no progress 30/09: AP distributed proposal and others commented. Brief discussion AP to incorporate update and reissue 07/10: Updated proposal was discussed. Comments will be incorporated into the next version. 14/10: Alan to update proposal to include array scenario where minOccurs > 0 21/10: Updated proposal reviewed 28/10: Updated proposal reviewed see minutes 04/11: Discussed semantics of discriminators on arrays. MB to produce examples 11/11: Absorbing action 033 into 045. Maybe decorated discriminator kinds are needed after all. MB and SF to continue with examples. 18/11: Went through WTX implementation of example. SF to gather more documentation about WTX discriminator rules.</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas 03/06: not discussed 24/06: No Progress 24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases) 15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide. ... 14/10: no progress 21/10: Discussed the real need for this being in the specification. It seemed that the main value is it define a schema location for downloading 'known' defaults from the web. 28/10: no progress 04/11: no progress 11/11: no update 18/11: no update</p>
056	<p>MB Resolve lengthUnits=bits including fillbytes 12/08: No Progress ... 28/10: no progress 04/11: MB to look at lengthUnits = bits 11/11: no update 18/11: no update</p>
059	<p>9/9: SH Define how encoding, byteorder and floating point format externally 16/09: no progress 07/10: no progress 14/10: no progress 21/10: SH to investigate 28/10: no progress 04/11: no progress 11/11: SH proposal accepted. One open issue - what is the full list of built-in variables? 18/11: added dfdl:binaryFloatRepresentation and dfdl:OutputNewLine. Action Closed</p>
061	<p>AP Refactor dfdl:textNumberFormat to remove dfdl:numberBase. 14/10: Base 2, 8, 16 numbers are invariably integers without formatting, use of pattern etc is overkill 21/10: no progress</p>

	28/10: no progress 04/11: no progress 11/11: Reviewed AP proposal, some comments to incorporate. 18/11: Approved latest draft subject to minor comments from SF and SKK. Closed
063	Write DFDL primer and test cases. 11/11: no update
064	MB/SH Request WG presentation at OGF 28
065	Resolve parsing rules for various lengthKinds

Closed actions

No	Action
051	Scoping rules. MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns 17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion 24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proposal 24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review 08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters. 15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up. 29/07: No Progress 05/08: No Progress 12/08: No Progress 19/08: AP will document new syntax rules. 26/08: No Progress 09/09: AP has documented new scoping rules. Not discussed 16/09: Not discussed. AP to update element reference examples 30/09: Significant dissatisfaction with proposed new rules. New proposal developed during call. AP to document. 07/10: New proposal was refined. Details in minutes. 14/10: Discussed at length. Details in minutes. 21/10: Discussed at length. Details in minutes. 04/11: defineFormat can only contain one active format block, Drop baseFormat, SKK to produce examples for selectors. 04/11: Further discussion see minutes. SKK to produce examples of selectors. 11/11: Closed . No open questions. Incorporate into spec via work item 051. 18/11: Approved draft 8
059	9/9: SH Define how encoding, byteorder and floating point format externally 16/09: no progress 07/10: no progress 14/10: no progress 21/10: SH to investigate 28/10: no progress 04/11: no progress 11/11: SH proposal accepted. One open issue - what is the full list of built-in variables? 18/11: added dfdl:binaryFloatRepresentation and dfdl:OutputNewLine. Action Closed - work item 064
061	AP Refactor dfdl:textNumberFormat to remove dfdl:numberBase. 14/10: Base 2, 8, 16 numbers are invariably integers without formatting, use of pattern etc is overkill 21/10: no progress 28/10: no progress 04/11: no progress 11/11: Reviewed AP proposal, some comments to incorporate. 18/11: Approved latest draft subject to minor comments from SF and SKK. Closed - workitem 065

Work items:

N o	Item	target version	stat
0 0 5	Improvements on property descriptions		not
0 1 1	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
0 1 2	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
0 3 3	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	037	ens
0 3 6	Update dfdl schema with change properties	ongoing	
0 3 8	Improve length section including bit handling		son
0 4 2	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM	none	not
0 5 1	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	037	
0 5 8	textPadCharacter %#rxx limitation and split to textxxxxPadCharacter	037	
0 5 9	limit terminatorCanBeMissing to last element in schema. Ignore elsewhere.	037	
0 6 0	New empty string semantic for dfdl:binaryBooleanTrueRep	037	
0 6 1	Change maxOccurs violations from processing error to validation error (if not 'fixed')	037	
0 6 2	Drop calendarUseZForUTC. describe zU, IU and TU symbols	037	
0 6 3	DefineFormat can contain only one active format. Drop baseFormat	037	
0 6 4	Define how encoding, byteorder and floating point format externally	037	
0 6 5	Refactor dfdl:textNumberFormat to remove dfdl:numberBase.	037	
0	document scope of selectors	037	

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	04-Nov-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	13:00 - 15:00
Meeting Editors	Alan Powell

Created by Alan Powell on 05-Nov-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 05-Nov-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Nov-04-2009

Agenda

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

1. 051 Scoping Rules

Check latest draft v7. Confirm agreement to

"It is a schema definition error if more than one format annotation occurs at the same annotation point, except when selectors are used, or if the same property is defined in long and short form. "

2. 045 Resolving points of uncertainty and parsing rules

Confirm wording for 'potentially point of uncertainty'

Confirm parsing rule

1. *The length of a dfdl:representation 'text' component which has a terminator, separator or parent terminator or separator not match the required length.*

3. Go through remaining actions

4. Plan to finish DFDL v 1

Status

10 Actions (issues to be resolved)

10 Work items (features to be documented, areas to be improved)

Strawman Schedule

Activity	Schedule	Who
Resolve Action items	23 Oct - 30 Oct 2009	WG
		AP

Write up work items	23 Oct - 2 Nov 2009	
Restructure and complete specification	23 Oct - 13 Nov 2009	AP
WG review	16 Nov - 27 Nov 2009	WG
Incorporate review comments	30 Nov - 7 Dec 2009	AP
OGF Editor Review	7 Dec - 19 Dec 2009	OGF
OGF Public Comment period (60 days)	4 Jan - 5 Mar 2010	OGF
OGF 28 Munich	15-19 March 2010	

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Nov-04-2009

Attendees

Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Marting (Progeny)
Stephanie Fetzner(IBM)

Apologies

Peter Lambros (IBM)

1. 051 Scoping Rules

Continued discussion on draft v7.

After last weeks decision to disallow multiple dfdl:format at the same annotation point, Steve pointed out that dfdl:defineFormat was now inconsistent in that it allowed multiple dfdl:formats.

Decided that dfdl:defineFormat will only allow one dfdl:format annoation.

We then discussed whether it was still necessary to have the dfdl:defineFormat baseFormat property and ref property its only dfdl:format annotation. Having 2 properties allows multiple inheritance but that is inconsistent other places where dfdl:format is used. We noted that the dfdl:format ref property allowed re-factoring more easily than the baseFormat property.

Decided that the baseFormat property is no longer needed and will be removed.

There was a long discussion on the semantics of selectors on the dfdl:format annoations in a dfdl:defineFormat block. Agreed that the current definition that selectors apply independently at each annotation point but added that dfdl:defineFormat is an annotation point equivalent to annotation points on schema components.

Suman agreed to produce some examples to show the semantics of selectors.

2. Resolving points of uncertainty and parsing rules

Discussed the semantics of discriminators on variable length arrays . Went through many examples of behaviours with no firm conclusion that a complete description found . Concluded that the best way forward was to produce a complete set of use cases. Mike B agreed to do this as part of action 033.

4. Go through remaining actions

Actions updated below

5. Plan to finish DFDL v 1

We agreed that the target should be to have the DFDL V1 specification ready for public review by OGF 28 in March 2010. Alan will redo the schedule and try to get more details of the OGF process.

Mike suggested that to make the spec useful we also needed a primer and a good set of worked examples that could be used as implementation 'test cases' - Action item raised.

It was noted that the examples in the spec should mainly be to clarify points of semantics and not to explain simple use cases.

We also discussed then need to reorganize the spec to make it more readable, It was felt that it was more important to complete the spec that reorganize it. Alan and Steve H will look at the structure to see how much needs to be done.

Next call 11 November 13:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:10

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: **064**

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
063	Write DFDL primer and test cases.

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify. 20/05: No Progress 27/05: No Progress 03/06: No Progress (low priority) 09/06: No Progress (low priority)

	<p>17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour</p> <p>24/06: no progress</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: no progress</p> <p>29/07: no progress</p> <p>05/08: no progress</p> <p>12/08: no progress</p> <p>19/08: Inconsistencies are being found in ICU behaviour so Calendars need reviewing again.</p> <p>26/08: Specific three character short time zones may not be maintained during round tripping when there is more than one short form for a time zone offset. Because dates and datetimes in the info set only maintain a time zone offset so on unparsing it isn't possible to say which short form will be selected for a particular offset when there is more than one possible. Need to document.</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: Will produce a list of known issues.</p> <p>28/10: Discussed ICU fractional seconds behaviour. SF to send latest understanding.</p> <p>04/11: no progress</p>
033	<p>MB: Need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p> <p>27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>....</p> <p>19/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: Action re-titled and assigned to Mike B</p> <p>21/10: no progress</p> <p>28/10: no progress</p> <p>04/11: Mike to produce examples for choices with variable occurrence arrays.</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p>

	<p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p> <p>17/06: no change</p> <p>24/06: no change</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>29/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>05/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>12/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>19/08: Clarify that this action is to go through the XML UPA checks to assess impact on dfdl schemas and advice best practice. Name clashes is just one example. SH or SKK</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: no progress</p> <p>28/10: no progress</p> <p>04/11: no progress</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p> <p>09/06: Progress but not discussed</p> <p>17/06: Discussed briefly</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: No Progress</p> <p>15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: No Progress</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: AP distributed proposal and others commented. Brief discussion AP to incorporate update and reissue</p> <p>07/10: Updated proposal was discussed. Comments will be incorporated into the next version.</p> <p>14/10: Alan to update proposal to include array scenario where minOccurs > 0</p> <p>21/10: Updated proposal reviewed</p> <p>28/10: Updated proposal reviewed see minutes</p> <p>04/11: Discussed semantics of discriminators on arrays. MB to produce examples</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases)</p> <p>15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>19/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p>

	<p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: Discussed the real need for this being in the specification . It seemed that the main value is it define a schema location for downloading 'known' defaults from the web.</p> <p>28/10: no progress</p> <p>04/11: no progress</p>
051	<p>Scoping rules.</p> <p>MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns</p> <p>17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion</p> <p>24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proosal</p> <p>24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review</p> <p>08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: AP will document new syntax rules.</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: AP has documented new scoping rules. Not discussed</p> <p>16/09: Not disussed. AP to update element reference examples</p> <p>30/09: Significant dissatisfaction with proposed new rules . New proposal developed during call. AP to document.</p> <p>07/10: New proposal was refined. Details in minutes.</p> <p>14/10: Discussed at length. Details in minutes.</p> <p>21/10: Discussed at length. Details in minutes.</p> <p>04/11: defineFormat can only contain one active format block, Drop baseFormat, SKK to produce examples for selectors.</p> <p>04/11: Further discussion see minutes. SKK to produce examples of selectors.</p>
056	<p>resolve lenghtUnit=bits including fillbytes</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: No Progress</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: no progress</p> <p>28/10: no progress</p> <p>04/11: MB to look at lengthUints = bits</p>
059	<p>9/9: define how encoding, byteorder and floating point format externally</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: SH to investigate</p> <p>28/10: no progress</p> <p>04/11: no progress</p>
061	<p>Refactor dfdl:textNumberFormat to remove dfdl:numberBase.</p> <p>14/10: Base 2, 8, 16 numbers are invariably integers without formatting, use of pattern etc is overkill</p> <p>21/10: no progress</p> <p>28/10: no progress</p> <p>04/11: no progress</p>

062	SH investigate technical writer support. 28/10: SH had contacted S Gao to understand the W3 process and support. 04/11: no progress
063	Write DFDL primer and test cases.

Closed actions :

--	--

Work items :

N o	Item	target version	stat
005	Improvements on property descriptions		not
011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
012	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
033	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	037	ens
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties	ongoing	
038	Improve length section including bit handling		son
042	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM	none	not
051	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	037	awa
058	textPadCharacter %#rxx limitation and split to textxxxxPadCharacter	037	
059	limit terminatorCanBeMissing to last element in schema. Ignore elsewhere.	037	
060	New empty string semantic for dfdl:binaryBooleanTrueRep	037	
061	Change maxOccurs violations from processing error to validation error (if not 'fixed')	037	
062	Drop calendarUseZForUTC. describe zU, IU and TU symbols	037	

0	DefineFormat can contain only one active format. Drop baseFormat	037
6		
3		

© Copyright IBM Corp. 1998, 2007 All Rights Reserved

© Copyright IBM Corp. 1998, 2007 All Rights Reserved

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	28-Oct-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	13:00 - 15:00
Meeting Editors	Alan Powell

Created by Alan Powell on 28-Oct-09
Last Modified by Alan Powell on 28-Oct-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Oct-28-2009

Agenda

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

NOTE: Call starts at 9:00 am EDT as UK has already switched from summer time .

1. 051 Scoping Rules

Check latest draft v7. Confirm agreement to
"It is a schema definition error if more that one format annotation occurs at the same annotation point, except when selectors used, or if the same property is defined in long and short form. "

2. 045 Resolving points of uncertainty and parsing rules

Confirm wording for 'potentially point of uncertainty"
Confirm parsing rule
1. *The length of a dfdl:representation 'text' component which has a terminator, separator or parent terminator or separator not match the required length.*

3. UTC timezone 'Z'

There is a conflict between the ZZZU calendar pattern and the calendarUseZForUTC property

ZU time zone (RFC 822) (Number) Z
 with output "Z" if the
 time zone is +00:00)

calendarUseZForUTC	Enum Valid values 'always', 'never', 'onInput', 'onOutput' Applies when a time zone appears in the data with pattern ZZZ (that is, +hh:mm) and the time zone is UTC (that is, GMT+00:00). Specifies whether 'Z' or '+00:00' should be used. Annotation: dfdl:calendarFormat
--------------------	--

I suggest we drop the property and have the following

ZZZ (strict) => accept +00:00 only on input, use +00:00 on output

ZZZU (strict) => accept Z only on input, use Z on output

ZZZ (lax) => accept +00:00 & Z on input, use +00:00 on output

ZZZU (lax) => accept +00:00 & Z on input, use Z on output

4. Go through remaining actions

5. Plan to finish DFDL v 1

Status

10 Actions (issues to be resolved)

10 Work items (features to be documented, areas to be improved)

Strawman Schedule

Activity	Schedule	Who
Resolve Action items	23 Oct - 30 Oct 2009	WG
Write up work items	23 Oct - 2 Nov 2009	AP
Restructure and complete specification	23 Oct - 13 Nov 2009	AP
WG review	16 Nov - 27 Nov 2009	WG
Incorporate review comments	30 Nov - 7 Dec 2009	AP
OGF Editor Review	7 Dec - 19 Dec 2009	OGF
OGF Public Comment period (60 days)	4 Jan - 5 Mar 2010	OGF
OGF 28 Munich	15-19 March 2010	

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , October-28-2009

Attendees

Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Marting (Progeny)
Stephanie Fetzner(IBM)

Apologies

Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Peter Lambros (IBM)

1. 051 Scoping Rules

Reviewed latest draft v7.

"It is a schema definition error if more than one format annotation occurs at the same annotation point, except when selectors are used, or if the same property is defined in long and short form. "

Agreed that multiple annotations should not be allowed. Wording on selectors is not clear. Will remove from this sentence and add sentence to say that selectors have been applied already.

Need better definition of 'applicable' and 'required' properties. Refer to property precedence section

2. Resolving points of uncertainty and parsing rules

Discussed Alan's proposal for describing variable arrays.

*"An alternative might be to consider an array as two points of uncertainty. One point is for the array and the other, which is nested inside the first, for the element. We can then have the rule that the discriminator resolves the element uncertainty only which always exists so doesn't need to be 'potential'.
The array uncertainty is resolved when minOccurs have been found."*

Needs further discussion

3. UTC timezone 'Z'

There is a conflict between the ZZZU calendar pattern and the calendarUseZForUTC property

ZU time zone (RFC 822) (Number) Z
 with output "Z" if the
 time zone is +00:00)

calendarUseZForUTC	Enum Valid values 'always', 'never', 'onInput', 'onOutput' Applies when a time zone appears in the data with pattern ZZZ (that is, +hh:mm) and the time zone is UTC (that is, GMT+00:00). Specifies whether 'Z' or '+00:00' should be used. Annotation: dfdl:calendarFormat
--------------------	--

I suggest we drop the property and have the following

ZZZ (strict) => accept +00:00 only on input, use +00:00 on output
ZZZU (strict) => accept Z only on input, use Z on output
ZZZ (lax) => accept +00:00 & Z on input, use +00:00 on output
ZZZU (lax) => accept +00:00 & Z on input, use Z on output

Agreed to drop calendarUseZForUTC but need to add symbols IU and TU

4. Go through remaining actions

Actions updated below

5. Plan to finish DFDL v 1

Next call 04 November 13:00 UK

Meeting closed , 14:15

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: **063**

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet

	<p>17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify. 20/05: No Progress 27/05: No Progress 03/06: No Progress (low priority) 09/06: No Progress (low priority) 17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour 24/06: no progress 01/07: no progress 15/07: no progress 29/07: no progress 05/08: no progress 12/08: no progress 19/08: Inconsistencies are being found in ICU behaviour so Calendars need reviewing again. 26/08: Specific three character short time zones may not be maintained during round tripping when there is more than one short form for a time zone offset. Because dates and datetimes in the infocset only maintain a time zone offset so on unparsing it isn't possible to say which short form will be selected for a particular offset when there is more than one possible. Need to document. 09/09: no progress 16/09: no progress 30/09: no progress 07/10: no progress 14/10: no progress 21/10: Will produce a list of known issues. 28/10: Discussed ICU fractional seconds behaviour. SF to send latest understanding.</p>
033	<p>MB: Need for scope indicator on discriminator 08/04: In progress within IBM 22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete. 29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK 06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples. 15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator 20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029) 27/05: No Progress (lower priority) 19/08: No Progress (lower priority) 26/08: No Progress (lower priority) 09/09: no progress 16/09: no progress 30/09: no progress 07/10: no progress 14/10: Action re-titled and assigned to Mike B 21/10: no progress</p>

	28/10: no progress
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p> <p>17/06: no change</p> <p>24/06: no change</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>29/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>05/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>12/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>19/08: Clarify that this action is to go through the XML UPA checks to assess impact on dfdl schemas and advice best practice. Name clashes is just one example. SH or SKK</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: no progress</p> <p>28/10: no progress</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p> <p>09/06: Progress but not discussed</p> <p>17/06: Discussed briefly</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: No Progress</p> <p>15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: No Progress</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: AP distributed proposal and others commented. Brief discussion AP to incorporate update and reissue</p>

	<p>07/10: Updated proposal was discussed. Comments will be incorporated into the next version.</p> <p>14/10: Alan to update proposal to include array scenario where minOccurs > 0</p> <p>21/10: Updated proposal reviewed</p> <p>28/10: Updated proposal reviewed see minutes</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases)</p> <p>15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>19/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: Discussed the real need for this being in the specification. It seemed that the main value is it define a schema location for downloading 'known' defaults from the web.</p> <p>28/10: no progress</p>
051	<p>Scoping rules.</p> <p>MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns</p> <p>17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion</p> <p>24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proosal</p> <p>24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review</p> <p>08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: AP will document new syntax rules.</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: AP has documented new scoping rules. Not discussed</p> <p>16/09: Not disussed. AP to update element reference examples</p> <p>30/09: Significant dissatisfaction with proposed new rules. New proposal developed during call. AP to document.</p> <p>07/10: New proposal was refined. Details in minutes.</p> <p>14/10: Discussed at length. Details in minutes.</p> <p>21/10: Discussed at length. Details in minutes.</p>
056	<p>resolve lenghtUnit=bits including fillbytes</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: No Progress</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: no progress</p> <p>28/10: no progress</p>
059	<p>9/9: define how encoding, byteorder and floating point format externally</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: SH to investigate</p> <p>28/10: no progress</p>

061	Refactor dfdl:textNumberFormat to remove dfdl:numberBase. 14/10: Base 2, 8, 16 numbers are invariably integers without formatting, use of pattern etc is overkill 21/10: no progress 28/10: no progress
062	SH investigate technical writer support. 28/10: SH had contacted S Gao to understand the W3 process and support.

Closed actions :

--	--

Work items:

N o	Item	target version	stat
005	Improvements on property descriptions		not
011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
012	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
033	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	037	ens
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties	ongoing	
038	Improve length section including bit handling		son
042	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM	none	not
051	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	037	awa
058	textPadCharacter %#rxx limitation and split to textxxxxPadCharacter	037	
059	limit terminatorCanBeMissing to last element in schema. Ignore elsewhere.	037	
060	New empty string semantic for dfdl:binaryBooleanTrueRep	037	
061	Change maxOccurs violations from processing error to validation error (if not 'fixed')	037	

0 6 2	Drop calendarUseZForUTC. describe zU, IU and TU symbols	037
-------------	---	-----

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	21-Oct-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	13:00 - 15:00
Meeting Editors	Alan Powell

Created by Alan Powell on 22-Oct-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 22-Oct-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Oct-21-2009

Agenda

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

1. 051 Scoping Rules

Review new description (email DFDL Scoping v6 20/10/2009) and examples.

2. 045 Resolving points of uncertainty and parsing rules

Review new description (email Resolving points of uncertainty v5 20/10/2009)

3. Comments on Draft 036

No comments received

4. Go through remaining actions

5. Plan to finish DFDL v 1

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , October-21-2009

Attendees

Suman Kalia (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Peter Lambros (IBM)
Steve Marting (Progeny)
Stephanie Fetzner (IBM)

Apologies

Mike Beckerle (Oco)

1. Scoping Rules

Continued the discussion on scoping rules. Alan's had distributed a new scoping document draft(v6) with input from Steve H and Stephanie. Suman and Steve H had made comments which we went through on the call.

Suman was concerned that the wording implied that the `dfdl:format` on the `xs:schema` didn't need to provide defaults for all the `dfdl:properties` which he thought was a departure from previously. Others pointed out that that had never been the case and that it was not possible to validate `dfdl:format` blocks in isolation only at the point of use.

Discussed whether the `dfdl:defineFormat` annotations should be in the table of annotation points. Alan pointed out there were other similar annotations, `defineNumberFormat`, etc. Decided to remove from the table but mention them below as they are only brought in scope when referenced.

Discussed the need for more examples and Alan pointed out that in general we had agreed that the spec would not contain many examples as the should also be a primer. Agreed to change one example to `element->element ref -> simpleType`.

Steve H suggested that following update to the rules

Rules

1. *Create an empty working set of "explicit" properties. Create an empty working set of "default" properties.*
2. *Move to the innermost schema component in the chain of references.*
3. *Assemble its directly relevant "explicit" properties from its local `dfdl:ref` (if present) and its local properties (if present), the latter overriding the former (that is, local wins). Combine these with the current working set of "explicit" properties. It is a schema definition error if there is the same property appears twice. Result is a new working set of "explicit" properties. Obtain directly relevant "default" properties from in-scope unnamed `dfdl:format` block (if present). Combine these with the current working set of "default" properties, the latter overriding the former (ie, inner wins). Result is a new working set of "default" properties.*
4. *Move to the schema component that references the current component, and repeat step 3. If there is no referencing component, move to step 5.*
5. *Validate the resultant set of properties. The "explicit" properties take priority, "defaults" only used when no "explicit" is present. It is a schema definition error if a required property is in neither the "explicit" nor the "default" working sets.*

Note: we didn't discuss the suggested change of disallowing multiple annotations at the same point (other than for selectors) or the same property in short and long form. Please review this change.

2. Resolving points of uncertainty and parsing rules

Reviewed the latest draft (v5) that Alan had distributed. The only change was the introduction of the 'potentially

uncertain' state discussed on the call last week. Alan was not overly happy with the new concept and will try some other way of describing the problem.

3. Comments on Draft 036

No comments received. It is now available on gridforge.

4. Go through remaining actions

Actions updated below

5. Plan to finish DFDL v 1

Alan pointed out that in order to meet the target of having the document ready for approval at the next OGF meeting we need to have all the action items resolve in the next month or so. Alan will produce an outline schedule for completing the spec.

Also discussed if there is any technical writer support available within IBM to edit the specification . Steve H will contact Sandy Gao to see who edits the XML schema specification

Next call 28 October 13:00 UK

Meeting closed , 14:30

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: **063**

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
062	SH investigate technical writer support.

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	<p>AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme</p> <p>10/9: Not allocated yet</p> <p>17/9: No update</p> <p>24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions</p> <p>22/10: No progress</p> <p>16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed</p> <p>21/1: add locale,</p> <p>04/02: changed from locale to specific properties</p> <p>18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour.</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify.</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour</p> <p>24/06: no progress</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: no progress</p> <p>29/07: no progress</p> <p>05/08: no progress</p> <p>12/08: no progress</p> <p>19/08: Inconsistencies are being found in ICU behaviour so Calendars need reviewing again.</p> <p>26/08: Specific three character short time zones may not be maintained during round tripping when there is more than one short form for a time zone offset. Because dates and datetimes in the infoset only maintain a time zone offset so on unparsing it isn't possible to say which short form will be selected for a particular offset when there is more than one possible. Need to document.</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: Will produce a list of known issues.</p>
033	<p>MB: Need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on</p>

	<p>discriminator</p> <p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p> <p>27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>....</p> <p>19/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: Action re-titled and assigned to Mike B</p> <p>21/10: no progress</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p> <p>17/06: no change</p> <p>24/06: no change</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>29/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>05/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>12/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>19/08: Clarify that this action is to go through the XML UPA checks to assess impact on dfdl schemas and advice best practice. Name clashes is just one example. SH or SKK</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: no progress</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p> <p>09/06: Progress but not discussed</p> <p>17/06: Discussed briefly</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: No Progress</p>

	<p>15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: No Progress</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: AP distributed proposal and others commented. Brief discussion AP to incorporate update and reissue</p> <p>07/10: Updated proposal was discussed. Comments will be incorporated into the next version.</p> <p>14/10: Alan to update proposal to include array scenario where minOccurs > 0</p> <p>21/10: Updated proposal reviewed</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases)</p> <p>15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>19/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: Discussed the real need for this being in the specification. It seemed that the main value is it define a schema location for downloading 'known' defaults from the web.</p>
051	<p>Scoping rules.</p> <p>MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns</p> <p>17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion</p> <p>24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proosal</p> <p>24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review</p> <p>08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: AP will document new syntax rules.</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: AP has documented new scoping rules. Not discussed</p> <p>16/09: Not disussed. AP to update element reference examples</p> <p>30/09: Significant dissatisfaction with proposed new rules. New proposal developed during call. AP to document.</p> <p>07/10: New proposal was refined. Details in minutes.</p> <p>14/10: Discussed at length. Details in minutes.</p> <p>21/10: Discussed at length. Details in minutes.</p>
056	<p>resolve lenghtUnit=bits including fillbytes</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: No Progress</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p>

	14/10: no progress 21/10: no progress
059	9/9: define how encoding, byteorder and floating point format externally 16/09: no progress 07/10: no progress 14/10: no progress 21/10: SH to investigate
061	Refactor dfdl:textNumberFormat to remove dfdl:numberBase. 14/10: Base 2, 8, 16 numbers are invariably integers without formatting, use of pattern etc is overkill 21/10: no progress
062	SH investigate technical writer support.

Closed actions :

054	ICU DecimalNumber/ Calendar behaviour 15/07: No progress 29/07: No Progress. 05/08: No Progress. This action is to discover and document ICU behaviour. DFDL will do whatever ICU does. 12/08: No Progress 19/09: More examples of inconsistent behaviour discovered 09/09: no progress 16/09: no progress 30/09: no progress 07/10: no progress 14/10: no progress 21/10: Decided to list the know issues and combine with action 012 .Closed
-----	---

Work items :

No	Item	target version	status
005	Improvements on property descriptions		not
011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
012	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
033	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	037	ens
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties	ongoing	
038	Improve length section including bit handling		son
044	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM	none	not

2			
051	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	037	awa
058	textPadCharacter %#rxx limitation and split to textxxxxPadCharacter	037	
059	limit terminatorCanBeMissing to last element in schema. Ignore elsewhere.	037	
060	New empty string semantic for dfdl:binaryBooleanTrueRep	037	
061	Change maxOccurs violations from processing error to validation error (if not 'fixed')	037	

© Copyright IBM Corp. 1998, 2007 All Rights Reserved

© Copyright IBM Corp. 1998, 2007 All Rights Reserved

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	07-Oct-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	13:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 08-Oct-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 09-Oct-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Oct-07-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Oct-07-2009

Attendees

Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Peter Lambros (IBM)
Stephanie Fetzner(IBM)

Apologies

Steve Marting (Progeny)
Suman Kalia (IBM)

051 - New scoping rules

A number of emails have pointed out minor flaws in the proposal from last week so we spent most of the call refining the proposal.

1. Top level xs:schema elements MAY have a dfdl:format annotation (but only one)

2. The top level xs:schema format annotation provides defaults for the dfdl properties for every DF DL-annotatable construct in the schema document.
(update 1) They do not apply to any constructs in included/imported schema which may have their own defaults
3. local dfdl annotations on a construct of the schema take precedence over properties coming from the lexically enclosing top-level schema format annotation (if there is one)
4. when a property binding appears explicitly on a reference (element, type, or group), the same property binding cannot appear explicitly on the referenced global definition or declaration . (Schema definition error)
5. The merged explicitly defined properties from the reference and declaration/definition take precedence over the defaults applied to the declaration/definition, which take precedence over the defaults applied to the reference.
6. The same precedence rules apply to simpleType inheritance
7. There are no dfdl annotations on xs:complexType and xs:group declarations
- 8 Variables can still be used for 'parameterization' but expected to be the exception.

Splitting dfdl :element and dfdl :simpleType properties .

SH proposed that the dfdl:properties on an xs:element and xs:simpleType, currently are nearly the same should be separated so that as far as possible the representational properties are on the xs:simpleType and only the instance properties are on the xs:element. That is become more type oriented similar to XML schema . After discussion of the details, particularly where dfdl:length would be allowed we decided delay any decision until next week. It was noted that it will not be possible to change later .
(update 1) The split also applies to xs:element and xs:complexType which would make xs:simpleTypes and xs:complexTypees symmetrical.

045: Resolving points of uncertainty

An updated proposal was distributed and comments received. The comment were largely editorial and will be incorporated into the next version.

AOB:

Draft 36 was made available but problems with gridforge prevented it being uploaded. Contact Alan Powell for a copy.

Next call 14 October 13:00 UK for 2 hours

Meeting closed , 15:05

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
060	Should dfdl become more type oriented and split dfdl:properties between element and simpleType/complexType

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify. 20/05: No Progress 27/05: No Progress 03/06: No Progress (low priority) 09/06: No Progress (low priority) 17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour

	<p>24/06: no progress 01/07: no progress 15/07: no progress 29/07: no progress 05/08: no progress 12/08: no progress 19/08: Inconsistencies are being found in ICU behaviour so Calendars need reviewing again. 26/08: Specific three character short time zones may not be maintained during round tripping when there is more than one short form for a time zone offset. Because dates and datetimes in the infoset only maintain a time zone offset so on unparsing it isn't possible to say which short form will be selected for a particular offset when there is more than one possible. Need to document. 09/09: no progress 16/09: no progress 30/09: no progress 07/10: no progress</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice. 08/04: In progress within IBM 22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete. 29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK 06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples. 15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator 20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029) 27/05: No Progress (lower priority) 19/08: No Progress (lower priority) 26/08: No Progress (lower priority) 09/09: no progress 16/09: no progress 30/09: no progress 07/10: no progress</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks. 22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that: a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) Ongoing in case another solution can be found. 29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing 06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl. 20/05: SH or SKK to investigate 27/05: No Progress 03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice. 17/06: no change</p>

	<p>24/06: no change 01/07: no progress 15/07: No Progress (lower priority) 29/07: No Progress (lower priority) 05/08: No Progress (lower priority) 12/08: No Progress (lower priority) 19/08: Clarify that this action is to go through the XML UPA checks to assess impact on dfdl schemas and advice best practice. Name clashes is just one example. SH or SKK 26/08: No Progress (lower priority) 09/09: no progress 16/09: no progress 30/09: no progress 07/10: no progress</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing 27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call 03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated 09/06: Progress but not discussed 17/06: Discussed briefly 24/06: No Progress 01/07: No Progress 15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way. 29/07: No Progress 05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules. 12/08: No Progress 19/08: No Progress 26/08: No Progress 09/09: no progress 16/09: no progress 30/09: AP distributed proposal and others commented. Brief discussion AP to incorporate update and reissue 07/10: Updated proposal was discussed. Comments will be incorporated into the next version.</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas 03/06: not discussed 24/06: No Progress 24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases) 15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide. 19/08: No Progress (lower priority) 26/08: No Progress (lower priority) 09/09: no progress 30/09: no progress 07/10: no progress</p>
051	<p>Scoping rules. MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns 17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion 24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proposal 24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review 08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters. 15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up. 29/07: No Progress 05/08: No Progress 12/08: No Progress 19/08: AP will document new syntax rules.</p>

	26/08: No Progress 09/09: AP has documented new scoping rules. Not discussed 16/09: Not discussed. AP to update element reference examples 30/09: Significant dissatisfaction with proposed new rules. New proposal developed during call. AP to document. 07/10: New proposal was refined. Details in minutes.
054	ICU DecimalNumber/ Calendar behaviour 15/07: No progress 29/07: No Progress. 05/08: No Progress. This action is to discover and document ICU behaviour. DFDL will do whatever ICU does. 12/08: No Progress 19/09: More examples of inconsistent behaviour discovered 09/09: no progress 16/09: no progress 30/09: no progress 07/10: no progress
056	resolve lengthUnit=bits including fillbytes 12/08: No Progress 19/08: No Progress 26/08: No Progress 09/09: no progress 30/09: no progress 07/10: no progress
059	9/9: define how encoding, byteorder and floating point format externally 16/09: no progress 07/10: no progress
060	Should dfdl become more type oriented and split dfdl:properties between element and simpleType/complexType

Closed actions :

057	Decide semantics and enumeration for 'parsed' occursCountKind 26/08: Subsequent discussion agreed on 'parsed' Need to agree semantics 09/09: no progress 16/09: occursxxx applies to array and optional elements. occursCountKind enumeration agreed. Semantics of 'parsed' are 'parse as many as possible'. 30/09: Closed

Work items:

N	Item	target version	status
003	Variables (from action 042)	036	done
005	Improvements on property descriptions		not
0	Envelopes and Payloads (from action 026)	036	done

06			
007	valueCalc (from action 029)	036	don
011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
012	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
033	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	036	ens
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties		
038	Improve length section including bit handling		son
042	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM		not
051	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	036	awa
052	add entity for 'one or more white space characters'	036	don
053	name, baseFormat, selector, escapeSchemeRef, textNumberFormatRef, textCalendarFormatRef, binaryCalendarFormatRef attributes only	036	don
054	Add occureCountKind='parsed'	036	don
055	Make dfdl:initiatedConet discriminating (from action 58)	036	don
056	bidirectional support (action 044)	036	don
057	Properties that take an expression (action 55)	036	don
058	textPadCharacter %#rxx limitation and split to textxxxxPadCharacter		
059	limit terminatorCanBeMissing to last element in schema. Ignore elsewhere.		
060			

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	16-Sep-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 01-Oct-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 01-Oct-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Sept-16-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Sept-16-2009

Attendees

Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Steve Marting (Progeny)

Apologies

Peter Lambros (IBM)

1 Go through actions -

042 - Variables.

PL had distributed an updated proposal answering comments from last week. Although nobody had reviewed it thoroughly it appeared to be satisfactory so was approved. - Closed

044 - bidi (update emailed yesterday, please review)

AP had distributed an updated proposal which was approved. Closed.
Will be incorporated into normal property section rather than an appendix

055 - Document which properties can take an expression

Proposed list approved

- dfdl:byteOrder
- dfdl:encoding
- dfdl:length
- dfdl:initiator
- dfdl:terminator
- dfdl:separator
-
- dfdl:occursStopValue
- dfdl:nilValue
- dfdl:textBooleanTrue
- dfdl:textBooleanFalse
- dfdl:inputValueCalc
- dfdl:outputValueCalc
- dfdl:nilIndicatorPath (path)

Subsequently added

- dfdl:binaryFloatRepresentation (can be specified externally in IBM products)
- dfdl:occursCount (see action 57 below)

057 - semantics for occursCountKind ='parsed'

Became a general discussions about arrays and optional elements.

dfdl:occursCountxxx properties should apply to both arrays and optional elements so can be used to control the existence on optional elements.

dfdl:occursStopValue is always a logical value and applies to simple elements only . Literal values are specified as a terminator of the array. Spec needs updating

Enumerations for dfdl:occursCountKind should be:

'fixed' - use xs:maxOccurs which must equal xs:minOccurs
'expression' - use dfdl:occursCount which must be an expression
'stopValue' - logical value to mark end of array
'parse' - use normal speculative parsing rules
'useAvailableSpace' - size delimited by parent.

The semantics of dfdl:occursCountKind='parsed' are
'parse as many as possible then validate against min/maxOccurs is validation is on. This is consistent with XML

UPA checks as any other semantic would cause UPA failures.

To be approved on next call

051 - scoping rules (email from AP)

Not discussed but AP agreed to redo SKK element reference samples with new rules

2. OGF meeting in Banff

Too late for Banff meeting but should aim to present completed spec in Munich 03/10. MB suggested that we host a webinar in 01/10 to publicise the spec.

3 Suman has requested a change in the WG call time to either 13:00 UK (8:00 US ET). I would also like to recommend extending the call to 2 hours as we are not getting through the work items.

Agreed calls will be from 13:00 UK (8:00 ET) for 2 hours

Next call 23 September 13:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:20

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify. 20/05: No Progress 27/05: No Progress 03/06: No Progress (low priority) 09/06: No Progress (low priority) 17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour 24/06: no progress

	<p>01/07: no progress 15/07: no progress 29/07: no progress 05/08: no progress 12/08: no progress 19/08: Inconsistencies are being found in ICU behaviour so Calendars need reviewing again. 26/08: Specific three character short time zones may not be maintained during round tripping when there is more than one short form for a time zone offset. Because dates and datetimes in the infoset only maintain a time zone offset so on unparsing it isn't possible to say which short form will be selected for a particular offset when there is more than one possible. Need to document. 09/09: no progress 16/09: no progress</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice. 08/04: In progress within IBM 22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete. 29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK 06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples. 15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator 20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029) 27/05: No Progress (lower priority) 19/08: No Progress (lower priority) 26/08: No Progress (lower priority) 09/09: no progress 16/09: no progress</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks. 22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that: a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) Ongoing in case another solution can be found. 29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing 06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl. 20/05: SH or SKK to investigate 27/05: No Progress 03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice. 17/06: no change 24/06: no change 01/07: no progress 15/07: No Progress (lower priority) 29/07: No Progress (lower priority) 05/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p>

	<p>12/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>19/08: Clarify that this action is to go through the XML UPA checks to assess impact on dfdl schemas and advice best practice. Name clashes is just one example. SH or SKK</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p> <p>09/06: Progress but not discussed</p> <p>17/06: Discussed briefly</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: No Progress</p> <p>15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: No Progress</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases)</p> <p>15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>19/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p>
051	<p>Scoping rules.</p> <p>MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns</p> <p>17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion</p> <p>24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proosal</p> <p>24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review</p> <p>08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: AP will document new syntax rules.</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: AP has documented new scoping rules. Not discussed</p> <p>16/09: Not disussed. AP to update element reference examples</p>
054	<p>ICU DecimalNumber/ Calendar behaviour</p> <p>15/07: No progress</p> <p>29/07: No Progress.</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. This action is to discover and document ICU behaviour. DFDL will do whatever ICU does.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/09: More examples of inconsistent behaviour discovered</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p>

056	resolve lenghtUnit=bits including fillbytes 12/08: No Progress 19/08: No Progress 26/08: No Progress 09/09: no progress
057	Decide semantics and enumeration for 'parsed' occursCountKind 26/08: Subsequent discussion agreed on 'parsed' Need to agree semantics 09/09: no progress 16/09: occursxxx applies to array and optional elements. occursCountKind enumeration agreed. Semantics of 'parsed' are 'parse as many as possible.
059	9/9: define how encoding, byteorder and floating point format externally 16/09: no progress

Closed actions :

042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification. To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name.</p> <p>06/05: No progress 20/05: AP to make proposal 27/05: MB proposed differentiating between input and output variables to avoid unnecessary evaluations during parse and unparse. Need to complete rest of variable specification. 03/06: Pointed out problem of declaring variables input or output when used to define syntax which is used both times. MB to update proposal to include how variables are set externally and how specific properties such as encoding are set. 09/06: SKK to use example to dicument his proposal 17/06: SKK to refine proposal. Other aspects need progress. 24/06: SKK proposal discussed but not accepted. PL to document simpler proposal. 07/01: PL working on proposal 15/07: PL has distributed his proposal. SH, MB and SKK have commented. Broad agreement in principle. Need to agree on better name for dfdl:variable to reflect the annotation's purpose. PL to update proposal. 15/07: No Progress 29/07: No Progress 05/08: SH and others had commented on Variables [Draft proposal - 20090715].doc. SH stated that fixOnMatch is not needed in dfdl v1.0 MB will document how to implement fixOnMatch behaviour with existing function. PL to update proposal 12/08: PL to update proposal with SKK examples. 17/08: Chase PL for update 26/08: PL distributed updated proposal. Agreement in principle but some parts need clarification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearer description of only one setVariable allowed even when default specified. State table is correct though. - Should document that there is no implied order of defineVariable and other annotations such as defineFormat which might refer to a variable - Should not in the table that it is not an schema error to have multiple setVariables for the same variable defined in the schema but only one should be execute. For example a setVariable in each component of a choice. Although this can only be detected at runtime it is still a schema definition error. - Send further comments to PL <p>09/09: Discussed comments.PL to update. Created separate action for externalizing encoding etc. 16/09: Updated proposal approved. Closed</p>
------------	--

044	13/05: Bidi 20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support. 27/05: Bidi is supported so will be needed in dfdl v1 03/06: No Progress 09/06: No Progress 24/06: No Progress 01/07: AP started investigation and documented issues. Suggest do whatever XML does. 15/07: No further progress 29/07: No Progress 05/08: AP has been in touch with IBM bidi experts. 12/08: No Progress 17/09: AP has been in touch with WTX and IBM experts. Support will cover 1) Specifying bidi string in DFDL schema, 2) Representaion in the info set 3) bidi propeties to describe instance data, including applicability to syntax elements 26/08: Initial proposal publish. General agreement. Send comments to AP 09/09: Discussed comments. AP to update 16/09: Updated proposal approved. Closed
055	Document which properties can take an expression 12/08: AP has distributed proposed list of properties and wording 19/08: SH to review proposal 26/08: SH agrees with proposal. Others to review. 09/09: Agreed 16/09: Closed

Work items:

N o	Item	target version	stat
003	Variables (from action 042)	036	awa
005	Improvements on property descriptions		not
006	Envelopes and Payloads (from action 026)	036	awa and
007	valueCalc (from action 029)	036	ens
011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
012	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
033	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	036	ens
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties		

038	Improve length section including bit handling		not
042	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM		not
051	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	036	awa
052	add entity for 'one or more white space characters'	036	
053	name, baseFormat, selector, escapeSchemeRef, textNumberFormatRef, textCalendarFormatRef, binaryCalendarFormatRef attributes only	036	
054	Add occureCountKind='parsed'	036	
055	Make dfdl:initiatedConet discriminating (from action 58)	036	
056	bidi support (action 044)	036	
057	Properties that take an expression (action 55)	036	

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	30-Sep-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	13:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 01-Oct-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 02-Oct-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Sept-30-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Sept-30-2009

Attendees

Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Steve Marting (Progeny)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Tim Kimber (IBM)

Apologies

Peter Lambros (IBM)

1. %rxx in TextPadCharacter

It has been proposed that use of the raw entity should be restricted in textPadCharacter

It was agreed that

- dfdl:textPadCharacter only one byte raw entity (%#rxx) can be specified
- dfdl:textPadCharacter must not be specified as a raw byte value if the code page is a variable-width code page.

Also SH proposed that dfdl:textPadCharacter be split to allow a default be specified for each logical type in a similar way to dfdl:textxxxJustification. Approved

dfdl:textPadCharacter will be split into dfdl:textStringPadCharacter, dfdl:textNumberPadCharacter, dfdl:textBooleanPadCharacter, dfdl:textCalendarPadCharacter

2. finalTerminatorCanBeMissing

It has been proposed to restrict the use of this property to the last field in a definition as the only known used case is missing terminator (typically <LF>) at end of file

MB expressed concern that if the property was only allowed to be specified on the last element in the schema it would make it difficult for that definition to be reused.

Agreed that dfdl:finalTerminatorCanBeMissing can be specified on any element but is ignored except on the last element in the schema.

051 - New scoping rules

There had been a number of emails from most of the members of the work group during the week, mostly expressing dissatisfaction with the new rules based on usability and lack of referential transparency. SKK expressed support for the new rules as he felt it was easier to implement tooling.

After considerable debate which mainly re-evaluated previously suggested solutions.

Need to be able to

- Set defaults for dfdl properties
- Allow the normal use of xs:include and xs:import to build schemas.
- Allow the applicable dfdl:properties on any given component to be easily discoverable.
- Be 'easy' for users to understand.

The following proposal evolved.

- A way to define dfdl property defaults at a schema level. Probably by a global dfdl:format annotation. The defaults apply to every component in the schema document.
- The global defaults belong to the target namespace of the schema so follow normal schema composition rules.
- dfdl:properties on xs:complexType and xs:group do not put the properties in scope.
- dfdl:properties on an element and its referenced simpleType are merged. It is an error if the same property is defined on the element and the referenced simpleType
- dfdl:properties on an element do not override properties on its referenced complexType. dfdl:properties on a complex element effectively only apply to the syntax part of the element (initiator terminator, etc),
- dfdl:properties on an element reference and its global element declaration are merged. It is an error if the same property is defined on the element reference and the element declaration.
- dfdl:properties on a group reference and its global group declaration are merged. It is an error if the same property is defined on the group reference and the group declaration
- variables can still be used for 'parameterization' but expected to be the exception.

AP to write up proposal

045: Resolving points of uncertainty

A brief discussion of AP proposal and subsequent comments. These were mostly clarification and expansions rather than disagreement. AP to incorporate comment and reissue.

Next call 7 October 13:00 UK for 2 hours

Meeting closed , 15:15

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress

	<p>16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed</p> <p>21/1: add locale,</p> <p>04/02: changed from locale to specific properties</p> <p>18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour.</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify.</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour</p> <p>24/06: no progress</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: no progress</p> <p>29/07: no progress</p> <p>05/08: no progress</p> <p>12/08: no progress</p> <p>19/08: Inconsistencies are being found in ICU behaviour so Calendars need reviewing again.</p> <p>26/08: Specific three character short time zones may not be maintained during round tripping when there is more than one short form for a time zone offset. Because dates and datetimes in the infoset only maintain a time zone offset so on unparsing it isn't possible to say which short form will be selected for a particular offset when there is more than one possible. Need to document.</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p> <p>27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>....</p> <p>19/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <p>a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd)</p> <p>b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models</p>

	<p>c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) Ongoing in case another solution can be found. 29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing 06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl. 20/05: SH or SKK to investigate 27/05: No Progress 03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice. 17/06: no change 24/06: no change 01/07: no progress 15/07: No Progress (lower priority) 29/07: No Progress (lower priority) 05/08: No Progress (lower priority) 12/08: No Progress (lower priority) 19/08: Clarify that this action is to go through the XML UPA checks to assess impact on dfdl schemas and advice best practice. Name clashes is just one example. SH or SKK 26/08: No Progress (lower priority) 09/09: no progress 16/09: no progress 30/09: no progress</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing 27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call 03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated 09/06: Progress but not discussed 17/06: Discussed briefly 24/06: No Progress 01/07: No Progress 15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way. 29/07: No Progress 05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules. 12/08: No Progress 19/08: No Progress 26/08: No Progress 09/09: no progress 16/09: no progress 30/09: AP distributed proposal and others commented. Brief discussion AP to incorporate update and reissue</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas 03/06: not discussed 24/06: No Progress 24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases) 15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide. 19/08: No Progress (lower priority) 26/08: No Progress (lower priority) 09/09: no progress 30/09: no progress</p>
051	<p>Scoping rules. MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns 17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion</p>

	24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proosal 24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review 08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters. 15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up. 29/07: No Progress 05/08: No Progress 12/08: No Progress 19/08: AP will document new syntax rules. 26/08: No Progress 09/09: AP has documented new scoping rules. Not discussed 16/09: Not disussed. AP to update element reference examples 30/09: Significant dissatisfaction with proposed new rules . New proposal developed during call. AP to document.
054	ICU DecimalNumber/ Calendar behaviour 15/07: No progress 29/07: No Progress. 05/08: No Progress. This action is to discover and document ICU behaviour. DFDL will do whatever ICU does. 12/08: No Progress 19/09: More examples of inconsistent behaviour discovered 09/09: no progress 16/09: no progress 30/09: no progress
056	resolve lenghtUnit=bits including fillbytes 12/08: No Progress 19/08: No Progress 26/08: No Progress 09/09: no progress 30/09: no progress
059	9/9: define how encoding, byteorder and floating point format externally 16/09: no progress

Closed actions :

057	Decide semantics and enumeration for 'parsed' occursCountKind 26/08: Subsequent discussion agreed on 'parsed' Need to agree semantics 09/09: no progress 16/09: occursxxx applies to array and optional elements . occursCountKind enumeration agreed. Semantics of 'parsed' are 'parse as many as possible'. 30/09: Closed

Work items:

No	Item	target version	status
003	Variables (from action 042)	036	done
0	Improvements on property descriptions		not

05			
006	Envelopes and Payloads (from action 026)	036	don
007	valueCalc (from action 029)	036	don
011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
012	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
033	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	036	ens
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties		
038	Improve length section including bit handling		son
042	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM		not
051	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	036	awa
052	add entity for 'one or more white space characters'	036	don
053	name, baseFormat, selector, escapeSchemeRef, textNumberFormatRef, textCalendarFormatRef, binaryCalendarFormatRef attributes only	036	don
054	Add occureCountKind='parsed'	036	don
055	Make dfdl:initiatedConet discriminating (from action 58)	036	don
056	bidi support (action 044)	036	don
057	Properties that take an expression (action 55)	036	don
058	textPadCharacter %#rxx limitation and split to textxxxxPadCharacter		
057	limit terminatorCanBeMissing to last element in schema. Ignore elsewhere.		
0			

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	23-Sep-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	13:00 - 14:00

Created by Alan Powell on 17-Sep-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 01-Oct-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Sept-23-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Sept-23-2009

Attendees

Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Steve Marting (Progeny)

Apologies

Peter Lambros (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)

1 Go through actions -

051 - scoping rules (email from AP)

AP had updated SKK element/group reference examples with new scoping rules which highlighted some concerns

1. We haven't really defined the scoping rules for dfdl:ref but they are assumed to be 'merge with local property definitions. Local takes precedence'
2. dfdl:ref to defineFormat blocks are very difficult to use with parameterization .
A dfdl:ref on an element/group reference probably has no effect. The properties would need to be converted to dfdl:setVariable .
A dfdl:ref on a global element/group declaration is OK but any property that needs to be overridden must be defined locally as a variable.
3. There is no easy way to provide a default for properties on global elements/groups that can be overridden. Suman had done this in his examples.
4. dfdl:lengthKind does not take an expression so cannot be a parameter.

MB concerned that new rules do not allow referential integrity.

MB had to leave early.

Went through the examples and although they would not pass dfdl validation as the global components do not define all the necessary dfdl properties they do obey the new scoping rules.

SKK asked that an example of a global element of complexType be included.

Needs more discussion.

Following not discussed

2. %rxx in TextPadCharacter

It has been proposed that use of the new entity should be restricted in textPadCharacter

3. finalTerminatorCanBeMissing

It has been proposed to restrict the use of this property to the last field in a definition as the only known used case is missing <LF> at end of file

AOB

V036 of the DFDL Specification will be published early next week.

Next call 23 September 13:00 UK for 2 hours

Meeting closed , 14:00

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify. 20/05: No Progress 27/05: No Progress 03/06: No Progress (low priority) 09/06: No Progress (low priority) 17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour 24/06: no progress

	<p>01/07: no progress 15/07: no progress 29/07: no progress 05/08: no progress 12/08: no progress 19/08: Inconsistencies are being found in ICU behaviour so Calendars need reviewing again. 26/08: Specific three character short time zones may not be maintained during round tripping when there is more than one short form for a time zone offset. Because dates and datetimes in the infoset only maintain a time zone offset so on unparsing it isn't possible to say which short form will be selected for a particular offset when there is more than one possible. Need to document. 09/09: no progress 16/09: no progress</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice. 08/04: In progress within IBM 22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete. 29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK 06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples. 15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator 20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029) 27/05: No Progress (lower priority) 19/08: No Progress (lower priority) 26/08: No Progress (lower priority) 09/09: no progress 16/09: no progress</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks. 22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that: a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) Ongoing in case another solution can be found. 29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing 06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl. 20/05: SH or SKK to investigate 27/05: No Progress 03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice. 17/06: no change 24/06: no change 01/07: no progress 15/07: No Progress (lower priority) 29/07: No Progress (lower priority) 05/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p>

	<p>12/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>19/08: Clarify that this action is to go through the XML UPA checks to assess impact on dfdl schemas and advice best practice. Name clashes is just one example. SH or SKK</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p> <p>09/06: Progress but not discussed</p> <p>17/06: Discussed briefly</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: No Progress</p> <p>15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: No Progress</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases)</p> <p>15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>19/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p>
051	<p>Scoping rules.</p> <p>MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns</p> <p>17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion</p> <p>24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proosal</p> <p>24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review</p> <p>08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: AP will document new syntax rules.</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: AP has documented new scoping rules. Not discussed</p> <p>16/09: Not disussed. AP to update element reference examples</p>
054	<p>ICU DecimalNumber/ Calendar behaviour</p> <p>15/07: No progress</p> <p>29/07: No Progress.</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. This action is to discover and document ICU behaviour. DFDL will do whatever ICU does.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/09: More examples of inconsistent behaviour discovered</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p>

056	resolve lenghtUnit=bits including fillbytes 12/08: No Progress 19/08: No Progress 26/08: No Progress 09/09: no progress
057	Decide semantics and enumeration for 'parsed' occursCountKind 26/08: Subsequent discussion agreed on 'parsed' Need to agree semantics 09/09: no progress 16/09: occursxxx applies to array and optional elements. occursCountKind enumeration agreed. Semantics of 'parsed' are 'parse as many as possible.
059	9/9: define how encoding, byteorder and floating point format externally 16/09: no progress

Closed actions :

042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification. To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name.</p> <p>06/05: No progress 20/05: AP to make proposal 27/05: MB proposed differentiating between input and output variables to avoid unnecessary evaluations during parse and unparse. Need to complete rest of variable specification. 03/06: Pointed out problem of declaring variables input or output when used to define syntax which is used both times. MB to update proposal to include how variables are set externally and how specific properties such as encoding are set. 09/06: SKK to use example to dicument his proposal 17/06: SKK to refine proposal. Other aspects need progress. 24/06: SKK proposal discussed but not accepted. PL to document simpler proposal. 07/01: PL working on proposal 15/07: PL has distributed his proposal. SH, MB and SKK have commented. Broad agreement in principle. Need to agree on better name for dfdl:variable to reflect the annotation's purpose. PL to update proposal. 15/07: No Progress 29/07: No Progress 05/08: SH and others had commented on Variables [Draft proposal - 20090715].doc. SH stated that fixOnMatch is not needed in dfdl v1.0 MB will document how to implement fixOnMatch behaviour with existing function. PL to update proposal 12/08: PL to update proposal with SKK examples. 17/08: Chase PL for update 26/08: PL distributed updated proposal. Agreement in principle but some parts need clarification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearer description of only one setVariable allowed even when default specified. State table is correct though. - Should document that there is no implied order of defineVariable and other annotations such as defineFormat which might refer to a variable - Should not in the table that it is not an schema error to have multiple setVariables for the same variable defined in the schema but only one should be execute. For example a setVariable in each component of a choice. Although this can only be detected at runtime it is still a schema definition error. - Send further comments to PL <p>09/09: Discussed comments.PL to update. Created separate action for externalizing encoding etc. 16/09: Updated proposal approved. Closed</p>
------------	--

044	13/05: Bidi 20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support. 27/05: Bidi is supported so will be needed in dfdl v1 03/06: No Progress 09/06: No Progress 24/06: No Progress 01/07: AP started investigation and documented issues. Suggest do whatever XML does. 15/07: No further progress 29/07: No Progress 05/08: AP has been in touch with IBM bidi experts. 12/08: No Progress 17/09: AP has been in touch with WTX and IBM experts. Support will cover 1) Specifying bidi string in DFDL schema, 2) Representaion in the info set 3) bidi propeties to describe instance data, including applicability to syntax elements 26/08: Initial proposal publish. General agreement. Send comments to AP 09/09: Discussed comments. AP to update 16/09: Updated proposal approved. Closed
055	Document which properties can take an expression 12/08: AP has distributed proposed list of properties and wording 19/08: SH to review proposal 26/08: SH agrees with proposal. Others to review. 09/09: Agreed 16/09: Closed

Work items:

N o	Item	target version	stat
003	Variables (from action 042)	036	awa
005	Improvements on property descriptions		not
006	Envelopes and Payloads (from action 026)	036	awa and
007	valueCalc (from action 029)	036	ens
011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
012	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
033	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	036	ens
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties		

038	Improve length section including bit handling		not
042	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM		not
051	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	036	awa
052	add entity for 'one or more white space characters'	036	
053	name, baseFormat, selector, escapeSchemeRef, textNumberFormatRef, textCalendarFormatRef, binaryCalendarFormatRef attributes only	036	
054	Add occureCountKind='parsed'	036	
055	Make dfdl:initiatedConet discriminating (from action 58)	036	
056	bidi support (action 044)	036	
057	Properties that take an expression (action 55)	036	

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	09-Sep-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 10-Sep-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 10-Sep-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Sept-09-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Sept-09-2009

Attendees

Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Peter Lambros (IBM)
Steve Marting (Progeny)
Kristoffer H Rose (IBM)

Apologies

None

Welcomed Steve Marting from Progeny Systems to the calls.

1 Go through actions -

042 - Variables. (PL please have responses to comments)

A number of people had sent comments to Peter and we went through the major ones. PL to update proposal.

Agreed to have a separate action to define how to externally specify encoding, byteorder and floating point format consistently across all dfdl schemas. ACTION

044 - bidi (email from AP)

Discussed proposal and comments.

Questioned if textBiDiNumeralShapes applied only to number types and not strings. Will check if unicode has separate code points for shapes and drop this property if there are. Drop 'contextual' anyway.

The properties of the infoSet should not include textBiDiNumeralShapes. SH doesn't like using dfdl properties to describe infoSet characteristics. Will define bidi characteristics separately and reference from infoSet and property description.

055 - Document which properties can take an expression (email from AP)

Proposal agreed

057 - semantics for occursCountKind ='parsed'

Not discussed

051 - scoping rules (email from AP)

Not discussed

2. OGF meeting in Banff

Not discussed

Next call 16 September 14:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:00

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
059	9/9: define how encoding, byteorder and floating point format externally

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify. 20/05: No Progress 27/05: No Progress 03/06: No Progress (low priority) 09/06: No Progress (low priority) 17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour 24/06: no progress

	<p>01/07: no progress 15/07: no progress 29/07: no progress 05/08: no progress 12/08: no progress 19/08: Inconsistencies are being found in ICU behaviour so Calendars need reviewing again. 26/08: Specific three character short time zones may not be maintained during round tripping when there is more than one short form for a time zone offset. Because dates and datetimes in the infoset only maintain a time zone offset so on unparsing it isn't possible to say which short form will be selected for a particular offset when there is more than one possible. Need to document. 09/09: no progress</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice. 08/04: In progress within IBM 22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete. 29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK 06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples. 15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator 20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029) 27/05: No Progress (lower priority) 19/08: No Progress (lower priority) 26/08: No Progress (lower priority) 09/09: no progress</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks. 22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that: a)DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) Ongoing in case another solution can be found. 29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing 06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl. 20/05: SH or SKK to investigate 27/05: No Progress 03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice. 17/06: no change 24/06: no change 01/07: no prgress 15/07: No Progress (lower priority) 29/07: No Progress (lower priority) 05/08: No Progress (lower priority) 12/08: No Progress (lower priority) 19/08: Clarify that this action is to go through the XML UPA checks to assess impact on dfdl</p>

	<p>schemas and advice best practice. Name clashes is just one example. SH or SKK</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p>
042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification. To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: AP to make proposal</p> <p>27/05: MB proposed differentiating between input and output variables to avoid unnecessary evaluations during parse and unparse. Need to complete rest of variable specification.</p> <p>03/06: Pointed out problem of declaring variables input or output when used to define syntax which is used both times. MB to update proposal to include how variables are set externally and how specific properties such as encoding are set.</p> <p>09/06: SKK to use example to document his proposal</p> <p>17/06: SKK to refine proposal. Other aspects need progress.</p> <p>24/06: SKK proposal discussed but not accepted. PL to document simpler proposal.</p> <p>07/01: PL working on proposal</p> <p>15/07: PL has distributed his proposal. SH, MB and SKK have commented. Broad agreement in principle. Need to agree on better name for dfdl:variable to reflect the annotation's purpose. PL to update proposal.</p> <p>15/07: No Progress</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: SH and others had commented on Variables [Draft proposal - 20090715].doc. SH stated that fixOnMatch is not needed in dfdl v1.0</p> <p>MB will document how to implement fixOnMatch behaviour with existing function. PL to update proposal</p> <p>12/08: PL to update proposal with SKK examples.</p> <p>17/08: Chase PL for update</p> <p>26/08: PL distributed updated proposal. Agreement in principle but some parts need clarification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearer description of only one setVariable allowed even when default specified. State table is correct though. - Should document that there is no implied order of defineVariable and other annotations such as defineFormat which might refer to a variable - Should not in the table that it is not an schema error to have multiple setVariables for the same variable defined in the schema but only one should be execute. For example a setVariable in each component of a choice. Although this can only be detected at runtime it is still a schema definition error. - Send further comments to PL <p>09/09: Discussed comments.PL to update. Created separate action for externalizing encoding etc.</p>
044	<p>13/05: Bidi</p> <p>20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support.</p> <p>27/05: Bidi is supported so will be needed in dfdl v1</p> <p>03/06: No Progress</p> <p>09/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: AP started investigation and documented issues. Suggest do whatever XML does.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: AP has been in touch with IBM bidi experts.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>17/09: AP has been in touch with WTX and IBM experts. Support will cover</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Specifying bidi string in DFDL schema, 2) Representaion in the infoset 3) bidi propeties to describe instance data, including applicability to syntax elements <p>26/08: Initial proposal publish. General agreement. Send comments to AP</p>

	09/09: Discussed comments. AP to update
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p> <p>09/06: Progress but not discussed</p> <p>17/06: Discussed briefly</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: No Progress</p> <p>15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: No Progress</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases)</p> <p>15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>19/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p>
051	<p>Scoping rules.</p> <p>MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns</p> <p>17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion</p> <p>24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proosal</p> <p>24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review</p> <p>08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: AP will document new syntax rules.</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: AP has documented new scoping rules. Not discussed</p>
054	<p>ICU DecimalNumber/ Calendar behaviour</p> <p>15/07: No progress</p> <p>29/07: No Progress.</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. This action is to discover and document ICU behaviour. DFDL will do whatever ICU does.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/09: More examples of inconsistent behaviour discovered</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p>
055	<p>Document which properties can take an expression</p> <p>12/08: AP has distributed proposed list of properties and wording</p> <p>19/08: SH to review proposal</p> <p>26/08: SH agrees with proposal. Others to review.</p> <p>09/09: Agreed</p>
056	<p>resolve lenghtUnit=bits including fillbytes</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: No Progress</p>

	26/08: No Progress 09/09: no progress
057	Decide semantics and enumeration for 'parsed' occursCountKind 26/08: Subsequent discussion agreed on 'parsed' Need to agree semantics 09/09: no progress
059	9/9: define how encoding, byteorder and floating point format externally

Closed actions :

058	Should dfdl:initiatedContent be discriminating? 26/08: Agreed that it should and will only be on groups

Work items :

No	Item	target version	status
003	Variables (from action 042)	036	awa
005	Improvements on property descriptions		not
006	Envelopes and Payloads (from action 026)	036	awa and
007	valueCalc (from action 029)	036	ens
011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
012	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
033	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	036	ens
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties		
038	Improve length section including bit handling		not
042	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM		not
051	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	036	awa
055	add entity for 'one or more white space characters'	036	

2			
0	name, baseFormat, selector, escapeSchemeRef, textNumberFormatRef, textCalendarFormatRef,	036	
5	binaryCalendarFormatRef attributes only		
3			
0	Add occureCountKind='parsed'	036	
5			
4			
0	Make dfdl:initiatedConet discriminating (from action 58)	036	
5			
5			
0			
5			
6			

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	26-Aug-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 26-Aug-09

Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 09-Sep-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Aug-26-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Aug-26-2009

Attendees

Steve Hanson (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Mike Beckerle (Oco)

Apologies

Peter Lambros (IBM)

1. Actions discussed and updated below.
2. New occursCountKind for when number of occurrences can be resolved by parsing.

Need to decide semantics

- Find as many repeating elements as possible then validate against minOccurs and maxOccurs
- Find up to maxOccurs repeating elements. If less than minOccurs found then processing error.

The spec currently implies the later semantic

Not discussed on call

There is no call next week

Next call 10 September 14:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:00

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet

	<p>17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify. 20/05: No Progress 27/05: No Progress 03/06: No Progress (low priority) 09/06: No Progress (low priority) 17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour 24/06: no progress 01/07: no progress 15/07: no progress 29/07: no progress 05/08: no progress 12/08: no progress 19/08: Inconsistencies are being found in ICU behaviour so Calendars need reviewing again. 26/08: Specific three character short time zones may not be maintained during round tripping when there is more than one short form for a time zone offset. Because dates and datetimes in the infoset only maintain a time zone offset so on unparsing it isn't possible to say which short form will be selected for a particular offset when there is more than one possible. Need to document.</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice. 08/04: In progress within IBM 22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete. 29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK 06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples. 15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator 20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029) 27/05: No Progress (lower priority) 19/08: No Progress (lower priority) 26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks. 22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that: a)DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p>

	<p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p> <p>17/06: no change</p> <p>24/06: no change</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>29/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>05/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>12/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>19/08: Clarify that this action is to go through the XML UPA checks to assess impact on dfdl schemas and advice best practice. Name clashes is just one example. SH or SKK</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification.</p> <p>To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: AP to make proposal</p> <p>27/05: MB proposed differentiating between input and output variables to avoid unnecessary evaluations during parse and unparse. Need to complete rest of variable specification.</p> <p>03/06: Pointed out problem of declaring variables input or output when used to define syntax which is used both times. MB to update proposal to include how variables are set externally and how specific properties such as encoding are set.</p> <p>09/06: SKK to use example to document his proposal</p> <p>17/06: SKK to refine proposal. Other aspects need progress.</p> <p>24/06: SKK proposal discussed but not accepted. PL to document simpler proposal.</p> <p>07/01: PL working on proposal</p> <p>15/07: PL has distributed his proposal. SH, MB and SKK have commented. Broad agreement in principle. Need to agree on better name for dfdl:variable to reflect the annotation's purpose. PL to update proposal.</p> <p>15/07: No Progress</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: SH and others had commented on Variables [Draft proposal - 20090715].doc. SH stated that fixOnMatch is not needed in dfdl v1.0</p> <p>MB will document how to implement fixOnMatch behaviour with existing function. PL to update proposal</p> <p>12/08: PL to update proposal with SKK examples.</p> <p>17/08: Chase PL for update</p> <p>26/08: PL distributed updated proposal. Agreement in principle but some parts need clarification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearer description of only one setVariable allowed even when default specified. State table is correct though. - Should document that there is no implied order of defineVariable and other annotations such as defineFormat which might refer to a variable - Should not in the table that it is not an schema error to have multiple setVariables for the same variable defined in the schema but only one should be execute. For example a setVariable in each component of a choice. Although this can only be detected at runtime it is still a schema definition error. - Send further comments to PL
044	<p>13/05: Bidi</p> <p>20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support.</p> <p>27/05: Bidi is supported so will be needed in dfdl v1</p>

	<p>03/06: No Progress</p> <p>09/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: AP started investigation and documented issues. Suggest do whatever XML does.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: AP has been in touch with IBM bidi experts.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>17/09: AP has been in touch with WTX and IBM experts. Support will cover</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Specifying bidi string in DFDL schema, 2) Representaion in the infoset 3) bidi propeties to describe instance data, including applicability to syntax elements <p>26/08: Initial proposal publish. General agreement. Send comments to AP</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p> <p>09/06: Progress but not discussed</p> <p>17/06: Discussed briefly</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: No Progress</p> <p>15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: No Progress</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases)</p> <p>15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>19/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
051	<p>Scoping rules.</p> <p>MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns</p> <p>17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion</p> <p>24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proosal</p> <p>24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review</p> <p>08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: AP will document new syntax rules.</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p>
054	<p>ICU DecimalNumber/ Calendar behaviour</p> <p>15/07: No progress</p> <p>29/07: No Progress.</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. This action is to discover and document ICU behaviour. DFDL will do whatever ICU does.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/09: More examples of inconsistent behaviour discovered</p>

055	Document which properties can take an expression 12/08: AP has distributed proposed list of properties and wording 19/08: SH to review proposal 26/08: SH agrees with proposal. Others to review.
056	resolve lenghtUnit=bits including fillbytes 12/08: No Progress 19/08: No Progress 26/08: No Progress
057	Decide semantics and enumeration for 'parsed' occursCountKind 26/08: Subsequent discussion agreed on 'parsed' Need to agree semantics
058	Should dfdl:initiatedContent be discriminating? 26/08: Agreed that it should and will only be on groups

Closed actions :

Work items:

No	Item	target version	status
003	Variables (from action 042)	036	awa
005	Improvements on property descriptions		not
006	Envelopes and Payloads (from action 026)	036	awa and
007	valueCalc (from action 029)	036	ens
011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
012	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
033	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	036	ens
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties		
038	Improve length section including bit handling		not
042	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM		not

051	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	036	awa
052	add entity for 'one or more white space characters'	036	
053	name, baseFormat, selector, escapeSchemeRef, textNumberFormatRef, textCalendarFormatRef, binaryCalendarFormatRef attributes only	036	
054	Add occureCountKind='parsed'	036	
055	Make dfdl:initiatedConet discriminating	036	

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	19-Aug-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 20-Aug-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 20-Aug-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Aug-19-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Aug-19-2009

Attendees

Steve Hanson (IBM)

Alan Powell (IBM)

Suman Kalia (IBM)

Apologies

Peter Lambros (IBM)

Mike Beckerle (Oco)

1. Actions discussed and updated below.
2. New occursCountKind for when number of occurrences can be resolved by parsing.
There have been email exchanges on the name of the enumeration and the semantics.

Need to decide semantics

- Find as many repeating elements as possible then validate against minOccurs and maxOccurs
- Find up to maxOccurs repeating elements. If less than minOccurs found then processing error.

The spec currently implies the later semantic

3. Make dfdl:initiatedContent discriminating

SH not happy with last calls decision to make discriminating

Next call 26 August 14:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:00

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
057	Decide semantics and enumeration for 'parsed' occursCountKind
058	Should dfdl:initiatedContent be discriminating?

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	<p>AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme</p> <p>10/9: Not allocated yet</p> <p>17/9: No update</p> <p>24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions</p> <p>22/10: No progress</p> <p>16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed</p> <p>21/1: add locale,</p> <p>04/02: changed from locale to specific properties</p> <p>18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour.</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify.</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour</p> <p>24/06: no progress</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: no progress</p> <p>29/07: no progress</p> <p>05/08: no progress</p> <p>12/08: no progress</p> <p>19/08: Inconsistencies are being found in ICU behaviour so Calendars need reviewing again.</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p> <p>27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>01/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>29/07: no progress (lower priority)</p> <p>05/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>12/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>19/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XMI Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL</p>

	<p>Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p> <p>17/06: no change</p> <p>24/06: no change</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>29/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>05/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>12/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>19/08: Clarify that this action is to go through the XML UPA checks to assess impact on dfdl schemas and advice best practice. Name clashes is just one example. SH or SKK</p>
042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification.</p> <p>To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: AP to make proposal</p> <p>27/05: MB proposed differentiating between input and output variables to avoid unnecessary evaluations during parse and unparse. Need to complete rest of variable specification.</p> <p>03/06: Pointed out problem of declaring variables input or output when used to define syntax which is used both times. MB to update proposal to include how variables are set externally and how specific properties such as encoding are set.</p> <p>09/06: SKK to use example to document his proposal</p> <p>17/06: SKK to refine proposal. Other aspects need progress.</p> <p>24/06: SKK proposal discussed but not accepted. PL to document simpler proposal.</p> <p>07/01: PL working on proposal</p> <p>15/07: PL has distributed his proposal. SH, MB and SKK have commented. Broad agreement in principle. Need to agree on better name for dfdl:variable to reflect the annotation's purpose. PL to update proposal.</p> <p>15/07: No Progress</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: SH and others had commented on Variables [Draft proposal - 20090715].doc. SH stated that fixOnMatch is not needed in dfdl v1.0</p> <p>MB will document how to implement fixOnMatch behaviour with existing function. PL to update proposal</p> <p>12/08: PL to update proposal with SKK examples.</p> <p>17/08: Chase PL for update</p>
044	<p>13/05: Bidi</p> <p>20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support.</p> <p>27/05: Bidi is supported so will be needed in dfdl v1</p> <p>03/06: No Progress</p> <p>09/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: AP started investigation and documented issues. Suggest do whatever XML does.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress</p>

	<p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: AP has been in touch with IBM bidi experts.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>17/09: AP has been in touch with WTX and IBM experts. Support will cover</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Specifying bidi string in DFDL schema, 2) Representaion in the infoset 3) bidi propeties to describe instance data, including applicability to syntax elements
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p> <p>09/06: Progress but not discussed</p> <p>17/06: Discussed briefly</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: No Progress</p> <p>15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: No Progress</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases)</p> <p>15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>05/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>12/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>19/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
051	<p>Scoping rules.</p> <p>MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns</p> <p>17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion</p> <p>24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proosal</p> <p>24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review</p> <p>08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: AP will document new syntax rules.</p>
054	<p>ICU DecimalNumber/ Calendar behaviour</p> <p>15/07: No progress</p> <p>29/07: No Progress.</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. This action is to discover and document ICU behaviour. DFDL will do whatever ICU does.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/09: More examples of inconsistent behaviour discovered</p>
055	<p>Document which properties can take an expression</p> <p>12/08: AP has distributed proposed list of properties and wording</p> <p>19/08: SH to review proposal</p>
056	<p>resolve lenghtKind=bits including fillbytes</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: No Progress</p>
057	Decide semantics and enumeration for 'parsed' occursCountKind

058	Should dfdl:initiatedContent be discriminating?
-----	---

Closed actions :

026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this</p> <p>22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. related to Action 028</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: Still a number of aspects to be decided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Composition - Does the envelope and payload need to be defined in the same schema or should they be dynamically bound at runtime? - Composition- How is a variable payload specified. Choice or xs:any; New action raised to discuss xs:any - extracting dynamic syntax from data. Covered by action 029 valuecalc. <p>03/06: Dynamic runtime binding will not be supported.</p> <p>SH investigating use of variables to enable standalone and use in envelope of global element.</p> <p>09/06: Payload should be specified using a choice rather than xs:any</p> <p>17/06: SH still working on example using variables</p> <p>24/06: SH to document how property list satisfies uses cases.</p> <p>01/07: SH to document how property list satisfies uses cases. PL looking at variable also. MB suggested modelling first separator as data for use case 3.</p> <p>15/07: Action 042 on variables now includes examples of envelopes and payloads. SH will also circulate what he has agreed with WTX team.</p> <p>29/07: no progress</p> <p>05/08: see action 042</p> <p>12/08: see action 042</p> <p>19/08: As fixOnMatch is no longer required in dfdl v1, Envelopes/payloads is completely covered by action 042 Variables. Closed</p>
-----	--

Work items:

No	Item	target version	status
003	Variables (from action 042)	036	awa
005	Improvements on property descriptions		not
006	Envelopes and Payloads (from action 026)	036	awa and
007	valueCalc (from action 029)	036	ens
0	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are		awa

1 1	separate) (from action 045)		
0 1 2	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
0 3 3	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	036	ens
0 3 6	Update dfdl schema with change properties		
0 3 8	Improve length section including bit handling		not
0 4 2	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM		not
0 5 1	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	036	awa
0 5 2	add entity for 'one or more white space characters'	036	
0 5 3	name, baseFormat, selector, escapeSchemeRef, textNumberFormatRef, textCalendarFormatRef, binaryCalendarFormatRef attributes only	036	
0 5 4	Add occureCountKind='parsed'	036	
0 5 5	Make dfdl:initiatedConet discriminating	036	

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	12-Aug-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 13-Aug-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 13-Aug-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Aug-12-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Aug-12-2009

Attendees

Mike Beckerle (Oco)

Alan Powell (IBM)

Suman Kalia (IBM)

Apologies

Peter Lambros (IBM)

Steve Hanson (IBM)

Actions discussed and updated below.

1. Scoping element and group reference (Suman)

Suman had emailed some examples of element and group references but these did not follow the proposed new scoping rules and parameterization. Suggest that PL uses these examples when completing Action 042 Variables.

2. New occursCountKind for when number of occurrences can be resolved by parsing.

Agreed that this needs to be added.

Following considered as new enumeration

- 'implicit': rejected. Although dfdl:lengthKind='implicit' for complexTypes meant 'the length of the children' for simpleTypes it has the very strict meaning on used xs:length or xs:maxlength.
- 'delimited' : rejected. dfdl:lengthKind='delimited' uses terminators and separators to determine length rather than initiators or other speculative parsing.
- 'parsed': accepted. Although not ideal it was felt this most described the behaviour.

It was also agreed that it wasn't necessary to add dfdl:initiatedContent fo arrays as for this to work the following element must also be initiated so the containing sequence would have dfdl:initiatedContent

3. Make dfdl:initiatedContent discriminating

It was agreed to extend the meaning of dfdl:initiatedContent to make it discriminating when the content is optional.

Next call 19 August 14:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:00

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify . 20/05: No Progress 27/05: No Progress 03/06: No Progress (low priority) 09/06: No Progress (low priority)

	<p>17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour</p> <p>24/06: no progress</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: no progress</p> <p>29/07: no progress</p> <p>05/08: no progress</p> <p>12/08: no progress</p>
026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this</p> <p>22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. related to Action 028</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: Still a number of aspects to be decided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Composition - Does the envelope and payload need to be defined in the same schema or should they be dynamically bound at runtime? - Composition- How is a variable payload specified. Choice or xs:any; New action raised to discuss xs:any - extracting dynamic syntax from data. Covered by action 029 valuecalc. <p>03/06: Dynamic runtime binding will not be supported.</p> <p>SH investigating use of variables to enable standalone and use in envelope of global element.</p> <p>09/06: Payload should be specified using a choice rather than xs:any</p> <p>17/06: SH still working on example using variables</p> <p>24/06: SH to document how property list satisfies uses cases.</p> <p>01/07: SH to document how property list satisfies uses cases. PL looking at variable also. MB suggested modelling first separator as data for use case 3.</p> <p>15/07: Action 042 on variables now includes examples of envelopes and payloads. SH will also circulate what he has agreed with WTX team.</p> <p>29/07: no progress</p> <p>05/08: see action 042</p> <p>12/08: see action 042</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p> <p>27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>01/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>29/07: no progress (lower priority)</p> <p>05/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>12/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p>

	<p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p> <p>17/06: no change</p> <p>24/06: no change</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>29/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>05/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>12/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification.</p> <p>To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: AP to make proposal</p> <p>27/05: MB proposed differentiating between input and output variables to avoid unnecessary evaluations during parse and unparse. Need to complete rest of variable specification.</p> <p>03/06: Pointed out problem of declaring variables input or output when used to define syntax which is used both times. MB to update proposal to include how variables are set externally and how specific properties such as encoding are set.</p> <p>09/06: SKK to use example to document his proposal</p> <p>17/06: SKK to refine proposal. Other aspects need progress.</p> <p>24/06: SKK proposal discussed but not accepted. PL to document simpler proposal.</p> <p>07/01: PL working on proposal</p> <p>15/07: PL has distributed his proposal. SH, MB and SKK have commented. Broad agreement in principle. Need to agree on better name for dfdl:variable to reflect the annotation's purpose. PL to update proposal.</p> <p>15/07: No Progress</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: SH and others had commented on Variables [Draft proposal - 20090715].doc. SH stated that fixOnMatch is not needed in dfdl v1.0</p> <p>MB will document how to implement fixOnMatch behaviour with existing function. PL to update proposal</p> <p>12/08: PL to update proposal with SKK examples.</p>
044	<p>13/05: Bidi</p> <p>20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support.</p> <p>27/05: Bidi is supported so will be needed in dfdl v1</p> <p>03/06: No Progress</p> <p>09/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p>

	<p>01/07: AP started investigation and documented issues. Suggest do whatever XML does.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: AP has been in touch with IBM bidi experts.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p> <p>09/06: Progress but not discussed</p> <p>17/06: Discussed briefly</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: No Progress</p> <p>15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases)</p> <p>15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>05/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>12/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
051	<p>Scoping rules.</p> <p>MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns</p> <p>17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion</p> <p>24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proosal</p> <p>24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review</p> <p>08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p>
054	<p>ICU DecimalNumber/ Calendar behaviour</p> <p>15/07: No progress</p> <p>29/07: No Progress.</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. This action is to discover and document ICU behaviour. DFDL will do whatever ICU does.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p>
055	<p>Document which properties can take an expression</p> <p>12/08: AP has distributed proposed list of properties and wording</p>
056	<p>resolve lenghtKind=bits including fillbytes</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p>

Closed actions :

Work items:

N o	Item	target version	stat
0 0 3	Variables (from action 042)	036	awa
0 0 5	Improvements on property descriptions		not
0 0 6	Envelopes and Payloads (from action 026)	036	awa and
0 0 7	valueCalc (from action 029)	036	ens
0 1 1	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
0 1 2	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
0 3 3	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	036	ens
0 3 6	Update dfdl schema with change properties		
0 3 8	Improve length section including bit handling		not
0 4 2	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM		not
0 5 1	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	036	awa
0 5 2	add entity for 'one or more white space characters'	036	
0 5 3	name, baseFormat, selector, escapeSchemeRef, textNumberFormatRef, textCalendarFormatRef, binaryCalendarFormatRef attributes only	036	
0 5 4	Add occureCountKind='parsed'	036	
0 5 5	Make dfdl:initiatedConet discriminating	036	

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	05-Aug-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 12-Aug-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 12-Aug-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Aug-05-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Aug-05-2009

Attendees

Mike Beckerle (Oco)

Alan Powell (IBM)

Apologies

Peter Lambros (IBM)

Suman Kalia (IBM)

Steve Hanson (IBM)

Actions discussed and updated below.

Discussed

1) Properties that can take expressions

- identification of all such properties

- wording to use when describing them

Agreed to be conservative and limit number of properties that can take expressions AP to document.

2) WSP entity

- spec does not match WTX equivalent, is this intentional?
- if yes then needs WSP+OWSP to handle 'at least one white space char'
- if no then don't have an entity for 'any single white space char'

Agreed to add new entity for 'one or more white space characters'

3) Spec says the format 'ref' and selector attributes must be expressed as an attribute since they are not a representation property.

- should this be also applicable for properties that are not representation but related to name and reference (QName types):

name, baseFormat, selector, escapeSchemeRef, textNumberFormatRef, textCalendarFormatRef, binaryCalendarFormatRef?

Agreed these properties should be attributes only

4) dfdl:fillByte and what it means when bits are involved

- part of the wider bit discussion

Next call 12 August 14:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:00

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
055	Document which properties can take an expression
056	resolve lengthKind=bits including fillbytes

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify. 20/05: No Progress 27/05: No Progress 03/06: No Progress (low priority) 09/06: No Progress (low priority)

	<p>17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour</p> <p>24/06: no progress</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: no progress</p> <p>29/07: no progress</p> <p>05/08: no progress</p>
026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this</p> <p>22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. related to Action 028</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: Still a number of aspects to be decided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Composition - Does the envelope and payload need to be defined in the same schema or should they be dynamically bound at runtime? - Composition- How is a variable payload specified. Choice or xs:any; New action raised to discuss xs:any - extracting dynamic syntax from data. Covered by action 029 valuecalc. <p>03/06: Dynamic runtime binding will not be supported.</p> <p>SH investigating use of variables to enable standalone and use in envelope of global element.</p> <p>09/06: Payload should be specified using a choice rather than xs:any</p> <p>17/06: SH still working on example using variables</p> <p>24/06: SH to document how property list satisfies uses cases.</p> <p>01/07: SH to document how property list satisfies uses cases. PL looking at variable also. MB suggested modelling first separator as data for use case 3.</p> <p>15/07: Action 042 on variables now includes examples of envelopes and payloads. SH will also circulate what he has agreed with WTX team.</p> <p>29/07: no progress</p> <p>05/08: see action 042</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p> <p>27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>01/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>29/07: no progress (lower priority)</p> <p>05/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XMI</p>

	<p>Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <p>a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd)</p> <p>b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models</p> <p>c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0)</p> <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p> <p>17/06: no change</p> <p>24/06: no change</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>29/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>05/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification.</p> <p>To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: AP to make proposal</p> <p>27/05: MB proposed differentiating between input and output variables to avoid unnecessary evaluations during parse and unparse. Need to complete rest of variable specification.</p> <p>03/06: Pointed out problem of declaring variables input or output when used to define syntax which is used both times. MB to update proposal to include how variables are set externally and how specific properties such as encoding are set.</p> <p>09/06: SKK to use example to document his proposal</p> <p>17/06: SKK to refine proposal. Other aspects need progress.</p> <p>24/06: SKK proposal discussed but not accepted. PL to document simpler proposal.</p> <p>07/01: PL working on proposal</p> <p>15/07: PL has distributed his proposal. SH, MB and SKK have commented. Broad agreement in principle. Need to agree on better name for dfdl:variable to reflect the annotation's purpose. PL to update proposal.</p> <p>15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: SH and others had commented on Variables [Draft proposal - 20090715].doc. SH stated that fixOnMatch is not needed in dfdl v1.0</p> <p>MB will document how to implement fixOnMatch behaviour with existing function. PL to update proposal</p>
044	<p>13/05: Bidi</p> <p>20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support.</p> <p>27/05: Bidi is supported so will be needed in dfdl v1</p> <p>03/06: No Progress</p> <p>09/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: AP started investigation and documented issues. Suggest do whatever XML does.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: AP has been in touch with IBM bidi experts.</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p>

	27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call 03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated 09/06: Progress but not discussed 17/06: Discussed briefly 24/06: No Progress 01/07: No Progress 15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way. 29/07: No Progress 05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules.
049	20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas 03/06: not discussed 24/06: No Progress 24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases) 15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide. 29/07: No Progress (lower priority) 05/08: No Progress (lower priority)
051	Scoping rules. MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns 17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion 24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proosal 24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review 08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters. 15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up. 29/07: No Progress 05/08: No Progress (lower priority)
054	ICU DecimalNumber/ Calendar behaviour 15/07: No progress 29/07: No Progress. 05/08: No Progress. This action is to discover and document ICU behaviour. DFDL will do whatever ICU does.
055	Document which properties can take an expression
056	resolve lenghtKind=bits including fillbytes

Closed actions :

Work items:

N o	Item	target version	stat
003	Variables (from action 042)	036	awa
005	Improvements on property descriptions		not
000	Envelopes and Payloads (from action 026)	036	awa and

6			
007	valueCalc (from action 029)	036	ens
011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
012	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
033	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	036	ens
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties		
038	Improve length section including bit handling		not
042	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM		not
051	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	036	awa
052	add entity for 'one or more white space characters'	036	
053	name, baseFormat, selector, escapeSchemeRef, textNumberFormatRef, textCalendarFormatRef, binaryCalendarFormatRef attributes only	036	

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	29-Jul-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 05-Aug-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 05-Aug-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , July-29-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , July-29-2009

Attendees

Steve Hanson (IBM)

Alan Powell (IBM)

Apologies

Peter Lambros (IBM)

Suman Kalia (IBM)

Mike Beckerle (Oco)

Actions discussed and updated below.

Discussed

- 1) Properties that can take expressions
 - identification of all such properties
 - wording to use when describing them

- 2) WSP entity

- spec does not match WTX equivalent, is this intentional?
- if yes then needs WSP+OWSP to handle 'at least one white space char'
- if no then don't have an entity for 'any single white space char'

3) Spec says the format 'ref' and selector attributes must be expressed as an attribute since they are not a representation property.

- should this be also applicable for properties that are not representation but related to name and reference (QName types):

name, baseFormat, selector, escapeSchemeRef, textNumberFormatRef, textCalendarFormatRef, binaryCalendarFormatRef?

4) dfdl:fillByte and what it means when bits are involved

- part of the wider bit discussion

Next call 5 August 14:00 UK

Meeting closed , 14:40

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	<p>AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme</p> <p>10/9: Not allocated yet</p> <p>17/9: No update</p> <p>24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions</p> <p>22/10: No progress</p> <p>16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed</p> <p>21/1: add locale,</p> <p>04/02: changed from locale to specific properties</p> <p>18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour.</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify.</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour</p> <p>24/06: no progress</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: no progress</p> <p>29/07: no progress</p>
026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this</p> <p>22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. related to Action 028</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: Still a number of aspects to be decided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Composition - Does the envelope and payload need to be defined in the same schema or should they be dynamically bound at runtime? - Composition- How is a variable payload specified. Choice or xs:any; New action raised to discuss xs:any - extracting dynamic syntax from data. Covered by action 029 valuecalc. <p>03/06: Dynamic runtime binding will not be supported.</p> <p>SH investigating use of variables to enable standalone and use in envelope of global element.</p> <p>09/06: Payload should be specified using a choice rather than xs:any</p> <p>17/06: SH still working on example using variables</p> <p>24/06: SH to document how property list satisfies uses cases.</p> <p>01/07: SH to document how property list satisfies uses cases. PL looking at variable also. MB suggested modelling first separator as data for use case 3.</p>

	<p>15/07: Action 042 on variables now includes examples of envelopes and payloads. SH will also circulate what he has agreed with WTX team.</p> <p>29/07: no progress</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p> <p>27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>01/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>29/07: no progress (lower priority)</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p> <p>17/06: no change</p> <p>24/06: no change</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>29/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification.</p> <p>To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: AP to make proposal</p> <p>27/05: MB proposed differentiating between input and output variables to avoid unnecessary evaluations during parse and unparse. Need to complete rest of variable specification.</p> <p>03/06: Pointed out problem of declaring variables input or output when used to define syntax which is used both times. MB to update proposal to include how variables are set externally and how specific properties such as encoding are set.</p>

	<p>09/06: SKK to use example to document his proposal</p> <p>17/06: SKK to refine proposal. Other aspects need progress.</p> <p>24/06: SKK proposal discussed but not accepted. PL to document simpler proposal.</p> <p>07/01: PL working on proposal</p> <p>15/07: PL has distributed his proposal. SH, MB and SKK have commented. Broad agreement in principle. Need to agree on better name for dfdl:variable to reflect the annotation's purpose. PL to update proposal.</p> <p>15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p>
044	<p>13/05: Bidi</p> <p>20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support.</p> <p>27/05: Bidi is supported so will be needed in dfdl v1</p> <p>03/06: No Progress</p> <p>09/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: AP started investigation and documented issues. Suggest do whatever XML does.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p> <p>09/06: Progress but not discussed</p> <p>17/06: Discussed briefly</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: No Progress</p> <p>15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases)</p> <p>15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
051	<p>Scoping rules.</p> <p>MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns</p> <p>17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion</p> <p>24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proposal</p> <p>24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review</p> <p>08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p>
054	<p>ICU DecimalNumber behaviour</p> <p>15/07: No progress</p> <p>29/07: No Progress.</p>

Closed actions :

Work items :

N o	Item	target version	stat
0 0 3	Variables (from action 042)	036	awa
0 0 5	Improvements on property descriptions		not
0 0 6	Envelopes and Payloads (from action 026)	036	awa and
0 0 7	valueCalc (from action 029)	036	ens
0 1 1	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
0 1 2	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
0 3 3	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	036	ens
0 3 6	Update dfdl schema with change properties		
0 3 8	Improve length section including bit handling		not
0 4 2	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM		not
0 5 1	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	036	awa

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	08-Jul-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 16:00

Created by Alan Powell on 06-Jul-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 08-Jul-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , July 7-8 2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Calls , July 7-8 2009

Meeting opened , 14:00 UK

Attendees

Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Peter Lambros (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)

Apologies

Suman Kalia (IBM)

Agenda:

Action 042 Variables .

The uses cases for variables refined to

1. Variable markup - set once from document content (typically near start of document)
2. Variable markup - set (possibly multiple times) based on first usage (eg first instance of separator determines separator character used)
3. Values set externally - eg encoding, byteorder
4. Parameterization of global entity - parameter set as fixed value or as expression
5. Envelope/payload - payload markup/discriminator set by value(s) in envelope

Proposal:

1. Variables defined at schema level
2. A dfdl:variable annotation to create a new instance of a variable. for example dfdl:variable ref=var1.
3. dfdl:set variable to set a value once
4. existing \$var to refer to variables.
5. The scope of a variable is where the instance is created.
6. New instance of a variable hides a previous variable of the same name.

PL documenting

Action 051 Scoping rules .

Simple Types

Further discussion of last weeks recommendation that dfdl annotations should not be allowed on simpleTypes .
Noted that the current scoping rule of the properties on the element taking precedence over properties on the simpleType effectively meant the simpleType properties were ignored as the element would pick up all properties from scope.

It was decided that

1. DFDL annotations will be allowed on simpleTypes
2. The properties on the element and the referenced simpleType will be *merged* . It is a schema definition error if the same property is explicitly specific on both the element and simpleType .
3. Global simpleTypes should not be validated .

Parameterization

Continued to investigate using variable for parameterization. Decided variables, parameters and properties were very similar.

Proposal: Still use variables for parameterization (see above)

AOB

There will be 1 calls next week

Next call 15th July 14:00 UK Scheduled for 2 hours

Meeting closed , 15:00 UK

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed

	<p>22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify.</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour</p> <p>24/06: no progress</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p>
026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this</p> <p>22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. related to Action 028</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: Still a number of aspects to be decided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Composition - Does the envelope and payload need to be defined in the same schema or should they be dynamically bound at runtime? - Composition- How is a variable payload specified. Choice or xs:any; New action raised to discuss xs:any - extracting dynamic syntax from data. Covered by action 029 valueCalc. <p>03/06: Dynamic runtime binding will not be supported.</p> <p>SH investigating use of variables to enable standalone and use in envelope of global element.</p> <p>09/06: Payload should be specified using a choice rather than xs:any</p> <p>17/06: SH still working on example using variables</p> <p>24/06: SH to document how property list satisfies uses cases.</p> <p>01/07: SH to document how property list satisfies uses cases. PL looking at variable also. MB suggested modelling first separator as data for use case 3.</p>
029	<p>MB: valueCalc (output length calculation)</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Action allocated to MB, this is to complete the work started at the Hursley WG F2F meeting.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: MB will have update for next call</p> <p>13/05: MB will have update for next call</p> <p>20/05: Some progress. will be circulated this week</p> <p>27/05: MB circulated proposal and got comments. Will update and review on next call</p> <p>03/06: Discussed proposal. MB to update dealing with uses cases raised. Options include a new lenghtKind='Reference' to make it easier to distinguish from fixed length case. Or use outputLengthCalc to separate calculation of parsing and unparsing length.</p> <p>09/06: SH/AP proposal discussed and MB to document</p> <p>17/06: MB to document proposal.</p> <p>Grammar updated and reviewed. Minor changes needed.</p> <p>24/06: Grammar description was updated and approved. Need to describe new function.</p> <p>01/07: MB to circulate grammar and document new XPATH function</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p>

	<p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p> <p>27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>01/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XMI Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p> <p>17/06: no change</p> <p>24/06: no change</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p>
038	<p>MB: Submit response to OMG RFI for non-XML standardization</p> <p>22/04: First step is for MB to mail the OGF Data Area chair to say that we want to submit</p> <p>29/04: MB has been in contact with OMG and will submit dfdl.</p> <p>06/05: MB has prepared response to OMG. Will send DFDL sepc v033</p> <p>20/05: Response has been sent to OMG based on v034</p> <p>27/05: Awaiting response from OMG.</p> <p>03/06: On hold</p>
042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification.</p> <p>To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: AP to make proposal</p> <p>27/05: MB proposed differentiating between input and output variables to avoid unnecessary evaluations during parse and unparse. Need to complete rest of variable specification.</p> <p>03/06: Pointed out problem of declaring variables input or output when used to define syntax which is used both times. MB to update proposal to include how variables are set externally and how specific properties such as encoding are set.</p> <p>09/06: SKK to use example to document his proposal</p> <p>17/06: SKK to refine proposal. Other aspects need progress.</p> <p>24/06: SKK proposal discussed but not accepted. PL to document simpler proposal.</p> <p>07/01: PL working on proposal</p>

044	13/05: Bidi 20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support. 27/05: Bidi is supported so will be needed in dfdl v1 03/06: No Progress 09/06: No Progress 24/06: No Progress 01/07: AP started investigation and documented issues. Suggest do whatever XML does.
045	20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing 27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call 03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated 09/06: Progress but not discussed 17/06: Discussed briefly 24/06: No Progress 01/07: No Progress
049	20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas 03/06: not discussed 24/06: No Progress 24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases)
051	Scoping rules. MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns 17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion 24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proosal 24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review
054	ICU DecimalNumber behaviour

Closed actions :

027	SH: Property precedence tables 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: Two things missing from the existing precedence trees. Firstly, does not show alternates (eg, initiator v initiatorkind). Secondly, need a tree per concrete DFDL object (eg, element). SH to update. 29/04: No progress 06/05: SH is updating tables which will be ready for next call 13/05: SH emailed updated version. AP commented.. See minutes for issues and property changes. 20/05: Updated version circulated. Review before next call and be ready for vote. 27/05: Updated version circulated. more comments raised. 03/06: Further updates to clarify 'core'. Also identified missing design for outputMinLength 17/06: Being updated to include outputMinlength 24/06: Table now in maintenance mode. Move to work item 01/07: closed
052	Discriminator timing property 24/06: Need to add timing property to discriminator 24/06: Agreed. Should default to after. Closed
053	poistion() function 24/06: agreed to add 24/06: Agreed. Closed

Work items:

No	Item	target version	status

003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)		
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)		
006	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008		
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008		
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -		done up to v35
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008 (deferred) ignoreCase added	035	done
011	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)		in progress
012	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan)		not started
027	Calendar schemes	035	done
032	Floating components	035	done
033	Changes from action 020 and 027 - renaming properties etc binNumberCheckPolicy	035	done
035	Remove unorderedInitiated, add initiated content (a041)	035	done
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties (Suman)		
037	Infoset text codepage	035	done
038	Improve length section		
039	Change scoping of simple types (A 046)	035	replace by new scoping rules
040	Document outputMinLength (A027)	035	done
042	mapping of the dfdl infoset to XDM		Not required for V1 specification
043	Document infoset data types (A043)	035	need to add logical to physical mapping
044	non-format scoping rules (A047)	035	done
045	Defer unresolvable choice.	035	done
046	Document properties for syntax ignore case, etc alternative to variable markup	035	done
047	Remove xs:any	035	done
048	Keep precedence tables up to date (SH)	035	done
049	Discriminator timing attribute	035	done
050	position() function	035	done

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	01-Jul-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 03-Jul-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 03-Jul-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , July 1 2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , July 1 2009

Meeting opened , 14:00 UK

Attendees

Mike Beckerle (Oco)

Alan Powell (IBM)

Peter Lambros (IBM)

Apologies

Steve Hanson (IBM)

Suman Kalia (IBM)

Agenda:

1. Go through actions

Actions updated below

Major discussions listed here.

Action 026 Envelopes and Payloads

Use cases expanded to :

1. Input -value of syntax item comes from header and is used in the body
2. Input -value of the syntax item is found in the header and is used in the body but may change if the actual syntax used in the body changes
3. Input - no header. value of syntax item comes from first time used in the body and must be one of a known set and doesn't change.
4. Input - no header, value of syntax item comes from first time used in the body and may be changed if the actual syntax used in a following body changes
5. Output - value of syntax item set in header info set and is used throughout in the body
6. Output - no header. the default value syntax item is used throughout in the body

Alternatively allowing syntax properties to be a list satisfies most of the use cases. SH to document. PL looking at variables.

Action 042 Variables.

The uses cases for variables refined to

1. Variable markup - set once from document content (typically near start of document)
2. Variable markup - set (possibly multiple times) based on first usage (eg first instance of separator determines separator character used)
3. Values set externally - eg encoding, byteorder
4. Parameterization of global entity - parameter set as fixed value or as expression
5. Envelope/payload - payload markup/discriminator set by value(s) in envelope

And the following aspects need to be defined

- Scoping of defineVariable
- naming/namespaces - include/import
- Unparsing
- Variable Type - enums
- Multiple setVariables in loops etc

It was proposed that

1. defineVariable is at schema level only and are global. (though need to go through uses cases to see if local needed also).
2. Variables are name space qualified
3. Variables can be set multiple times (needed for parameterization)

PL to document

Action 051 Scoping rules.

New lexical scoping rules need to cover

1. How parameterization works
2. Global simple types

3. dfdl:hidden

AP had updated scoping presentation with to show the use of variables for parameter passing. Also showed impact on global simple types (dfdl properties not allowed) and dfdl:hidden. Implies that variables need to be set more than once. MB to review.

ICU Decimal Number support .

Investigation of ICU has identified that ICU is very lax when parsing decimal number and doesn't enforce the pattern. This has implications for numberCheckPolicy and lengthKind=implicit.

It looks as though numberCheckPolicy='strict' is not enforceable on parsing. Suggest that we make this an unparsing property.

LengthKind=implicit uses the numberPattern to determine the length of the data. Need to specify that only certain patterns that produce reasonable results will be supported. This length will be used to extract the data before applying the pattern.

AOB

There will be 2 calls next week

Next call 7th and 8th July 14:00 UK Scheduled for 2 hours

Meeting closed , 15:00 UK

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
054	ICU DecimalNumber behaviour

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify. 20/05: No Progress

	<p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour</p> <p>24/06: no progress</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p>
026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this</p> <p>22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. related to Action 028</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: Still a number of aspects to be decided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Composition - Does the envelope and payload need to be defined in the same schema or should they be dynamically bound at runtime? - Composition- How is a variable payload specified. Choice or xs:any; New action raised to discuss xs:any - extracting dynamic syntax from data. Covered by action 029 valuecalc. <p>03/06: Dynamic runtime binding will not be supported.</p> <p>SH investigating use of variables to enable standalone and use in envelope of global element.</p> <p>09/06: Payload should be specified using a choice rather than xs:any</p> <p>17/06: SH still working on example using variables</p> <p>24/06: SH to document how property list satisfies uses cases.</p> <p>01/07: SH to document how property list satisfies uses cases. PL looking at variable also. MB suggested modelling first separator as data for use case 3.</p>
029	<p>MB: valueCalc (output length calculation)</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Action allocated to MB, this is to complete the work started at the Hursley WG F2F meeting.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: MB will have update for next call</p> <p>13/05: MB will have update for next call</p> <p>20/05: Some progress. will be circulated this week</p> <p>27/05: MB circulated proposal and got comments. Will update and review on next call</p> <p>03/06: Discussed proposal. MB to update dealing with uses cases raised. Options include a new lengthKind='Reference' to make it easier to distinguish from fixed length case. Or use outputLengthCalc to separate calculation of parsing and unparsing length.</p> <p>09/06: SH/AP proposal discussed and MB to document</p> <p>17/06: MB to document proposal.</p> <p>Grammar updated and reviewed. Minor changes needed.</p> <p>24/06: Grammar description was updated and approved. Need to describe new function.</p> <p>01/07: MB to circulate grammar and document new XPATH function</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p>

	<p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p> <p>27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>01/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p> <p>17/06: no change</p> <p>24/06: no change</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p>
038	<p>MB: Submit response to OMG RFI for non-XML standardization</p> <p>22/04: First step is for MB to mail the OGF Data Area chair to say that we want to submit</p> <p>29/04: MB has been in contact with OMG and will submit dfdl.</p> <p>06/05: MB has prepared response to OMG. Will send DFDL sepc v033</p> <p>20/05: Response has been sent to OMG based on v034</p> <p>27/05: Awaiting response from OMG.</p> <p>03/06: On hold</p>
042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification.</p> <p>To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: AP to make proposal</p> <p>27/05: MB proposed differentiating between input and output variables to avoid unnecessary evaluations during parse and unparse. Need to complete rest of variable specification.</p> <p>03/06: Pointed out problem of declaring variables input or output when used to define syntax which is used both times. MB to update proposal to include how variables are set externally and how specific properties such as encoding are set.</p> <p>09/06: SKK to use example to document his proposal</p> <p>17/06: SKK to refine proposal. Other aspects need progress.</p> <p>24/06: SKK proposal discussed but not accepted. PL to document simpler proposal.</p> <p>07/01: PL working on proposal</p>
044	<p>13/05: Bidi</p> <p>20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support.</p> <p>27/05: Bidi is supported so will be needed in dfdl v1</p> <p>03/06: No Progress</p> <p>09/06: No Progress</p>

	24/06: No Progress 01/07: AP started investigation and documented issues. Suggest do whatever XML does.
045	20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing 27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call 03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated 09/06: Progress but not discussed 17/06: Discussed briefly 24/06: No Progress 01/07: No Progress
049	20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas 03/06: not discussed 24/06: No Progress 24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases)
051	Scoping rules. MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns 17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion 24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proosal 24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review
054	ICU DecimalNumber behaviour

Closed actions :

027	SH: Property precedence tables 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: Two things missing from the existing precedence trees. Firstly, does not show alternates (eg, initiator v initiatorkind). Secondly, need a tree per concrete DFDL object (eg, element). SH to update. 29/04: No progress 06/05: SH is updating tables which will be ready for next call 13/05: SH emailed updated version. AP commented.. See minutes for issues and property changes. 20/05: Updated version circulated. Review before next call and be ready for vote. 27/05: Updated version circulated. more comments raised. 03/06: Further updates to clarify 'core'. Also identified missing design for outputMinLength 17/06: Being updated to include outputMinlength 24/06: Table now in maintenance mode. Move to work item 01/07: closed
052	Discriminator timing property 24/06: Need to add timing property to discriminator 24/06: Agreed. Should default to after. Closed
053	poistion() function 24/06: agreed to add 24/06: Agreed. Closed

Work items:

No	Item	target version	status
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)		
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)		
006	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008		
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008		mostly

			complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -		under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008		proposal needs writing up
011	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)		in progress
012	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan)		not started
027	Calendar schemes	034	
032	Floating components		
033	Changes from action 020 and 027 - renaming properties etc		
035	Remove unorderedInitiated, add initiated content (a041)		
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties (Suman)		
037	InfoSet text codepage		
038	Improve length section		
039	Change scoping of simple types (A 046)		
040	Document outputMinLength (A027)		
042	mapping of the dfdl infoSet to XDM		Not required for V1 specification
043	Document infoSet data types (A043)		
044	non-format scoping rules (A047)		
045	Defer unresolvable choice.		
046	Document properties for syntax ignore case, etc alternative to variable markup		
047	Remove xs:any		
048	Keep precedence tables up to date (SH)		
049	Discriminator timing attribute		
050	position() function		

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	24-Jun-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 24-Jun-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 25-Jun-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Calls , June 23-24 2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Calls , June 23-24 2009

These minutes cover the series of meetings and calls which took place June 23-24 2009

Meeting opened , 14:00 UK

Attendees

Steve Hanson (IBM)

Suman Kalia (IBM)

Alan Powell (IBM)

Peter Lambros (IBM)

Stephanie Fetzner(IBM)

Apologies

Mike Beckerle (Oco)

Agenda:

1. Go through actions

Actions updated below

Major discussions listed here.

Action 026 Envelopes and Payloads

Continued discussion of using variables to extract syntax from header but also allowing body to be used stand alone.

Use cases expanded to :

1. Input -value of syntax item comes from header and is used in the body
2. Input -value of the syntax item is found in the header and is used in the body but may change if the actual syntax used in the body changes
3. Input - no header. value of syntax item comes from first time used in the body and must be one of a known set and doesn't change.
4. Input - no header, value of syntax item comes from first time used in the body and may be changed if the actual syntax used in a following body changes
5. Output - value of syntax item set in header info set and is used throughout in the body
6. Output - no header. the default value syntax item is used throughout in the body

We considered adding a 'dynamic' property to `defineVariable` to show that if unset when first used the value should be taken from the data. However it was felt that this may be unnecessarily complicated.

Alternatively allowing syntax properties to be a list satisfies most of the use cases. SH to document.

Action 042 Variables.

The uses cases for variables refined to

1. Variable markup - set once from document content (typically near start of document)
2. Variable markup - set (possibly multiple times) based on first usage (eg first instance of separator determines separator character used)
3. Values set externally - eg encoding, byteorder
4. Parameterization of global entity - parameter set as fixed value or as expression
5. Envelope/payload - payload markup/discriminator set by value(s) in envelope

And the following aspects need to be defined

- Scoping of `defineVariable`
- naming/namespaces - include/import
- Unparsing
- Variable Type - enums
- Multiple setVariables in loops etc

SKK had refined his proposal to allow `defineVariable` at schema, `defineFormat` and locally which are analogous to Java global static, private static and local variables. SKK also felt it would be difficult for a dfdl editor to show which variables were available at particular elements. However the rest of the group did not think that the extra complication was needed for the defined use cases.

It was proposed that

1. `defineVariable` is at schema level only and are global. (though need to go through uses cases to see if local needed also).

2. Variables are name space qualified
3. Variables can be set multiple times (needed for parameterization)

PL to document

Action 051 Scoping rules .

New lexical scoping rules need to cover

1. How parameterization works
2. Global simple types
3. dfdl:hidden

We went through examples of using variables for parameterization and it seemed to hang together although the scope of variables meant that the scope of parameters was different from scoping for properties.

To simplify the validation of global simple types it is proposed that there are no dfdl annotations on simple types. The unit of reuse is a global element.

Hidden fields must be defined in a global group declaration. This must be valid but this can be achieved by adding a ref to the same defineFormat as the parent complexType. Tooling could do the 'automatically' when fields are hidden.

The MB presentation will be updated to include these proposals.

Action Unresolvable choices .

It has been agreed to defer unresolvable choices from DFDL V1

Action 052 Discriminator Timing

Currently discriminator timing is implicitly 'after' which means that a component will be parsed before the discriminator is evaluated. However that means that a parsing failure of the component will cause speculative parsing to backtrack even though the discriminator might have evaluated to true and fixed the point of uncertainty. We need to add a timing property to discriminator so that it can be evaluated before parsing when the content of the component is not needed for the evaluation.

Action 053 XPATH position () function

Use cases of arrays of existence flags or field lengths would be simplified if there was a position () function

```
<xs:element name="size" type="xs:int"
    dfdl:lengthKind="explicit" dfdl:length="4"/>
<xs:element name="len" type="xs:int" maxOccurs="unbounded"
    dfdl:occursKind="explicit" dfdl:occursCount="{../size}"
    dfdl:lengthKind="explicit" dfdl:length="4"/>
<xs:element name="image" type="xs:hexBinary" maxOccurs="unbounded"
    dfdl:occursKind="explicit" dfdl:occursCount="{../size}"
    dfdl:lengthKind="explicit" dfdl:length="{../len[fn:position()]}" />
```

This implies that a context is maintained while navigating arrays and the expression is evaluated for every occurrence of an element.

Agreed to add position()

AOB

Note: we can only make one call next week

Next call 1st July 14:00 UK Scheduled for 2 hours

Meeting closed , 16:00 UK

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
052	Discriminator timing property 24/06: Need to add timing property to discriminator
053	poistion() function 24/06: agreed to add

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	<p>AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme</p> <p>10/9: Not allocated yet</p> <p>17/9: No update</p> <p>24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions</p> <p>22/10: No progress</p> <p>16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed</p> <p>21/1: add locale,</p> <p>04/02: changed from locale to specific properties</p> <p>18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour.</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify.</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour</p> <p>24/06: no progress</p>
026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this</p> <p>22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. related to Action 028</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: Still a number of aspects to be decided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Composition - Does the envelope and payload need to be defined in the same schema or should they be dynamically bound at runtime? - Composition- How is a variable payload specified. Choice or xs:any; New action raised to discuss xs:any - extracting dynamic syntax from data. Covered by action 029 valuecalc. <p>03/06: Dynamic runtime binding will not be supported.</p> <p>SH investigating use of variables to enable standalone and use in envelope of global element.</p> <p>09/06: Payload should be specified using a choice rather than xs:any</p> <p>17/06: SH still working on example using variables</p> <p>24/06: SH to document how property list satisfies uses cases.</p>
027	<p>SH: Property precedence tables</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Two things missing from the existing precedence trees. Firstly, does not show alternates (eg, initiator v initiatorkind). Secondly, need a tree per concrete DFDL object (eg, element). SH to update.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: SH is updating tables which will be ready for next call</p> <p>13/05: SH emailed updated version. AP commented.. See minutes for issues and property changes.</p> <p>20/05: Updated version circulated. Review before next call and be ready for vote.</p> <p>27/05: Updated version circulated. more comments raised.</p> <p>03/06: Further updates to clarify 'core'. Also identified missing design for outputMinLength</p>

	<p>17/06: Being updated to include outputMinlength</p> <p>24/06: Table now in maintenance mode. Move to work item</p>
029	<p>MB: valueCalc (output length calculation)</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Action allocated to MB, this is to complete the work started at the Hursley WG F2F meeting.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: MB will have update for next call</p> <p>13/05: MB will have update for next call</p> <p>20/05: Some progress. will be circulated this week</p> <p>27/05: MB circulated proposal and got comments. Will update and review on next call</p> <p>03/06: Discussed proposal. MB to update dealing with uses cases raised. Options include a new lenghtKind='Reference' to make it easier to distinguish from fixed length case. Or use outputLengthCalc to separate calculation of parsing and unparsing length.</p> <p>09/06: SH/AP proposal discussed and MB to document</p> <p>17/06: MB to document proposal.</p> <p>Grammar updated and reviewed. Minor changes needed.</p> <p>24/06: Grammar description was updated and approved. Need to describe new function.</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p> <p>27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks TBD) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p> <p>17/06: no change</p> <p>24/06: no change</p>

038	<p>MB: Submit response to OMG RFI for non-XML standardization</p> <p>22/04: First step is for MB to mail the OGF Data Area chair to say that we want to submit</p> <p>29/04: MB has been in contact with OMG and will submit dfdl.</p> <p>06/05: MB has prepared response to OMG. Will send DFDL sepc v033</p> <p>20/05: Response has been sent to OMG based on v034</p> <p>27/05: Awaiting response from OMG.</p> <p>03/06: On hold</p>
042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification.</p> <p>To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: AP to make proposal</p> <p>27/05: MB proposed differentiating between input and output variables to avoid unnecessary evaluations during parse and unparse. Need to complete rest of variable specification.</p> <p>03/06: Pointed out problem of declaring variables input or output when used to define syntax which is used both times. MB to update proposal to include how variables are set externally and how specific properties such as encoding are set.</p> <p>09/06: SKK to use example to document his proposal</p> <p>17/06: SKK to refine proposal. Other aspects need progress.</p> <p>24/06: SKK proposal discussed but not accepted. PL to document simpler proposal.</p>
044	<p>13/05: Bidi</p> <p>20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support.</p> <p>27/05: Bidi is supported so will be needed in dfdl v1</p> <p>03/06: No Progress</p> <p>09/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Pseudo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p> <p>09/06: Progress but not discussed</p> <p>17/06: Discussed briefly</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p>
051	<p>Scoping rules.</p> <p>MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns</p> <p>17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion</p> <p>24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proposal</p>
052	<p>Discriminator timing property</p> <p>24/06: Need to add timing property to discriminator</p>
053	<p>position() function</p> <p>24/06: agreed to add</p>

Closed actions :

028	<p>SH: Variable markup</p> <p>08/04: Discussed briefly at end of call, IBM to see whether there any use cases that require recursive use of DFDL.</p> <p>15/04: Use case was distributed and will be discussed on next call.</p> <p>22/04: The use case in question is EDI where the terminating markup for the payload segments is defined in the ISA envelope segment. The markup is modelled as an element of simple type where the allowable markup values are defined as enums on the type. But we need to handle two cases - firstly where the envelope is present, so the value used by the payload is taken from</p>
------------	--

	<p>the envelope. Secondly where only the payload is present. Here we need a way of scanning for all the enum values, and adopting the one we actually find, when parsing. And using a default when unparsing. SH to explore use of a DFDL variable, where the variable has a default, but also has a type that is the same as the markup element - that way we get to use the enums without defining everything twice.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: Progress made and will tie to other actions</p> <p>03/06: General desire to avoid having to introduce variable markup in V1.</p> <p>Proposed having a property to control case behaviour of all syntax (initiator, terminator, separator) rather than separate ones for each. Similar property to 'values' (textZeroRep, textBooleanTrueRep, etc). and allowing lists of values. SH need to solve remaining uses case as described in action 026</p> <p>09/06: SH proposal discussed. ICU questions to be researched</p> <p>17/06: ICU is always case insensitive. SH to update proposal.</p> <p>24/06 Recursive use of dfdl will not be supported in dfdl v1 (except for prefixlengthType). Closed.</p>
050	<p>27/05: xs:any currently limited to initiated text element. Is this sufficient? Should xs:any in its current form be deferred?</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>09/06: Proposed dropping xs:any support</p> <p>17/06: Agreed to defer from DFDL v1 subject to final checks that IBM do not need function.</p> <p>24/06: Not needed by IBM. Closed</p>

Work items:

No	Item	target version	status
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)		
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)		
006	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008		
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008		mostly complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -		under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008		proposal needs writing up
011	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)		in progress
012	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan)		not started
027	Calendar schemes	034	
032	Floating components		

033	Changes from action 020 and 027 - renaming properties etc		
035	Remove unorderedInitiated, add initiated content (a041)		
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties (Suman)		
037	Infoset text codepage		
038	Improve length section		
039	Change scoping of simple types (A 046)		
040	Document outputMinLength (A027)		
042	mapping of the dfdl infoset to XDM		Not required for V1 specification
043	Document infoset data types (A043)		
044	non-format scoping rules (A047)		
045	Defer unresolvable choice.		
046	Document properties for syntax ignore case, etc alternative to variable markup		
047	Remove xs:any		

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	17-Jun-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 16:00

Created by Alan Powell on 18-Jun-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 18-Jun-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Calls , June 16-17 2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Calls , June 16-17 2009

These minutes cover the series of meetings and calls which took place June 16-17 2009

Meeting opened , 14:00 UK

Attendees

Steve Hanson (IBM)
Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Peter Lambros (IBM)

Apologies

Agenda:

Action 028 Variable Markup / Recursive use of DFDL

As decided on last calls recursive use of DFDL will not be supported in DFDL v1

The uses cases are satisfied as follows:

a) Case insensitivity of data (eg, true & TRUE for text boolean)

A new property that indicates the case sensitivity of representation data values. Note: this property will not effect calendar values, such as Monday, which will always be case insensitive.

b) Case insensitivity of markup (eg, hdr & HDR for initiator)

A new property that indicates the case sensitivity of all markup on a component.

c) Different possible values for non-white space markup (eg, @ and # for separator)

Markup properties will allow a list of values

d) Different possible values for data (eg, true & yes for text boolean)

Value properties will allow a list of values

e) Encoding of markup different to encoding of data (eg, initiator and terminator different to data)

The markup properties must be put on a wrapping xs:sequence and controlled by the xs:sequence's encoding property.

Action 042 Variables.

The uses cases for variables are

1. Extracting syntax data fields
2. As an indicator to identify Payload
3. As an easier way to set bits in bitmap
4. As the way dfdl properties can be set from outside the parser.

And the following aspects need to be defined

- Scoping of defineVariable
- naming/namespaces - include/import
- Unparsing
- Variable Type - enums
- Multiple setVariables in loops etc

SKK documented his proposal to define the scope of variables by defining them in a defineFormat annotation.

Variables are in scope when the defineFormat is referenced in addition to existing scoping rules. While it seems attractive to group variable definitions there was concern that it is changing the semantics of defineFormat and making it incompatible with the other definexxx annotations. SKK to refine proposal.

Other aspects of variable still to be resolved.

Action 051 Implement concerns with current scoping rules .

MB proposed a new syntax for defining parameters that identified which properties can be overridden. Concern at the complexity. SH proposed using existing variables.

Discussion on how overriding should work with simple types. Options :

1. Existing rules. Simple types must be completely valid
2. Disallow dfdl annotations on simple types.

3. Only allow 'value representation' properties which must be completely valid.

Next call 23 and 24th June 14:00 UK Scheduled for 2 hours

Meeting closed , 16:00 UK

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

--	--

No	Action
012	<p>AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme</p> <p>10/9: Not allocated yet</p> <p>17/9: No update</p> <p>24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions</p> <p>22/10: No progress</p> <p>16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed</p> <p>21/1: add locale,</p> <p>04/02: changed from locale to specific properties</p> <p>18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour.</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify.</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour</p>
026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this</p> <p>22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. related to Action 028</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: Still a number of aspects to be decided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Composition - Does the envelope and payload need to be defined in the same schema or should they be dynamically bound at runtime? - Composition- How is a variable payload specified. Choice or xs:any; New action raised to discuss xs:any - extracting dynamic syntax from data. Covered by action 029 valuecalc. <p>03/06: Dynamic runtime binding will not be supported.</p> <p>SH investigating use of variables to enable standalone and use in envelope of global element.</p> <p>09/06: Payload should be specified using a choice rather than xs:any</p> <p>17/06: SH still working on example using variables</p>
027	<p>SH: Property precedence tables</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Two things missing from the existing precedence trees. Firstly, does not show alternates (eg, initiator v initiatorkind). Secondly, need a tree per concrete DFDL object (eg, element). SH to update.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: SH is updating tables which will be ready for next call</p> <p>13/05: SH emailed updated version. AP commented.. See minutes for issues and property changes.</p> <p>20/05: Updated version circulated. Review before next call and be ready for vote.</p> <p>27/05: Updated version circulated. more comments raised.</p> <p>03/06: Further updates to clarify 'core'. Also identified missing design for outputMinLength</p> <p>17/06: Being updated to include outputMinlength</p>
028	<p>SH: Variable markup</p> <p>08/04: Discussed briefly at end of call, IBM to see whether there any use cases that require recursive use of DFDL.</p>

	<p>15/04: Use case was distributed and will be discussed on next call.</p> <p>22/04: The use case in question is EDI where the terminating markup for the payload segments is defined in the ISA envelope segment. The markup is modelled as an element of simple type where the allowable markup values are defined as enums on the type. But we need to handle two cases - firstly where the envelope is present, so the value used by the payload is taken from the envelope. Secondly where only the payload is present. Here we need a way of scanning for all the enum values, and adopting the one we actually find, when parsing. And using a default when unparsing. SH to explore use of a DFDL variable, where the variable has a default, but also has a type that is the same as the markup element - that way we get to use the enums without defining everything twice.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: Progress made and will tie to other actions</p> <p>03/06: General desire to avoid having to introduce variable markup in V1.</p> <p>Proposed having a property to control case behaviour of all syntax (initiator, terminator, separator) rather than separate ones for each. Similar property to 'values' (textZeroRep, textBooleanTrueRep, etc). and allowing lists of values. SH need to solve remaining uses case as described in action 026</p> <p>09/06: SH proposal discussed. ICU questions to be researched</p> <p>17/06: ICU is always case insensitive. SH to update proposal.</p>
029	<p>MB: valueCalc (output length calculation)</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Action allocated to MB, this is to complete the work started at the Hursley WG F2F meeting.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: MB will have update for next call</p> <p>13/05: MB will have update for next call</p> <p>20/05: Some progress. will be circulated this week</p> <p>27/05: MB circulated proposal and got comments. Will update and review on next call</p> <p>03/06: Discussed proposal. MB to update dealing with uses cases raised. Options include a new lenghtKind='Reference' to make it easier to distinguish from fixed length case. Or use outputLengthCalc to separate calculation of parsing and unparsing length.</p> <p>09/06: SH/AP proposal discussed and MB to document</p> <p>17/06: MB to document proposal.</p> <p>Grammar updated and reviewed. Minor changes needed.</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p> <p>27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XMI</p>

	<p>Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <p>a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd)</p> <p>b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models</p> <p>c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0)</p> <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p> <p>17/06: no change</p>
038	<p>MB: Submit response to OMG RFI for non-XML standardization</p> <p>22/04: First step is for MB to mail the OGF Data Area chair to say that we want to submit</p> <p>29/04: MB has been in contact with OMG and will submit dfdl.</p> <p>06/05: MB has prepared response to OMG. Will send DFDL sepc v033</p> <p>20/05: Response has been sent to OMG based on v034</p> <p>27/05: Awaiting response from OMG.</p> <p>03/06: On hold</p>
042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification.</p> <p>To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: AP to make proposal</p> <p>27/05: MB proposed differentiating between input and output variables to avoid unnecessary evaluations during parse and unparse. Need to complete rest of variable specification.</p> <p>03/06: Pointed out problem of declaring variables input or output when used to define syntax which is used both times. MB to update proposal to include how variables are set externally and how specific properties such as encoding are set.</p> <p>09/06: SKK to use example to document his proposal</p> <p>17/06: SKK to refine proposal. Other aspects need progress.</p>
044	<p>13/05: Bidi</p> <p>20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support.</p> <p>27/05: Bidi is supported so will be needed in dfdl v1</p> <p>03/06: No Progress</p> <p>09/06: No Progress</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Pseudo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p> <p>09/06: Progress but not discussed</p> <p>17/06: Discussed briefly</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p>
050	<p>27/05: xs:any currently limited to initiated text element. Is this sufficient? Should xs:any in its current form be deferred?</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>09/06: Proposed dropping xs:any support</p> <p>17/06: Agreed to defer from DFDL v1 subject to final checks that IBM do not need function.</p>
051	<p>Scoping rules.</p> <p>MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns</p> <p>17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion</p>

Closed actions :

043	13/05: Types in the info set. Currently info set types have defined value space but that implies a parser would have to validate input. Is this correct? 20/05: SH No progress 27/05: No Progress 03/06: No Progress 09/06: SH proposed staying with XML built-in types. Closed 17/06 closed
047	20/05 AP: Scoping for non-format annotations 27/05: Discussed briefly. AP to distribute 03/06: Proposal discussed briefly. Will be updated. 09/06: Doc emailed. Awaiting outcome of variable to define/set variable rules. 17/06: Closed. Move to work item. Will be updated when variables resolved.
048	20/05: AP investigate Restart 27/05: Suggest RESTART is not part of the scope for DFDL. 03/06: not discussed 09/06: Closed

Work items :

No	Item	target version	status
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)		
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)		
006	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008		
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008		mostly complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -		under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008		proposal needs writing up
011	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)		in progress
012	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan)		not started
0	Calendar schemes	034	

2 7			
0 3 2	Floating components		
0 3 3	Changes from action 020 and 027 - renaming properties etc		
0 3 5	Remove unorderedInitiated, add initiated content (a041)		
0 3 6	Update dfdl schema with change properties (Suman)		
0 3 7	InfoSet text codepage		
0 3 8	Improve length section		
0 3 9	Change scoping of simple types (A 046)		
0 4 0	Document outputMinLength (A027)		
0 4 2	mapping of the dfdl infoSet to XDM		Not required for V1 specification
0 4 3	Document infoSet data types (A043)		
0 4 4	non-format scoping rules (A047)		

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	10-Jun-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 16:00

Created by Alan Powell on 10-Jun-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 11-Jun-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Calls , June 8-10 2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Calls , June 8-10 2009

These minutes cover the series of meetings and calls which took place June 8-10 2009

Meeting opened , 14:00 UK

Attendees

Steve Hanson (IBM)

Mike Beckerle (Oco)

Suman Kalia (IBM)

Alan Powell (IBM)

Stephanie Fetzner (IBM)

Apologies

Agenda:

Action 026 Envelopes and payloads

It is expected that an `xs:choice` will be the way that payloads are defined in an envelope. `xs:any` support, as currently defined is not sufficient for this purpose (see action 050). There will be no support for dynamic binding of envelope and payload at runtime.

Markup define in the data is covered under action 042 Variables

Action 027 Property Precedence

Tables are being updated to incorporate recent decisions.

Action 028 Variable Markup

The uses cases for variable markup are:

- a) Case insensitivity of data (eg, true & TRUE for text boolean)
- b) Case insensitivity of markup (eg, hdr & HDR for initiator)
- c) Different possible values for non-white space markup (eg, @ and # for separator)
- d) Different possible values for data (eg, true & yes for text boolean)
- e) Encoding of markup different to encoding of data (eg, initiator and terminator different to data)

SH proposed a solution to each of these that did not require variable markup see email 9/6/2009. After discussion so minor changes were agreed and will be documented. Variable markup will not be supported in DFDL v1

Action 029 valueCalc

SH and AP proposed that a new xpath function (or new parameter on `dfdl:length`) that gave the representation length of an element without padding or truncation being applied allowed all the uses cases to be supported. The meaning of the various `lengthKinds` is unchanged. In particular `lengthKind='explicit'` always gets the length from the `dfdl:length` property on parsing and unparsing even when it is an expression. If the expression gets the length from a previous data field then the new function can be used to ensure that the field contains the correct length.

MB to update description

MB to update grammar diagrams to add padding fields.

Action 042 Variables.

The uses cases for variables are

1. Extracting syntax data fields
2. As an indicator to identify Payload
3. As an easier way to set bits in bitmap
4. As the way `dfdl` properties can be set from outside the parser.

And the following aspects need to be defined

- Scoping of `defineVariable`
- naming/namespaces - include/import
- Unparsing
- Variable Type - enums
- Multiple `setVariables` in loops etc

SKK proposed scoping by putting `dfdl:defineVariable` within a `dfdl:defineFormat`. Will update the file path example to illustrate the design.

Action 043 Types in the infoSet .

It was agreed that the types in the infoset will be schema the built-in types. Sufficient validation occurs to ensure the data can be converted to the built-in type. Rules have been defined the valid data representations for each built-in type.

Action 042 Scoping for non -format annotations

Scoping rules have been defined and agreed. Awaiting the resolution of defineVariable discussion

Action 050 xs:any Support

The support for xs:any is currently limited to allowing initiated string fields which is very limited . Support should be either dropped or extended to allow complex content. It is proposed that xs:any is dropped from dfdl V1.

Implement concerns with current scoping rules .

Concerns have been raised that the current scoping rules make it difficult to design good implementations . In particular it is difficult for an editor to be able to should which dfdl properties are set on an element without extensive tree walking. A dfdl schema validator would not be able to tell the context where global components where reused to global components would have to be valid in their own right. A number of possible solutions were discussed including removing scoping and introducing dfdl :schema wide defaults. A proposal to keep scoping but modify the rules was the favoured option. MB to document.

Next call 16 and 17th June 14:00 UK Scheduled for 2 hours

Meeting closed , 16:30 UK

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
051	Scoping rules. MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify.

	<p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (low priority)</p>
026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this</p> <p>22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. related to Action 028</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: Still a number of aspects to be decided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Composition - Does the envelope and payload need to be defined in the same schema or should they be dynamically bound at runtime? - Composition- How is a variable payload specified. Choice or xs:any; New action raised to discuss xs:any - extracting dynamic syntax from data. Covered by action 029 valuecalc. <p>03/06: Dynamic runtime binding will not be supported.</p> <p>SH investigating use of variables to enable standalone and use in envelope of global element.</p> <p>09/06: Payload should be specified using a choice rather than xs:any</p>
027	<p>SH: Property precedence tables</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Two things missing from the existing precedence trees. Firstly, does not show alternates (eg, initiator v initiatorkind). Secondly, need a tree per concrete DFDL object (eg, element). SH to update.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: SH is updating tables which will be ready for next call</p> <p>13/05: SH emailed updated version. AP commented.. See minutes for issues and property changes.</p> <p>20/05: Updated version circulated. Review before next call and be ready for vote.</p> <p>27/05: Updated version circulated. more comments raised.</p> <p>03/06: Further updates to clarify 'core'. Also identified missing design for outputMinLength</p> <p>09/06:</p>
028	<p>SH: Variable markup</p> <p>08/04: Discussed briefly at end of call, IBM to see whether there any use cases that require recursive use of DFDL.</p> <p>15/04: Use case was distributed and will be discussed on next call.</p> <p>22/04: The use case in question is EDI where the terminating markup for the payload segments is defined in the ISA envelope segment. The markup is modelled as an element of simple type where the allowable markup values are defined as enums on the type. But we need to handle two cases - firstly where the envelope is present, so the value used by the payload is taken from the envelope. Secondly where only the payload is present. Here we need a way of scanning for all the enum values, and adopting the one we actually find, when parsing. And using a default when unparsing. SH to explore use of a DFDL variable, where the variable has a default, but also has a type that is the same as the markup element - that way we get to use the enums without defining everything twice.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: Progress made and will tie to other actions</p> <p>03/06: General desire to avoid having to introduce variable markup in V1.</p> <p>Proposed having a property to control case behaviour of all syntax (initiator,</p>

	<p>terminator,separator) rather than separate ones for each. Similar property to 'values' (textZeroRep, textBooleanTrueRep, etc). and allowing lists of values. SH need to solve remaining uses case as described in action 026</p> <p>09/06: SH proposal discussed. ICU questions to be researched</p>
029	<p>MB: valueCalc (output length calculation)</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Action allocated to MB, this is to complete the work started at the Hursley WG F2F meeting.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: MB will have update for next call</p> <p>13/05: MB will have update for next call</p> <p>20/05: Some progress. will be circulated this week</p> <p>27/05: MB circulated proposal and got comments. Will update and review on next call</p> <p>03/06: Discussed proposal. MB to update dealing with uses cases raised. Options include a new lenghtKind='Reference' to make it easier to distinguish from fixed length case. Or use outputLengthCalc to separate calculation of parsing and unparsing length.</p> <p>09/06: SH/AP proposal discussed and MB to document</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p> <p>27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p>
038	<p>MB: Submit response to OMG RFI for non-XML standardization</p> <p>22/04: First step is for MB to mail the OGF Data Area chair to say that we want to submit</p> <p>29/04: MB has been in contact with OMG and will submit dfdl.</p> <p>06/05: MB has prepared response to OMG. Will send DFDL sepc v033</p>

	20/05: Response has been sent to OMG based on v034 27/05: Awaiting response from OMG. 03/06: On hold
042	MB: Complete variable specification. To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally . Must be a known variable name. 06/05: No progress 20/05: AP to make proposal 27/05: MB proposed differentiating between input and output variables to avoid unnecessary evaluations during parse and unparse. Need to complete rest of variable specification. 03/06: Pointed out problem of declaring variables input or output when used to define syntax which is used both times. MB to update proposal to include how variables are set externally and how specific properties such as encoding are set. 09/06: SKK to use example to document his proposal
043	13/05: Types in the infoset. Currently infoset types have defined value space but that implies a parser would have to validate input. Is this correct? 20/05: SH No progress 27/05: No Progress 03/06: No Progress 09/06: SH proposed staying with XML built-in types. Closed
044	13/05: Bidi 20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support. 27/05: Bidi is supported so will be needed in dfdl v1 03/06: No Progress 09/06: No Progress
045	20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing 27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call 03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated 09/06: Progress but not discussed
047	20/05 AP: Scoping for non-format annotations 27/05: Discussed briefly . AP to distribute 03/06: Proposal discussed briefly . Will be updated. 09/06: Doc emailed. Awaiting outcome of variable to define/setvariable rules.
048	20/05: AP investigate Restart 27/05: Suggest RESTART is not part of the scope for DFDL. 03/06: not discussed 09/06: Closed
049	20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas 03/06: not discussed
050	27/05: xs:any currently limited to initiated text element. Is this sufficient? Should xs:any in its current form be deferred? 03/06: not discussed 09/06: Proposed dropping xs:any support
051	Scoping rules. MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns

Closed actions :

Work items:

N o	Item	target version	status
0 0 3	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)		
0 0 5	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)		
0 0 6	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008		
0 0 7	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008		mostly comple te
0 0 8	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -		under review
0 0 9	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008		propos al needs writing up
0 1 1	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)		in progres s
0 1 2	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan)		not started
0 2 7	Calendar schemes	034	
0 3 2	Floating components		
0 3 3	Changes from action 020 and 027 - renaming properties etc		
0 3 5	Remove unorderedInitiated, add initiated content (a041)		
0 3 6	Update dfdl schema with change properties (Suman)		
0 3 7	InfoSet text codepage		
0 3 8	Improve length section		
0 3	Change scoping of simple types (A 046)		

9			
0	Document outputMinLength (A027)		
4			
0			
0	mapping of the dfdl infoset to XDM		Not required for V1 specification
4			
2			

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	03-Jun-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 16:00

Created by Alan Powell on 04-Jun-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 04-Jun-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , June-03-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , June-03-2009

Meeting opened , 14:00 UK

Attendees

Steve Hanson (IBM)
Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)

Apologies

Agenda:

1. Go through actions.

Action 26: Envelopes and payloads

Extensive discussion of the file path example.

SH is working on using variables to allow a body structure (global element) to be used either stand alone or wrapped by an envelope.

Agreed that DFDL will not support the dynamic binding of payloads to envelopes at runtime. Both the envelope and payload must be defined (probably using import) in the same dfdl schema.

Action 27 Property precedence

Work on precedence tables highlighted missing design for outputMinLength. AP distributed proposal which used lengthkind to control minimum padding behaviour. Group decided to modify this so that

- outputMinLength was only used on types that did not have a minLength facet
- should document that outputMinLength=0 is the same as turning padding off.

Converted to work item

2. DFDL V1 Workshop

IBM are to make concerted effort over the next 2 weeks to resolve all the actions. Conference calls will be held on the same number at the same time Monday 8th -Wednesday 10th and Tuesday - Wednesday 16th

3. dfdl:textBooleanIgnoreCase

If has been suggested that it would be helpful to ignore the case on textBooleanTrueRep and textBooleanFalseRep. Options are a textBooleanIgnoreCase property or allow a list of values for textBooleanTrue/falseRep

This will be included in Variable markup discussion

Next call 10 June 14:00 UK Scheduled for 2 hours

Meeting closed , 16:15 UK

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify. 20/05: No Progress

	<p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (low priority)</p>
026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this</p> <p>22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. related to Action 028</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: Still a number of aspects to be decided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Composition - Does the envelope and payload need to be defined in the same schema or should they be dynamically bound at runtime? - Composition- How is a variable payload specified. Choice or xs:any; New action raised to discuss xs:any - extracting dynamic syntax from data. Covered by action 029 valuecalc. <p>03/06: Dynamic runtime binding will not be supported.</p> <p>SH investigating use of variables to enable standalone and use in envelope of global element.</p>
027	<p>SH: Property precedence tables</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Two things missing from the existing precedence trees. Firstly, does not show alternates (eg, initiator v initiatorkind). Secondly, need a tree per concrete DFDL object (eg, element). SH to update.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: SH is updating tables which will be ready for next call</p> <p>13/05: SH emailed updated version. AP commented.. See minutes for issues and property changes.</p> <p>20/05: Updated version circulated. Review before next call and be ready for vote.</p> <p>27/05: Updated version circulated. more comments raised.</p> <p>03/06: Further updates to clarify 'core'. Also identified missing design for outputMinLength</p>
028	<p>SH: Variable markup</p> <p>08/04: Discussed briefly at end of call, IBM to see whether there any use cases that require recursive use of DFDL.</p> <p>15/04: Use case was distributed and will be discussed on next call.</p> <p>22/04: The use case in question is EDI where the terminating markup for the payload segments is defined in the ISA envelope segment. The markup is modelled as an element of simple type where the allowable markup values are defined as enums on the type. But we need to handle two cases - firstly where the envelope is present, so the value used by the payload is taken from the envelope. Secondly where only the payload is present. Here we need a way of scanning for all the enum values, and adopting the one we actually find, when parsing. And using a default when unparsing. SH to explore use of a DFDL variable, where the variable has a default, but also has a type that is the same as the markup element - that way we get to use the enums without defining everything twice.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: Progress made and will tie to other actions</p> <p>03/06: General desire to avoid having to introduce variable markup in V1.</p> <p>Proposed having a property to control case behaviour of all syntax (initiator, terminator, separator) rather than separate ones for each. Similar property to 'values' (textZeroRep, textBooleanTrueRep, etc). and allowing lists of values. SH need to solve remaining uses case as described in action 026</p>
029	<p>MB: valueCalc (output length calculation)</p>

	<p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Action allocated to MB, this is to complete the work started at the Hursley WG F2F meeting.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: MB will have update for next call</p> <p>13/05: MB will have update for next call</p> <p>20/05: Some progress. will be circulated this week</p> <p>27/05: MB circulated proposal and got comments. Will update and review on next call</p> <p>03/06: Discussed proposal. MB to update dealing with uses cases raised. Options include a new lenghtKind='Reference' to make it easier to distinguish from fixed length case. Or use outputLengthCalc to separate calculation of parsing and unparsing length.</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p> <p>27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XMI Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p>
038	<p>MB: Submit response to OMG RFI for non-XML standardization</p> <p>22/04: First step is for MB to mail the OGF Data Area chair to say that we want to submit</p> <p>29/04: MB has been in contact with OMG and will submit dfdl.</p> <p>06/05: MB has prepared response to OMG. Will send DFDL sepc v033</p> <p>20/05: Response has been sent to OMG based on v034</p> <p>27/05: Awaiting response from OMG.</p> <p>03/06: On hold</p>
042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification.</p> <p>To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p>

	<p>20/05: AP to make proposal</p> <p>27/05: MB proposed differentiating between input and output variables to avoid unnecessary evaluations during parse and unparse. Need to complete rest of variable specification.</p> <p>03/06: Pointed out problem of declaring variables input or output when used to define syntax which is used both times. MB to update proposal to include how variables are set externally and how specific properties such as encoding are set.</p>
043	<p>13/05: Types in the infoset. Currently infoset types have defined value space but that implies a parser would have to validate input. Is this correct?</p> <p>20/05: SH No progress</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: No Progress</p>
044	<p>13/05: Bidi</p> <p>20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support.</p> <p>27/05: Bidi is supported so will be needed in dfdl v1</p> <p>03/06: No Progress</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p>
047	<p>20/05 AP: Scoping for non-format annotations</p> <p>27/05: Discussed briefly. AP to distribute</p> <p>03/06: Proposal discussed briefly. Will be updated.</p>
048	<p>20/05: AP investigate Restart</p> <p>27/05: Suggest RESTART is not part of the scope for DFDL.</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p>
050	<p>27/05: xs:any currently limited to initiated text element. Is this sufficient? Should xs:any in its current form be deferred?</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p>

Closed actions :

036	<p>SH: Provide use case for floating component in a sequence</p> <p>08/04: Raised</p> <p>15/04: Use case sent and discussed. SH to do further investigation</p> <p>22/04: IBM feedback from WTX team is that alternate suggested ways of modelling the EDI floating NTE segment have significant usability issues. The DFDL principle is that for a problem that can be expressed as two-layered, then two DFDL models are needed. The EDI NTE segment does not fall into this though, as its use is on a per sequence basis. Ongoing.</p> <p>29/04: Agreed that need to be in V1. SH to make a proposal</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: SH has almost completed the proposal</p> <p>27/05: Proposal circulated and approved</p> <p>03/06: Closed</p>
032	<p>DG: Investigate compatibility between DFDL infoset and XDM</p> <p>08/04: No update</p> <p>22/04: No update</p> <p>29/04: No update</p> <p>06/05: DG indicates will have update next week</p> <p>13/05: see minutes</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: No Progress - Dave can you indicate status?</p> <p>03/06: A mapping of the dfdl infoset to XDM needs to be provided. Converted to work item</p>

Work items:

No	Item	target version	status
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)		
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)		
006	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008		
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008		mostly complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -		under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008		proposal needs writing up
011	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)		in progress
012	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan)		not started
027	Calendar schemes	034	
032	Floating components		
033	Changes from action 020 and 027 - renaming properties etc		
035	Remove unorderedInitiated, add initiated content (a041)		
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties (Suman)		
037	Infoset text codepage		
038	Improve length section		

039	Change scoping of simple types (A 046)		
040	Document outputMinLength (A027)		
041	Floating (a036)		
042	mapping of the dfdl infoSet to XDM		Not required for V1 specification

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	27-May-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 28-May-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 28-May-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , May-27-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , May-27-2009

Meeting opened , 14:00 UK

Attendees

Steve Hanson (IBM)
Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)

Apologies

Agenda:

1. Go through actions.

Updated below:

2. Completing DFDL V1

3. AOB

Next call 04 June 14:00 UK Scheduled for 2 hours

Meeting closed , 15:10 UK

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
050	27/05: xs:any currently limited to initiated text element. Is this sufficient? Should xs:any in its current form be deferred?

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	<p>AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme</p> <p>10/9: Not allocated yet</p> <p>17/9: No update</p> <p>24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions</p> <p>22/10: No progress</p> <p>16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed</p> <p>21/1: add locale,</p> <p>04/02: changed from locale to specific properties</p> <p>18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour.</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify.</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p>
026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this</p> <p>22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. related to Action 028</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: Still a number of aspects to be decided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Composition - Does the envelope and payload need to be defined in the same schema or should they be dynamically bound at runtime? - Composition- How is a variable payload specified. Choice or xs:any; New action raised to discuss xs:any - extracting dynamic syntax from data. Covered by action 029 valuecalc.
027	<p>SH: Property precedence tables</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Two things missing from the existing precedence trees. Firstly, does not show alternates (eg, initiator v initiatorkind). Secondly, need a tree per concrete DFDL object (eg, element). SH to update.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: SH is updating tables which will be ready for next call</p> <p>13/05: SH emailed updated version. AP commented.. See minutes for issues and property changes.</p> <p>20/05: Updated version circulated. Review before next call and be ready for vote.</p> <p>27/05: Updated version circulated. more comments raised.</p>
028	<p>SH: Variable markup</p> <p>08/04: Discussed briefly at end of call, IBM to see whether there any use cases that require recursive use of DFDL.</p> <p>15/04: Use case was distributed and will be discussed on next call.</p> <p>22/04: The use case in question is EDI where the terminating markup for the payload segments is defined in the ISA envelope segment. The markup is modelled as an element of simple type where the allowable markup values are defined as enums on the type. But we need to handle two cases - firstly where the envelope is present, so the value used by the payload is taken from the envelope. Secondly where only the payload is present. Here we need a way of scanning for all the enum values, and adopting the one we actually find, when parsing. And using a default when unparsing. SH to explore use of a DFDL variable, where the variable has a default, but also has a type that is the same as the markup element - that way we get to use the enums</p>

	<p>without defining everything twice. 29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. 06/05: No progress 13/05: No progress 20/05: No Progress 27/05: Progress made and will tie to other actions</p>
029	<p>MB: valueCalc (output length calculation) 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: Action allocated to MB, this is to complete the work started at the Hursley WG F2F meeting. 29/04: No progress 06/05: MB will have update for next call 13/05: MB will have update for next call 20/05: Some progress. will be circulated this week 27/05: MB circulated proposal and got comments. Will update and review on next call</p>
032	<p>DG: Investigate compatibility between DFDL infoset and XDM 08/04: No update 22/04: No update 29/04: No update 06/05: DG indicates will have update next week 13/05: see minutes 20/05: No Progress 27/05: No Progress - Dave can you indicate status?</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice. 08/04: In progress within IBM 22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete. 29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK 06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples. 15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator 20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029) 27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
036	<p>SH: Provide use case for floating component in a sequence 08/04: Raised 15/04: Use case sent and discussed. SH to do further investigation 22/04: IBM feedback from WTX team is that alternate suggested ways of modelling the EDI floating NTE segment have significant usability issues. The DFDL principle is that for a problem that can be expressed as two-layered, then two DFDL models are needed. The EDI NTE segment does not fall into this though, as its use is on a per sequence basis. Ongoing. 29/04: Agreed that need to be in V1. SH to make a proposal 06/05: No progress 20/05: SH has almost completed the proposal 27/05: Proposal circulated and approved</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks. 22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that: a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the</p>

	<p>equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0)</p> <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p>
038	<p>MB: Submit response to OMG RFI for non-XML standardization</p> <p>22/04: First step is for MB to mail the OGF Data Area chair to say that we want to submit</p> <p>29/04: MB has been in contact with OMG and will submit dfdl.</p> <p>06/05: MB has prepared response to OMG. Will send DFDL sepc v033</p> <p>20/05: Response has been sent to OMG based on v034</p> <p>27/05: Awaiting response from OMG.</p>
042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification.</p> <p>To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: AP to make proposal</p> <p>27/05: MB proposed differentiating between input and output variables to avoid unnecessary evaluations during parse and unparse. Need to complete rest of variable specification.</p>
043	<p>13/05: Types in the infoset. Currently infoset types have defined value space but that implies a parser would have to validate input. Is this correct?</p> <p>20/05: SH No progress</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p>
044	<p>13/05: Bidi</p> <p>20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support.</p> <p>27/05: Bidi is supported so will be needed in dfdl v1</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Pseudo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p>
047	<p>20/05 AP: Scoping for non-format annotations</p> <p>27/05: Discussed briefly. AP to distribute</p>
048	<p>20/05: AP investigate Restart</p> <p>27/05: Suggest RESTART is not part of the scope for DFDL.</p>
049	20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas
050	27/05: xs:any currently limited to initiated text element. Is this sufficient? Should xs:any in its current form be deferred?

Closed actions :

046	<p>20/05 AP: Document changes to simple type scoping</p> <p>27/05: Closed moved to work item</p>

Work items :

No	Item	target version	status
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)		

005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)		
006	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008		
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008		mostly complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -		under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008		proposal needs writing up
011	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)		in progress
012	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan)		not started
027	Calendar schemes	034	
032	Floating components		
033	Changes from action 020 and 027 - renaming properties etc		
035	Remove unorderedInitiated, add initiated content (a041)		
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties (Suman)		
037	Infoset text codepage		
038	Improve length section		
039	Change scoping of simple types (A 046)		

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	20-May-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 16:00

Created by Alan Powell on 21-May-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 21-May-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , May-20-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , May-20-2009

Meeting opened , 14:00 UK

Attendees

Steve Hanson (IBM)
Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)

Apologies

Dave Glick (drac)

Agenda:

1. Go through actions.

Updated below:

2. Codepage for text items in infoset.

It is proposed that text values in the infoset should be ISO10646.

Agreed

3. Annotations on Top Level element

Highlighted usability problem that the top level element cannot inherit dfdl properties from scope as no complex type has been used yet. A reference to a defineFormat needs to be on both the top element and its complex type. Suggested that could add a defineFormat property that used that defineFormat to set defaults for the schema but that would cause problems with include/import. Solutions seemed worse than the problem so will leave it as it is.

4. Scoping of elements and Types

MB has pointed out a problem with the current scoping rules and proposed that properties on an element should override those on its type.

Discussion on whether an element was an instance of a simpleType or enclosed a simple type. For example if dfdl:initiator on both element and simple type do you get one or two initiators.. Also discussed separating dfdl properties between element and type so that none were common. The need to be able to use XSD simple types directly made this impossible. Decided that an element is an instance of a simple type and that properties on the element override those on the simple type. Noted that this is different from complex type.

Action: AP to document change to simple type scoping rules.

5. Scoping rules for assert/discriminator and other annotations

The scoping rules for non-format annotations are not defined. AP to make a proposal

6. Need for the equivalent of WTX Restart

Restart indicates where in the schema to restart parsing when unable to correctly parse content

Could be viewed as an implementation decision. More investigation needed

7. Built-in Specifications

Spec Section 23 **Built-in Specifications**

TBD: this section gives the names, import URLs for, rep-property definition sets, property definitions, etc. for the built-in named format definitions

The intention is that a small number of built-in specifications are provided for common format styles.

8. AOB

Next call 27 May 14:00 UK Scheduled for 1 hour

Meeting closed , 16:10 UK

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
045	20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing
046	20/05 AP: Document changes to simple type scoping
047	20/05 AP: Scoping for non-format annotations
048	20/05: AP investigate Restart
049	20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify. 20/05: No Progress

026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this</p> <p>22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. related to Action 028</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p>
027	<p>SH: Property precedence tables</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Two things missing from the existing precedence trees. Firstly, does not show alternates (eg, initiator v initiatorkind). Secondly, need a tree per concrete DFDL object (eg, element). SH to update.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: SH is updating tables which will be ready for next call</p> <p>13/05: SH emailed updated version. AP commented.. See minutes for issues and property changes.</p> <p>20/05: Updated version circulated. Review before next call and be ready for vote.</p>
028	<p>SH: Variable markup</p> <p>08/04: Discussed briefly at end of call, IBM to see whether there any use cases that require recursive use of DFDL.</p> <p>15/04: Use case was distributed and will be discussed on next call.</p> <p>22/04: The use case in question is EDI where the terminating markup for the payload segments is defined in the ISA envelope segment. The markup is modelled as an element of simple type where the allowable markup values are defined as enums on the type. But we need to handle two cases - firstly where the envelope is present, so the value used by the payload is taken from the envelope. Secondly where only the payload is present. Here we need a way of scanning for all the enum values, and adopting the one we actually find, when parsing. And using a default when unparsing. SH to explore use of a DFDL variable, where the variable has a default, but also has a type that is the same as the markup element - that way we get to use the enums without defining everything twice.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p>
029	<p>MB: valueCalc (output length calculation)</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Action allocated to MB, this is to complete the work started at the Hursley WG F2F meeting.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: MB will have update for next call</p> <p>13/05: MB will have update for next call</p> <p>20/05: Some progress. will be circulated this week</p>
032	<p>DG: Investigate compatibility between DFDL infoset and XDM</p> <p>08/04: No update</p> <p>22/04: No update</p> <p>29/04: No update</p> <p>06/05: DG indicates will have update next week</p> <p>13/05: see minutes</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p>

	<p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p>
036	<p>SH: Provide use case for floating component in a sequence</p> <p>08/04: Raised</p> <p>15/04: Use case sent and discussed. SH to do further investigation</p> <p>22/04: IBM feedback from WTX team is that alternate suggested ways of modelling the EDI floating NTE segment have significant usability issues. The DFDL principle is that for a problem that can be expressed as two-layered, then two DFDL models are needed. The EDI NTE segment does not fall into this though, as its use is on a per sequence basis. Ongoing.</p> <p>29/04: Agreed that need to be in V1. SH to make a proposal</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: SH has almost completed the proposal</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p>
038	<p>MB: Submit response to OMG RFI for non-XML standardization</p> <p>22/04: First step is for MB to mail the OGF Data Area chair to say that we want to submit</p> <p>29/04: MB has been in contact with OMG and will submit dfdl.</p> <p>06/05: MB has prepared response to OMG. Will send DFDL sepc v033</p> <p>20/05: Response has been sent to OMG based on v034</p>
039	<p>SKK: Approach for creating Schema-For-DFDL xsds.</p> <p>22/04: Resolve issue around multiple declarations needed for DFDL properties, perhaps using MB's meta approach</p> <p>29/04: Don't like qualified attributes in long form. SKK to check there are no code gen implications, eg EMF.</p> <p>06/05: SKK will send update by Friday</p> <p>20/05: SKK and MB have produced Schema for DFDL, XSD dfdl subset and examples.. Close</p>
042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification.</p> <p>To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: AP to make proposal</p>
043	<p>13/05: Types in the infoset. Currently infoset types have defined value space but that implies a parser would have to validate input. Is this correct?</p> <p>20/05: SH No progress</p>
044	<p>13/05: Bidi</p> <p>20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support.</p>
045	<p>20/05: AP: Speculative parsing</p>

Closed actions :

039	SKK: Approach for creating Schema-For-DFDL xsds. 22/04: Resolve issue around multiple declarations needed for DFDL properties , perhaps using MB's meta approach 29/04: Don't like qualified attributes in long form. SKK to check there are no code gen implications, eg EMF. 06/05: SKK will send update by Friday 20/05: SKK and MB have produced Schema for DFDL, XSD dfdl subset and examples.. SKK owner of dfdl schema and will update as properties change Closed
040	SH: LengthKind on complex objects. 29/04: All send comment before next call 06/05: See minutes. Agreed to remove lengthKind from sequence and choice. 20/05: Closed moved to workitem
041	AP: UnorderedInitiated 29/04: All: Review for next call 06/05: See minutes: Agreed to generalize to all sequences 20/05: Closed. Move to work item

Work items :

N o	Item	target version	status
0 0 3	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)		
0 0 5	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)		
0 0 6	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008		
0 0 7	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008		mostly comple te
0 0 8	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -		under review
0 0 9	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008		propos al needs writing up
0 1 1	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)		in progres s
0 1 2	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan)		not started

0 2 7	Calendar schemes	034	
0 3 2	Floating components		
0 3 3	Changes from action 020 and 027 - renaming properties etc		
0 3 5	Remove unorderedInitiated, add initiated content (a041)		
0 3 6	Update dfdl schema with change properties (Suman)		
0 3 7	InfoSet text codepage		
0 3 8	Improve length section		

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	13-May-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 14-May-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 14-May-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , May-14-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , May-14-2009

Meeting opened , 14:00 UK

Attendees

Steve Hanson (IBM)
Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Dave Glick (drac)

Apologies

Agenda:

1. Go through actions.

Action 027 Property precedence tables

- 1) Missing property dfdl:textBooleanJustification --added
- 2) What is the rule when the same DFDL properties occur on a xs:simpleType and a xs:element that uses that type? Does this work a) like element/group references (ie, properties combined with element winning) or b) like complex element and its sequence (ie, element and simpleType are considered separate objects)? I don't think section 10 covers this case.
- 3) Should we allow the DFDL nil & default control properties on a simple type? Only on element
- 4) Should we allow DFDL occurs properties on global elements? - No.
- 5) Missing work item to get BiDi properties into shape and incorporated into spec. Should these be grouped, like escape scheme, calendar scheme, etc? Do they apply to calendar and number types? - Action created
- 6) Should dfdl:integerBooleanXXXRep be renamed dfdl:binaryBooleanXXXRep ? - agreed
- 7) We might want to reconsider the name of the new flag dfdl:initiated - it could be read that the xs:sequence itself is initiated rather than its children. - renamed initiatedContent
- 8) Should dfdl:initiated also apply to xs:choice? - yes
- 9) Draft 33 property precedence had dfdl:outputLengthCalc - was removed.

Action 028 Dfdl infoSet and XDM

Discussed DG document. SH commented that document tried to make the dfdl infoSet be XDM rather than be compatible with XDM. DFDL does not need all the complexity in XDM.
Need a mapping between dfdl infoSet and XDM to make sure there are no unnecessary differences. This needs to consider character sets, validation (types for unvalidated data) and arrays

2. Check Work items

- add incorporate DG comments on 033

3. Annotations on Top Level element

Not discussed: Please review before next call

4. Scoping rules for assert/discriminator and other annotations

Not discussed: Please review before next call

5. Comments latest version (034)

Not discussed: Please review before next call

6. AOB

Next call 13 May 14:00 UK

Note: Scheduled for 2 hours

Meeting closed , 15:10 UK

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
043	13/05: Types in the info set. Currently info set types have defined value space but that implies a parser would have to validate input. Is this correct?
044	13/05: Bidi

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood.

	<p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify.</p>
026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this</p> <p>22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. related to Action 028</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p>
027	<p>SH: Property precedence tables</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Two things missing from the existing precedence trees. Firstly, does not show alternates (eg, initiator v initiatorkind). Secondly, need a tree per concrete DFDL object (eg, element). SH to update.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: SH is updating tables which will be ready for next call</p> <p>13/05: SH emailed updated version. AP commented.. See minutes to issues.</p>
028	<p>SH: Variable markup</p> <p>08/04: Discussed briefly at end of call, IBM to see whether there any use cases that require recursive use of DFDL.</p> <p>15/04: Use case was distributed and will be discussed on next call.</p> <p>22/04: The use case in question is EDI where the terminating markup for the payload segments is defined in the ISA envelope segment. The markup is modelled as an element of simple type where the allowable markup values are defined as enums on the type. But we need to handle two cases - firstly where the envelope is present, so the value used by the payload is taken from the envelope. Secondly where only the payload is present. Here we need a way of scanning for all the enum values, and adopting the one we actually find, when parsing. And using a default when unparsing. SH to explore use of a DFDL variable, where the variable has a default, but also has a type that is the same as the markup element - that way we get to use the enums without defining everything twice.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: No progress</p>
029	<p>MB: valueCalc (output length calculation)</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Action allocated to MB, this is to complete the work started at the Hursley WG F2F meeting.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: MB will have update for next call</p> <p>13/05: MB will have update for next call</p>
032	<p>DG: Investigate compatibility between DFDL infoset and XDM</p> <p>08/04: No update</p> <p>22/04: No update</p> <p>29/04: No update</p> <p>06/05: DG indicates will have update next week</p> <p>13/05: see minutes</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to</p>

	<p>respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator . MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p>
036	<p>SH: Provide use case for floating component in a sequence</p> <p>08/04: Raised</p> <p>15/04: Use case sent and discussed. SH to do further investigation</p> <p>22/04: IBM feedback from WTX team is that alternate suggested ways of modelling the EDI floating NTE segment have significant usability issues . The DFDL principle is that for a problem that can be expressed as two-layered, then two DFDL models are needed. The EDI NTE segment does not fall into this though, as its use is on a per sequence basis. Ongoing.</p> <p>29/04: Agreed that need to be in V1. SH to make a proposal</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity . And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this . Note this is equally applicable to XMI Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a)DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p>
038	<p>MB: Submit response to OMG RFI for non-XML standardization</p> <p>22/04: First step is for MB to mail the OGF Data Area chair to say that we want to submit</p> <p>29/04: MB has been in contact with OMG and will submit dfdl.</p> <p>06/05: MB has prepared response to OMG. Will send DFDL sepc v033</p>
039	<p>SKK: Approach for creating Schema-For-DFDL xsds.</p> <p>22/04: Resolve issue around multiple declarations needed for DFDL properties , perhaps using MB's meta approach</p> <p>29/04: Don't like qualified attributes in long form. SKK to check there are no code gen implications, eg EMF.</p> <p>06/05: SKK will send update by Friday</p>
040	<p>SH: LengthKind on complex objects.</p> <p>29/04: All send comment before next call</p> <p>06/05: See minutes. Agreed to remove lengthKind from sequence and choice.</p>
041	<p>AP: UnorderedInitiated</p> <p>29/04: All: Review for next call</p> <p>06/05: See minutes: Agreed to generalize to all sequences</p>
042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification.</p> <p>To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally . Must be a known variable name.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p>
043	<p>13/05: Types in the infoset. Currently infoset types have defined value space but that implies a parser would have to validate input. Is this correct?</p>
044	<p>13/05: Bidi</p>

Closed actions :

020	<p>SH: Resolve packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy</p> <p>22/10: No progress</p> <p>10/12: added how to decide to overpunch and sign position</p> <p>11/02: proposal largely agreed. SH to make minor changes</p> <p>18/02: AP to document unsigned type behaviour</p> <p>25/02: no progress</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: SH to complete last remaining issue, which is the behaviour when logical type is signed/unsigned and the physical type is unsigned/signed.</p> <p>29/04: SH had identified a problem with definition values and types in the infoSet and will email proposal. DG to be asked to accelerate action 032 to see if helps</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: Original problem has been resolved and added to v034. CLOSED</p> <p>Will open new action for signed/unsigned types in the infoSet.</p>

Work items:

No	Item	target version	status
001	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008		deferred
002	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	034	
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)		
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)		
006	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008		
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008		mostly complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -		under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008		proposal needs writing up
010	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 (A033)	034	in progress
011	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)		in progress

012	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan)		not started
025	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	034	added but needs work
026	Remove duration	034	
027	Calendar schemes	034	
028	Validation ranges (A035)	034	
029	Decimals (A020) - document unsigned type behaviour - packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy	034	
030	Remove redundant properties, fix examples. (A036)	034	
031	Specialized annotations	034	
032	Floating components		
033	Changes from action 020 - renaming properties etc		

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	06-May-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 06-May-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 06-May-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , May-06-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , May-06-2009

Meeting opened , 14:00 UK

Attendees

Steve Hanson (IBM)
Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)

Apologies

Dave Glick (drac)

Agenda:

1. Go through actions.
Actions updated below
2. LengthKind on Sequences and choices.

Agreed with proposal to remove lengthKind from sequences and choices.

Discussed whether other properties such as initiator and terminator should also be moved but decided it would introduce too many elements and make the resultant tree deep. Will keep open until SH completes property precedence and will then look at all sequence and choice properties

3. Discuss UnorderedInitated email from SH

Agreed that it was useful to indicate that children of sequences are initiated to enable more helpful error messages to be generated. Agreed to generalize to all sequences not just unordered.

4. InfoSet codepage and encoding

Decided simplest solution is to pick UTF-16

5. AOB

Next version (034) will be available for review on Friday

Next call 13 May 14:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:10 UK

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	<p>AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme</p> <p>10/9: Not allocated yet</p> <p>17/9: No update</p> <p>24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions</p> <p>22/10: No progress</p> <p>16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed</p> <p>21/1: add locale,</p> <p>04/02: changed from locale to specific properties</p> <p>18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour.</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p>
020	<p>SH: Resolve packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy</p> <p>22/10: No progress</p> <p>10/12: added how to decide to overpunch and sign position</p> <p>11/02: proposal largely agreed. SH to make minor changes</p> <p>18/02: AP to document unsigned type behaviour</p> <p>25/02: no progress</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: SH to complete last remaining issue, which is the behaviour when logical type is signed/unsigned and the physical type is unsigned/signed.</p> <p>29/04: SH had identified a problem with definition values and types in the info set and will email proposal. DG to be asked to accelerate action 032 to see if helps</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p>
026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this</p> <p>22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. related to Action 028</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p>
027	<p>SH: Property precedence tables</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Two things missing from the existing precedence trees. Firstly, does not show alternates (eg, initiator v initiator kind). Secondly, need a tree per concrete DFDL object (eg, element). SH to update.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p>

	06/05: SH is updating tables which will be ready for next call
028	<p>SH: Variable markup</p> <p>08/04: Discussed briefly at end of call, IBM to see whether there any use cases that require recursive use of DFDL.</p> <p>15/04: Use case was distributed and will be discussed on next call.</p> <p>22/04: The use case in question is EDI where the terminating markup for the payload segments is defined in the ISA envelope segment. The markup is modelled as an element of simple type where the allowable markup values are defined as enums on the type. But we need to handle two cases - firstly where the envelope is present, so the value used by the payload is taken from the envelope. Secondly where only the payload is present. Here we need a way of scanning for all the enum values, and adopting the one we actually find, when parsing. And using a default when unparsing. SH to explore use of a DFDL variable, where the variable has a default, but also has a type that is the same as the markup element - that way we get to use the enums without defining everything twice.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal.</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p>
029	<p>MB: valueCalc (output length calculation)</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Action allocated to MB, this is to complete the work started at the Hursley WG F2F meeting.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: MB will have update for next call</p>
032	<p>DG: Investigate compatibility between DFDL infoSet and XDM</p> <p>08/04: No update</p> <p>22/04: No update</p> <p>29/04: No update</p> <p>06/05: DG indicates will have update next week</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p>
036	<p>SH: Provide use case for floating component in a sequence</p> <p>08/04: Raised</p> <p>15/04: Use case sent and discussed. SH to do further investigation</p> <p>22/04: IBM feedback from WTX team is that alternate suggested ways of modelling the EDI floating NTE segment have significant usability issues. The DFDL principle is that for a problem that can be expressed as two-layered, then two DFDL models are needed. The EDI NTE segment does not fall into this though, as its use is on a per sequence basis. Ongoing.</p> <p>29/04: Agreed that need to be in V1. SH to make a proposal</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p>

	06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.
038	MB: Submit response to OMG RFI for non-XML standardization 22/04: First step is for MB to mail the OGF Data Area chair to say that we want to submit 29/04: MB has been in contact with OMG and will submit dfdl. 06/05: MB has prepared response to OMG. Will send DFDL sepc v033
039	SKK: Approach for creating Schema-For-DFDL xsds. 22/04: Resolve issue around multiple declarations needed for DFDL properties, perhaps using MB's meta approach 29/04: Don't like qualified attributes in long form. SKK to check there are no code gen implications, eg EMF. 06/05: SKK will send update by Friday
040	SH: LengthKind on complex objects. 29/04: All send comment before next call 06/05: See minutes. Agreed to remove lengthKind from sequence and choice.
041	AP: UnorderedInitiated 29/04: All: Review for next call 06/05: See minutes: Agreed to generalize to all sequences
042	MB: Complete variable specification. To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name. 06/05: No progress

Closed actions :

024	<No owner> String XML type 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: Need to allocate owner. Work is to describe the semantics of using dfdl:representation="xml" to model a well-formed XML fragment in an overall non-XML document described by a DFDL schema. 29/04: As no resource available to progress this action agreed to defer from V1. Will close next week if no objections 06/05: closed

Work items:

No	Item	target version	status
001	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008		
002	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	034	
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)		
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)		
0	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008		

06			
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008		mostly complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -		under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008		proposal needs writing up
010	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 (A033)	034	in progress
011	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)		in progress
012	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan)		not started
025	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	034	added but needs work
026	Remove duration	034	
027	Calendar schemes	034	
028	Validation ranges (A035)	034	
029	Decimals (A020) - document unsigned type behaviour - packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy	034	
030	Remove redundant properties, fix examples. (A036)	034	
031	Specialized annotations	034	
032	Floating components		
033	Specialized annotations	034	

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	29-Apr-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 29-Apr-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 29-Apr-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , April-29-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , April-29-2009

Meeting opened , 14:00 UK

Attendees

Steve Hanson (IBM)
Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)

Apologies

Dave Glick (drac)

Agenda:

1. Go through actions.
Actions updated below
2. LengthKind on Sequences and choices.

LengthKind on sequences and choices and their parent element has proved confusing to new users of DFDL. It is proposed that lengthKind is removed from groups and only allow it to be set on parent element. See email from SH

Not discussed. Action raised. Please review SH email and make comments before next call

3. Discuss UnorderedInitated email from SH

Not discussed. Action raised. Please review SH email and make comments before next call

4. InfoSet codepage and encoding

The spec does not say what codepage and encoding is used for string fields.

5. AOB

Next version (034)

6. Next call 6 May 14:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:10 UK

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
040	SH: LengthKind on complex objects. 29/04: All send comment before next call
041	AP: UnorderedInitiated 29/04: All: Review for next call
042	MB: Complete variable specification. To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name.

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress
020	SH: Resolve packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy 22/10: No progress 10/12: added how to decide to overpunch and sign position 11/02: proposal largely agreed. SH to make minor changes 18/02: AP to document unsigned type behaviour 25/02: no progress 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: SH to complete last remaining issue, which is the behaviour when logical type is signed/unsigned and the physical type is unsigned/signed. 29/04: SH had identified a problem with definition values and types in the info set and will email proposal. DG to be asked to accelerate action 032 to see if helps
024	<No owner> String XML type 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: Need to allocate owner. Work is to describe the semantics of using dfdl:representation="xml" to model a well-formed XML fragment in an overall non-XML document described by a DFDL schema. 29/04: As no resource available to progress this action agreed to defer from V1. Will close next week if no objections
026	SH: Envelopes and Payloads 08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this 22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect. 29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. related to Action 028

027	<p>SH: Property precedence tables</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Two things missing from the existing precedence trees. Firstly, does not show alternates (eg, initiator v initiatorkind). Secondly, need a tree per concrete DFDL object (eg, element). SH to update.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p>
028	<p>SH: Variable markup</p> <p>08/04: Discussed briefly at end of call, IBM to see whether there any use cases that require recursive use of DFDL.</p> <p>15/04: Use case was distributed and will be discussed on next call.</p> <p>22/04: The use case in question is EDI where the terminating markup for the payload segments is defined in the ISA envelope segment. The markup is modelled as an element of simple type where the allowable markup values are defined as enums on the type. But we need to handle two cases - firstly where the envelope is present, so the value used by the payload is taken from the envelope. Secondly where only the payload is present. Here we need a way of scanning for all the enum values, and adopting the one we actually find, when parsing. And using a default when unparsing. SH to explore use of a DFDL variable, where the variable has a default, but also has a type that is the same as the markup element - that way we get to use the enums without defining everything twice.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal.</p>
029	<p>MB: valueCalc (output length calculation)</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Action allocated to MB, this is to complete the work started at the Hursley WG F2F meeting.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p>
032	<p>DG: Investigate compatibility between DFDL infoset and XDM</p> <p>08/04: No update</p> <p>22/04: No update</p> <p>29/04: No update</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p>
036	<p>SH: Provide use case for floating component in a sequence</p> <p>08/04: Raised</p> <p>15/04: Use case sent and discussed. SH to do further investigation</p> <p>22/04: IBM feedback from WTX team is that alternate suggested ways of modelling the EDI floating NTE segment have significant usability issues. The DFDL principle is that for a problem that can be expressed as two-layered, then two DFDL models are needed. The EDI NTE segment does not fall into this though, as its use is on a per sequence basis. Ongoing.</p> <p>29/04: Agreed that need to be in V1. SH to make a proposal</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p>

038	MB: Submit response to OMG RFI for non-XML standardization 22/04: First step is for MB to mail the OGF Data Area chair to say that we want to submit 29/04: MB has been in contact with OMG and will submit dfdl.
039	SKK: Approach for creating Schema-For-DFDL xsds. 22/04: Resolve issue around multiple declarations needed for DFDL properties, perhaps using MB's meta approach 29/04: Don't like qualified attributes in long form. SKK to check there are no code gen implications, eg EMF.

Closed actions :

025	AP: Escape schemes 21/1: discussed requirements 04/02: AP/SH to describe behaviour for known length text fields. Need to discuss if comment escapes should be supported. 11/02 new draft distributed: 18/02: SH up document concerns 25/02: SH and AP have refined proposal ready for approval. 04/03: SH and AP have further refined proposal. 11/03: discussed. suggested a simplified proposal be evaluated. 18/03: SH and AP had further discussions on simplified proposal 08/04: See minutes, review in detail for next call 15/04: See minutes, review for next call 22/04: MB mailed answers to the mailing list in response to AP's last few questions. Following agreed: <i>1.Should data containing the escapeEscapeCharacater cause escaping to be used if if so how should it be escaped.</i> <i>EEC alone isn't an active character. it has to be followed by the EC to be interpreted at all. That said, if the pair EEC EC appears in the data, then yes, we must escape the EC, with another EEC.</i> <i>2.Should we only look for escapeStartString at the beginning of the data</i> <i>Yes, we will be restrictive/conservative for v1.0</i> <i>3.Property names (everyone has their own favourite so lets just pick one.)</i> <i>Only changes are escapeBlockStart and escapeBlockEnd.</i> AP to incorporate the agreed scheme into draft 0.34. 29/04: closed. Moved to workitems
034	AP: Remove redundant properties, correct old examples 08/04: No update 22/04: In progress as part of draft 0.34. 29/04: closed. Moved to work item
035	AP: Add validation ranges to spec, update specialized annotations in spec. 08/04: Raised. For draft 0.34 22/04: In progress as part of draft 0.34. 29/04: closed. Moved to work item

Work items:

No	Item	target version	status
001	String XML type (lan P) - Apr 30, 2008		
0		034	

02	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008		
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)		
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)		
006	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008		
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008		mostly complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -		under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008		proposal needs writing up
010	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 (A033)	034	in progress
011	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)		in progress
012	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan)		not started
025	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	034	added but needs work
026	Remove duration	034	
027	Calendar schemes	034	
028	Validation ranges (A035)	034	
029	Decimals (A020) - document unsigned type behaviour - packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy	034	
030	Remove redundant properties, fix examples. (A036)	034	
033	Specialized annotations	034	

1			
0	Floating components		
3			
2			
0	Specialized annotations	034	
3			
3			

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	15-Apr-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00
Meeting Editors	Alan Powell, Steve Hanson

Created by Alan Powell on 16-Apr-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 29-Apr-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , April-15-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , April-15-2009

Attendees

Suman Kalia (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Dave Glick (drac)

Apologies

1. Escape Schemes

Alan has mailed latest refinement (V2) just before the call. MB sent comments

Agreed to drop escapeKind='escapeBlock2' as it was quite restrictive and was primarily intended for XML style escaping which should be covered by representation='XML'.

We got bogged down in individual use cases so AP agreed to document a set of use cases

2. 'Floating' definitions

SH had sent out an example of need for floating definitions.

The NTE segment in older X12 formats can appear multiple times anywhere within a transaction.

This could be modelled in dfdl using

- an array of choices which has all the possible fields as choices. This would mean that the fields other than the NTE segment could appear in any order so the document could not be validated using just the schema.
- Inserting an optional NTE segment between every other segment. Such a schema would violate UPA rules if any other segments were optional.

SH will investigate further to find out if this is used in versions of X 12 that should be supported by DFDL v1.

3. Recursive use of DFDL for variable markup

SH has sent a use case which WTX solved using 'variable markup'.

The use case is from EDI. EDI transactions consist of an initial header segment which defines, among other things, the separator that is used by the data segments that follow. The problem is that EDI transactions may be processed in their entirety, or individual data segments may be processed without the header segment. For the former case, DFDL supports this fine, using an XPath expression to locate the separator, which is defined as an element, the simple type of which enumerates the allowable values, enabling validation. But for the latter case, the XPath expression won't resolve, as there is no header. An explicit dfdl:separator property could be used instead, being a space separated list of all the allowable values - but that then duplicates the separator element enums, leaving a maintenance problem.

To be discussed on next call.

4. AOB

Issues to be discussed

- Suman has identified that the short and long form properties require all dfdl properties to be defined at least twice in the schema for DFDL.
- The scoping rules for annotations other than dfdl:format are not specified and need to be clarified.

Actions updated below.

Next call 22 April 14:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:15

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed
020	SH: Resolve packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy 22/10: No progress 10/12: added how to decide to overpunch and sign position 11/02: proposal largely agreed. SH to make minor changes 18/02: AP to document unsigned type behaviour 25/02: no progress 08/04: Not discussed
023	MB: Review Schema 1.1 29/1: AP and SH to talk to Sandy Gao

	04/02 Call arranged for Friday 11/02: Call took place. Identified useful changes. Consolidate with previous list. 04/03: decided to stay on Schema 1.0. 08/04: Not discussed
024	String XML type 08/04: Not discussed
025	Escape schemes 21/1: discussed requirements 04/02: AP/SH to describe behaviour for known length text fields. Need to discuss if comment escapes should be supported. 11/02 new draft distributed: 18/02: SH up document concerns 25/02: SH and AP have refined proposal ready for approval. 04/03: SH and AP have further refined proposal. 11/03: discussed. suggested a simplified proposal be evaluated. 18/03: SH and AP had further discussions on simplified proposal 08/04: See minutes, review in detail for next call 15/04: See minutes, review for next call
026	SH: Envelopes and Payloads 08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this
027	Property precedence tables 08/04: Not discussed
028	SH: Variable markup 08/04: Discussed briefly at end of call, IBM to see whether there any use cases that require recursive use of DFDL. 15/04: Used case was distributed and will be discussed on next call.
029	valueCalc (output length calculation) 08/04: Not discussed
032	DG: Investigate compatibility between DFDL info set and XDM 08/04: No update
033	AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice. 08/04: In progress within IBM
034	AP: Remove redundant properties, correct old examples 08/04: No update
035	AP: Add validation ranges to spec, update specialized annotations in spec. 08/04: Raised. For draft 0.34
036	SH: Provide use case for floating component in a sequence 08/04: Raised 15/04: Use case sent and discussed. SH to do further investigation

Closed actions :

--	--

Work items :

N o	Item	
0010	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	

0 2	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
0 0 3	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)	
0 0 5	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)	
0 0 6	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008	
0 0 7	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008	mostly complete
0 0 8	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -	under review
0 0 9	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008	proposal needs writing up
0 1 0	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 * in progress *	
0 1 1	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)	in progress
0 1 2	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan) * not started *	
0 2 5	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	added but needs work
0 2 6	Remove duration	

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	08-Apr-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00
Meeting Editors	Alan Powell, Steve Hanson

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Apr-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 29-Apr-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , April-08-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , April-08-2009

Attendees

Suman Kalia (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Mike Beckerle (Oco)

Apologies

Alan Powell (IBM)
Dave Glick (drac)

1. Escape Schemes

Alan has mailed latest refinement

Overall

Agreed with the scope of the escape scheme support, ie, support three well-known variants, and not provide overly complex open ended support

Annotation structure.

Why dfdl:defineEscapeScheme and dfdl:escapeScheme, instead of just dfdl:escapeScheme and an optional

name attribute? For consistency with dfdl:defineFormat, dfdl:defineNumberFormat, etc, and it makes it clear that the top level scope of the naming is a peer to dfdl:defineFormat not inside them.

Annotation properties.

These need a careful review to make sure that they behave in the expected manner.

For example, should escape start/end bracketing be at the start/end of the field, or anywhere in the field?

Action raised to review in detail for next call.

2. Validation ranges

Need to decide whether to allow restricted use of xs:union to model this.

Agreed that this should be supported. For such a union:

- The member types must all be derived from the same schema simple type
- Any DFDL annotations on member types are a schema definition error

Will be added to draft 0.34.

3. Specialized annotations

Need to decide whether to drop specialized annotations altogether, or use the scheme below, which does not affect scoping in any way but which makes it clear what is allowed where.

Specialized annotations on xsd objects only, dfdl:format on scoping constructs only

dfdl:defineFormat => dfdl:format

xs:complexType => dfdl:format

xs:sequence => dfdl:sequence

xs:choice => dfdl:choice

xs:group ref => dfdl:group

xs:element or xs:element ref => dfdl:element

xs:any => dfdl:any

xs:simpleType => dfdl:simpleType

dfdl:format is exactly as specified in draft 0.33, its properties apply to all relevant objects

Scoping rules as specified in draft 0.33

Agreed that this scheme provided the best balance between simplicity and validation capability.

Will be added to draft 0.34.

4. Exclusion lists.

XML Schema only allows inclusion list of enumerations, does DFDL need to support exclusion list of enumerations? It would be nice if it did, but if we provided a DFDL property that said 'treat enums as exclusion instead of inclusion', removal of the DFDL annotations would change the validation semantic. Agreed that exclusion provision is something that DFDL would inherit from XML Schema, when and if it gets added there.

5. Consuming extraneous data that occurs at the end of the stream

This is where the DFDL model matches input data ok, except that there is some extra data in the stream. This can be explicitly modelled, using a hidden optional element. Agreed that whether such a hidden optional element is needed, or whether the data is simply ignored, is up to individual DFDL implementations. The spec will not take a position.

6. 'Floating' definitions

A known element, the position of which can be anywhere in a sequence of other elements - is this something DFDL needs to support? Capability is offered by IBM's WTX product. Can be used for comments, but DFDL plans to handle comments post 1.0 using an explicit mechanism or using layering. Real purpose of floating component is for older EDI formats where there is a segment that can appear anywhere, and can appear any number of times. Action raised for IBM to provide a concrete example for discussion. The issue for DFDL is how does a floating component appear in the DFDL infoset, and how does it validate in the sequence. One possibility is a property dfdl:floating=yes/no and if an element has that property set, it can be expected anywhere when parsing, but appears in the correct point in the sequence in the parsed infoset, On unparsing it

must appear in in the correct point in the sequence, and is output in that place.

7. Recursive use of DFDL for variable markup

Use of a DFDL annotated element/type to describe an initiator, length prefix, terminator, separator, etc. Steve suggested the most important use of "variable markup-like mechanism" in IBM's WTX product is to reference a location earlier in the bit stream where a delimiter value is found. We handle this already by use of a path expression. The additional variable markup mechanism was to avoid proliferation of keywords for various corner cases on initiator, terminator and separator. Eg., what if you want the initiator to be "Name" or "name" only, not "NAME", "nAmE", etc. So case insensitive is not expressive enough. This can always be modeled, just not as an initiator tag. Feeling was to leave out variable markup (other than for prefix lengths) for v1.0, and to propose the minimum set of extra properties that can be used to address the common use cases, but that IBM needed to see whether this satisfied all WTX use cases.

(Post-call update. It doesn't, there is a use case from WTX, Steve will mail this out before next call).

Actions updated below.

Next call 15 April 14:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:05

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
035	AP: Add validation ranges to spec, update specialized annotations in spec. 08/04: Raised. For draft 0.34
036	SH: Provide use case for floating component in a sequence 08/04: Raised

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed
020	SH: Resolve packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy 22/10: No progress 10/12: added how to decide to overpunch and sign position 11/02: proposal largely agreed. SH to make minor changes 18/02: AP to document unsigned type behaviour 25/02: no progress 08/04: Not discussed
023	MB: Review Schema 1.1 29/1: AP and SH to talk to Sandy Gao 04/02 Call arranged for Friday 11/02: Call took place. Identified useful changes. Consolidate with previous list. 04/03: decided to stay on Schema 1.0. 08/04: Not discussed
024	String XML type 08/04: Not discussed
025	Escape schemes 21/1: discussed requirements 04/02: AP/SH to describe behaviour for known length text fields. Need to discuss if comment escapes should be supported. 11/02 new draft distributed: 18/02: SH up document concerns 25/02: SH and AP have refined proposal ready for approval. 04/03: SH and AP have further refined proposal. 11/03: discussed. suggested a simplified proposal be evaluated. 18/03: SH and AP had further discussions on simplified proposal 08/04: See minutes, review in detail for next call
026	SH: Envelopes and Payloads 08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this
027	Property precedence tables 08/04: Not discussed
028	SH: Variable markup

	08/04: Discussed briefly at end of call, IBM to see whether there any use cases that require recursive use of DFDL.
029	valueCalc (output length calculation) 08/04: Not discussed
032	DG: Investigate compatibility between DFDL infoset and XDM 08/04: No update
033	AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice. 08/04: In progress within IBM
034	AP: Remove redundant properties, correct old examples 08/04: No update

Closed actions :

031	DG: Review dfdl v033 11/02: Initial comments received 18/02: Will include work items 5 and 12. 11/03: complete
-----	---

Work items:

No	Item	
001	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
002	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)	
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)	
006	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008	
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008	mostly complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -	under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008	proposal needs writing up
010	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 * in progress *	
0	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and	

1 1	variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)	in progress
0 1 2	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan) * not started *	
0 2 5	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	added but needs work
0 2 6	Remove duration	

© Copyright IBM Corp. 1998, 2007 All Rights Reserved

© Copyright IBM Corp. 1998, 2007 All Rights Reserved

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	22-Apr-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Apr-09

Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 17-Aug-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , April-22-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , April-22-2009

Meeting opened , 14:00 UK

Attendees

Steve Hanson (IBM)

Mike Beckerle (Oco)

Apologies

Suman Kalia (IBM)

Alan Powell (IBM)

Agenda:

1. Go through actions.
Actions updated below.

2. OGF 26 in Chapel Hill, NC
Not possible for Mike to attend so no DFDL session.
Next OGF is 27 which we should make every effort to attend.
October 12-16, 2009

The Banff Centre
Banff, Alberta, Canada

3. OMG non-XML/XML Information Transformation Standardization (RFI)

This RFI is asking for vendors to put forward candidate non-XML technologies for adoption as standards. Agreed that OGF should put forward DFDL. Action raised for Mike to mail OGF Data Area chair.

4. Short and long form properties require all DFDL properties to be defined at least twice in the schema for DFDL

Mike sent an email to the mailing list suggesting a meta approach, where the properties are defined once, and an XSL generates the concrete xsd in the necessary form. Action raised for Suman to respond.

5. AOB

There was no other business.

6. Next call 29 April 14:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:10 UK

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
----	--------

037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <p>a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd)</p> <p>b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models</p> <p>c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0)</p> <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p>
038	<p>MB: Submit response to OMG RFI for non-XML standardization</p> <p>22/04: First step is for MB to mail the OGF Data Area chair to say that we want to submit</p>
039	<p>SKK: Approach for creating Schema-For-DFDL xsds.</p> <p>22/04: Resolve issue around multiple declarations needed for DFDL properties, perhaps using MB's meta approach</p>

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	<p>AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme</p> <p>10/9: Not allocated yet</p> <p>17/9: No update</p> <p>24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions</p> <p>22/10: No progress</p> <p>16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed</p> <p>21/1: add locale,</p> <p>04/02: changed from locale to specific properties</p> <p>18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour.</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood.</p>
020	<p>SH: Resolve packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy</p> <p>22/10: No progress</p> <p>10/12: added how to decide to overpunch and sign position</p> <p>11/02: proposal largely agreed. SH to make minor changes</p> <p>18/02: AP to document unsigned type behaviour</p> <p>25/02: no progress</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: SH to complete last remaining issue, which is the behaviour when logical type is signed/unsigned and the physical type is unsigned/signed.</p>
024	<p><No owner> String XML type</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Need to allocate owner. Work is to describe the semantics of using dfdl:representation="xml" to model a well-formed XML fragment in an overall non-XML document described by a DFDL schema.</p>
025	<p>AP: Escape schemes</p> <p>21/1: discussed requirements</p> <p>04/02: AP/SH to describe behaviour for known length text fields. Need to discuss if comment escapes should be supported.</p> <p>11/02 new draft distributed:</p> <p>18/02: SH up document concerns</p> <p>25/02: SH and AP have refined proposal ready for approval.</p>

	<p>04/03: SH and AP have further refined proposal. 11/03: discussed. suggested a simplified proposal be evaluated. 18/03: SH and AP had further discussions on simplified proposal 08/04: See minutes, review in detail for next call 15/04: See minutes, review for next call 22/04: MB mailed answers to the mailing list in response to AP's last few questions. Following agreed: <i>1.Should data containing the escapeEscapeCharacater cause escaping to be used if if so how should it be escaped.</i> <i>EEC alone isn't an active character. it has to be followed by the EC to be interpreted at all. That said, if the pair EEC EC appears in the data, then yes, we must escape the EC, with another EEC.</i> <i>2.Should we only look for escapeStartString at the beginning of the data</i> <i>Yes, we will be restrictive/conservative for v1.0</i> <i>3.Property names (everyone has their own favourite so lets just pick one.)</i> <i>Only changes are escapeBlockStart and escapeBlockEnd.</i> AP to incorporate the agreed scheme into draft 0.34.</p>
026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads 08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this 22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p>
027	<p>SH: Property precedence tables 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: Two things missing from the existing precedence trees. Firstly, does not show alternates (eg, initiator v initiatorkind). Secondly, need a tree per concrete DFDL object (eg, element). SH to update.</p>
028	<p>SH: Variable markup 08/04: Discussed briefly at end of call, IBM to see whether there any use cases that require recursive use of DFDL. 15/04: Use case was distributed and will be discussed on next call. 22/04: The use case in question is EDI where the terminating markup for the payload segments is defined in the ISA envelope segment. The markup is modelled as an element of simple type where the allowable markup values are defined as enums on the type. But we need to handle two cases - firstly where the envelope is present, so the value used by the payload is taken from the envelope. Secondly where only the payload is present. Here we need a way of scanning for all the enum values, and adopting the one we actually find, when parsing. And using a default when unparsing. SH to explore use of a DFDL variable, where the variable has a default, but also has a type that is the same as the markup element - that way we get to use the enums without defining everything twice.</p>
029	<p>MB: valueCalc (output length calculation) 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: Action allocated to MB, this is to complete the work started at the Hursley WG F2F meeting.</p>
032	<p>DG: Investigate compatibility between DFDL infoset and XDM 08/04: No update 22/04: No update</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice. 08/04: In progress within IBM 22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p>
034	<p>AP: Remove redundant properties, correct old examples 08/04: No update 22/04: In progress as part of draft 0.34.</p>

035	AP: Add validation ranges to spec, update specialized annotations in spec. 08/04: Raised. For draft 0.34 22/04: In progress as part of draft 0.34.
036	SH: Provide use case for floating component in a sequence 08/04: Raised 15/04: Use case sent and discussed. SH to do further investigation 22/04: IBM feedback from WTX team is that alternate suggested ways of modelling the EDI floating NTE segment have significant usability issues. The DFDL principle is that for a problem that can be expressed as two-layered, then two DFDL models are needed. The EDI NTE segment does not fall into this though, as its use is on a per sequence basis. Ongoing.

Closed actions :

023	MB: Review Schema 1.1 29/1: AP and SH to talk to Sandy Gao 04/02 Call arranged for Friday 11/02: Call took place. Identified useful changes. Consolidate with previous list. 04/03: decided to stay on Schema 1.0. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: Closed . But see new action 037 which has been raised as a result.
-----	--

Work items :

No	Item	
001	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
002	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)	
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)	
006	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008	
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008	mostly complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -	under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008	proposal needs writing up
011	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 * in progress *	

0		
0 1 1	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)	in progress
0 1 2	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan) * not started *	
0 2 5	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	added but needs work
0 2 6	Remove duration	

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	15-Apr-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Apr-09

Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 17-Aug-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , July-15-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , July-15-2009

Attendees

Suman Kalia (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Mike Beckerle (Oco)

Apologies

Alan Powell (IBM)
Peter Lambros (IBM)

Actions discussed and updated below.

Work items tidied up to reflect issue of draft 0.35.

Next call 22 July 14:00 UK

Meeting closed , 14:40

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed

	<p>22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood.</p> <p>29/04: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify.</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour</p> <p>24/06: no progress</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: no progress</p>
026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this</p> <p>22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope. The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p> <p>29/04: SH and AP working on proposal. related to Action 028</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>06/05: No progress</p> <p>20/05: No Progress</p> <p>27/05: Still a number of aspects to be decided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Composition - Does the envelope and payload need to be defined in the same schema or should they be dynamically bound at runtime? - Composition- How is a variable payload specified. Choice or xs:any; New action raised to discuss xs:any - extracting dynamic syntax from data. Covered by action 029 valuecalc. <p>03/06: Dynamic runtime binding will not be supported.</p> <p>SH investigating use of variables to enable standalone and use in envelope of global element.</p> <p>09/06: Payload should be specified using a choice rather than xs:any</p> <p>17/06: SH still working on example using variables</p> <p>24/06: SH to document how property list satisfies uses cases.</p> <p>01/07: SH to document how property list satisfies uses cases. PL looking at variable also. MB suggested modelling first separator as data for use case 3.</p> <p>15/07: Action 042 on variables now includes examples of envelopes and payloads. SH will also circulate what he has agreed with WTX team.</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p> <p>27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>03/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>01/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form,</p>

	<p>would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found. 29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing 06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl. 20/05: SH or SKK to investigate 27/05: No Progress 03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice. 17/06: no change 24/06: no change 01/07: no progress 15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p>
042	<p>MB: Complete variable specification. To include how properties such as encoding can be set externally. Must be a known variable name. 06/05: No progress 20/05: AP to make proposal 27/05: MB proposed differentiating between input and output variables to avoid unnecessary evaluations during parse and unparse. Need to complete rest of variable specification. 03/06: Pointed out problem of declaring variables input or output when used to define syntax which is used both times. MB to update proposal to include how variables are set externally and how specific properties such as encoding are set. 09/06: SKK to use example to document his proposal 17/06: SKK to refine proposal. Other aspects need progress. 24/06: SKK proposal discussed but not accepted. PL to document simpler proposal. 07/01: PL working on proposal 15/07: PL has distributed his proposal. SH, MB and SKK have commented. Broad agreement in principle. Need to agree on better name for dfdl:variable to reflect the annotation's purpose. PL to update proposal.</p>
044	<p>13/05: Bidi 20/05: AP: will check what IBM products support. 27/05: Bidi is supported so will be needed in dfdl v1 03/06: No Progress 09/06: No Progress 24/06: No Progress 01/07: AP started investigation and documented issues. Suggest do whatever XML does. 15/07: No further progress</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing 27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call 03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated 09/06: Progress but not discussed 17/06: Discussed briefly 24/06: No Progress 01/07: No Progress 15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way.</p>

049	20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas 03/06: not discussed 24/06: No Progress 24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases) 15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide.
051	Scoping rules. MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns 17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion 24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proposal 24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review 08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters. 15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up.
054	ICU DecimalNumber behaviour 15/07: No progress.

Closed actions :

029	MB: valueCalc (output length calculation) 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: Action allocated to MB, this is to complete the work started at the Hursley WG F2F meeting. 29/04: No progress 06/05: MB will have update for next call 13/05: MB will have update for next call 20/05: Some progress. will be circulated this week 27/05: MB circulated proposal and got comments. Will update and review on next call 03/06: Discussed proposal. MB to update dealing with uses cases raised. Options include a new lengthKind='Reference' to make it easier to distinguish from fixed length case. Or use outputLengthCalc to separate calculation of parsing and unparsing length. 09/06: SH/AP proposal discussed and MB to document 17/06: MB to document proposal. Grammar updated and reviewed. Minor changes needed. 24/06: Grammar description was updated and approved. Need to describe new function. 01/07: MB to circulate grammar and document new XPATH function 15/07: Closed . MB has documented this. Key points are included in draft 0.35, work item exists to make sure the rest makes draft 0.36.
038	MB: Submit response to OMG RFI for non-XML standardization 22/04: First step is for MB to mail the OGF Data Area chair to say that we want to submit 29/04: MB has been in contact with OMG and will submit dfdl. 06/05: MB has prepared response to OMG. Will send DFDL sepc v033 20/05: Response has been sent to OMG based on v034 27/05: Awaiting response from OMG. 03/06: On hold 15/07: Closed . Eventually a response will come back.

Work items :

N	Item
003	Variables (from action 042)

0 0 5	Improvements on property descriptions
0 0 6	Envelopes and Payloads (from action 026)
0 0 7	valueCalc (from action 029)
0 1 1	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) (from action 028)
0 1 2	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics
0 3 3	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)
0 3 6	Update dfdl schema with change properties
0 3 8	Improve length section including bit handling
0 4 2	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM
0 5 1	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	14-Oct-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	13:00 - 15:00
Meeting Editors	Alan Powell

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Apr-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 15-Oct-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Oct-14-2009

Agenda

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

1. 051 Scoping Rules

Review new description (email Scoping Rules with Schema default 13/10/2009) and examples.

2. Binary/Boolean

For a Boolean with representation='binary' you can specify separate values for true and false. However you cannot say false = non-zero (or vice versa). I suggest we need a simple way to specify 'non-zero'

3. NumberBase and textNumberxxx (email Problem with dfdl:numberBase and number representation properties 9/10/2009)
It looks as though we didn't properly consider dfdl:NumberBase when defining the number representation properties as they may assume base 10.

dfdl:numberBase should be ignored if textNumberRepresentation is 'zoned'.

The dfdl:textNumberFormat properties which are really only for decimal numbers so perhaps dfdl:NumberBase should be modified.

The alternative is to say which of the dfdl:textNumberFormat properties apply when dfdl:numberBase is not '10'

4. Validating min /maxOccurs (email Validation of min/mxOccurs 8/10/2009)

Tim Kimber had asked some questions about min/maxOccurs which I answered concluding:

"So if an array has too few occurrences (and no default) it is a processing error, if it has too many it is a validation error"

The WG should confirm this conclusion

5. 045 Resolving points of uncertainty and parsing rules

Review latest draft.

6. Comments on Draft 036

Please review the latest draft

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , October-14-2009

Attendees

Suman Kalia (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Peter Lambros (IBM)
Steve Marting (Progeny)

Apologies

Alan Powell (IBM)

1. Scoping Rules

Continued the discussion on scoping rules. Mike and Steve H have returned comments on Alan's scoping document draft.

For the benefit of Suman & Steve M, the rationale behind the revised rules was explained.

Suman was concerned that we no longer supported a use case, where a DFDL author creates in an xsd a reusable complex type which has local element children that are silent or incomplete with respect to DFDL properties, then includes/imports that into other DFDL xsds that supply the remaining DFDL properties. The old scoping rules would have allowed the local element children to pick up in-scope properties. Is this a major use case? Consensus was that it was not. The majority of xsds will not allow much if any customisation , and those that do can handle it via DFDL variables (eg, encoding) or via DFDL properties that permit multiple entries (eg, separator).

The behaviour of XSDL with respect to global default attributes was confirmed. They only act on the objects in the same xsd. An included/imported object does not pick up the parent xsd's global default attributes. But it was noted that there was an exception to this rule, the so-called 'chameleon namespace' scenario, where if an xsd is silent about its namespace, a parent with a target namespace can import it and impose that namespace on the imported xsds objects.

In the spirit of this, Mike proposed a way of supporting Suman's use case, where a new DFDL attribute is provided that allows an xsd to decide whether it gets its defaults from a local xsd's dfdl:format or from parent xsd's dfdl:format. This should work ok, but it was agreed not to add this to DFDL 1.0, and to keep for a future version. (Mike's write up is at the foot of these minutes)

Whether to allow dfdl:ref to take a variable was also discussed, currently it does not.

Agreed that Steve H's type oriented approach to DFDL properties would not be adopted for DFDL 1.0.

Actions 051 & 060 updated below.

2. Binary/Boolean

For a Boolean with representation='binary' you can specify separate values for true and false. However you cannot say false = 0 and true = non-zero. This facility is needed by some formats, eg, ASN.1.

Discussed alternative solutions:

- a) Use an entity to indicate any non-zero value (eg, %anz;)
- b) Use a separate property to control this
- c) Use empty string to indicate any value other than the associated false value
- d) Use strict/lax processing to control this.

Decided that c) was the neatest solution. Applies to dfdl:binaryBooleanTrueRep only. Empty string means any value other than dfdl:binaryBooleanFalseRep.

Work item added for draft 37.

3. numberBase and text numbers

We didn't properly consider dfdl:numberBase when defining text number representation properties as they mostly assume base 10.

Agreed that the use of bases 2, 8 and 16 would invariably be used for integers only, without signs, decimal separators, exponents and other formatting options. That rules out the use of several properties, which is good. But you still need a dfdl:textNumberFormat to define the pattern for an integer, which seems overkill. The numberBase property probably needs moving from dfdl:textNumberFormat altogether, and placing outside.

New action 061 raised to come up with a proposal for this refactoring.

4. Validating min /maxOccurs

The spec in a couple of places clearly states that violation of min/maxOccurs constraints are processing errors, not validation errors. Reason being that both properties get dragged into parsing and unparsing. However, for values of dfdl:occursCountKind other than 'fixed', maxOccurs is not actually used, so perhaps it is better to treat maxOccurs violations under those circumstances as a validation error. Violations of maxOccurs when dfdl:occursCountKind='fixed' is still a processing error. This was agreed.

Work item added for draft 37.

5. Resolving points of uncertainty and parsing rules

Alan & Steve H spent some time discussing the uncertainty document and Alan has sent out a revision for review. Comments welcome, especially on the listed rules for resolving uncertainty.

Steve H wants to ensure that the rules for resolving uncertainty do not preclude the use of 'on-demand' parsing as this is a valuable performance and memory technique for implementations. Steve thinks that the current rules should be ok. And there will always be some formats to which on-demand parsing can't be applied well.

A problem was spotted with uncertainty and arrays. If an element has minOccurs not equal to maxOccurs, but greater than zero (say x), then the point of uncertainty does not actually start until index x+1. What does it mean to place a discriminator on that element (or one of its children if complex)? The rules as worded mean that for indices less than x+1, the discriminator might actually be used to resolve a higher point of uncertainty. Which is clearly wrong.

Mike agreed that the full solution to this is part of existing action 033 which is looking at the need to scope indicators on discriminators. All agreed that scope indicators should be avoided if at all possible.

A proposal was put forward for handling this specific array scenario. As well as states 'certain' and 'uncertain' add the concept of a 'possibly uncertain' state (better name welcome). This state is entered for the array element described above when processing indices 1 through x. Any discriminator evaluated in this state can

result in false and cause backtracking, but if it evaluates to true it does not resolve anything. That can only happen in the 'uncertain' state.

Actions 33 and 45 updated.

6. Comments on draft 036

Please review the latest draft, the revision section describes the changes, plus change marking is on.

Agreed that the removal of `dfdl:lengthKind = 'implicit'` from text numbers and calendars was a good idea. It does make the easiest cases slightly less convenient to model, but avoids numerous issues with the hard cases. Disallowing now means we always have the option to add it back at a future date.

7. Extensibility

Steve H asked whether the DFDL language needs to be extended to handle 'extensibility' scenarios, which he encounters in the real world.

For example, an industry standard format has regular revisions. The format allows users to add their own extensions. When a revision occurs, a user wants to apply the revision but retain his extensions in the simplest way possible.

The XSDL mechanisms for doing this are substitution groups and wildcards.

DFDL language supports extensibility today. User can declare global elements in a separate xsd, include that xsd in the core model, and add element references into the core model at the appropriate point. Alternatively, user can additionally declare a global group in his separate xsd, add the element references in there, and just add a group reference to the core model. Even less invasive, the core model can ship with a dummy xsd containing an empty global group, and ship with a group reference already in place, in which case the user just swaps the dummy xsd for his own xsd.

Agreed that this should handle the use cases Steve H sees. No changes needed in DFDL 1.0.

Next call 21 October 13:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:00

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: **062**

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
061	Refactor dfdl:textNumberFormat to remove dfdl:numberBase. 14/10: Base 2, 8, 16 numbers are invariably integers without formatting, use of pattern etc is overkill

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify. 20/05: No Progress 27/05: No Progress

	<p>03/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>09/06: No Progress (low priority)</p> <p>17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour</p> <p>24/06: no progress</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: no progress</p> <p>29/07: no progress</p> <p>05/08: no progress</p> <p>12/08: no progress</p> <p>19/08: Inconsistencies are being found in ICU behaviour so Calendars need reviewing again.</p> <p>26/08: Specific three character short time zones may not be maintained during round tripping when there is more than one short form for a time zone offset. Because dates and datetimes in the infoset only maintain a time zone offset so on unparsing it isn't possible to say which short form will be selected for a particular offset when there is more than one possible. Need to document.</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p>
033	<p>MB: Need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p> <p>27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>....</p> <p>19/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: Action re-titled and assigned to Mike B</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p>

	<p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p> <p>17/06: no change</p> <p>24/06: no change</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>15/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>29/07: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>05/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>12/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>19/08: Clarify that this action is to go through the XML UPA checks to assess impact on dfdl schemas and advice best practice. Name clashes is just one example. SH or SKK</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p> <p>09/06: Progress but not discussed</p> <p>17/06: Discussed briefly</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>01/07: No Progress</p> <p>15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: No Progress</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: AP distributed proposal and others commented. Brief discussion AP to incorporate update and reissue</p> <p>07/10: Updated proposal was discussed. Comments will be incorporated into the next version.</p> <p>14/10: Alan to update proposal to include array scenario where minOccurs > 0</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases)</p> <p>15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>19/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p>
051	<p>Scoping rules.</p> <p>MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns</p> <p>17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion</p> <p>24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proosal</p> <p>24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review</p>

	08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters. 15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up. 29/07: No Progress 05/08: No Progress 12/08: No Progress 19/08: AP will document new syntax rules. 26/08: No Progress 09/09: AP has documented new scoping rules. Not discussed 16/09: Not discussed. AP to update element reference examples 30/09: Significant dissatisfaction with proposed new rules. New proposal developed during call. AP to document. 07/10: New proposal was refined. Details in minutes. 14/10: Discussed at length. Details in minutes.
054	ICU DecimalNumber/ Calendar behaviour 15/07: No progress 29/07: No Progress. 05/08: No Progress. This action is to discover and document ICU behaviour. DFDL will do whatever ICU does. 12/08: No Progress 19/09: More examples of inconsistent behaviour discovered 09/09: no progress 16/09: no progress 30/09: no progress 07/10: no progress 14/10: no progress
056	resolve lengthUnit=bits including fillbytes 12/08: No Progress 19/08: No Progress 26/08: No Progress 09/09: no progress 30/09: no progress 07/10: no progress 14/10: no progress
059	9/9: define how encoding, byteorder and floating point format externally 16/09: no progress 07/10: no progress 14/10: no progress
061	Refactor dfdl:textNumberFormat to remove dfdl:numberBase. 14/10: Base 2, 8, 16 numbers are invariably integers without formatting, use of pattern etc is overkill

Closed actions :

060	Should dfdl become more type oriented and split dfdl:properties between element and simpleType/complexType 14/10: Closed. No.
------------	---

Work items :

N o	Item	target version	stat
0	Improvements on property descriptions		not

05			
011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
012	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
033	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	037	ens
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties	ongoing	
038	Improve length section including bit handling		son
042	Mapping of the DFDL infoset to XDM	none	not
051	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	037	awa
058	textPadCharacter %rxx limitation and split to textxxxxPadCharacter	037	
059	limit terminatorCanBeMissing to last element in schema. Ignore elsewhere.	037	
060	New empty string semantic for dfdl:binaryBooleanTrueRep	037	
061	Change maxOccurs violations from processing error to validation error (if not 'fixed')	037	

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	11-Nov-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	13:00 - 15:00
Meeting Editors	Alan Powell

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Apr-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 26-Nov-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Nov-11-2009

Agenda

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

1. 051 Scoping Rules

Review Suman's selectors examples

2. 061 Refactor dfdl:textNumberFormat to remove dfdl:numberBase.

Review Alan's updated spec fragment (see e-mail)

3. 059: External specification of encoding , byte order

Review Steve H's proposal (see e-mail)

4. 045 Resolving points of uncertainty and parsing rules

Continue discussion of semantics of discriminators and arrays

Use web meeting to discuss Mike B's example (see e-mail)

<https://www2.gotomeeting.com/join/319038563>

6. Test suite for DFDL

Discuss Mike's e-mail and what IBM is doing as part of its implementation work

5. Go through remaining actions

6. Plan to finish DFDL v 1

Updated strawman schedule

Activity	Schedule	Who
Resolve Action items	- 23 Nov 2009	WG
Write up work items	16 Nov - 4 Dec 2009	AP

Restructure and complete specification	23 Nov - 4 Dec 2009	AP
WG review	7 Dec - 18 Dec 2009	WG
Incorporate review comments	4 Jan - 29 Jan 2010	AP +
OGF Editor Review / Incorporate changes	1 Feb - 1 Mar 2010	OGF
OGF Public Comment period (60 days)	1 Mar - 30 Apr 2010	OGF
OGF 28 Munich	15-19 March 2010	

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , November-11-2009

Attendees

Suman Kalia (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Mike Beckerle (Oco)
Peter Lambros (IBM)
Steve Marting (Progeny)
Stephanie Fetzner (IBM)

Apologies

Alan Powell (IBM)

1. 051 Scoping Rules

Two issues discussed:

a) Use of selectors

Reviewed Suman's selectors examples. Agreement that the semantic was correctly captured and no further action needed.

b) Default dfdl:format annotation

Rejected proposal to wrap this in an unnamed dfdl:defineFormat. All dfdl:definexxx should be named.

Action 51 closed.

2. 061 Refactor dfdl:textNumberFormat to remove dfdl :numberBase .

Reviewed Alan's updated spec fragment.

Looks good, a couple of comments:

a) Suggestion to replace the enum 'text' from dfdl:textNumber Representation, as it is confusing because of dfdl:representation enum 'text'. Proposals were 'plain' or 'regular'. More welcomed.

b) In dfdl:textNumberFormatRef, the clause should just say "Only applies when textNumberBase is '10' " for consistency with other text properties.

Action 61 updated.

3. 059: External specification of encoding , byte order

Reviewed Steve H's proposal.

Agreed that DFDL xsd wins over context.

Agreed that \$encoding & \$byteOrder would be built-in 'external' variables in DFDL namespace.

\$encoding should have default UTF-8

\$byteOrder should have default big-endian

Rejected formal spec statement that DFDL implementation can optionally override DFDL xsd

Action 59 updated.

4. 045 Resolving points of uncertainty and parsing rules

Continued discussion of semantics of discriminators and arrays , using Mike's example. The example has 3 levels of uncertainty. The following key points emerged during the web meeting.

The use of timing="after" on a 'forward looking' dfdl:discriminator does not always work. Because it is evaluated at the end of parsing the hosting component, a failure might have occurred while parsing one of the children. The failure will cause backtracking, even though we might have parsed enough to evaluate the discriminator.

The WTX equivalent (component rules on identifier fields) handles 'forward looking' by continually trying to evaluate the rule as it processes a component's children. Conceptually timing="during".

Mike changed the discriminators so that they were decorated, eg, choiceDiscriminator, occurDiscriminator. This makes what the discriminator applies to more obvious. An equivalent alternative is to link the component and the discriminator using an id/idref, or an SCD. Mike will think more on this, and also whether other decorated discriminators are needed, eg, for unordered/floating sequences.

Stephanie will supply equivalent WTX type tree for comparison.

It was noted that there is a big semantic difference between DFDL discriminators and WTX component rules - if the former's expression evaluates to false then a processing error is raised. Not so with WTX, which will continue on.

Action 45 updated.

Action 33 closed and merged into 45.

5. Actions

Updated below.

Note closure of action 62 which was not discussed on the call - we have the name of an IBM technical writer to assist with spec completion.

Next call 18 November 13:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:00

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: **064**

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour. 08/04: Not discussed 22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood. 29/04: No progress 06/05: No progress 13/05: Calendar has been added to latest spec version v034 but still a few details to clarify. 20/05: No Progress ... 09/06: No Progress (low priority) 17/06: SH to check ICU code for lax calendar behaviour

	<p>24/06: no progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>12/08: no progress</p> <p>19/08: Inconsistencies are being found in ICU behaviour so Calendars need reviewing again.</p> <p>26/08: Specific three character short time zones may not be maintained during round tripping when there is more than one short form for a time zone offset. Because dates and datetimes in the infoset only maintain a time zone offset so on unparsing it isn't possible to say which short form will be selected for a particular offset when there is more than one possible. Need to document.</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: Will produce a list of known issues.</p> <p>28/10: Discussed ICU fractional seconds behaviour. SF to send latest understanding.</p> <p>04/11: no progress</p> <p>11/11: no update</p>
037	<p>All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks.</p> <p>22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity. And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this. Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) <p>Ongoing in case another solution can be found.</p> <p>29/04: Will ask DG and S Gao for opinion before closing</p> <p>06/05: Discussed S Gao email and suggestions. Decided need to review all XML UPA rules and decide which apply to dfdl.</p> <p>20/05: SH or SKK to investigate</p> <p>27/05: No Progress</p> <p>03/06: The concern is that some dfdl schemas will fail UPA check when validation is turned on or when edited using tooling that enforces UPA checks. Renaming fields will resolve some/most issues. Need documentation that describes issue and best practice.</p> <p>17/06: no change</p> <p>24/06: no change</p> <p>01/07: no progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>12/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>19/08: Clarify that this action is to go through the XML UPA checks to assess impact on dfdl schemas and advice best practice. Name clashes is just one example. SH or SKK</p> <p>26/08: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>09/09: no progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>04/11: no progress</p> <p>11/11: Steve has started to look at this. He has requested a 'consumable' definition of the UPA rules from the XSD WG members. Even non-normative Appendix H in the XSD 1.0 spec is hard to consume.</p>
045	<p>20/05 AP: Speculative Parsing</p> <p>27/05: Psuedo code has been circulated. Review for next call</p> <p>03/06: Comments received and will be incorporated</p> <p>09/06: Progress but not discussed</p> <p>17/06: Discussed briefly</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p>

	<p>01/07: No Progress</p> <p>15/07: No progress. MB not happy with the way the algorithm is documented, need to find a better way.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress. Will document behaviour as a set of rules.</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>30/09: AP distributed proposal and others commented. Brief discussion AP to incorporate update and reissue</p> <p>07/10: Updated proposal was discussed. Comments will be incorporated into the next version.</p> <p>14/10: Alan to update proposal to include array scenario where minOccurs > 0</p> <p>21/10: Updated proposal reviewed</p> <p>28/10: Updated proposal reviewed see minutes</p> <p>04/11: Discussed semantics of discriminators on arrays. MB to produce examples</p> <p>11/11: Absorbing action 033 into 045. Maybe decorated discriminator kinds are needed after all. MB and SF to continue with examples.</p>
049	<p>20/05 AP Built-in specification description and schemas</p> <p>03/06: not discussed</p> <p>24/06: No Progress</p> <p>24/06: No Progress (hope to get these from test cases)</p> <p>15/07: No progress. Once available, the examples in the spec should use the dfdl:defineFormat annotations they provide.</p> <p>...</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: Discussed the real need for this being in the specification. It seemed that the main value is it define a schema location for downloading 'known' defaults from the web.</p> <p>28/10: no progress</p> <p>04/11: no progress</p> <p>11/11: no update</p>
056	<p>MB Resolve lengthUnits=bits including fillbytes</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>28/10: no progress</p> <p>04/11: MB to look at lengthUnits = bits</p> <p>11/11: no update</p>
059	<p>9/9: SH Define how encoding, byteorder and floating point format externally</p> <p>16/09: no progress</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: no progress</p> <p>21/10: SH to investigate</p> <p>28/10: no progress</p> <p>04/11: no progress</p> <p>11/11: SH proposal accepted. One open issue - what is the full list of built-in variables?</p>
061	<p>AP Refactor dfdl:textNumberFormat to remove dfdl:numberBase.</p> <p>14/10: Base 2, 8, 16 numbers are invariably integers without formatting, use of pattern etc is overkill</p> <p>21/10: no progress</p> <p>28/10: no progress</p> <p>04/11: no progress</p> <p>11/11: Reviewed AP proposal, some comments to incorporate.</p>
063	<p>Write DFDL primer and test cases.</p> <p>11/11: no update</p>

Closed actions

No	Action
033	<p>MB: Need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p> <p>29/04: TK has sent examples shown need for discriminators beyond choice. Agreed. MB to respond to TK</p> <p>06/05: Discussed suggestion of adding type indicator to discriminator. MB to provide examples.</p> <p>15/03: Semantic documented in v034. MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator</p> <p>20/05: MB to provide examples of need for scope indicator on discriminator (but lower priority than action 029)</p> <p>27/05: No Progress (lower priority)</p> <p>....</p> <p>07/10: no progress</p> <p>14/10: Action re-titled and assigned to Mike B</p> <p>21/10: no progress</p> <p>28/10: no progress</p> <p>04/11: Mike to produce examples for choices with variable occurrence arrays.</p> <p>11/11: Closed. Incorporated into action 045.</p>
051	<p>Scoping rules.</p> <p>MB: to document change to scoping rules to satisfy implementation concerns</p> <p>17/06: MB and SH proposals discussed. Needs further discussion</p> <p>24/06: AP to update presentation with latest proposal</p> <p>24/06: AP had updated presentation. MB to review</p> <p>08/07: Discussed at length. Simple types will now take annotations. Variables will be used for parameters.</p> <p>15/07: No further progress. Needs final write up.</p> <p>29/07: No Progress</p> <p>05/08: No Progress</p> <p>12/08: No Progress</p> <p>19/08: AP will document new syntax rules.</p> <p>26/08: No Progress</p> <p>09/09: AP has documented new scoping rules. Not discussed</p> <p>16/09: Not discussed. AP to update element reference examples</p> <p>30/09: Significant dissatisfaction with proposed new rules. New proposal developed during call. AP to document.</p> <p>07/10: New proposal was refined. Details in minutes.</p> <p>14/10: Discussed at length. Details in minutes.</p> <p>21/10: Discussed at length. Details in minutes.</p> <p>04/11: defineFormat can only contain one active format block, Drop baseFormat, SKK to produce examples for selectors.</p> <p>04/11: Further discussion see minutes. SKK to produce examples of selectors.</p> <p>11/11: Closed. No open questions. Incorporate into spec via work item 051.</p>
062	<p>SH investigate technical writer support.</p> <p>28/10: SH had contacted S Gao to understand the W3 process and support.</p> <p>04/11: no progress</p> <p>11/11: Closed. SH has the name of an IBM technical writer who can help with spec preparation - Mark Tibbits.</p>

Work items:

No	Item	target version	status
005	Improvements on property descriptions		not

011	How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) (from action 045)		awa
012	Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics		not
033	Numeric data - what physical reps are allowed for what logical types (from action 020)	037	ens
036	Update dfdl schema with change properties	ongoing	
038	Improve length section including bit handling		son
042	Mapping of the DFDL info set to XDM	none	not
051	Revised scoping rules (from action 051)	037	
058	textPadCharacter % # rxx limitation and split to textxxxxPadCharacter	037	
059	limit terminatorCanBeMissing to last element in schema. Ignore elsewhere.	037	
060	New empty string semantic for dfdl:binaryBooleanTrueRep	037	
061	Change maxOccurs violations from processing error to validation error (if not 'fixed')	037	
062	Drop calendarUseZForUTC. describe zU, IU and TU symbols	037	
063	DefineFormat can contain only one active format. Drop baseFormat	037	

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	01-Apr-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 02-Apr-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 02-Apr-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , April-1-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , April-1-2009

Attendees

Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)

Apologies

Mike Beckerle(Oco)
Dave Glick (drac)
Suman Kalia (IBM)

As only SH and AP were available the call was cancelled

Next call 8 April 14:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:00

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress

034 Work items:

N o	Item	
0 0 1	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
0 0 2	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
0 0 3	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)	
0 0 5	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)	
0 0 6	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008	
0 0 7	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008	mostly complete
0 0 8	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -	under review
0 0 9	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008	proposal needs writing up
0 1 0	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 * in progress *	
0 1 1	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)	in progress
0 1 2	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan) * not started *	
0 2 5	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	added but needs work
0 2 6	Remove duration	

complete - specification updated

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	01-Apr-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 02-Apr-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 02-Apr-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , April-1-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , April-1-2009

Attendees

Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)

Apologies

Mike Beckerle(Oco)
Dave Glick (drac)
Suman Kalia (IBM)

As only SH and AP were available the call was cancelled

Next call 8 April 14:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:00

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress

034 Work items:

N o	Item	
0 0 1	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
0 0 2	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
0 0 3	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)	
0 0 5	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)	
0 0 6	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008	
0 0 7	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008	mostly complete
0 0 8	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -	under review
0 0 9	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008	proposal needs writing up
0 1 0	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 * in progress *	
0 1 1	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)	in progress
0 1 2	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan) * not started *	
0 2 5	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	added but needs work
0 2 6	Remove duration	

complete - specification updated

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	18-Mar-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 19-Mar-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 20-Mar-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , March-18-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , March-18-2009

Attendees

Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Dave Glick (drac)
Suman Kalia (IBM)

Apologies

Mike Beckerle(Oco)

1. Specialized Annotations

The whole call was taken up discussing the "dfdl:sequence and other specialized annotations" proposal emailed by SH. In summary proposes

- the use of specialized annotations on each schema object. eg dfdl:sequence
- a separate set of scoped properties for each specialization.

```
<xs:complexType name="myType">
```

```

<xs:annotation><xs:appinfo source="http://www.ogf.org/dfdl/">
  <dfdl:complexType>
    <dfdl:sequence lengthKind="implicit" ... />
    <dfdl:element lengthKind="delimited" ... />
  </dfdl:complexType>
</xs:appinfo></xs:annotation>

```

There was general agreement with the proposal but a lot of discussion about the two issues that SH identified.

a. The meaning of short form annotations on complex type.

```

<xs:complexType name="myType" dfdl:lengthKind="implicit" ... >

```

It is not clear which specialized annotation scope the short form properties on complex type should apply to. There was a lot of discussion between 1) disallowing short form annotation on complex type and 2) applying them to all specialized scopes.

Disallowing short form is simple but makes complex type different, forces long form which is much more verbose, means common properties, eg encoding, to be specified the same on multiple specialized annotations. This is a particular problem for element and simple type.

However applying short form to all specialization introduces a new level of inheritance and consequent complexity.

b. You are forced to set common properties in multiple places in defineFormat.

```

<xs:annotation><xs:appinfo source="http://www.ogf.org/dfdl/">
  <dfdl:defineFormat>
    <dfdl:sequence encoding="UTF-8" ... />
    <dfdl:element encoding="UTF-8" ... />
    <dfdl:simpleType encoding="UTF-8" ... />
    <dfdl:choice encoding="UTF-8" ... />
    <dfdl:any encoding="UTF-8" ... />
  </dfdl:defineFormat>
</xs:appinfo></xs:annotation>

```

Possible solution is to use dfdl:format to set common properties

```

<xs:annotation><xs:appinfo source="http://www.ogf.org/dfdl/">
  <dfdl:defineFormat>
    <dfdl:format encoding="UTF-8" ... />
    <dfdl:sequence ... />
    <dfdl:element ... />
    <dfdl:simpleType ... />
    <dfdl:choice ... />
    <dfdl:any ... />
  </dfdl:defineFormat>
</xs:appinfo></xs:annotation>

```

The consensus was that there should be a way to provide common properties so this solution was preferred and you could use the same for complex type

```

<xs:annotation><xs:appinfo source="http://www.ogf.org/dfdl/">

```

```
<dfdl:complexType>
  <dfdl:format encoding="UTF-8" ... />
  <dfdl:sequence ... />
  <dfdl:element ... />
  <dfdl:simpleType ... />
  <dfdl:choice ... />
  <dfdl:any ... />
</dfdl:complexType>
</xs:appinfo></xs:annotation>
```

It was agreed that this was the preferred solution.

During the discussion SK asked what was the precedence of short and long-form properties on the same object. AP subsequently sent SK section 10.3 which states that long-form have precedence over short-form.

2. AOB

To be discussed

- Escape Schemes
- Validation ranges and exclusion lists
- Consuming extraneous data after schema has be used.
- 'Floating' definitions
- Actions

Next call 25 March 14:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:00 GMT

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour.

020	SH: Resolve packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy 22/10: No progress 10/12: added how to decide to overpunch and sign position 11/02: proposal largely agreed. SH to make minor changes 18/02: AP to document unsigned type behaviour 25/02: no progress
023	MB: Review Schema 1.1 29/1: AP and SH to talk to Sandy Gao 04/02 Call arranged for Friday 11/02: Call took place. Identified useful changes. Consolidate with previous list. 04/03: decided to stay on Schema 1.0.
024	String XML type
025	Escape schemes 21/1: discussed requirements 04/02: AP/SH to describe behaviour for known length text fields. Need to discuss if comment escapes should be supported. 11/02 new draft distributed: 18/02: SH up document concerns 25/02: SH and AP have refined proposal ready for approval. 04/03: SH and AP have further refined proposal. 11/03: discussed. suggested a simplified proposal be evaluated. 18/03: SH and AP had further discussions on simplified proposal
026	SH: Envelopes and Payloads
027	Property precedence tables
028	Variable markup
029	valueCalc (output length calculation)
031	DG: Review dfdl v033 11/02: Initial comments received 18/02: Will include work items 5 and 12. 11/03: complete
032	DG: Investigate compatibility between DFDL infoset and XDM
033	04/03: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.
034	04/03: AP remove redundant properties

Closed actions :

034 Work items:

No	Item	
00	String XML type (lan P) - Apr 30, 2008	

1		
0	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
0		
2		
0	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)	
0		
3		
0	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)	
0		
5		
0	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008	
0		
6		
0	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008	mostly complete
0		
7		
0	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -	under review
0		
8		
0	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008	proposal needs writing up
0		
9		
0	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 * in progress *	
1		
0		
0	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)	in progress
1		
1		
0	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan) * not started *	
1		
2		
0	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	added but needs work
2		
5		
0	Remove duration	
2		
6		

complete - specification updated

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	11-Mar-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 11-Mar-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 11-Mar-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , March-11-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , March-11-2009

Attendees

Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Dave Glick (drac)
Suman Kalia (IBM)

Apologies

Mike Beckerle(Oco)
Tim Kimber (IBM)

1. Specialized Annotations

Discussed SH proposal for using just specialized annotations. Generally thought to be reasonable if details can be worked out. Additional suggestion for dfdl:format and dfdl:complextype to allow specialized annotations as children rather than them being the union of all properties. Led to perhaps allowing scoped properties to be tied to specialized annotation. eg dfdl:sequence lengthKind and dfdl:element: lengthKind. Identified problem with short form properties on complexType, which specialized annotation should they apply to?
SH to update proposal.

2. Escape Schemes

IBM have done work to complete the current proposal (006) to provide a general mechanism that covers all cases and have concluded that it ends up to be much to complicated. They have suggested a simplified version that covers that major cases only.

Summary. : allow a single reference on field to an escape scheme.

The escapeScheme defines one of 3 different escape alternatives

- escapeCharacter and escapeforescapeCharacter
- escape surround/bracket with escapeforescapeCharacter
- escape surround/bracket with alternate escape surround/bracket

Also suggested adding property to list 'Other characters that need to be escaped' as a catchall mechanism

AP document simplified proposal

3. Validation ranges and exclusion lists .

General agreement that validation outside that provided by schema validation should be avoided . Discussed SH emailed proposal to use unions to define validation ranges. Need to decide if benefit of validation ranges has enough value to justify the complication of allowing limited union support. Be prepared to decide on the next call.

4. AOB

To be discussed

- Consuming extraneous data after schema has be used.
- 'Floating' definitions
- Actions

Next call 18 March 14:00

Meeting closed , 15:00 GMT

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour.

020	SH: Resolve packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy 22/10: No progress 10/12: added how to decide to overpunch and sign position 11/02: proposal largely agreed. SH to make minor changes 18/02: AP to document unsigned type behaviour 25/02: no progress
023	MB: Review Schema 1.1 29/1: AP and SH to talk to Sandy Gao 04/02 Call arranged for Friday 11/02: Call took place. Identified useful changes. Consolidate with previous list. 04/03: decided to stay on Schema 1.0.
024	String XML type
025	Escape schemes 21/1: discussed requirements 04/02: AP/SH to describe behaviour for known length text fields. Need to discuss if comment escapes should be supported. 11/02 new draft distributed: 18/02: SH up document concerns 25/02: SH and AP have refined proposal ready for approval. 04/03: SH and AP have further refined proposal. 11/03: discussed. suggested a simplified proposal be evaluated.
026	SH: Envelopes and Payloads
027	Property precedence tables
028	Variable markup
029	valueCalc (output length calculation)
031	DG: Review dfdl v033 11/02: Initial comments received 18/02: Will include work items 5 and 12. 11/03: complete
032	DG: Investigate compatibility between DFDL infoset and XDM
033	04/03: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.
034	04/03: AP remove redundant properties

Closed actions :

034 Work items:

N	Item	
0	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
0		
1		

0 0 2	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
0 0 3	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)	
0 0 5	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)	
0 0 6	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008	
0 0 7	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008	mostly complete
0 0 8	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -	under review
0 0 9	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008	proposal needs writing up
0 1 0	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 * in progress *	
0 1 1	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)	in progress
0 1 2	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan) * not started *	
0 2 5	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	added but needs work
0 2 6	Remove duration	

complete - specification updated

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	04-Mar-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 05-Mar-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 05-Mar-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , March-04-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , March-04-2009

Attendees

Mike Beckerle(Oco)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Tim Kimber (IBM)

Apologies

Dave Glick (drac)

1. XML Schema 1.1

It was agreed that the lack of support for Schema 1.1 in tools, libraries etc would be an inhibitor to DFDL implementations so it was agreed to remain on XML schema 1.0 .

SH highlighted the main issues with staying on XSD 1.0

1) xs:all improvements - relaxing min/max occurs, allowing wildcards,

I don't see an alternative to our current proposal of dfdl:sequenceKind.

2) weakened wildcard

Either live with this restriction, or say that the DFDL parser will implement the 1.1 rule where an optional element takes precedent over a wildcard and say that **if** you use this feature of DFDL, you should avoid XML schema tools that implement this UPA check. (It is my understanding that many tools that validate XML Schema for correctness do not include the UPA checks).

These issues need to be resolved.

It was noted that Schema 1.1 assert only allow reference to children of the item with the assert and that it would be desirable if DFDL was compatible. As there are dfdl use cases where reference to earlier fields is required AP to investigate if assigning earlier fields to variables is sufficient.

2. DFDL:ASSERT and DFDL:DISCRIMINATOR

Discussion to clarify the semantics of assert and discriminator.

Decided that dfdl:discriminator should only be used to resolve choices. TK to investigate if there are other use cases where discriminator would be useful.

dfdl:assert is to ensure that a document is well formed which, while possibly applying similar tests, is separate from validation. Confirmed that assert cannot be turned off.
AP to document semantics.

3. Reducing number of properties

General agreement to reduce properties when they are redundant and don't support a common use case.

LengthKind=NullTerminated, typeSubstitution, and trimkind.will be removed.

dfdl:format specialization such as dfd::sequence were also discussed. It had been pointed out in emails that there are two stable options

- Only dfdl:format with no specializations
- Only specializations and no general dfdl:format.

Supporting both dfdl:format and specialization was felt to be undesirable.

SH point out that the second option was not practical for all constructs as complex type definitions which put properties in scope would require all possible properties.

I was agreed that for dfdl v1 the specializations would be dropped.

4. AOB

To be discussed

- Escape Schemes
- Consuming extraneous data after schema has be used.
- 'Floating' definitions
- Validation ranges and exclusion lists
- Actions

Next call 11 March 14:00

Meeting closed , 15:00 GMT

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
033	04/03: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.
034	04/03: AP remove redundant properties

Current Actions :

No	Action

012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour.
020	SH: Resolve packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy 22/10: No progress 10/12: added how to decide to overpunch and sign position 11/02: proposal largely agreed. SH to make minor changes 18/02: AP to document unsigned type behaviour 25/02: no progress
023	MB: Review Schema 1.1 29/1: AP and SH to talk to Sandy Gao 04/02 Call arranged for Friday 11/02: Call took place. Identified useful changes. Consolidate with previous list. 04/03: decided to stay on Schema 1.0.
024	String XML type
025	Escape schemes 21/1: discussed requirements 04/02: AP/SH to describe behaviour for known length text fields. Need to discuss if comment escapes should be supported. 11/02 new draft distributed: 18/02: SH up document concerns 25/02: SH and AP have refined proposal ready for approval. 04/03: SH and AP have further refined proposal.
026	SH: Envelopes and Payloads
027	Property precedence tables
028	Variable markup
029	valueCalc (output length calculation)
031	DG: Review dfdl v033 11/02: Initial comments received 18/02: Will include work items 5 and 12.
032	DG: Investigate compatibility between DFDL infoset and XDM
033	04/03: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.
034	04/03: AP remove redundant properties

Closed actions :

[illegible]

034 Work items:

N o	Item	
0 0 1	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
0 0 2	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
0 0 3	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)	
0 0 5	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)	
0 0 6	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008	
0 0 7	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008	mostly complete
0 0 8	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -	under review
0 0 9	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008	proposal needs writing up
0 1 0	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 * in progress *	
0 1 1	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)	in progress
0 1 2	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan) * not started *	
0 2 5	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	added but needs work
0 2 6	Remove duration	

complete - specification updated

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	25-Feb-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 26-Feb-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 26-Feb-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , February-25-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , February-25-2009,

Attendees

Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Dave Glick (drac)
Tim Kimber (IBM)

Apologies

Mike Beckerle(Oco)

1. Discussion of D Glick Spec 033 review

Dave has done a thorough review of DFDL Spec v033 and circulated an email with the major point which was discussed on this call.

Major areas discussed

- Balance of formal spec vs Primer. The spec should be make a clearer distinction between normative and non-normative information.
- Parts of the document sound like implementation details which shouldn't be included

- DG suggested clearer document structure but wasn't sure on the best order to list representation properties. Possible suggestion is alphabetic list of properties with a number of indexes giving different views .
- Should be better with RFC2119 terminology SHOULD, MUST, etc
- Discussed whether dfdl infoset should be subset/compatible with XML infoset or XDM. General agreement that it should be as compatible as possible with XDM. DG to investigate how close they can be made.
- Types of DFDL properties should be more clearly specified .
- DG wondered whether case sensitivity would work for all locales . Suggested investigate using collations.

5. AOB

IBM want to have the spec technically complete within the next 6-8 weeks.
Next call 1 March 14:00

Meeting closed , 15:00 GMT

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
032	DG: Investigate compatibility between DFDL infoset and XDM

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour.
020	SH: Resolve packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy 22/10: No progress 10/12: added how to decide to overpunch and sign position 11/02: proposal largely agreed. SH to make minor changes 18/02: AP to document unsigned type behaviour 25/02: no progress
023	MB: Review Schema 1.1 29/1: AP and SH to talk to Sandy Gao 04/02 Call arranged for Friday 11/02: Call took place. Identified useful changes. Consolidate with previous list.
024	String XML type
025	Escape schemes 21/1: discussed requirements 04/02: AP/SH to describe behaviour for known length text fields. Need to discuss if comment escapes should be supported. 11/02 new draft distributed: 18/02: SH up document concerns 25/02: SH and AP have refined proposal ready for approval.
026	SH: Envelopes and Payloads
027	Property precedence tables
028	Variable markup
029	valueCalc (output length calculation)
031	DG: Review dfdl v033 11/02: Initial comments received 18/02: Will include work items 5 and 12.

Closed actions :

034 Work items:

N o	Item	
001	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
002	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)	
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)	
006	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008	
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008	mostly complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -	under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008	proposal needs writing up
010	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 * in progress *	
011	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)	in progress
012	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan) * not started *	

0 2 5	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	added but needs work
0 2 6	Remove duration	

complete - specification updated

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	18-Feb-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 19-Feb-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 19-Feb-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , February-18-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , February-18-2009,

Attendees

Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Dave Glick (drac)

Apologies

Mike Beckerle(Oco)

1. XSD 1.1

Discussion deferred

2. Escape Schemes

Further discussion of latest proposal.

Noted the need to properly describe the function of escapeScheme and in particular distinguish from substitution mechanisms such as XML entities which are sometimes called escapes .

SH felt there could be confusion with the two use cases of escapeCharacter. Suggested separate properties.
Action SH to document issues and improve wording

Discussed whether comment type escapes should be supported. Decided they are not needed on V1. AP to confirm that if IBM products provide support.

2. Review Actions

Action 20 - There had been a number of email exchanges following on from last weeks call.
Decided to keep 'zoned' as it is well known to users who need the support.

Discussion on whether dfdl should allow unsigned logical types to have 'signed' phsyical representation. If so what should be the behaviour when there is a mismatch of signs.

Action: AP to describe behaviour

3. calendarFormats

SH and AP have been discussing the behaviour of strict and lax parsing which needs a more complete description.

4. TypeSubstitution

AP raised whether typeSubstitution needs to be supported in DFDL v1.

5. AOB

DG to take a look at Work items 5 and 12 while continuing review

MB will not be available next week

Next call 25 February 14:00

Meeting closed , 15:00 GMT

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properties 18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour.
020	SH: Resolve packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy

	22/10: No progress 10/12: added how to decide to overpunch and sign position 11/02: proposal largely agreed. SH to make minor changes 18/02: AP to document unsigned type behaviour
023	MB: Review Schema 1.1 29/1: AP and SH to talk to Sandy Gao 04/02 Call arranged for Friday 11/02: Call took place. Identified useful changes. Consolidate with previous list.
024	String XML type
025	Escape schemes 21/1: discussed requirements 04/02: AP/SH to describe behaviour for known length text fields. Need to discuss if comment escapes should be supported. 11/02 new draft distributed: 18:02: SH up document concerns
026	SH: Envelopes and Payloads
027	Property precedence tables
028	Variable markup
029	valueCalc (output length calculation)
031	DG: Review dfdl v033 11/02: Initial comments received 18/02: Will include work items 5 and 12.

Closed actions :

034 Work items:

No	Item	
001	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
002	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)	
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)	
0	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008	

06		
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008	mostly complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -	under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008	proposal needs writing up
010	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 * in progress *	
011	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)	in progress
012	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan) * not started *	
025	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	added but needs work
026	Remove duration	

complete - specification updated

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	11-Feb-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 12-Feb-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 12-Feb-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , February 11-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

Weekly Working Group Conference Call

14:00 GMT, 11 February 2009

Attendees

Alan Powell (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Dave Glick (drac)

Aplogies

Mike Beckerle(Oco)

1. XSD 1.1

Went through Schema 1.1 changes presentation from Sandy Gao.
Some items need further investigation

2. Review Actions

Action 20 - Discussed suggested changes from SH. Observed that non-overpunching zoned was the same as text. Need to decide if unsigned types are allowed to have representation zoned.

Other actions updated below

3. Escape Schemes

Discussed latest proposal. General agreement that list of references was better than list of pairs of delimiters .
Observed that property names within xxxFormats don't need type prefix eg calendarPatternKind -> patternKind

Need to discuss if comment escapes should be supported.

4. Calendar/Number formats

Didn't discuss

4. AOB

Next call 18 February 14:00

Meeting closed , 15:00 GMT

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale, 04/02: changed from locale to specific properies
020	SH: Resolve packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy 22/10: No progress 10/12: added how to decide to overpunch and sign position 11/02: proposal largely agreed. SH to make minor changes
023	MB: Review Schema 1.1 29/1: AP and SH to talk to Sandy Gao 04/02 Call arranged for Friday 11/02: Call took place. Idnetified useful changes. Consolidate with previous list.
024	String XML type
025	Escape schemes 21/1: discussed requirements 04/02: AP/SH to describe behaviour for known length text fields. Need to discuss if comment escapes should be supported. 11/02 new draft distributed:
026	SH: Envelopes and Payloads
027	Property precedence tables
028	Variable markup
029	valueCalc (output length calculation)
031	DG: Review dfdl v033 11/02: Initial comments received

Closed actions :

034 Work items:

No	Item	
001	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
002	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)	
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)	
006	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008	
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008	mostly complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -	under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008	proposal needs writing up
010	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 * in progress *	
011	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)	in progress
012	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan) * not started *	
025	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	added but needs work
026	Remove duration	

complete - specification updated

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	04-Feb-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 05-Feb-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 05-Feb-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , February 04-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

Weekly Working Group Conference Call 14:00 GMT, 04 February 2009

Attendees

Alan Powell (IBM)
Mike Beckerle(Oco)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Dave Glick (drac)

1. XSD 1.1

SH and AP have scheduled a call with Sandy for this Friday

2. Welcome David Glick

MB welcomed David Glick to the WG. David gave some background to his interest in DFDL. He is currently leading a SBIR project for the US Navy which involves efficiently parsing binary network data. DG will review draft 033 and submit comments

3. Escape Schemes

Further discussion of proposal distributed by AP , in particular scanning/skipping known length text fields.

SH and AP pointed out that the (assumed) speculative parsing behaviour required that known length text fields needed to be scanned if terminating syntax was in scope so last week's proposal was not correct.

AP/SH to write up description of speculative parsing , scanning, escaping text fields.

Need to discuss if comment escapes should be supported.

4. Calendar/Number formats

AP raised question about whether locale or specific properties should be used to define properties such as decimalseparator in numberFormat and langauge in calendarFormat. Decided that specific properties should be used as it gave more control and didn't require users to 'find' the correct locale for a format.

4. AOB

Next call 11 February 14:00

Meeting closed , 15:00 GMT

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

Actions raised at this meeting

034 Work items:

No	Item	
001	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
002	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)	
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)	
006	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008	
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008	mostly complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -	under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008	proposal needs writing up
010	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 * in progress *	
011	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)	in progress
012	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan) * not started *	
025	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	added but needs work
026	Remove duration	

complete - specification updated

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	28-Jan-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 30-Jan-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 30-Jan-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , January-28-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

Weekly Working Group Conference Call

14:00 GMT, 28 January 2009

Attendees

Alan Powell (IBM)
Mike Beckerle(Oco)
Steve Hanson (IBM)

1. XSD 1.1

SH and AP will arrange a call with Sandy Gao

2. Escape Schemes

Discussed proposal distributed by AP

Escape schemes apply to all logical types with text representation

As with other defnxxxxFormats it is the escapeSchemeRefermce that is in scope not the properties within the escape scheme.

SH proposed allowing multiple escape refs for each alternate escape delimiter pairs rather than defining them

in on escape scheme.

When escapeSchemeRef is blank then no escape scheme applies

Discussion about whether escape schemes apply to known length as well as variable length text fields . Earlier decision to scan known length text fields for parent syntax items implies need to allow escape .

Suggested syntax

1. escapeSchemeRef= blank means no escaping and don't scan
2. escapeSchemeRef=something but escape delimiters and escapecharacter are blank means no escape but scan for syntax
3. escapeSchemeRef=something but escape delimiters and escapeCharacter are something means escape and scan for syntax

Subsequent discussions indicate that some products scan if there are syntax items in scope even if known length. Needs further discussion.

Need to discuss if comment escapes should be supported.

4. AOB

Next call 04 February 14:00

Meeting closed , 15:00 GMT

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
031	

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale,
020	SH: Resolve packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy 22/10: No progress 10/12: added how to decide to overpunch and sign position
023	MB: Review Schema 1.1 29/1: AP and SH to talk to Sandy Gao
024	String XML type
025	Escape schemes 21/1: discussed requirements
026	SH: Envelopes and Payloads
027	Property precedence tables
028	Variable markup
029	valueCalc (output length calculation)
030	AP: confirm with WTX that can drop duration 21/6: WTX confirm that they do not have a duration type so do not need it in dfdl. Will drop from spec. Closed

Closed actions :

030	AP: confirm with WTX that can drop duration 21/6: WTX confirm that they do not have a duration type so do not need it in dfdl. Will drop from spec. Closed

034 Work items:

No	Item	
001	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
002	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)	
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)	
006	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008	
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008	mostly complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -	under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008	proposal needs writing up
010	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 * in progress *	
011	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)	in progress
012	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan) * not started *	
025	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	added but needs work

complete - specification updated

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	21-Jan-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Alan Powell on 23-Jan-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 23-Jan-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , January -21-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

Weekly Working Group Conference Call

14:00 GMT, 21 January 2009

Attendees

Alan Powell (IBM)

Mike Beckerle(Oco)

Apologies

Steve Hanson (IBM)

1. XSD 1.1

Deferred to next call

2. Calendar formats

Discussed updated (v4) supplement emailed by AP

Agreed millisec/secSinceEpoc cannot be implied by length of logical data so need seperate enumerations.

Observed that these options were really combination of 3 properties binary, length and sec/millisec.

Suggested renaming to binarySeconds and binaryMilliseconds

Packed calendars: decided that need to be able to specify at least the packedDecimalSignCodes property rather than assuming a default so reference will be added to calendar description

Locale needs to be specified for numberformats and calendarFormats (didn't identify any other areas) as it modifies the behaviour of ICU. Decided to add locale to numberFormat and CalendarFormat

3. Escape Schemes

Agreed need for multiple escape delimiter pairs but not nested.

Need an escape for escape character even though in most cases this will be the same character, eg /n //, There are some formats that have a different escape, eg /n &/. Only need single escape characters and one level of escape characters.

Discussed how to deal with comments of the form /* comment */ where the escape delimiters are also the initiator and terminator of the field. Semantic needed is 'only look for field terminator not any parent terminator or any other syntax elements'. May fall out naturally from the speculative parsing rules. Need further discussion.

4. AOB

Next call 28 January 14:00

Meeting closed , 15:00 GMT

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
031	

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed 21/1: add locale,
020	SH: Resolve packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy 22/10: No progress 10/12: added how to decide to overpunch and sign position
023	MB: Review Schema 1.1
024	String XML type
025	Escape schemes 21/1: discussed requirements
026	SH: Envelopes and Payloads
027	Property precedence tables
028	Variable markup
029	valueCalc (output length calculation)
030	AP: confirm with WTX that can drop duration 21/6: WTX confirm that they do not have a duration type so do not need it in dfdl. Will drop from spec. Closed

Closed actions :

030	AP: confirm with WTX that can drop duration 21/6: WTX confirm that they do not have a duration type so do not need it in dfdl. Will drop from spec. Closed

034 Work items:

No	Item	
001	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
002	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)	
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)	
006	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008	
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008	mostly complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -	under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008	proposal needs writing up
010	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 * in progress *	
011	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)	in progress
012	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan) * not started *	
025	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	added but needs work

complete - specification updated

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	16-Jan-09 (Fri)
Meeting Time	15:00 - 16:00

Created by Alan Powell on 20-Jan-09

Last Modified by Alan Powell on 20-Jan-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , January-16-2009

Agenda

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

Weekly Working Group Conference Call 15:00 GMT, 16 January 2009

Attendees

Steve Hanson (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Mike Beckerle(Oco)

1. Non-supported XSD constructs in DFDL schema

It was agreed that dfdl v1 will not allow non-supported XSD constructs, such as attributes, to exist in dfdl schema. That is they will be treated as errors rather than ignored.

2. XSD 1.1

For next meeting we will revisit the list of areas to be investigated produced by MB

3. Padding to minlength

Proposal documented in last call (10 December 2008) was approved

4. Implicit Lengths

Decided to disallow zoned for Float and Double. **Approved**

Use numberPattern for all zoned lengths instead of fixed length implied by type - **Approved**

Discussed using virtual decimal point and/or fractional digits for implied length of decimal. Decided against.

Need to complete for Date/Time, Date, Time

Drop DFDL support for duration as a logical type. **Action: check with WTX**

Simple type	text (+ xml)	binary	
String	Length/maxlength	n/a	
Float	Text: numberPattern (length of positive subpattern)	32	
Double	Text: numberPattern	64	
Decimal/Integer	Text: numberPattern Zoned:numberPattern	Pkd/bcd: (TotalDigits+1)/2	
Long, UnsignedLong	Text: numberPattern Zoned:numberPattern	binary: 64 Pkd/bcd: (TotalDigits+1)/2	
Int, Unsignedint	Text: numberPattern Zoned:numberPattern	binary: 32 Pkd/bcd: (TotalDigits+1)/2	
Short, Unsignedshort	Text: numberPattern Zoned:numberPattern	binary: 16 Pkd/bcd: (TotalDigits+1)/2	
Byte, Unsignedbyte	Text: numberPattern Zoned:numberPattern	binary: 8 Pkd/bcd: (TotalDigits+1)/2	
DateTime	Calendarpattern		
Date	Calendarpattern		
Time	Calendarpattern		
Duration	Calendarpattern		
Boolean	Length of textBooleanTrue	32	
HexBinary	n/a	Length/maxlength	

5. Calendar formats

Briefly discussed supplement emailed by AP . Has been updated and will be redistributed

Note change from SecondsSinceEpoc and milliSecondsSinceEpoc to binary not implemented as it was based on using length of logical type to decide which to use but DateTime , Date and Time types do not have variable length.

3. Zoned Decimal

Discussed behaviour of IBM iSeries not overpunching positive numbers . Approved changes.

4. AOB

Next call 21 January 14:00

Meeting closed , 16:00 GMT

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

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
030	AP: confirm with WTX that can drop duration

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme 10/9: Not allocated yet 17/9: No update 24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions 22/10: No progress 16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed
020	SH: Resolve packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy 22/10: No progress 10/12: added how to decide to overpunch and sign position
023	MB: Review Schema 1.1
024	String XML type
025	Escape schemes
026	SH: Envelopes and Payloads
027	Property precedence tables
028	Variable markup
029	valueCalc (output length calculation)
030	AP: confirm with WTX that can drop duration

Closed actions :

003	AP: Update spec from WTX document 13/8: All resolved issues have been added to spec. Remaining unresolved items need discussion 10/9: Alan will pull out the remaining unresolved items and circulate for discussion next week 17/9: Doc distributed and partially discussed 15/10: All updates complete except minlength 22/10: No update 12/11: Updates have been sent to wtx to review. Will chase up for comments 16/1: Updates have been made to spec v033. Closed
018	AP: Agree padding to minimum length 15/10: Needs documenting 22/10: No update 26/11: discussed and AP to suggest dfdl:minlength 16/1: proposal approved. Closed

034 Work items:

No	Item	
001	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
002	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
003	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)	
005	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)	
006	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008	
007	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008	mostly complete
008	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -	under review
009	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008	proposal needs writing up
010	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 * in progress *	
011	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)	in progress
012	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan) * not started *	
025	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	added but needs work

complete - specification updated