TeamRoom Plus

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	**DFDL 1.0**
Meeting Date	**05-Dec-07 (Wed)**
Meeting Time	**17:00 - 18:00**
Meeting Editors	Mike Beckerle, Steve Hanson

Created by Ian W Parkinson on 05-Dec-07
Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 16-Jan-08

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Dec-05-2007

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
17:00 GMT, 05 Dec 2007

Attendees
Mike Beckerle (IBM)
Simon Parker (PolarLake)
Ian Parkinson (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)
Suman Kalia (IBM)

1. Expression Language
Alan is working on the DFDL expression language, and has come across issues regarding expressions which refer to portions of the document which have not yet been parsed, or have not yet been serialized. During serialization, reference to unserialized portions of the document might result in a DFDL implementation needing to cache large amounts of data, which may prevent streaming.

Suman suggested that DFDL tooling could catch these cases and provide an error or warning. Mike stressed

that we do not want to prevent the use of DFDL to describe formats which are not easily streamable, giving an example of a large data structure which includes a checksum near the beginning of the document, However it may be useful for the user to know when they have inadvertently made it hard for a DFDL-described format to be streamed, though Simon felt this would be out of scope for the DFDL specification.

Suman and Simon suggested that a physical-length function, in the expression language, would be necessary to allow the calculation of the length of structures, even if under some circumstances this could make streaming difficult. Mike suggested that we would also need a function which returns the number of bytes between two elements in the physical document.

During parsing, the situation is clearer, and the meeting agreed that a rule stating that an expression could not refer forward is reasonable. Alan noted that many cases affected by such a restriction could be fixed by adjusting the order of fields in the schema, and Suman pointed out that such a restriction could easily be lifted later but not easily imposed later.

Suman and Alan wondered whether document size might cause issues for a compliance test suite. Mike suggested that the specification could include a requirement on the minimum document size that may be supported by an implementation; Ian suggested that an implementation which could deal only with even very small documents would be useful in embedded systems. Simon wondered if we could require an implementation to disclose its minimum supported document size, but also felt that this would be difficult to predict, as schema complexity might override size issues.

2. Null vs. Default values
Following an email discussion regarding the "nillable" and "default" attributes in XSD, Mike asked whether these attributes are genuinely orthogonal or whether we could restrict their use. Elements would be allowed to either be nillable or have a default, but not both,

Simon felt that the "default" attribute is more important than "nillable", and that a null value was intended to convey the the non-presence of an element. It would then not make sense to allow minOccurs="0" in combination with nillable="true". In contrast, Mike felt that null was a special value orthogonal to the element's value-space. Suman pointed out that the meaning of null depends on the application.

Mike will put forward a suggestion to simplify this area.

3. Other business
Mike has distributed a new draft, version 30, of the DFDL specification, and invites comments. He asked that comments be provided using Microsoft Word's review facilities.

Meeting closed , 18:00 GMT

Mike distributed minutes of this meeting before I could distribute the above. Here is a copy of his minutes, taken from the WG mailing list:

OGF DFDL WG minutes 2007-12-05 call

Suman Kalia, Simon Parker, Alan Powell, Mike Beckerle

(who else? - was someone else on also)

We discussed

Output issues in the DFDL expression language:

E.g.., an outputValueCalc for a field in the header of a data stream may contain information that requires you to know the rep, or length of the rep, of the whole data item.

We concluded that this kind of thing can't be ruled out. Some formats just require buffering and are not streamable; however, implementations can vary on just how large a data item they're able to cope with here.

Expression language section will include a subsection highlighting this issue and that implementations can vary here.

Alan will update his expression language proposal and include this.

Also suggested was a path length-from-to function that takes 2 path expressions and gives you the size of the represntation between them. (start of first, to last bit before start of 2nd).
(I don't think we discussed a clear use case motivating this, but there may be one. We did discuss applications trying to fit data into limited size boxes, but the use case is not clear.
Also note that all representation lengths are subject to change due to different starting alignments.)

Nillable and Default:

We also discussed the interaction of nillable and having a default.

The sense of the group on the call is that we can restrict these so that if something is nillable it cannot also have a default value, and that the behavior of DFDL on output for a required element that is nillable but not in the logical data, is to create a null value. Everyone agreed that there is no need for a property useNullValueForDefault because this should always be the behavior.

Mike will forward a proposal.

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

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoo

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	**DFDL 1.0**
Meeting Date	**28-Nov-07 (Wed)**
Meeting Time	**17:00 - 18:00**
Meeting Editors	Mike Beckerle, Steve Hanson

Created by Ian W Parkinson on 28-Nov-07
Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 16-Jan-08

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Nov-28-2007

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) prefix length strings - as circulated in email

2) plan for contents of next draft

I suggest this as a starting point:
- binary/opaque should be resolved
- null/defaults
- facets discussion (which we use and how) integrated
- choiceType enum + length properties on choice
- prefix lengths
- wildcards with dimensions
- integer type added

3) Any other items

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
17:00 GMT, 28 Nov 2007

Attendees
Mike Beckerle (IBM)
Geoff Judd (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Ian Parkinson (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)

1. Introduction
The agenda, distributed by Mike prior to the call, covered two main items for discussion.

A proposal has been circulated to the DFDL-WG mailing list, describing the use of annotated simple types for describing length prefixes, which had already been discussed within IBM. In the absense of Simon Parker or representatives from parties other than IBM, the meeting opted not to discuss this proposal at this time.

2. Plan for contents of next draft
The distributed agenda included a draft list of items to be included in the next draft of the DFDL specification. Steve queried the 'integer type added' item: Mike explained there had been a debate over support for both the integer XSD type and the decimal type. We had previously opted to support both, as the canonical representation for decimal includes a trailing ".0" on integers, which may be confusing for users.

Mike would like to prepare, along similar lines, a plan covering several draft versions of the specification. Some work items, such as the SWIFT example, would be omitted from the plan as they do not directly concern the text of the specification. Mike's plan will be distributed via the DFDL-WG mailing list.

Alan asked if we should set a target date for completion of the specification. Mike observed that we had previously set target dates that had not been achieved; however Steve felt that as we are in a position to plan the next few drafts of the specification, a target date is likely to be more reasonable.

3. Other business
Steve has been revisiting the decimal supplement, and has found some errors. Mike observed that it would be desirable for DFDL's support of packed decimal numbers and floating point numbers to be analogous. One complexity lies in the number of types of packed decimal that DFDL needs to support (including 'pure', unsigned packed, IBM packed, and zoned decimal), along with variants, which Mike felt might best be addressed through a small pattern language. Steve would investigate this further.

Meeting closed , 17:30 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

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoo

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	**DFDL 1.0**
Meeting Date	**21-Nov-07 (Wed)**
Meeting Time	**17:00 - 18:00**
Meeting Editors	Mike Beckerle, Steve Hanson

Created by Ian W Parkinson on 21-Nov-07
Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 16-Jan-08

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Nov-21-2007

Agenda

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

Person Responsible	Time Allotted	Subject to be reviewed	Link to Materials to be r (also click to post your u

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
17:00 GMT, 21 Nov 2007

Attendees
Mike Beckerle (IBM)
Geoff Judd (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Suman Kalia (IBM)

Simon Parker (PolarLake)
Ian Parkinson (IBM)

1. Introduction
Mike would like, in this meeting, to cover the hexBinary and base64Binary debate, and also to discuss the use of 'any' wildcards with minOccurs and maxOccurs.

2. 'Any' wildcards with minOccurs and maxOccurs
The DFDL specification presently disallows the use of minOccurs and maxOccurs on 'any' wildcards, in contrast to XML schema. Simon stated that he sees no reason to forbid this, and that these properties might be useful, for example when structures could be followed by arbitrary extensions.

Suman felt that the most common use case would be minOccurs="0" and maxOccurs="1". Mike wondered whether this would be useful within unordered groups, and thought it would be a good way to model an 'all' group containing some known fields and a number of unknown fields.

Mike took an action item to investigate this further.

3. hexBinary and base 64Binary
The working group has been discussing, via email, the use of hexBinary and base64Binary types, along with 'enumeration' and 'pattern' properties. Mike asked the group whether we should disallow the 'enumeration' and 'pattern' properties on binary types (as they are difficult to use, in particular with base64Binary), and whether we should remove support for base64Binary (as it shares a value space with hexBinary, and is therefore a synonym of hexBinary in DFDL).

Simon felt that this distinction remained a useful hint to any component emitting XML based on a DFDL infoset. He also observed that base64Binary is more commonly used than hexBinary, and is preferred. Mike argued that while base 64 might be preferred to hexadecimal in terms of space, hexadecimal is more readable. Steve observed that hexBinary is commonly used.

While Mike felt that supporting fixed and default binary values might lead to requiring support for patterns and enumeration, the meeting agreed that there are use cases for default and fixed values - for example, some file formats use "eyecatchers" which are best expressed in hexadecimal. Mike pointed out that this could be achieved usng a string type, but suggested allowing 'default' and 'fixed' for hexBinary. Simon suggested that something similar would be necesssary for base64Binary, as some values (such as passwords and identifiers) are frequently expressed in base 64.

Sandy Gao (IBM) has been asked to comment on whether there are any use cases where patterns are used with hexBinary of base64Binary.

To conclude this discussion, Mike proposed the following: to retain support for both base64Binary and hexBinary, with identical content in DFDL; to allow both 'fixed' and 'default' for both base64Binary and hexBinary, but (pending further information from Sandy) to disallow 'pattern' and 'enum'.

[Simon and Suman left the meeting]

4. Array Prefixes and Suffixes
Mike asked whether the group was happy with the omission of array prefixes and suffixes. We know how to add these back should we ever need to, and there is a concern that including them would lead to many more array properties being necessary. Steve was happy with the present proposal.

5. Choice type and Length properties on Choice
Mike observed that there is a need to distinguish between choice groups which are of constant length, and choice groups where the length is determined by the relevent subelement. Where the choice is unresolvable, it is not possible to have a choice of variable length.

Steve felt that as we are able to make assertions, there would be very few cases where a choice is unresolvable. Mike pointed out that in an unresolvable choice group, each arm would need consistant enough syntax for a parser to be able to determine the end; and that this could be modelled as arms with enough information to discriminate. Geoff suggested that experience with IBM's MRM technology shows this to be unusual.

The meeting considered two options. We could specify two properties, one to select between constant length and variable length; and one to select between resolvable and unresolvable. In this option, the combination variable-length/unresolvable would be disallowed. In the second option, we would have a single property with three possible values: constant length, variable length or unresolvable. The meeting agreed upon the second option.

When experimenting with the DFDL language recently, Steve found specifying length on structures to be awkward. He proposed removing 'lengthKind' on choice elements, and Mike added that we would also wish to remove other associated properties such as 'intitator' and 'terminator'. On reflection, the meeting decided to keep these properties, noting that using these on a choice element is identical to wrapping the choice element in a sequence element with the same properties.

6. Other business
There has, internally within IBM, been a discussion regarding length prefixes on strings. Mike will circulate a proposal to the working group, to allow prefix formats to be described through annotations on simpleType definitions.

Meeting closed , 17:55 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

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoo

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	**DFDL 1.0**
Meeting Date	**16-Nov-07 (Fri)**
Meeting Time	**14:00 - 15:00**
Meeting Editors	Mike Beckerle, Steve Hanson

Created by Ian W Parkinson on 16-Nov-07
Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 28-Nov-07

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Nov-16-2007

Agenda

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

Person Responsible	Time Allotted	Subject to be reviewed	Link to Materials to be r (also click to post your u

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

Working Group Conference Call
14:00 GMT, 16 Nov 2007

Attendees
Mike Beckerle (IBM)
Geoff Judd (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Suman Kalia (IBM)

Ian Parkinson (IBM)
Alan Powell (IBM)

1. Introduction
Mike called the meeting to discuss the revised Data Grammar portion of the DFDL specification, which he had previously circulated. This was discussed on the regular, weekly, conference call on 14th November, in Mike's absence. Mike will not be able to attend the next scheduled conference call.

2. Review of DFDL Data Grammar
The meeting discussed the following points:

1. As noted in the previous meeting, both the ComplexContent and ComplexElement productions include a "Prefix" element. Mike stated that this redundancy does exist in DFDL, but it sometimes necessary, e.g. for embedded groups. Steve suggested that, if this did need to be changed, we would do so with restrictions rather than a change to the productions.
2. Suman suggested that the present grammar specification does not satisfactorily cover the case where the start of an array needs to be aligned, with individual array elements automatically being aligned. Mike suggested that this can be dealt with, in a DFDL schema, by encapsulating the array in an element or sequence.This would require the author to build additional encapsulation around the array, which Suman felt would be unnatural, and suggested it would be more natural to introduce a property to explicitly deal with this situation. Mike observed that the XML specification treats arrays as simply adjacent elements, so we should minimize the number of properties which affect an entire array rather than each individual element. Mike and Suman will collaborate on a concrete proposal to address this.
3. Mike expressed discomfort with the use of "binary" and "opaque" to describe raw data, as these words ,ay be ambiguous. "opaque" in particular may refer to unparsed data, or to anyType elements. Suggested alternatives included "octets", "bits", "raw" and "blob".
4. The SequenceContent production currently contains a "finalUnused" element. Mike wondered whether this would best be moved to the Sequence production. Suman felt that there would then be issues with prefixes and suffixes. The meeting saw no good reason to change this.
5. Precedence order needs to be defined. Steve and Geoff will attempt to define a static order.
6. Regarding the query raised at the previous meeting concerning initial prefix Separators and final postfix Separators, Mike confirmed that these had been removed following comments in a previous draft of the document. They had originally been intended to support certain properties which could be now be defined using other features of the grammar.

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

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoo

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	**DFDL 1.0**
Meeting Date	**14-Nov-07 (Wed)**
Meeting Time	**17:00 - 18:00**
Meeting Editors	Mike Beckerle, Steve Hanson

Created by Ian W Parkinson on 14-Nov-07
Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 28-Nov-07

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Nov-14-2007

Agenda

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

Person Responsible	Time Allotted	Subject to be reviewed	Link to Materials to be r (also click to post your u

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
17:00 GMT, 14 Nov 2007

Attendees
Geoff Judd (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Simon Parker (PolarLake)

Ian Parkinson (IBM)

Apologies
Mike Beckerle (IBM)

1. Information Set Proposal
Following last week's review of the Information Set proposal, Simon updated the proposal and distributed a new draft, version 7. Alan queried the reference to empty lists under "No Value", asking if this was necessary as DFDL does not use a concept of lists - this is carried over from the XML Information Set specification, and is only theoretical. The proposal will be distributed wider within IBM to solicit final comments.

2. Review of Revised DFDL Data Grammar
Mike has updated the Data Grammar portion of the DFDL specification, to take into account the InfoSet proposal, and distributed this via the DFDL-WG mailing list.

The meeting reviewed the revised grammar, touching upon the following points:
1. Both the ComplexContent and ComplexElement productions include a "Prefix" element. Alan asked whether this duplication was necessary. Steve and Simon noted that this had not changed during the revision and that there are cases where this is useful. The meeting agreed not to change this.
2. Alan asked why we need both Element and ComplexContent in the SequenceItem production. Element effectively introduces a name.
3. Simon noted that most of the changes were in the productions, and wondered what influence the InfoSet proposal actually had on the specification. Steve said that there had been real changes, for example with SimpleElement and ComplexElement.
4. Steve observed that Prefix and Postfix Separators no longer appear in the productions table. The meeting agreed that these were probably no longer necessary, and that this was a useful simplification, but to check this with Mike.

3. Object Constraint Language
The UML diagram in the revised InfoSet proposal uses Object Constraint Language[1] (OCL) to specify an invariant on the Element class. Simon asked the meeting to consider whether this might be a useful approach in other sections of the DFDL specification, in particular when describing parser behaviour. Suman was concerned that it might prove useful only for specifying parser internals which should not be covered in the language specification.

4. Other Business
1. Suman asked if we need to define a parser API. Steve suggested that this should not form part of the language specification, but that there may need to be other specification documents.
2. Steve and Alan will be compiling a list of remaining work items to move the specification towards completion.
3. Work has started within IBM, to attempt to describe a number of industry standard data formats, including SWIFT and ISO 8583, using DFDL. Simon has a long standing work item to attempt to describe a number of custom application formats. These efforts should help validate the utility of DFDL and suggest specification revisions.
4. Thanksgiving is next week - will this affect attendence of next weeks meeting?

Meeting closed 17:35 GMT

Actions
1. Mike to comment on the omission of initial prefix Separators and final postfix Separators from the productions table, in the revised DFDL Data Grammar. Are these intended to be covered by other elements in the productions, or do they need to be added?

References

1. Object Constraint Language; specification at http://www.omg.org/technology/documents/formal/ocl.htm

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

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoo

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	**DFDL 1.0**
Meeting Date	**07-Nov-07 (Wed)**
Meeting Time	**17:00 - 18:00**
Meeting Editors	Mike Beckerle, Steve Hanson

Created by Ian W Parkinson on 07-Nov-07
Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 11-Jan-08

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , Nov-07-2007

Agenda

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

Person Responsible	Time Allotted	Subject to be reviewed	Link to Materials to be r (also click to post your u

Minutes

Meeting Minutes

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

Attendees

Mike Beckerle (IBM)
Geoff Judd (IBM)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Suman Kalia (IBM)
Simon Parker (PolarLake)
Ian Parkinson (IBM)

1. Introduction

The previous meeting left two areas for consideration: the Information Set (InfoSet) proposal, and the work

regarding defaulting and nulls. This meeting would cover a review of a revised InfoSet proposal. The defaults/nulls issue has not been progressed.

2. Review of Revised Information Set Proposal

Steve and Simon have collaborated on a revision, v6, of the InfoSet proposal. This has been circulated via the DFDL-WG mailing list.

The meeting reviewed the v6 proposal, highlighting the following points:

1. There remain two types of information item: Element Information Items and Document Information Items. There are now two categories of Element Information Item: simple, and complex.
2. The description of Document Information Items incorrectly lists a "root" member. This should be replaced by a "children" member. Geoff pointed out that the associated UML diagram suggests that a Document Information Item may contain multiple children; this will be restricted in the text.
3. The "dfdl version" member is now used to describe the version of DFDL to which the InfoSet conforms; it does not describe the version of the parser generating the InfoSet. In particular, for an InfoSet to inlcude a dfdl version identifier, there is now no requirement for that InfoSet to have been generated by a DFDL parser.
4. Mike queried the meaning of "absolute Schema Component Descriptor"; it should identify a schema as a whole. This is a term defined by the SCD specification, and an appropriate citation should be added to the proposal.
5. The meeting discussed, at length, the "data value" member of Element Information Item, which the proposal lists as being of type String. Mike pointed out that this is insufficient to distinguish between some binary floating-point values, and suggested that it should be of a type defined by the "data type" member. Suman suggested this would also make for a more natural API. Simon remarked on the precedent set by XML Schema where all values are represented as strings. Mike closed the discussion advocating dropping the word "String" from the definition of the "data value" member.
6. Suman queried the purpose of the document information item. This is an in-memory artifact only, which acts as a container of the InfoSet's data, and has no representation in a serialization of the InfoSet. This should be clarified in the proposal.
7. The proposal now contains a UML diagram illustrating the object model. The relationship between Parent and Element requires some clarifying: it should be modelled as a composite containment relationship.
8. Simon highlighted that the "schema" member of Element Information Item may be either a relative or an absolute SCD; while the "schema" member of Document Information Item must be an absolute SCD.
9. The current version makes no mention of arrays, preferring to treat arrays as repeated children with the same name. The meeting consdered how to denote arrays in the InfoSet, but opted instead to add a note regarding arrays to the specification.

Mike will circulate his notes regarding the agreed changes to the spec. Simon will circulate a new version, v7, incorporating further comments.

3. Other Business

There was no other business.

Meeting closed

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

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoo

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	**DFDL 1.0**
Meeting Date	**31-Oct-07 (Wed)**
Meeting Location/call-in	**DE2J16**
Meeting Time	**17:00 - 18:00**
Meeting Editors	Mike Beckerle, Steve Hanson

Created by Steve Hanson on 01-Nov-07
Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 11-Jan-08

OGF DFDL Working Group Call Oct -31-2007

Agenda

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

Call details

Link to last call minutes
<none>

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.

Minutes:

Discussed: Separator semantics via rewriting - Alan Powell (prior to call) raised objections to MikeB's treatment of separator properties semantics in draft of nulls/optionals/defaults memo.

Mike agrees. This stuff is a mess. Needs to be reworked.

Action item: Mike to rework.

Discussed: Boxed data, i.e., sequences with dfdl:length specifications as means of specifying box size surrounding dfdl-described content.

Proposed to drop this from DFDL V1.0.

Action: examine important formats to see if this feature is needed. We know there are formats that use it (IMS blocks), but must they be supported in single schemas or is a two-layer via two schemas approach acceptable?

Resolved: not dropping this. New simpler examples are needed which make this clearer than the example in the email/memo by Mike.

(Note: this is the whole section on valueCalc properties. This has already been identified as an area needing a write up.)

Discussed: does infoset include things like the representation length of items? This information is needed to express output for formats where one element stores the rep-length of another. Suman pointed out that this information doesn't need to be available in the infoset. The relationships between elements of many kinds cannot be expressed directly in terms of the infoset, so why require this representation-level relationship to be so expressed?

Resolved: infoset does not contain represnetation artifacts like representation length. Mike mentioned that it does contain number of occurrences for arrays. However, later discussion of infoset brings into doubt whether the infoset even knows about arrays.

Discussed: infoset

Metadata link? Suman has advocated for this. It's an optional thing. SCD paths are acceptable to most. Simon maintained that this shouldn't be part of the infoset but really is an implementation consideration.

UML model: Discussed that it should match XML infoset terminology and also the grammar terminology used in the spec. (note: or the grammar terminology be made to conform to the infoset - actually this is more likely) Simon's model has arrays as distinct from sequence groups. We discussed eliminating arrays as a concept and going to a neutral term that captures both sequence groups and arrays (things with children).

Action: Steve H. and Simon P. to work out remaining infoset issues. Provide UML diagram.

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