

# TeamRoor Plus

IBM TeamRoor

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



## Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	25-Jul-17 (Tues)
Meeting Time	15:00 - 16:00

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Mar-11

Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 25-Jul-17

### OGF DFDL Working Group Call, 25 July 2017

#### Agenda

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

#### 1. Daffodil Open Source Project

Status update.

#### Minutes

##### Meeting Minutes

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

##### Attendees

Steve Hanson

Mike Beckerle

##### Apologies

##### Minutes

##### IPR Statement

"I acknowledge that participation in this meeting is subject to the OGF Intellectual Property Policy."

##### Meeting closed

##### Next regular call

TBD @ 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

Subject	Document Type	Created	Mod
---------	---------------	---------	-----

Next action: **296**

### Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

### Current Actions:

No	Action
228	<b>Review set of tutorial lessons (All)</b> 17/9/13: Lesson 1 proposes a set of lessons, needs reviewing as over 2 years old. ... 22/10: No progress 31/10: Becoming a focus for Tresys. Steve to send his 'Modeling Data Formats using DFDL' powerpoint. ... 19/11: No further progress 26/11: Possibility of help from MITRE high-school student, and from Marisa at IBM. ...

	<p>11/3/14: No further progress</p> <p>25/3: MITRE have produced a couple of new tutorials under the guidance of James Gariss. Jonathan to forward for review.</p> <p>Mike observed that an html tutorial could be generated from a tdml file using XSLT.</p> <p>11/4: Not discussed</p> <p>15/4: Jonathan will send 4 new mini-tutorials. Need to figure out best way to incorporate into the tutorial structure.</p> <p>29/4: Tutorials received. Mark has taken a quick read. Mark &amp; Steve to review and report back.</p> <p>6/5: Still with Mark and Steve</p> <p>20/5: Mark has reviewed. Will ask IBM information development to recommend a way to portray the existing and new lessons, preferably web-based. Find somewhere to host them. OGF? GitHub? developerWorks? NCSA?</p> <p>3/6: Steve has also reviewed.</p> <p>...</p> <p>17/6: No further progress on tutorials. Tim is looking into the creation of some DFDL how-to videos using the IBM Integration Studio.</p> <p>...</p> <p>31/3/15: No further progress</p> <p>14/4: Agreed that the need for better tutorials has become pressing for Daffodil users who aren't using IBM's tools and material. Discussed creating tutorials based on a tdml file with comments that is processed to produce html. Mike to investigate.</p> <p>28/4: Mike has sent an example tdml file which embeds instances of a new 'tutorial' element in various places. These elements contain html which can be extracted and formatted in a browser. Suggest future DFDL tutorials are created using this technology.</p> <p>12/5: Not discussed</p> <p>...</p> <p>22/9: No further progress</p> <p>3/11: Daffodil team has someone working on the new 'tutorial' element in tdml files. In time this should result in some new tutorials and re-working of existing tutorials.</p> <p>5/1/16: Mike has started a bitOrder tutorial using the tdml file approach (uses stylesheets to render html).</p> <p>16/2: The bitOrder tutorial is available on the web @ <a href="https://opensource.ncsa.illinois.edu/bamboo/artifact/DFDL-MASTER21/JOB1/build-132/Tutorials/bitorder.tutorial.tdml.xml">https://opensource.ncsa.illinois.edu/bamboo/artifact/DFDL-MASTER21/JOB1/build-132/Tutorials/bitorder.tutorial.tdml.xml</a></p> <p>1/3: Awaiting review. Web-based try out facility under development at Tresys.</p> <p>...</p> <p>27/6/17: No further progress</p>
242	<p><b>Standardise on a single tdml format for DFDL tests (All)</b></p> <p>5/2/14: Steve has requested permission for IBM to view / use the Daffodil tdml files, as a precursor to trying to standardise on a common tdml format. Was formerly part of action 066.</p> <p>...</p> <p>18/2: No further progress</p> <p>11/3: Mike and Steve discussing the best way to share and cooperate on tdml format.</p> <p>25/3: Discussed the creation of an OGF document that will own and define a standardised tdml format.</p> <p>11/4: Proposal is for the OGF document to define a tdml format without Tresys or IBM copyright statement.</p> <p>15/4: Draft document on Redmine</p> <p>...</p>

	<p>6/5: No further progress</p> <p>20/5: Mark has read through the document. Particularly concerned with how namespaces are handled in the infoset.</p> <p>...</p> <p>17/6: No further progress</p> <p>25/6: Mike has added bit order capability as per action 233.</p> <p>...</p> <p>9/12: No further progress</p> <p>6/1/15: Mike to resurrect this as Tresys would like to run their tdml suite against both Daffodil and IBM DFDL.</p> <p>...</p> <p>10/2: No further progress</p> <p>24/2: Mike updating the Daffodil TDML test runner to handle unparser (ie, serializer) tests</p> <p>...</p> <p>14/4: No further progress</p> <p>28/4: Tresys have enhanced their tdml runner to allow unparser tests and round-trip tests (parser-&gt;unparser-&gt;parser) as well as the new tutorial tag (see action 228)</p> <p>12/5: Not discussed</p> <p>...</p> <p>3/11: No progress</p> <p>5/1/16: No progress. Needs more interoperability between implementations to be really useful.</p> <p>...</p> <p>27/6/17: <a href="#">No further progress</a></p>
250	<p><b>Public comment: dfdl:valueLength and dfdl:contentLength descriptions (Mike)</b></p> <p>19/11/14: <a href="http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/63">http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/63</a>. Agreed that the function names were ok as per errata 3.18, and that the spec is clear that they refer to the grammar regions. However the grammar regions mentioned do not fully include literal nil values. Discussed what happens when parsing - remember the length or re-parse? What about lengthUnits 'characters' when the data is binary? Also the 'Notes' that follow the table need to be reworked.</p> <p>26/11: Needs wording to handle all the issues found, assigned to Mike.</p> <p>...</p> <p>11/3/15: Still with Mike</p> <p>25/3: Mike has sent out revised wording, reviewed by Mark and Steve. Noted that the words need to explain the concept of building a complex element from the bottom up, and these words are equally applicable to several places in section 12.3. Mike to revise accordingly.</p> <p>11/4: More revised wording sent by Mike. Started to review but realised it needed some off-line preparation and thought. Review for next call.</p> <p>15/4: Review comments from Steve and Tim. The functions need to be clear that they work off the infoset value. The detailed wording is needed but should be removed to a new sub-section of 12.3, probably at end. Most sub-sections of 12.3, and the functions in 23.5.3 will refer to this new sub-section. 23.5.3 should limit itself to behaviour specific to the functions, such as not potentially represented, the effect of the \$lengthUnits argument. Also discussed what happens if \$path argument returns a nodeset &gt; 1; should be a processing error, can always use a predicate to select one node of an array.</p> <p>29/4: See various email discussions. Several things noted by Mike, and he recommends a rewrite of some of section 12.3. Then the description of the two functions becomes much simpler. Deferring for now, and will resurrect after current spec revision is finalised.</p> <p>6/5: Mike is working on a mind map for the length section. Deferring until needed.</p>

	<p>....</p> <p>23/9: Rewrite should be postponed to future 1.1. Still need to answer the original questions about the functions though...</p> <p>...</p> <p>25/4/2016: Undeferring action as some of these issues are now impacting Daffodil team as they write their unparser. Steve has sent the email threads on this action to Mike. Mike will combine with his issues and distill into a single thread.</p> <p>7/6: Thread to include use of a variable with dfdl:outputValueCalc. May be undefined at point of evaluation.</p> <p>5/7: Mike has been looking at this. Two main points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Computing the content length of a complex element with internal alignment.</li> <li>2) Computing length in chars of a complex element which is not 100% text</li> </ol> <p>Mike will send out a discussion via email. Noted that rules should also apply to prefixed length calculation.</p> <p>(Aside: IBM DFDL unparser does not support a prefixed length complex element with length units chars and variable width encoding).</p> <p>2/8: Mike has sent out several emails.</p> <p>#1: Proposes that term ComplexValue is added to the grammar to better handle ElementUnused. Knock-on effect on the wording of dfdl:valueLength(). Agreed on the change. <b>Issue <a href="https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/316">https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/316</a> created.</b></p> <p>Spec says escapeCharacter, escapeBlockStart, escapeBlockEnd, escapeEscapeCharacter contribute to the content length of an element. This is not correct, they are part of the value length. <b>Issue <a href="https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/317">https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/317</a> created.</b></p> <p>#2: Gives some options for computing DFDL length functions when target complex element has interior alignment. Agreed that the DFDL processor should detect this and give runtime SDE. This is an example of expression forward reference deadlock. Need new paragraph in section 23 of spec to cover this. <b>Issue <a href="https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/318">https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/318</a> created.</b></p> <p>#3: Argues that DFDL should only encode/decode when it needs to when computing DFDL length functions, to allow for performance. Agreed that this behaviour was ok. <b>Issue <a href="https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/319">https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/319</a> created.</b></p> <p>13/9: Review issues created. Need to come up with the revised descriptions for dfdl:valueLength and dfdl:contentLength functions before action can be closed.</p> <p>...</p> <p><a href="#">27/6/17: No further progress</a></p>
279	<p><b>Improve defaulting description to explicitly cover local groups (Mike)</b></p> <p>28/4/15: Only talks about elements, should mention local sequence and choice.</p> <p>12/5: Not discussed</p> <p>23/6: Section 15.1.3 needs to say what happens when a choice branch does not contain any elements; such a choice branch is selected (but see action 280 below as minOccurs '0' might change this). Section 9.4 also needs updating to say what happens when local groups are found within a complex type.</p> <p>11/8: Steve did some tests with IBM DFDL. Just need some words as above. Action assigned to Mike.</p> <p>25/8: In progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>5/1/16: No progress</p> <p>...</p> <p><a href="#">27/6/17: No further progress</a></p>
287	<p><b>Find a way to handle a variable path step in DFDL expression (All)</b></p> <p>1/3/16: DFDL4S currently using a hack that embeds a regex in a path step.</p> <p>10/5: No progress</p> <p>24/5: Need example from DFDL4S</p> <p>..</p>

	<p>5/7: Need to ask DFDL4S for example.</p> <p>2/8: DFDL4S sent example. They use dfdl:contentLength() with a path that has a step that contains a regex as a wildcard. Mike has requested the wider set of schemas to be sent, in order to see if there is a viable alternative.</p> <p>13/9: Response received from DFDL4S, not yet analysed.</p> <p>...</p> <p>10/1/17: No further progress</p> <p>7/2: Mike has analysed the schemas and sent a comprehensive reply to DFDL4S. He believes that the variable path step is effectively a way of parameterizing the expression, and has described how this can be done using DFDL variables. DFDL4S have responded and will talk to the contractor that authored the implementation.</p> <p>21/2: No response so far from DFDL4S.</p> <p>4/4: Mike has seen a further example of this. Still no response from DFDL4S.</p> <p>...</p> <p><a href="#">27/6: No further progress</a></p>
289	<p><b>Unparsing: expression refers backwards to outputValueCalc which refers beyond it.</b></p> <p>2/8/16: Need to decide if this is allowed and if so if there are any restrictions.</p> <p>13/9: Motivating scenario is where a variable is being set to a length element using dfdl:setVariable, which on unparsing is set using dfdl:outputValueCalc. So although the variable is referring backwards to the length element, it is effectively forward referencing so must block. Mike believes this is unavoidable.</p> <p>11/10: Daffodil has implemented this, Mike to provide scenario</p> <p>8/11: Mike couldn't find example, will continue to look</p> <p>10/1/17: Mike has realised that all the examples were reworked to avoid using variables, hence why can't be found.</p> <p>7/2: Daffodil will soon be implementing dfdl:newVariableInstance which will bring this up again.</p> <p>...</p> <p><a href="#">27/6: Waiting for Daffodil to implement dfdl:newVariableInstance</a></p>
290	<p><b>Should utf16Width be optional? (Steve)</b></p> <p>13/9/16: Adds complexity to implementing the core set of encodings. Steve to investigate IBM DFDL's support for utf16Width to assess the complexity.</p> <p>11/10: No further progress</p> <p>8/11: IBM DFDL uses the property to set the min/max bytes per char properties of its internal charset class. In that sense it is no different from any other variable-width encoding. Steve believes that there is no additional complexity beyond that needed for UTF-8. Mike to think further, particularly for the case when surrogate pairs are involved.</p> <p>10/1/17: Mike believes there are issues. Steve to do some testing with IBM DFDL to see if the implementation works.</p> <p>...</p> <p><a href="#">27/6: No progress</a></p>
292	<p><b>Write up proposal for allowing hexBinary elements to have dfdl:lengthUnits='bits' (Mike)</b></p> <p>7/2/17: Mike will create a proposal for evaluation.</p> <p>21/2: No progress</p> <p>4/4: Daffodil has experimental implementation, will be evaluated and written up.</p> <p>...</p> <p><a href="#">27/6: Daffodil to write up.</a></p>
293	<p><b>Investigate solutions to enabling choices in hidden groups to be unparsed (All)</b></p> <p>7/2/17: Study of problem needed in order to best evaluate any proposals.</p> <p>21/2: Mike has circulated a proposal internally within Daffodil.</p> <p>4/4: No progress but immediate need has gone away. On hold for now.</p>

	... <a href="#">27/6: On hold.</a>
<b>294</b>	<b>Converting integer enumerations to meaningful strings in infoset (Mike)</b> 18/4/17: Requirement from Daffodil user for parser to convert an integer enum to a meaningful string value in infoset. Daffodil has put forward a proposal but it relies on [unionMemberSchema] which is a validation-only property. <a href="https://opensource.ncsa.illinois.edu/confluence/display/DFDL/Enumerations+and+Range+Tables+via+Simple+Type+Unions">https://opensource.ncsa.illinois.edu/confluence/display/DFDL/Enumerations+and+Range+Tables+via+Simple+Type+Unions</a> Mike to re-think the approach, and also consider whether this kind of transformation is really a post-DFDL step. Steve to check how XQuery would approach the same problem. <a href="#">16/5: No progress</a>
<b>295</b>	<b>Convert existing issues into errata (Steve)</b> 27/6/17: The current set of resolved issues in Redmine need writing up as errata in the current errata experience document, in preparation for incorporation into the next rev of the DFDL 1.0 spec.

## Closed actions

No	Action

## Deferred actions

No	Action
<b>241</b>	<b>Public comment: Bi-di properties placement in precedence section (All)</b> 7/11: This looks deliberate but the asymmetry between parsing and unparsing is unclear. Really needs Daffodil or IBM DFDL to implement these properties, which has not happened yet. Deferring this action. ... 23/9: Candidate to be moved out to 1.1 ?

## Work items:

No	Item	Owner	Target	Status