

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-Feb-12 (Tues)
Meeting Time	15:00 - 16:00

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Mar-11

Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 27-Feb-12

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , 28 February 2012

Agenda

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

1. Daffodil Open Source Project

Status update.

2. Escape schemes and nil /empty processing

Ensure the spec behaves correctly when block style escaping is used with empty strings and with nil values .
Last week we said:

a) empty

Unparsing: Empty string will only be escaped if generateEscapeBlock is 'always'.

Parsing: If escapeBlockStart/End characters are present then the content region is not empty.

This will not cause a default value to be applied, the value is taken as empty string.

b) nil value

Parsing: Escape scheme applied before nil processing, so can't use escaping to switch off nil.

Unparsing: Escape scheme applied after nil processing.

Steve has looked at the property precedence section to see if it needs changing.

3. Errata 3.3 revisited

See e-mail. This errata has documented that when property is lengthKind 'explicit', 'implicit', 'prefixed' or 'pattern', it means that delimiter scanning is turned off and in-scope delimiters are not looked for within or between elements. It has been questioned whether this is the correct behaviour for 'implicit' complex elements.

4. Modeling Bradley Sexton 's RTF format

See e-mail from Bradley. Ideal way to model RTF format is using dfdl:lengthKind 'pattern'.

This is not yet supported in IBM DFDL 1.0 so is there an alternative?

5. Document information item [schema] member.

The spec says this is "A reference to a DFDL schema associated with this information set, if any".

If multiple schemas are involved, is this the schema that contains the root element or the schema that was passed to the parser, as these could be different (eg, schema A imports schema B which contains the root) ?

4. AOB

Minutes

Meeting Minutes

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

Attendees

Steve Hanson (IBM)
Mike Beckerle

Apologies

Minutes

1. Daffodil Open Source Project
2. Escape schemes and nil /empty processing
3. Errata 3.3 revisited
4. Modeling Bradley Sexton 's RTF format
5. Document information item [schema] member.

Meeting closed

Next call

Tues 6th Mar 2012 @ 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

Next action: 168

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

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

	<p>02/02: Steve has sent comments on three tutorials. Alan to send updated versions by the end of the week. Alan has also distributed the first part of the tutorial on text representation and would like feedback.</p> <p>09/02: Steve had reviewed tutorials 3,4,5 and updated versions have been distributed. Joe reviewed lesson on text elements.</p> <p>Main points. Using 'represented as text' is confusing. Examples are too cluttered. Suggest simple targeted examples but still build up to final complete schema</p> <p>23/02: New versions distributed and Steve has commented.</p> <p>02/03: Alan has published the final versions of tutorials 4,5,6 and is working on text representations. There was some discussion about the detail that needs to be covered. Should limit it to 'common usage' and refer to the spec for details of edge cases.</p> <p>09/03: Alan distributed an update to the text tutorial. Please review.</p> <p>30/03: Steve has spent half a day tidying up lessons 1 to 6 and has uploaded them as pdfs to gridforge. They are now more coherent, and many inconsistencies and errors fixed.</p> <p>Ownership of draft lessons (text properties, binary properties, advanced features) has been passed to Steve. Also need to make a schema available for the examples.</p> <p>13/04: Steve is working on the text properties tutorial.</p> <p>04/05: No progress</p> <p>18/05: No progress</p> <p>01/06: No progress</p> <p>08/06: No progress</p> <p>15/06: This is on hold until Steve clears up spec issues and other workload. Steph has looked at the later lessons, and noted that they are more direct compared to the more wordy earlier lessons.</p> <p>28/06: On hold.</p> <p>...</p> <p>29/11: Tim offered to take a look at the next outstanding tutorials. Steve / Tim to discuss</p> <p>6/12: No progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>10/01: No progress, offer from Mike to help. First step is to make any corrections due to errata.</p> <p>17/01: No progress</p> <p>24/01: No update</p> <p>31/01: Daffodil project team will be working their way through the existing tutorials and reviewing</p> <p>14/02: Daffodil team to start reviewing tutorials hopefully this Friday.</p> <p>21/02: Moved to this coming Friday</p> <p>28/02:</p>
133	<p>Make a set of default formats available (Suman)</p> <p>19/01: Suman expects some default formats to be ready by Feb 9th. Will need approval to publish</p> <p>26/01: Stephanie sent the defaults used by test cases to Suman</p> <p>02/02: no update</p> <p>09/02: no update</p> <p>23/02: no update</p> <p>02/03: Same as 132</p> <p>09/03: No update. Same license issue apply though.</p> <p>13/04: No update.</p> <p>04/05: IBM will make one default format available. Suman is working through the IBM process to permit publication.</p> <p>18/05: Awaiting response from IBM legal.</p> <p>01/06:</p> <p>08/06: Awaiting response from IBM legal. IBM also want to prove that the default format has the properties sensibly defined to plans to include in internal testing.</p> <p>15/06: No change.</p> <p>...</p> <p>19/07: 19/07: Suman will talk to IBM legal and make it clear that the license must allow users to actively use the format xsd(s).</p> <p>26/07: No update</p> <p>16/08: Same issue as action 132</p> <p>23/08: No update</p>

	<p>30/08: As action 132</p> <p>20/09: Steve has mailed IBM Hursley legal</p> <p>27/09: Steve to meet with IBM Hursley legal</p> <p>4/10: No further progress</p> <p>18/10: Steve has met with legal, can publish the xsds after tidy up. Will create OGF info document.</p> <p>1/11: No further progress.</p> <p>...</p> <p>29/11: Steve has a version of the default format available, waiting for one last IBM legal procedure.</p> <p>6/12: Waiting for one last IBM legal procedure.</p> <p>13/12: Still waiting for one last IBM legal procedure. OK to review iwhat we have so far though, so Steve sent out an xsd containing a single defineFormat and a single defineEscapeScheme.</p> <p>The spec in section 19 makes it clear that any such xsds are essentially examples, so this xsd will be treated as such. It will be in a 'DFDL example' namespace and we will publish as OGF information document on GridForge.</p> <p>Reviewed the properties and changed occursCountKind to 'parsed'. (Noted that 'implicit' is better but that is subject of an errata not yet folded back into the spec).</p> <p>Stayed with lengthKind 'delimited' with a comma separator so that the xsd would actually model a real single record CSV stream.</p> <p>Steve to improve the example usage section in the prolog to include namespaces and example data, and run some real CSV tests.</p> <p>10/01: IBM legal process complete. Steve has updated the xsd as above and used it to model CSV data. Steve to formalise as an OGF document.</p> <p>17/01: Steve has created an OGF document and mailed it to the WG, but noted that it has both IBM and OGF copyright. Steve to get advice on how to proceed from OGF editors.</p> <p>24/01: Mail sent to OGF, no reply yet</p> <p>31/01: Reply received from OGF, problem being discussed</p> <p>14/02: Update received from OGF, Steve to digest and work out how to publish.</p> <p>21/02: Steve still in dialog with OGF, document sent to OGF board to approval</p> <p>28/02: Steve waiting to hear back from OGF board</p>
140	<p>Spec issue: Parsing: 'missing' v 'empty', role of initiators, default values (All)</p> <p>01/06: See minutes.</p> <p>08/06: Still under discussion. Tim has sent Mike a selection of data formats to guide the discussion.</p> <p>15/06: Not discussed - an extra call has been scheduled to go through this.</p> <p>28/06: A series of extra calls are being held between Mike, Steve, Tim and Steph.</p> <p>05/07: Next extra call is Wed 6th July - Steve to send invite</p> <p>12/07: Two more calls held. Next call is Wed 13th July.</p> <p>19/07: More calls held, next call is Fri 22nd July.</p> <p>26/07: More calls held, good progress</p> <p>16/08: Steve will set up next call for when Tim has returned from holiday</p> <p>23/08: Two more calls scheduled for this week, remaining issues: separator suppression, empty strings, sparse arrays (see action 136)</p> <p>30/08: Call held earlier today. Still remaining - separator suppression (matrix); sparse arrays; empty strings; empty value delimiter policy. Steve to summarise where we have got so far before remaining items are tackled.</p> <p>20/09: Steve has summarised where we are with action 140, which Tim and Mike have reviewed. 2 hours call planned for Thursday.</p> <p>27/09: Calls held, progressing the separator suppression behaviour</p> <p>4/10: More calls held, progressing separator suppression, sparse arrays (see action 136) and emptyValueDelimiterPolicy behaviour</p> <p>18/10: All issues now in a single document, call held earlier today. Next call Thursday.</p> <p>1/11: Extra calls still ongoing</p> <p>8/11: Extra calls still going, when action 140 document complete will send to Steph for review</p> <p>15/11: Mike is verifying the action 140 conclusions by writing an algorithm in SCALA which can be ultimately be used in Daffodil</p> <p>22/11: Call to be held next week</p> <p>29/11: Next call 30/11</p>

	<p>6/12: Next call 7/12</p> <p>13/12: Had call earlier today, making good progress. Next call first week of Jan.</p> <p>10/01: Next call to be scheduled for Wed or Fri</p> <p>17/01: No call last week, call tomorrow</p> <p>24/01: Two calls held, next call Wed, looking at separator suppression</p> <p>31/01: Separator suppression discussions ongoing, proposal to rename policy and enums. Call later this week.</p> <p>14/02: Now looking at separator suppression and unparsing. Next call on Friday</p> <p>21/02: Separator suppression on parsing/unparsing matrix agreed.</p> <p>28/02:</p>
145	<p>Provide a 'dispatch' way of discriminating a choice for better performance of the envelope/payload use case (Steve, Mike, Suman)</p> <p>12/7: See minutes. Need to choose a proposal and flesh out.</p> <p>19/07: Waiting for proposals</p> <p>26/07: Waiting for proposals</p> <p>16/08: Waiting for proposals. Suman added to action.</p> <p>...</p> <p>1/11: Steve to send a proposal</p> <p>...</p> <p>28/02: Waiting for Steve to find time to do this</p>
146	<p>Model NRL's bit-oriented format where complex repeating element carries a 'last' indicator (Steve, Mike)</p> <p>19/07: NRL to send xsd and example of format.</p> <p>26/07: Steve/Tim put forward a proposal that used a discriminator that looked at the previous item's repeatBit in the array and failed if it was 0. This looks like it will work. Mike to add the correct DFDL annotations to take into account both repeatBit and presentBit in a single discriminator, and auto-set them using outputValueCalc.</p> <p>A more usable solution to the 'last indicator' problem is desirable though. Noted that this has a 'repeat..until' semantic.</p> <p>16/08: Adam and Ryan to evaluate Steve/Tim proposal as it is potentially fragile relying as it does on backtracking.</p> <p>23/08: Adam and Ryan had meeting with Boyd Fletcher and others, still evaluating to see whether change to spec is needed to handle this better.</p> <p>30/08: No update</p> <p>20/09: Looking like a spec change would be beneficial. Adam will provide details within the next month.</p> <p>27/09: Waiting to hear from NRL. Mike to find out how they are progressing.</p> <p>4/10: Mike will contact NRL to see how things are progressing.</p> <p>18/10: No update - Steve & Mike to chase</p> <p>1/11: No update</p> <p>8/11: Update on NRL via Mike - staffing the team to carry forward the DFDL work</p> <p>15/11: No update</p> <p>22/11: No update</p> <p>29/11: NSA still expressing an interest in Daffodil</p> <p>6/12: No update</p> <p>13/12: NSA held a meeting with Steve & Mike to discuss their contributing to Daffodil through 2012</p> <p>10/01: Will be added as an action item for the Daffodil Open Source Project</p> <p>...</p> <p>28/02: On hold</p>
159	<p>Property documentFinalTerminatorCanBeMissing not flexible enough ? (Steve)</p> <p>10/01: Do we need to upgrade this property to handle formats where the terminator is not allowed on output but tolerated on input?</p> <p>...</p> <p>28/02: With Steve to investigate further</p>
161	<p>Fold errata into DFDL spec (Mike/Steve)</p> <p>17/01: Start with Steve updating spec to include his marked up changes</p> <p>...</p> <p>14/02: Steve has published errata document v8 which includes all resolved errata up until today, but has not yet started to fold into spec.</p>

	<p>21/02: No progress but Steve will start this week</p> <p>28/02: Steve has started on this. Editorial corrections made. Going through spec and flagging (using Word comments) where errata affect the spec.</p> <p>If the errata is simple then fixing the spec at the same time. The outcome of this first pass is that a spec reader can immediately see which sections are affected by errata.</p>
167	<p>Establish SWIFT etc use of numbers with virtual decimal points (Steve)</p> <p>21/2: Then we can decide what to do with patterns that contain #, V, P</p> <p>28/02: Steve has chatted to Steph who considers it likely that people do this, though not seen it in a current standard. Supported by IBM WTX and MRM.</p>

Closed actions

No	Action

Deferred actions

No	Action
129	<p>Press release to publicise DFDL (Steve)</p> <p>Steve is pulling together a press release at IBM. Want to include as many contributors and interested parties as possible. NCSA are keen to be included. Also likely that US National Archive will want to be included. Mike has indicated OCO are too.</p> <p>17/11: no progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>08/12: Still no response from IBM press office</p> <p>15/12: no progress</p> <p>....</p> <p>09/03: No progress</p> <p>30/03: Making this action deferred until IBM is in a position to say something more concrete about any implementation.</p>
131	<p>Transformation of DFDL properties to a canonical form (Joe)</p> <p>08/12: Joe has produced a XSLT to transform a DFDL schema to a canonical element form. When tested it should be made available on the WG gidforge site.</p> <p>15/12: Alan tested against test dfdl schema which worked correctly (after fixing some errors in the schema)</p> <p>22/12: no update</p> <p>12/01: Joe has some defects to fix before making available on gridforge.</p> <p>19/01: There is a difficult problem to solve before Joe make the style sheet public</p> <p>26/01: Working on problems</p> <p>02/02: no progress</p> <p>09/02: As it wasn't a simple as exoected this will be treated as a low priority action</p> <p>23/02: Low prioity</p> <p>09/03: Low priority</p> <p>30/03: Deferring for now</p>
066	<p>Investigate format for defining test cases (All)</p> <p>25/11: IBM to see if it is possible to publish its test case format.</p> <p>04/12: no update</p> <p>...</p> <p>17/02: IBM is willing in principle to publish the test case format and some of the test cases . May need some time to build a 'compliance suite'</p> <p>24/03: No progress</p> <p>03/03: Discussions have been taking place on the subset of tests that will be provided .</p> <p>10/03: work is progressing</p> <p>17/03: work is progressing</p> <p>31/03: work is progressing</p> <p>14/04: And XML test case format has been defined and is being tested.</p> <p>21/04. Schema for TDML defined. Need to define how this and the test cases will be made public</p> <p>05/05: Work still progressing</p>

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

Work items:

No	Item	Owner	Target	Status
043	Track errata list for 1.0 of the spec. http://forge.gridforum.org/sf/go/doc16280?nav=1	Steve	N/A	Draft 0007 on grid forge.
044	Incorporate errata list into DFDL spec.	Steve/Mike	TBD	

