DFDL WG Call Agenda

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	**DFDL 1.0**
Meeting Date	**19-Nov-13 (Tues)**
Meeting Time	**16:00 - 17:00**

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Mar-11
Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 18-Nov-13

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , 19 November 2013

Agenda

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

1. Daffodil Open Source Project
Status update.

2. Go through public comments
Public comment is now complete.
Continue through the public comments, resolving where possible to do so.

3. 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

Apologies

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

Minutes

1. Daffodil Open Source Project

2. Go through public comments

Meeting closed

Next regular call
Tues 26th Nov 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

Subject	Document Type	Created	Modified

Next action: **242**

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
066	**Investigate format for defining test cases (All)** 25/11:IBM to see if it is possible to publish its test case format . 04/12: no update ... 17/02: IBM is willing in principle to publish the test case format and some of the test cases . May need some time to build a 'compliance suite'? 24/03: No progress 03/03: Discussions have been taking place on the subset of tests that will be provided .

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

...
10/07/2012: Discussed schemes to create interchangeable tests. Ideally need a DFDL defined error code per failure, in conjunction with specific inserts.

...
26/3/2013: Resurrecting deferred action.
We have got to the point where it makes sense to converge the IBM DFDL and Daffodil variations of .tdml file.
Steve to seek permission from IBM to make the list of IBM DFDL error messages available to DFDL WG.

...
24/5: No further progress.
28/5: Mike summarised the status of Daffodil's tdml runner. Since IBM shared the tdml format, Daffodil has added a) bit file support with in-line comments; b) embedded schema; c) failure checking by multiple string matching. IBM has added a) some flags that map to parser API 'features' such as optional checks; b) code to handle illegal XML characters. 1200 parser test cases written for Daffodil, about 60 of the original IBM shared tests now pass in Daffodil. Steve will email OGF and ask if there is an approved process for demonstrating that multiple implementations generate the same set of test results. To progress with a shared tdml format, IBM will need to get legal approval to view the Daffodil source test cases, Steve to kick this off. Mark noted that IBM's tdml format has evolved in order to make the infoset comparison easier, Mark will see whether the shared tests use the latest version.
4/6: Steve has emailed OGF for guidance, reply received. Experience documents needed to verify conformance, but there is not a requirement to have executable tests. However, a set of executable tests is what we need ideally.
Discussed error messages and identifiers for different errors and what the granularity should be. Steve has asked for permission to send the IBM DFDL error messages to the DFDL WG, they should be used as a starting point. Need to agree what constitutes the minimum content of an error message.

...
22/10: No further progress
31/10: Steve has permission to send IBM DFDL's error messages to the WG.
5/11: Error messages sent

...
19/11: No further progress

200	Establish recommended practices for pushing changes to GitHub (Mike)
	29/1: Mike will talk to Tresys who have used Git a lot.
5/2: Mike to talk to Tresys this week, Tim has sent some links.
12/2: Information sent by Mike, Steve to review.

...
19/11: No further progress |
| 224 | Add section for implementation defined limits (Jonathan) |
| | 3/9: Several places in the spec cite this, should be grouped. Currently partially listed in section 2.6.
Also note distinction between 'implementation defined' and 'implementation dependent'. Check spec for correct usage.
Resolve during public comment.
10/9: No progress
17/9: Jonathan sent a reference to the W3C XProc standard where the distinction is made clear. Jonathan will go through the spec and gather everything that is implementation defined/dependent. Public comment to be raised
24/9: With Jonathan to raise.
1/10: Public comment 97 raised (http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/97)
8/10: With Jonathan to provide words.
22/10: Jonathan has defined implementation defined/dependent and started to classify. Steve and Mike had trouble with the definitions, Steve to re-word and send for comment.
31/10: Reworded version sent |

	5/11: Rewording approved. Jonathan proceeding with classification, will distribute for review when complete. ... 19/11: Still with Jonathan
228	**Review set of tutorial lessons (All)** 17/9: 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
237	**Public comment : Do we need the lengthKind 'endOfParent' restriction for local groups ? (All)** 5/11: http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/51. Stops such an element being wrapped in a local group. It looks like this was added to make checking easier. Really the restriction is that the element is "last in the box", and could in principle have surrounding intermediate sequences or implicit choices. Need concise language to express this. 12/11: Need language written. 19/11:
239	**Public comment : Implicit alignment and groups (All)** 7/11: http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/45 and http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/57. Discussed whether implicit alignment of a model group should always be '1', to avoid problems of having to look ahead to child elements, which is problematic if the group has an initiator or there are alternatives such as choice branches or unordered content. Led onto discussion on the existing rule that an optional element must have same alignment as the following element (define 'following'). Should their be a rule for sequences that are unordered or have floating children must have children with same alignment? This is consistent. Noted that these rules are all meant to stop authors from creating silly schemas. Alternatively should such checks be relaxed? 12/11: Email sent to Suman, Steve to chase. 19/11: Still with Suman

Closed actions

No	Action

Deferred actions

No	Action
131	**Transformation of DFDL properties to a canonical form (Joe)** 08/12: Joe has produced a XSLT to transform a DFDL schema to a canonical element form. When tested it should be made available on the WG gidforge site. 15/12: Alan tested against test dfdl schema which worked correctly (after fixing some errors in the schema) 22/12: no update 12/01: Joe has some defects to fix before making available on gridforge. 19/01: There is a difficult problem to solve before Joe make the style sheet public 26/01: Working on problems 02/02: no progress 09/02: As it wasn't a simple as exoected this will be treated as a low priority action 23/02: Low prioity 09/03: Low priority 30/03: Deferring for now
233	**Public comment : Formats with bit order reversed (Mike)**

	1/10: http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/43. Mike to provide words for potential new property for review. 8/10: Words sent by Mike generated considerable discussion. Mike will update the words to make the subject more consumable, and move the bulk of the discussion to a new main section at the end of the spec (suggest between existing sections 24 & 25). 22/10: Mike wants to have a working implementation before closing on this, so marking the public comment as deferred. 31/10: Deferring for now
241	**Public comment: Bi-di properties placement in precedence section (All)** 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.

Work items:

No	Item	Owner	Target	Status
045	Resolve public comments and incorporate into spec	All	2013-10-22	Pending