

DFDL WG Call Agenda

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

Meeting about - Pasted In -

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	08-Jul-14 (Tues)
Meeting Time	16:00 - 17:00

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Mar-11

Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 07-Jul-14

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , 8 July 2014

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. Daffodil Open Source Project

Status update.

2. Direct dispatch choice and case -sensitivity

Andy Edwards from IBM has sent a proposal to make the matching case-insensitive for performance. Or should dfdl:ignoreCase be used here?

3. OGF 24 in London

The OGF board have emailed the DFDL WG asking "*whether the DFDL group would like to meet either for continued work on the standards and any associated documents, or for purposes of a demonstration or tutorial session at this event.*"

4. Use of ES entity in delimiters

Steve Lawrence from the Daffodil project has observed that DFDL spec is not consistent about delimiters and the %ES; entity, since erratum 2.148 was updated by public comment to allow WSP* on its own for delimiters (under some circumstances). The point being that "%WSP*;" is the same as "%ES; %WSP+;" (on parsing, longest match is taken; on unparsing nothing is output).

5. 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**Meeting closed****Next regular call**

Tues 15th July 2014 @ 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: 263

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
224	Add section for implementation defined limits (Jonathan)

	<p>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.</p> <p>10/9: No progress</p> <p>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</p> <p>24/9: With Jonathan to raise.</p> <p>1/10: Public comment 97 raised (http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/97)</p> <p>8/10: With Jonathan to provide words.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>31/10: Reworded version sent</p> <p>5/11: Rewording approved. Jonathan proceeding with classification, will distribute for review when complete.</p> <p>...</p> <p>28/1: Still with Jonathan</p> <p>5/2: Jonathan is up to section 12.7. Discovered an issue with binary packed calendars, new action 252 raised.</p> <p>...</p> <p>11/2: No more progress</p> <p>18/2: Jonathan has around 20 changes identified so far, and has sent for an initial review. Comments back to Jonathan before next week's call please.</p> <p>11/3: Reviewed the document so far. Decided that imprecise size limits are implementation-dependent not implementation-defined. Jonathan to update and complete document, and propose errata that result.</p> <p>25/3: No further progress</p> <p>11/4: Not discussed</p> <p>15/4: Still in progress. Jonathan will take what he has so far and reword as an erratum. This can be added to experience document 1 and then merged into the DFDL spec draft. Jonathan will try and do that this week.</p> <p>29/4: Jonathan still making progress, will send what he has by end of week.</p> <p>6/5: Latest draft sent by Jonathan. Review for next time. Mike will incorporate into spec.</p> <p>...</p> <p>3/6: No progress</p> <p>10/6: Not complete. Decided that next published specification would not include this.</p> <p>17/6: No update</p> <p>25/6: No update</p> <p>8/7:</p>
228	<p>Review set of tutorial lessons (All)</p> <p>17/9: Lesson 1 proposes a set of lessons, needs reviewing as over 2 years old.</p> <p>...</p> <p>22/10: No progress</p> <p>31/10: Becoming a focus for Tresys. Steve to send his 'Modeling Data Formats using DFDL' powerpoint.</p> <p>...</p> <p>19/11: No further progress</p> <p>26/11: Possibility of help from MITRE high-school student, and from Marisa at IBM.</p> <p>...</p> <p>11/3: 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 & 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>25/6: No further progress</p> <p>8/7:</p>
233	<p>Public comment : Formats with bit order reversed (Mike)</p> <p>1/10: http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/43. Mike to provide words for potential new property for review.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>22/10: Mike wants to have a working implementation before closing on this, so marking the public comment as deferred.</p> <p>31/10: Deferring for now</p> <p>25/6: Un-deferring as Daffodil has implemented this now and Mike has created an experience document in Redmine (). All to review Mike's document before next call on 8th July, and respond with comments. IBM will hold a review and send consolidated comments.</p> <p>8/7:</p>
248	<p>Discriminators and potential points of uncertainty (Steve)</p> <p>28/1: Steve to write up a proposal to prevent a discriminator from behaving in a non-obvious manner when used with a potential point of uncertainty that turns out not to be an actual point of uncertainty.</p> <p>5/2: Steve sent an email to check whether choice branches, unordered elements and floating elements should always be actual points of uncertainty, as there are times when there is no uncertainty, eg, last choice branch; all floating elements found. It was decided that they are always actual points of uncertainty. To do otherwise will complicate implementations and result in fragile schemas. Steve will proceed with the proposal on that basis.</p> <p>...</p> <p>25/3: No further progress</p> <p>11/4: Proposal sent to mailing list by Steve. Concern that having a potential PoU that in practice can never be an actual PoU is counter intuitive and we are better off saying that for certain occursCountKinds there is no potential PoU. The behaviour is therefore the same as for scalar elements. Means that occursCountKind 'fixed' and occursCountKind 'implicit' with minOccurs=maxOccurs behave differently wrt to discriminators. Steve will reword the proposal accordingly.</p> <p>...</p> <p>29/4: No further progress</p> <p>6/5: Steve came to reword the proposal to say that for certain occursCountKinds there is no potential PoU, but it raised an issue. Steve has resent the original proposal with responses to Tim's questions. It is clear that a discriminator inside an array can not leak outside the array because it is evaluated for each occurrence. But should that be expressed by saying that a) all arrays are potential PoUs and a discriminator can't leak outside a PoU, or b) only some arrays are potential PoUs and a discriminator can't leak outside a PoU or an array. Please can WG members review the email and have a position on the wording.</p> <p>20/5: Tim has reviewed, back with Steve</p> <p>...</p> <p>3/6: No progress</p> <p>10/6: Not complete. Decided that next published specification would not include this.</p>

	<p>...</p> <p>8/7: No progress</p>
250	<p>Standardise on a single tdml format for DFDL tests (All)</p> <p>5/2: 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>8/7:</p>
258	<p>Consider allowing more flexible escapeCharacter schemes (Mike)</p> <p>6/5: Motivated by example of an escape character which is active when in front of an in-scope delimiter, but not when in front of another character.</p> <p>20/5: Can't model Mike's example with current facilities, but Mike's example is a generalisation of a particular MITRE example. Do we really need this? Jonathan to follow up.</p> <p>3/6: Closed. Jonathan has provided the background to the MITRE example which was really about initiators and terminators. The generalised use case is perhaps speculative, so it was agreed not to change the DFDL spec to handle this unless a concrete use case emerges.</p> <p>17/6: Re-opened. vCard 3.0 (http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc2426) is an example of a format that exhibits the need for this. Need a proposal to handle this case, and which fits in with the existing extraEscapedCharacters and escapeEscapeCharacter property. Noted that using lengthKind 'pattern' is sometimes a way of working round this kind of thing.</p> <p>25/6: No progress</p> <p>8/7:</p>
260	<p>Positional and non-positional sequences (All)</p> <p>10/6: Spec defines the above but also allows different occursCountKinds within the same sequence which may have different (implied) separatorSuppressionPolicy, which results in a sequence which is a mixture of both. Should this be allowed? If so what are the rules? Can certain combinations be disallowed?</p> <p>17/6: IBM have discussed internally and will submit a proposal.</p> <p>25/6: Proposal sent to WG. Initial reaction is that the intended semantic for Positional sequence is option a) - an observer of the raw data can identify an occurrence of an element in the sequence solely by counting separators.</p> <p>8/7: Tim emailed an example which he would like to discuss before WG decides on option a) or b).</p>
261	<p>Implied separatorSuppressionPolicy for occursCountKind 'expression' (All)</p> <p>10/6: Spec says it is 'never' (positional sequence) but you have to parse to identify the position, so isn't that non-positional?</p> <p>17/6: Some other issues noted around 'expression' as per email thread. IBM have discussed this internally and will submit a proposal.</p> <p>25/6: Proposal sent to WG. The aim of ensuring the integrity of the data stream is sound, but need to think carefully about the use of dfdl:contentLength() in outputValueCalc to make sure there is no deadlock or inconsistency.</p> <p>8/7:</p>
262	<p>Publish updated specification (All)</p>

	<p>10/6: Start to address Word comments in draft r11. Got to the start of section 12.3 (length properties).</p> <p>17/6: Extra call held, nearly all comments addressed in draft r12 by Mike. Draft r13 created by Steve for remaining comments plus recent spec errata. Mike aiming to create draft r14 for WG review by next week.</p> <p>25/6: Mike fixing up the references to ensure hyperlinks present in derived html. Then draft r14 can be issued for WG review.</p> <p>8/7: Mike has posted draft r15 on Redmine.</p>
--	---

Closed actions

No	Action

Deferred actions

No	Action
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>
200	<p>Establish recommended practices for pushing changes to GitHub (Mike)</p> <p>29/1: Mike will talk to Tresys who have used Git a lot.</p> <p>5/2: Mike to talk to Tresys this week, Tim has sent some links.</p> <p>12/2: Information sent by Mike, Steve to review.</p> <p>...</p> <p>2/12: No further progress</p> <p>14/1: Deferring until needed</p>
241	<p>Public comment : Bi-di properties placement in precedence section (All)</p> <p>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.</p>
242	<p>Public comment : dfdl:valueLength and dfdl:contentLength descriptions (Mike)</p> <p>19/11: http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/63. 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: 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</p>

	<p>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 info set 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 > 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</p>
251	<p>Create official error codes (All)</p> <p>5/2: Create official error codes for all possible errors implied by the DFDL spec.</p> <p>This is a big piece of work, so this action is deferred for now. Was formerly part of action 066.</p>

Work items:

No	Item	Owner	Target	Status
045	Resolve public comments and incorporate into spec GFD.207	All	2014-04-30	Pending