

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	22-Sep-15 (Tues)
Meeting Time	16:00 - 17:00

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Mar-11

Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 21-Sep-15

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , 22 September 2015

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. 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

Minutes

IPR Statement

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

Meeting closed

Next regular call

Tues 6th October 2015 @ 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: 285

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

No	Action
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 26/11: Possibility of help from MITRE high-school student, and from Marisa at IBM. ... 11/3: No further progress 25/3: MITRE have produced a couple of new tutorials under the guidance of James Gariss . Jonathan to forward for review. Mike observed that an html tutorial could be generated from a tdml file using XSLT . 11/4: Not discussed

	<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?</p> <p>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: 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>
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 info set.</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->unparser->parser) as well as the new tutorial tag (see action 228)</p> <p>12/5: Not discussed</p> <p>...</p> <p>22/9: No further progress</p>
279	<p>Improve defaulting description to explicitly cover local groups (Mike)</p> <p>28/4: 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>22/9:</p>
280	<p>Choice branch rule minOccurs <= 0 ? (All)</p> <p>28/4: Is this still needed given how occursCountKind and discriminators now work ?</p> <p>12/5: Not discussed</p> <p>23/6: Steve sent an email where he attempted to find the justifications for the restriction (extra point of uncertainty, known-to-exist rules). Steve will do some more digging to see at what point this restriction was introduced, and look at XML scenarios.</p> <p>11/8: Steve believes that the restriction is to be consistent with not allowing minOccurs=0 on the choice itself, as both allow the choice to be absent logically. Think about this more for next call. Also is the inputValueCalc restriction needed ?</p> <p>25/8: Steve has emailed his thoughts. Mike in agreement. Steve to check with Alex who raised the problem originally.</p> <p>22/9: Alex also agrees with the email.</p>
282	<p>Does XPath have operators for checking a value is in a range ? (Steve)</p> <p>12/5: Investigate whether equivalent to DFDL4S 'in' operator exists.</p> <p>23/6: Mike has found an XPath 'intersect' operator. Handles the enumeration case well, but not as convenient for ranges as DFDL4S's 'in' operator.</p> <p>11/8: Looked back at the motivating example from DFDL4S. Agreed that DFDL functions to do the equivalent of 'in' and 'inrange' would be useful if nothing can be re-used from XPath. Steve to write up a proposal taking into account different data types.</p> <p>..</p> <p>22/9: No progress</p>
283	<p>Investigate incorporation of ICU fallback mappings into dfdl:encodingErrorPolicy (Steve)</p> <p>23/6: IBM has requirements from customers to support fallback mappings.</p> <p>11/8: No progress. Steve to look at prior proposal.</p> <p>25/8: Discussion and proposal emailed by Steve. Should DFDL add a new property or can it all be handled by extra dfdl:encodingErrorPolicy enums ?</p> <p>22/9: Proposal sent by Steve</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> <p>...</p> <p>23/9: Candidate to be moved out to 1.1 ?</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 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 > 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>
251	<p>Create official error codes (All)</p> <p>5/2/14: Create official error codes for all possible errors implied by the DFDL spec . This is a big piece of work , so this action is deferred for now . Was formerly part of action 066.</p> <p>...</p> <p>10/2/15: Un-deferring this action for consideration . The IBM error message numbers could be a good starting point for a list of error codes , although they are a mixture of generic and specific so some revision likely to be needed . Tresys to evaluate.</p> <p>...</p> <p>24/2: No progress</p> <p>24/3: Mike has read through the IBM error messages and will write up findings</p>

	31/3: No further progress 14/4: Mike has sent email. Concluded that this is a large exercise and effort better put in to tutorials. Deferring again.
--	---

Work items :

No	Item	Owner	Target	Status