TeamRoom Plus

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	16-Aug-11 (Tues)
Meeting Time	15:00 - 16:00

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Mar-11
Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 17-Aug-11

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , 16 August 2011

Agenda

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

1. Spec issues from Mike Beckerle
A number of issues have been spotted by Mike. Some have been resolved by action 139 below, but others remain.
Last remaining issue:

12.3.7.1.3. Byte order mark
Byte-order marks are explicitly stated to be "not characters" in the Unicode standard .
No such thing as a BOM codepoint in a UTF-8 string. A UTF-8 byte sequence might encode the character code for a BOM, but this would be a meaningless inclusion of a BOM character code in a context where it will never be interpreted. I suggest that we drop the term UTF-8 here, and BOM's that get encoded when they are interpreted as character codes, and translated by the UTF-8 encoding algorithm into a multi-byte UTF-8 byte sequence, is handled the same way as other non-characters, i.e., what do we do when a high or low surrogate codepoint is present and we're to encode as UTF-8. I think the answer is we run the UTF-8 encode/decode algorithm, and whatever Unicode character code it creates is what it creates , and if that happens to come out as any of the non-characters (BOMs, surrogates, others perhaps), so be it.
The topic is about Unicode non-characters, not specifically BOMs .
The general topic is encoding/decoding our infoset Unicode character codes which have no real representation in the specified encoding.

2. Further spec issues from IBM
As implementation has progressed, a number of issues have been spotted in the DFDL 1.0 spec by the IBM implementation team. Remaining items for resolution.

17. InputValuecalc and OutputValueCalc and applicability to simple types. The spec is confused on this issue.
The descriptions of the properties say dfdl:element only, but the text above that allows them for simple types.
The property precedence implies they are allowed.
The prefixLengthType description in 12.3.4 specifically disallows OutputValueCalc.
Steve thinks that originally they were not allowed on simple types, until it was observed that you might want to model a prefixLengthType as a hidden complex element and use inputValueCalc to access it. That's powerful and could get you out of a hole.
Question - do we really need that complexity in DFDL 1.0 ?
Note that IBM implementation currently assumes elements only.

17. InputValueCalc. Description talks about returning an empty string being ok if minLength permits this .
I would have thought that inputValueCalc is allowed to return any value corresponding to the base built-in type, and

that a validation check, if enabled, would pick up any violation of facets in the usual manner.
Suggest deleting this text as it is just one example of a validation failure.

17, 14.5. We decided recently that inputValueCalc, outputValueCalc and hiddenGroupRef could not be put in scope via dfdl:ref. But presumably it is still possible for an element reference or group reference to use these properties?
Clarify whether these properties may be set on local object, global object and/or reference to global.

13.8. Spec does not say anything about physical lengths of binary floats and doubles. For IEEE 754-2008 these look to be 2, 4, 8, and 16 (for 754-1985 only 4 and 8 are allowed). For IBM 390 these look to be 4, 8 and 16 bytes. Can binary float data ever appear with different lengths? Should the spec insist on this subset of physical lengths? Is 16 supported, given that xs:double can not hold an extended (quadruple) float?

3. Infoset and union types
If an element has a union type, there is no way to know which member of the union is actually used from the DFDL Infoset. The [schema] SCD shows the element declaration, from which you can get to the union type. And [datatype] only shows the underlying built-in type (which in DFDL is common to all the union members). It's an edge case, but a little inconvenient to use DFDL infoset as PSVI without revalidating the values.

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
Adam Fox (US NRL)
Ryan Farrell (US NRL)
Steve Hanson (IBM)
Mike Beckerle (Deloitte)
Suman Kalia (IBM)

Apologies
Tim Kimber (IBM)

1. Spec issues from Mike Beckerle
A number of issues have been spotted by Mike. Some have been resolved by action 139 below, but others remain.   Last remaining issue:

12.3.7.1.3. Byte order mark
Defer until next week when Tim is around

2. Further spec issues from IBM
As implementation has progressed, a number of issues have been spotted in the DFDL 1.0 spec by the IBM implementation team. Remaining items for resolution.

17. InputValuecalc and OutputValueCalc and applicability to simple types. The spec is confused on this issue.
The descriptions of the properties say dfdl:element only, but the text above that allows them for simple types.
The property precedence implies they are allowed.
The prefixLengthType description in 12.3.4 specifically disallows OutputValueCalc.
Steve thinks that originally they were not allowed on simple types, until it was observed that you might want to model a prefixLengthType as a hidden complex element and use inputValueCalc to access it. That's powerful and could get you out of a hole.
Question - do we really need that complexity in DFDL 1.0 ?
Note that IBM implementation currently assumes elements only.
Agreed that these properties should be applicable to elements only for 1.0. Any application to simple types is a future extension.

17. InputValueCalc. Description talks about returning an empty string being ok if minLength permits this. I would have thought that inputValueCalc is allowed to return any value corresponding to the base built-in type, and that a validation check, if enabled, would pick up any violation of facets in the usual manner. Suggest deleting this text as it is just one example of a validation failure.
Agreed that the text can be deleted. Clarify that inputValueCalc value is validated like a parsed value, so processing error if value does not conform to base type, and validation error if validation enabled and value conforms to base type but not actual type.

17, 14.5. We decided recently that inputValueCalc, outputValueCalc and hiddenGroupRef could not be put in scope via dfdl:ref. But presumably it is still possible for an element reference or group reference to use these properties? Clarify whether these properties may be set on local object, global object and/or reference to global.
InputValueCalc and OutputValueCalc: Allowed on local element and element ref but not on global element. HiddenGroupRef: Allowed on any xs:sequence or xs:choice but not on any xs:group, including ref.

13.8. Spec does not say anything about physical lengths of binary floats and doubles. For IEEE 754-2008 these look to be 2, 4, 8, and 16 (for 754-1985 only 4 and 8 are allowed). For IBM 390 these look to be 4, 8 and 16 bytes. Can binary float data ever appear with other lengths? Should the spec insist on this subset of physical lengths? Is 16 supported, given that xs:double can not hold an extended (quadruple) float?
XSD 1.0 xs:float and xs:double are IEEE 754-1985.
XSD 1.1 xs:float and xs:double are IEEE 754-2008.
Does this mean that DFDL physical IEEE floating point data must be 1985, and spec should state this?
Check with XSD WG as to policy about quad precision floats, as ideally DFDL should pick up on any future XSD change.
(Note: adding our own DFDL type is to be avoided because it means the logical model is different when DFDL annotations are removed).
New **action 149** raised.

16. occursCount is allowed to be a non-negative integer. This is superfluous as the property is only used when occursCountKind is expression. Suggest only allowing DFDL Expression as type of occursCount.
Agreed.

3. Infoset and union types
If an element has a union type, there is no way to know which member of the union is actually used from the DFDL Infoset. The [schema] SCD shows the element declaration, from which you can get to the union type. And [datatype] only shows the underlying built-in type (which in DFDL is common to all the union members). It's an edge case, but a little inconvenient to use DFDL infoset as PSVI without revalidating the values.
Go back to XSD WG.for a more complete description of the issue.
Need to ensure that this is not the tip of an iceberg around PSVI.
New **action 150** raised.

Meeting closed
16:00 UK

Next call
Tues 23rd Aug 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

Next action: **151**

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
149	**Clarify DFDL IEEE float support (Steve, Mike)** 16/08: Do we support IEEE 754-1985 or -2008 or both? Do we allow physical lengths of 2 or 16?
150	**What is missing from the DFDL infoset to enable XSD PSVI to be built from it ? (Steve)** 16/08: Issue raised by the XSD WG.

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.

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.

09/02: Steve had reviewed tutorials 3,4,5 and updated versions have been distributed. Joe reviewed lesson on text elements.

Main points. Using 'represented as text' is confusing. Examples are too cluttered. Suggest simple targeted examples but still build up to final complete schema

23/02: New versions distributed and Steve has commented.

02/03: Alan has published the final versions of tutorials 4,5,6 and is working on text respresentations. 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.

09/03: Alan distributed an update to the text tutorial. Please review.

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. 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.

13/04: Steve is working on the text properties tutorial.

04/05: No progress

18/05: No progress

01/06: No progress

08/06: No progress

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.

28/06: On hold.

...

26/07: On hold

16/08: On hold

124	DFDL web content on OGF standards pages (Steve, Bob)

13/10: no progress

10/11: no progress

17/11: Alan has looked at the OGF web pages and there aren't many standards listed. Some of the links point to very short primers rather than the specification

...

08/12: Alan to produce some information to be ready for when spec is approved. Still no word about is it was discussed/approved at OGF meeting

15/12: no progress

22/12: Steve has developed a summary web page for DFDL which will be sent to OGF when spec is approved.

12/01: Not heard from Joel about updated OGF pages Alan to chase. Will also track other site updates: Wikipedia, IBM developerworks etc.

19/01: Still no response from Joel. Other web site that need updating
- IBM virtual XML
- Defuddle
- Wikipedia
- Need google trawl for others
Also need to make spec and tutorials more accessible on the web, eg in pdf and/or html format.

26/01: Still not heard from Joel about OGF web pages. PDF versions of the Specification and tutorials have been uploaded to gridforge.

02/02: A DFDL web page is available at www.ogf.org/dfdl. We need to update the IBM virtual XML and MCSA Defuddle pages. Will ask Mike Beckerle to update his DFDL page.

09/02: Wikipedia DFDL page is available.

23/02: All sites except Defuddle have been updated.

02/03: NCSA web pages have been updated. The DFDL WG home page needs updating and should provide links to spec and tutorials.

09/03: Steve has updated the DFDL WG home page and is in contact with Edinburgh University to update an old DFDL presentation. Would like to have a separate DFDL tutorial page to link to the individual lessons.

30/03: Bob will chase the update of the old Defuddle web pages. IBM investigating conversion of spec and tutorials from pdf to html for usability from browsers.

13/04: Bob still sorting out the Defuddle updates. IBM work to convert the spec to html has started.

04/05: Jim Myers has updated the sourceforge download page but not the Defuddle home/overview pages, Bob will chase. IBM has converted the spec to html pages, needs some tidying before being made public.

18/05: IBM aims to publish the web version by end June. Steve checking with OGF whether the web spec is a 'derivative work' in terms of the copyright notice, or can be considered an actual copy of the spec.

01/06: Still waiting on status of web spec from OGF

08/06: OGF have come back to us and said that it is ok to create a web version of the spec. If it is unchanged then it is a copy, otherwise it is a derivative work. Either way, the copyright covers this so there is not a problem. The web version is looking good, some minor tidy-up changes needed where formatting is not quite right. When IBM is happy with it, Steve will circulate to the WG for review.

15/06: Ongoing

28/06: Steve needs to take a final look at all the pages, get any problems fixed, then distribute to the WG

05/07: Reviewed, some editorial changes needed, and a problem with the table numbers getting reset across pages. When these are fixed Steve will distribute.

12/07: Editorial changes made, fixing the table numbers and also XML indentation in examples.

19/07: Work has started to address the two issues noted on 12/07.

26/07. Changes made, Steve will distribute to the WG prior to posting on the OGF web site and updating the Wikipedia link.

16/08: Steve has incorporated comments from WG and sent off to OGF standards council. Positive feedback from Alan Sill, awaiting final response.

132	**Publishing DFDL xsd (Suman)**
	08/12: Agreed that it should be made available. Suman has started the approval process in IBM
	15/12: no progress
	22/12: no update
	12/01: Suman is getting approval from IBM to publish.
	19/01: Waiting to get IBM approval to publish
	26/01: no update
	02/02: No update
	09/02: no update
	23/02: no update
	02/03: Suman is working through the IBM process to permit publication. There was discussion about what licence the XSD would be published under and how that would effect use in products. Suman to investigate
	09/03: No update
	30/03: Suman has sent information to IBM legal. Reminded him about the license issue.
	13/04: No update.
	04/05: IBM has permission to release the DFDL model xsds to WG members only, Suman has a couple more changes to make and will send to Steve for review. License clarification needed.
	18/05: Awaiting response from IBM legal. Suman will send Steve the model xsd for review.
	01/06:
	08/06. Awaiting response from IBM legal. Suman will send Steve the model xsd for review.
	15/06: Steve has received the xsds (there are three of them) and will review.
	28/06: Not reviewed yet
	05/07: Need to fully understand what WG members are able to do with it. The real usefulness is in other implementers being able to use the xsds to validate DFDL xsds so the license needs to reflect this.
	12/07: No further progress
	19/07: Suman will talk to IBM legal and make it clear that the license must allow users to

	actively use the xsds. 26/07: No update 16/08: Steve has reviewed and sent comments to Suman. Suman has asked legal to clarify re-distribution rules, taking into account OGF licensing terms and patent filing.
133	**Make a set of default formats available (Suman)** 19/01: Suman expects some default formats to be ready by Feb 9th. Will need approval to publish 26/01: Stephanie sent the defaults used by test cases to Suman 02/02: no update 09/02: no update 23/02: no update 02/03: Same as 132 09/03: No update. Same license issue apply though. 13/04: No update. 04/05: IBM will make one default format available. Suman is working through the IBM process to permit publication. 18/05: Awaiting response from IBM legal. 01/06: 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. 15/06: No change. ... 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). 26/07: No update 16/08: Same issue as action 132

136	**Arrays with missing elements (Steve)**
	
	There is a problem when there are empty/missing array elements with an index greater than minOccurs. For example:
	
	xs:element name"array" minOccurs=0, maxOccurs=10 lengthKind='delimited'
	
	Datastream: ,,,value3,value4
	
	Infoset will contain:
	  array[1] = value3
	  array[2] = value4
	
	This is because elements with an index greater than minOccurs are optional and so do not get defaulted.
	
	Unparsing this infoset will produce:
	
	 Datastream: value3,value4
	
	You could make the empty space (%ES;) the nil value which will work for simple elements but not for complex.
	
	Infoset will contain:
	  array[1] = nil
	  array[2] = nil
	  array[3] = value3
	  array[4] = value4
	
	23/02: Discussed options
	1. Changed definition of required for arrays to be 'required up to the last instance in the data stream of the array'
	2. add index to the element info item
	Steve to investigate if XDM uses an index.
	02/03: No progress
	09/03: No update

	30/03: Stephanie recognised the issue from IBM's WTX. Here, the solution was to provide an option so that the user explicitly chose whether the position in the array was significant, as it is not always and on output some users do not want defaults or blanks to appear. Not yet resolved. 13/04: Steve has verified that XDM does not carry index information, but will check with IBM's W3C rep to see if that has ever been expressed as a requirement. Steve also said that the area of defaulting missing required elements on parsing (especially complex elements) is one that the IBM implementation team has raised some concerns about, so Steve and the team are looking at this area again. It is possible that the spec will change to clarify behaviour, and so this action should be used to cover this work. 04/05: In progress. 18/05: In progress, at minimum some clarification to the spec is needed 01/06: Discussed to bring Mike up to speed. Solution will depend on other spec discussions. 08/06: Still under discussion 15/06: Will come back to this after action 140 resolved 28/06: As above ... 26/07: As above 16/08: See action 140
140	Spec issue: Parsing: 'missing' v 'empty', role of initiators, default values (All) 01/06: See minutes. 08/06: Still under discussion. Tim has sent Mike a selection of data formats to guide the discussion. 15/06: Not discussed - an extra call has been scheduled to go through this. 28/06: A series of extra calls are being held between Mike, Steve, Tim and Steph. 05/07: Next extra call is Wed 6th July - Steve to send invite 12/07: Two more calls held. Next call is Wed 13th July. 19/07: More calls held, next call is Fri 22nd July. 26/07: More calls held, good progress 16/08: Steve will set up next call for when Tim has returned from holiday
141	Should text number exponent, infinity and Nan rep properties be lists ? (IBM) 28/6: There is certainly a requirement for DFDL to handle multiple reps for these properties. If ignoreCase is not an option due to ICU then should these allow a list? 05/07: In progress with IBM. 12/07: Still with IBM 19/07: Still with IBM 26/07: Still with IBM 16/08: Still with IBM
145	Provide a 'dispatch' way of discriminating a choice for better performance of the envelope/payload use case (Steve, Mike, Suman) 12/7: See minutes. Need to choose a proposal and flesh out. 19/07: Waiting for proposals 26/07: Waiting for proposals 16/08: Waiting for proposals. Suman added to action.
146	Model NRL's bit-oriented format where complex repeating element carries a 'last' indicator (Steve, Mike) 19/07: NRL to send xsd and example of format. 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. A more usable solution to the 'last indicator' problem is desirable though. Noted that this has a 'repeat..until' semantic. 16/08: Adam/Ryan to evaluate Steve/Tim proposal as it is potentially fragile relying as it does on backtracking.
147	Clarify the rules when for padding /trimming and nil handling interact (Steve, Mike) 19/07: It would seem that for literalCharacter you would want to apply nil processing first, else the nil character can get trimmed away. But for literalValue, trimming first is desirable to allow a single nil value to apply to multiple different fixed length elements. There is an inconsistency here, but is that ok?

	26/07: No further thought on this
	16/08: No further thought on this. Needs sub-team to evaluate.
148	**Clarify the rules around pattern -based lengths and scanability (Mike)**
	26/07: Mike to provide words
	16/08: Mike and Steve have discussed via e-mail and will report back to WG when concluded.

Closed actions

No	Action

Deferred actions

No	Action
129	**Press release to publicise DFDL (Steve)**
	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.
	17/11: no progress
	...
	08/12: Still no response from IBM press office
	15/12: no progress
	....
	09/03: No progress
	30/03: Making this action deferred until IBM is in a position to say something more concrete about any implementation.
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
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.

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	Ongoing
044	Incorporate errata list into DFDL spec.	Steve	TBD	