DFDL WG Call Minutes

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	**DFDL 1.0**
Meeting Date	**08-Oct-13 (Tues)**
Meeting Time	**16:00 - 17:00**

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Mar-11
Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 08-Oct-13

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , 8 October 2013

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. Go through public comments
Continue through the public comments, resolving if 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
Steve Hanson
Mike Beckerle
Tim Kimber

Apologies
Suman Kalia
Jonathan Cranford

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

Minutes

1. Daffodil Open Source Project
Not discussed.

2. Go through public comments
The following additional public comments were discussed .
- 116: Allow Japanese ASCII ccsid 943 for zoned decimals - New action 234

Meeting closed
17:10 UK

Next regular call
Tues 15th Oct 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: **235**

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
234	Public comment 116: Allow Japanese ASCII ccsid 943 for zoned decimals (Steve) 8/10: Agreed that existing 'ASCII compatible' rule is too strict, Steve to propose new rule.

Current Actions :

	Action

No	
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. ... 8/10: 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. ... 8/10: 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

No	Action
	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.
227	**Clarify words for erratum 2.100 in sections 12.3.7 and dfdl:textPadKind (Steve)** 17/9: Steve to propose updated words. Public comment 25 raised (http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/25). 24/9: With Steve who will review all of 12.3.7. ... 8/10: Still with Steve to review
228	**Review set of tutorial lessons (All)** 17/9: Lesson 1 proposes a set of lessons, needs reviewing as over 2 years old. ... 8/10: No progress
233	**Public comment 43: 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).

Closed actions

No	Action
220	**Review reworked information on bit fields (Steve)** 20/8: Major changes to presentation rather than content, but a full review is needed even so. 28/8: Mike and Steve collaborating on getting this into the spec and reviewed. Spotted an issue in passing with the grammar, the RightPadOrFill region could actually contain pad characters and fill bytes, for the text & lengthUnits 'bytes' combination. **Erratum taken.** 3/9: Draft r14.5 contains updates. Went through the remaining open comments. Most can be closed now, a few remain and will be handled in public comment, specifically - adding lengthUnits 'bits' for packed calendars; - documenting the endOfParent case where RightFill can be encountered. 10/9: No progress 17/9: Public comment 26 raised for packed calendars issue (http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/26) Public comment 27 raised for endOfParent issue (http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/27) 24/9: Agreed to allow packed calendars with lengthUnits 'bits'. **Public comment 26 resolved.** Mike to add a reply to public comment 27. 1/10: Mike added reply, Steve to provide words for section 12.3.7.3. 8/10: **Closed.** Words added to public comment. **Resolved.**
221	**Ensure 'nil' is handled by DFDL expressions (Mike)** 20/8: Possible problem with 'nil' and expressions. Needs investigation. 28/8: No further progress. Unlikely to make the published draft. 3/9: No progress - deferred until public comment 10/9: No progress 17/9: Public comment 28 raised (http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/28) 24/9: Requires some detailed investigation 1/10: Proposal from Mike to treat nil as a separate infoset item member 'nilled'. Review for next week. 8/10: **Closed.** Reviewed. Steve added some words for section 23.3. **Resolved.**
222	**Improve some of the wording used in separator suppression description (All)** 28/8: Mike has some concerns with the accuracy of the wording, see email thread. 3/9: No progress - deferred until public comment 10/9: No progress 17/9: Public comment to be raised 24/9: With Mike to raise

	1/10: Public comment 67 raised (http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/67) with suggested wording. Mike to add inputValueCalc case. 8/10: **Closed**. Wording added to public comment for inputValueCalc. **Resolved**.
225	**Consistent terminology for describing text data (Mike)** 3/9: Ensure spec uses 'textual' and other agreed terms in a consistent way. Resolve during public comment. 10/9: No progress 17/9: Public comment to be raised 24/9: With Mike to raise 1/10: Public comment 66 raised (http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/66). Make sure that all uses of text/textual data are not ambiguous with the use of 'text representation'; consider improving glossary to define 'Text' in terms of anything requiring dfdl:encoding to be set. 8/10: **Closed**. Public comment updated. **Resolved**.
229	**Should evaluation of multiple newVariableInstance and multiple setVariable be deterministic ? (All)** 24/9: Public comment 39 raised (http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/39) 1/10: Mike sent proposal by email. Decided that order should be deterministic across multiple annotations points in the same resolved set, innermost first. Mike to update public comment 39. 8/10: **Closed**. Reviewed and agreed on the revised words sent by Mike. **Resolved**.
230	**Should WSP* be allowed when ES is not allowed ? (Steve)** 24/9: Public comment 40 raised (http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/40). Steve to make proposal. 1/10: Public comment 40 updated. Mike to modify Steve's proposal so that WSP* not allowed when scanning for delimiters. 8/10: **Closed**. Revised proposal added to public comment. **Resolved**.
231	**Attend NIST Data Symposium (Mike, Jonathan)** 24/9: Check availability to attend the symposium in Gaithersburg, MD, to present DFDL. 1/10: No definite availability, need to decide by Friday Oct 4th as abstract and bio needed. 8/10: **Closed**. Steve Lawrence attending, abstract and bio submitted.

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 |
| | |

Work items:

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