

DFDL WG Call Minutes

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

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	11-Feb-14 (Tues)
Meeting Time	16:00 - 17:00

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Mar-11

Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 12-Feb-14

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , 11 February 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. Leading/trailing white space in property values that are DFDL expressions

See public comment at <http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/251>

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 Hnason
Tim Kimber
Alex Wood
Mark Frost
Jonathan Cranford
Mike Beckerle

Apologies

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. Leading/trailing white space in property values that are DFDL expressions

See public comment at <http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/251>.

Agreed that it is all white space that is trimmed, and spec words should be improved.

Resolved.

Meeting closed

16:15 UK

Next regular call

Tues Feb 18th 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: 253

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action

Current Actions :

Action

No	
224	<p>Add section for implementation defined limits (Jonathan)</p> <p>3/9: Several places in the spec cite this, should be grouped. Currently partially listed in section 2.6.</p> <p>Also note distinction between 'implementation defined' and 'implementation dependent'. Check spec for correct usage.</p> <p>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>11/2: No more progress</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>11/2: No further progress</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>11/2: Still with Mike</p>
246	<p>Refactor DFDL spec into a multipart MS Word document (Mike)</p> <p>28/1: Mike to see whether this solves the fragility and size problems that the spec experiences today.</p> <p>...</p> <p>11/2: Not started</p>
247	<p>Update DFDL errata documents to incorporate public comments (Steve)</p> <p>28/1: To keep all spec issues documented in one place, the public comments will be added to the errata documents.</p> <p>...</p> <p>11/2: Not started</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>11/2: No further progress</p>
249	<p>Revise the array forward progress requirement (Steve)</p> <p>28/1: Tim to revise section 16.6 to correct errors and include 'implicit' bounded use case.</p> <p>5/2: Tim sent out revised section. Steve has reviewed and sent an updated section. Broadly correct, but can be improved further by use of bullets, explicit mention of empty and nil representation, and use of 'must' not 'may' for the bounded case. Steve to update.</p> <p>11/2: 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>11/2: No further progress</p>
252	<p>Clarify binary packed calendar relationship with calendar pattern (Steve)</p> <p>5/2: The spec could be clearer that the digits in a binary packed calendar representation have a semantic given by the dfdl:calendarPattern property. Errata 2.2 already improved the spec in this area and added an example, but it could still be improved. Steve will look at the property description for dfdl:binaryCalendarRep in 13.13, and correct the paragraph in 13.11.1 that implies non-digits are allowed.</p> <p>Also in 12.7.3.2.4 it says the max length of a binary packed calendar is implementation defined, but it should be possible to specify a minimum based on the longest legal calendar pattern for a binary packed calendar.</p> <p>11/2: No further progress</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 priority</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>
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>
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>
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	All	2013-10-22	Pending