

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	02-Dec-14 (Tues)
Meeting Time	16:00 - 17:00

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Mar-11

Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 03-Dec-14

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , 2 Dec 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. MIL-STD-2045 schemas on GitHub

These do not comply with the latest DFDL 1.0 specification:

- some less common properties are missing
- use of '=' in DFDL expressions instead of 'eq' ('general comparison' versus 'value comparison')
- use of lengthUnits 'bits' with xs:nonNegativeInteger

3. DFDL demo opportunity at Cloud Plugfest 11-12 Dec. in London

Alan Sill has asked if DFDL WG are able to attend and demo DFDL.

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

Steve Hanson
Mike Beckerle
Mark Frost

Apologies

Alex Wood
Tim Kimber

Minutes

1. Daffodil Open Source Project

Going through QA for version 0.16.

Fully removed the Saxon XPath code so big performance improvement.

Next step to focus on bugs so can release version 1.0.

Unparser work to start in 2015.

2. MIL-STD-2045 schemas on GitHub

These do not comply with the latest DFDL 1.0 specification. corrected so that ...

- missing properties added

- removed '=' in DFDL expressions removed ('general comparison' not in spec)

- re-modelled xs:nonNegativeInteger into an array (one place)

Re-published on GitHub.

3. DFDL demo opportunity at Cloud Plugfest 11-12 Dec. in London

Steve looking into this but probably can't attend due to other work commitments on 11 & 12.

4. Public comments for DFDL experience document #3

The public comment period for the MIL-STD-2045 experience document is now finished.

There are a couple of comments that need to be incorporated into the document prior to its submission to the OGF for editorial review. **New action 275.**

5. Erratum 2.100

Steve to send email regarding this erratum. IBM DFDL's pre-erratum behaviour is being used by some customers so the unqualified change in behaviour prescribed by erratum 2.100 might not be possible.

IPR Statement

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

Meeting closed

16:30 UK

Next regular call

Tues 9th December @ 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: **276**

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
275	Publish DFDL experience document #3 (MIL-STD-2045) (Mike) 2/12: There are a couple of public comments that need to be incorporated into the document.

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 15/4: Jonathan will send 4 new mini-tutorials. Need to figure out best way to incorporate into the tutorial structure. 29/4: Tutorials received. Mark has taken a quick read. Mark & Steve to review and report back.

	<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>...</p> <p>2/12: 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>2/12: No further progress</p>

Closed actions

No	Action
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</p>

	<p>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>26/8: No progress</p> <p>2/9: No concrete progress although Steve came across this exact scenario when modelling NACHA Addenda records, and used asserts instead of discriminators to side-step the issue.</p> <p>...</p> <p>28/10: No further progress</p> <p>11/11: Steve has looked into this again and will email findings for next call.</p> <p>18/11: Proposal sent by Steve. Mike to review for next call.</p> <p>25/11: Mike's review observed that the success behaviour and the failure behaviour of the discriminator becomes asymmetric. That is, when a discriminator fails, the parser backs out an enclosing actual PoU, but when it succeeds it might not positively resolve that PoU. This is not necessarily a problem, and is better than changing the failure behaviour (which needs to remain the same as that for an assert). Alex pointed out the scenario where two (or more) discriminators existed within a PoU, the behaviour today being that the second would resolve a higher level PoU. It was realised that the proposal to prevent leakage would affect this scenario, and would force rewrite of some existing schemas. It was observed that the proposal was an attempt to introduce 'targeted' PoU resolution by the back door, and that workarounds exist to use OCK 'parsed' or split the array into required and optional sections, or to add a choice that used dfdl:occursIndex. Agreed that Steve would revisit his original motivating EDI example and that a behaviour change would only be pursued if he found a compelling reason to do so.</p> <p>2/12: Closed. Steve sent his EDI example, which is indeed exploiting the current behaviour. As it is not clear whether this can be changed, or to what, the action is closed with no changes to the spec.</p>
274	<p>XPaths: Namespaces of element names in the path (Mike)</p> <p>23/9: Clarify how path steps are to be interpreted wrt namespace. Mike to look at IBM and MITRE suggestions and how unique/key/keyref paths work.</p> <p>14/10: Mike has researched this, and will circulate to the WG.</p> <p>28/10: Email sent by Mike. Review for next call.</p> <p>11/11: Mike to update his research after responses from Tim. Review for next call.</p> <p>18/11: Mike still can't find language in XSDL 1.0 spec that definitively states how this works, but the book 'Definitive XML Schema' says <i>"A child element-type name which must be prefixed if it is in a namespace"</i>. WG agreed that this rule is the one that should be adopted. It is therefore not possible in a DFDL expression to refer to an element that has a target namespace without the use of a namespace prefix. Mike to figure out how this is incorporated into section 23 for next call.</p> <p>25/11: With Mike for next call.</p> <p>2/12: Closed. Mike sent email detailing a new note to be added to the end of section 23.4.</p> <p>Erratum raised tracked by http://redmine.ogf.org/issues/246.</p>

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>

No	Item	Owner	Target	Status