

DFDL WG Call Agenda

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

Meeting about - Pasted In -

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	10-Feb-15 (Tues)
Meeting Time	16:00 - 17:00

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Mar-11

Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 09-Feb-15

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , 10 Feb 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 17th February January 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: 279

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>10/2: 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>...</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>
275	<p>Publish DFDL experience document #3 (MIL-STD-2045) (Mike)</p> <p>2/12: There are a couple of public comments that need to be incorporated into the document.</p> <p>9/12: Mike to update the document ready for next stage of the OGF cycle. Any impact on the DFDL spec to be identified.</p> <p>...</p> <p>27/1: No progress</p> <p>10/2: Question about how partial bytes are filled from dfdl:fillByte is already covered by spec.</p>
276	<p>Revisit erratum 2.100 (All)</p> <p>9/12: Motivated by the existing IBM DFDL unparser implementation for lengthKind 'explicit' (expression) and the binary integer/decimal round tripping use case where leading zeros are lost, the proposal from 2013 was re-circulated by Steve for comment. Review for next call.</p> <p>6/1/15: Discussed adding a new lengthKind 'expression' plus a new enum property (eg) outputLengthExpressionPolicy to control whether the expression is used or not when unparsing. One of the policy enums would behave exactly like IBM DFDL's implementation of lengthKind 'explicit' with an expression (ie, pre-erratum 2.100), which could then be deprecated (ie, IBM DFDL would continue to support it). This was seen as preferable to just a new policy property for 'explicit' as that affects existing schemas. IBM to make the decision after internal discussion.</p> <p>13/1: IBM is proposing to leave the existing behaviour as it was prior to erratum 2.100, so</p>

	<p>describe 'explicit' as 'fixed length' in the spec and handle the 'variable length' scenario using <code>outputValueCalc</code> with <code>dfdl:valueLength()</code>. Possible extension to <code>dfdl:valueLength()</code> needed to handle the 'minimum length' case where padding is applied? Mike to review Steve's email.</p> <p>27/1: Mike will review this week</p> <p>10/2: Reviewed by Mike with minor comments. Not thought necessary to provide a function that returns minimum length at this point.</p>
277	<p>When is an expression for <code>dfdl:separator</code> evaluated when within an array ? (Tresys)</p> <p>6/1/15: Mike to run updated section 16.3 past the Daffodil team.</p> <p>13/1: No progress</p> <p>27/1: Mike to check back with Tresys team.</p> <p>10/2: Tresys team happy with section 16.3.</p>
278	<p>When <code>maxOccurs</code> is used but exceeded during unparsing (Mike)</p> <p>13/1: Mike to review Steve's email for next call.</p> <p>27/1: Mike will review this week</p> <p>10/2: Reviewed by Mike, agreed that unparsing should stop output of occurrences when <code>maxOccurs</code> is reached for <code>lengthKinds</code> that are sensitive to it.</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 gridforge 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 : <code>dfdl:valueLength</code> and <code>dfdl:contentLength</code> descriptions (Mike)</p> <p>19/11: http://redmine.ogf.org/boards/15/topics/63. Agreed that the function names were ok as</p>

	<p>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 info set 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: 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