

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	08-Aug-19 (Thurs)
Meeting Time	16:00 - 17:00

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Mar-11

Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 08-Aug-19

OGF DFDL Working Group Call, 8th August 2019

Agenda

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

1. Daffodil Open Source Project

Status update

2. Daffodil proposal for handling hexBinary data as BLOB files

See <https://wiki.apache.org/confluence/display/DAFFODIL/Proposal%3A+Binary+Large+Objects> and email to WG.

3. Bidi properties

No implementation supports these properties, should they be dropped from DFDL 1.0?
Also see deferred action 241.

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

Apologies

Bradd Kadlecik

Minutes

1. Daffodil Open Source Project

Presenting at ApacheCon, details at <https://redmine.ogf.org/news/135>

2. Daffodil proposal for handling hexBinary data as BLOB files

See <https://cwiki.apache.org/confluence/display/DAFFODIL/Proposal%3A+Binary+Large+Objects>.

The proposal means that a schema extension is needed, which is a first for DFDL.

The proposal also means that validation of the hexBinary data is not possible.

Steve Lawrence has sent an alternative proposal. **New action 312.**

3. Bidi properties

No implementation supports these properties, should they be dropped from DFDL 1.0?

Un-defering **action 241** in order to debate a proposal that they should be dropped.

4. Experimental features

These will be tracked in issue trackers, and a separate table is added to these minutes as a convenient list and link.

IPR Statement

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

Meeting closed

Next regular call

29th August 2019 @ 16:00 UK (3 weeks time)

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

Action Items and Other Meeting Documents

Subject	Document Type	Created	Modified

Next action: **313**

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
312	BLOBs as URIs in infoSet (Mike) 8/8: Proposed new experimental feature to ease the usability of writing schemas for image file formats. The idea is that a file reference is added to the infoSet, and the BLOB data written to a file. Needs issue tracker raising. Added to experimental features table.

Current Actions:

No	Action
241	Public comment: Bi-di properties placement in precedence section (All) 7/11/14: 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. ... 23/9: Candidate to be moved out to 1.1 ? ... 8/8/19: Un-deferring this action. No implementation has yet included the bidirectional capability, nor are there plans to do so. Steve proposed that it should be dropped from DFDL 1.0, to ease the standardization process.
242	Standardise on a single tdml format for DFDL tests (All) 5/2/14: 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. ... 18/2: No further progress 11/3: Mike and Steve discussing the best way to share and cooperate on tdml

format.

25/3: Discussed the creation of an OGF document that will own and define a standardised tdml format.

11/4: Proposal is for the OGF document to define a tdml format without Tresys or IBM copyright statement.

15/4: Draft document on Redmine

...

6/5: No further progress

20/5: Mark has read through the document. Particularly concerned with how namespaces are handled in the info set.

...

17/6: No further progress

25/6: Mike has added bit order capability as per action 233.

...

9/12: No further progress

6/1/15: Mike to resurrect this as Tresys would like to run their tdml suite against both Daffodil and IBM DFDL.

...

10/2: No further progress

24/2: Mike updating the Daffodil TDML test runner to handle unparser (ie, serializer) tests

...

14/4: No further progress

28/4: Tresys have enhanced their tdml runner to allow unparser tests and round-trip tests (parser->unparser->parser) as well as the new tutorial tag (see action 228)

12/5: Not discussed

...

3/11: No progress

5/1/16: No progress. Needs more interoperability between implementations to be really useful.

...

25/7/17: No further progress

3/10: No further progress although forthcoming work to add packed/zoned numbers may force <https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/339> progress

...

11/12: Expected to look at this in the next month or so

...

4/9/18: No further progress

16/10: Mike has started work on a TDML runner that can drive a pluggable DFDL implementation, in support of interoperability testing, including IBM DFDL.

1/11: Pluggable TDML runner working. On Github at

<https://github.com/OpenDFDL/ibmDFDLCrossTester>. Schema resolution for IBM DFDL achieved using its schema resolver feature and pointing it at Daffodil's resolver. IBM DFDL sample uses mark() on its input stream but IBM believes this is not necessary.

15/11: IBM DFDL and Daffodil have dependencies on different releases of ICU. Forcing changes to the TDML runner to isolate the implementations under test.

29/11: Good progress on the TDML runner, see email from Mike. The `ibmCrossTestRig` is not part of Daffodil (because it links against IBM DFDL), but is open source Apache License v2, and is currently in review at <https://github.com/OpenDFDL/ibmDFDLCrossTester/pull/1>. Steve needs to talk to IBM legal to check this is ok as it currently modifies IBM DFDL sample code.

10/1/19: Daffodil have removed the modified IBM DFDL sample code. Steve to ask whether IBM can donate tests from the existing IBM DFDL test suite.

7/2: If permitted, the tests from IBM can be used to see how the IBM and Daffodil tdmls have diverged.

5/4: IBM are permitted to send Daffodil some example tdmls. Steve to send some

	<p>to Mike for next call.</p> <p>...</p> <p>31/5: No progress</p> <p>27/6: Steve has sent example TDML files to Mike, under the existing IBM Grant of Copyright agreement with Apache.</p> <p>11/7: Daffodil to adapt their test runner so that it works with the IBM TDML file variant. Action can be closed when this is done.</p> <p>8/8: No further progress</p>
250	<p>Public comment: dfdl:valueLength and dfdl:contentLength descriptions (Mike)</p> <p>19/11/14: 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>11/3/15: 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 infoSet 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> <p>...</p> <p>25/4/2016: Undeferring action as some of these issues are now impacting Daffodil team as they write their unparser. Steve has sent the email threads on this action to Mike. Mike will combine with his issues and distill into a single thread.</p> <p>7/6: Thread to include use of a variable with dfdl:outputValueCalc. May be undefined at point of evaluation.</p> <p>5/7: Mike has been looking at this. Two main points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Computing the content length of a complex element with internal alignment. 2) Computing length in chars of a complex element which is not 100% text <p>Mike will send out a discussion via email. Noted that rules should also apply to prefixed length calculation.</p> <p>(Aside: IBM DFDL unparser does not support a prefixed length complex element with length units chars and variable width encoding).</p> <p>2/8: Mike has sent out several emails.</p> <p>#1: Proposes that term ComplexValue is added to the grammar to better handle</p>

	<p>ElementUnused. Knock-on effect on the wording of dfdl:valueLength(). Agreed on the change. Issue https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/316 created.</p> <p>Spec says escapeCharacter, escapeBlockStart, escapeBlockEnd, escapeEscapeCharacter contribute to the content length of an element. This is not correct, they are part of the value length. Issue https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/317 created.</p> <p>#2: Gives some options for computing DFDL length functions when target complex element has interior alignment. Agreed that the DFDL processor should detect this and give runtime SDE. This is an example of expression forward reference deadlock. Need new paragraph in section 23 of spec to cover this. Issue https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/318 created.</p> <p>#3: Argues that DFDL should only encode/decode when it needs to when computing DFDL length functions, to allow for performance. Agreed that this behaviour was ok. Issue https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/319 created.</p> <p>13/9: Review issues created. Need to come up with the revised descriptions for dfdl:valueLength and dfdl:contentLength functions before action can be closed.</p> <p>...</p> <p>8/8/19: No further progress</p>
279	<p>Improve defaulting description to explicitly cover local groups (Mike)</p> <p>28/4/15: Only talks about elements, should mention local sequence and choice.</p> <p>12/5: Not discussed</p> <p>23/6: Section 15.1.3 needs to say what happens when a choice branch does not contain any elements; such a choice branch is selected (but see action 280 below as minOccurs '0' might change this). Section 9.4 also needs updating to say what happens when local groups are found within a complex type.</p> <p>11/8: Steve did some tests with IBM DFDL. Just need some words as above.</p> <p>Action assigned to Mike.</p> <p>25/8: In progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>5/1/16: No progress</p> <p>...</p> <p>8/8/19: No further progress</p>
289	<p>Unparsing: expression refers backwards to outputValueCalc which refers beyond it.</p> <p>2/8/16: Need to decide if this is allowed and if so if there are any restrictions.</p> <p>13/9: Motivating scenario is where a variable is being set to a length element using dfdl:setVariable, which on unparse is set using dfdl:outputValueCalc. So although the variable is referring backwards to the length element, it is effectively forward referencing so must block. Mike believes this is unavoidable.</p> <p>11/10: Daffodil has implemented this, Mike to provide scenario.</p> <p>8/11: Mike couldn't find example, will continue to look</p> <p>10/1/17: Mike has realised that all the examples were reworked to avoid using variables, hence why can't be found.</p> <p>7/2: Daffodil will soon be implementing dfdl:newVariableInstance which will bring this up again.</p> <p>...</p> <p>17/4/18: Waiting for Daffodil to implement dfdl:newVariableInstance</p> <p>15/5: Daffodil team have supplied an example of this from the PCAP schema. Likely to require a flag on newVariableInstance (or maybe variable declaration) to indicate whether needed on parse, unparse or both.</p> <p>...</p> <p>8/8/19: No further progress</p>
293	<p>Investigate solutions to enabling choices in hidden groups to be unparsed (All)</p> <p>7/2/17: Study of problem needed in order to best evaluate any proposals.</p> <p>21/2: Mike has circulated a proposal internally within Daffodil.</p>

	<p>4/4: No progress but immediate need has gone away. On hold for now.</p> <p>...</p> <p>17/4/18: On hold.</p> <p>15/5: Daffodil now looking at this and will write up a proposal. Potential commonality with action 289.</p> <p>...</p> <p>8/8/19: No further progress</p>
306	<p>Confirm IBM DFDL behaviour when parsing empty strings (Steve)</p> <p>7/8: IBM DFDL has not fully implemented the behaviour changes arising from action 140 with respect to empty string elements. Daffodil is about to do so. IBM DFDL users have complained about lack of defaults when parsing but other than that appear happy. Are the rules in the spec for empty strings over complicated? Steve to document the behaviour for IBM DFDL to inform the discussion.</p> <p>...</p> <p>1/11: In progress - there are a lot of subtle scenarios</p> <p>15/11: Not discussed</p> <p>...</p> <p>7/2/19: No further progress</p> <p>5/4: Steve has documented IBM DFDL behaviour and summarised options. The problem is that IBM DFDL does not handle empty strings correctly when parsing; it errors if required, and throws away if optional (regardless of markup). Mike to test Daffodil (but the only non-compliance is likely to be that a default value is not used if present and required string is empty). Discussed a proposal for a new property that caused Daffodil to implement the IBM rules. More thought needed.</p> <p>2/5: Mike sent proposal for new enum property dfdl:emptyElementPolicy with values 'noOptionalEmptyElements' (matches current IBM DFDL behaviour) and 'optionalEmptyElementsWithSyntax' (matches DFDL 1.0 spec and Daffodil behaviour). Review for next call.</p> <p>31/5: Email discussion on the name and enums for the property. Steve proposed dfdl:emptyElementParsePolicy = 'treatAsMissing' 'treatAsEmpty'. Daffodil has implemented this and it has shown it to work. For positional occurrences where order needs preserving, also need to use nillable='true' and dfdl:nilValue='%ES;'. This shows up a potential flaw in the name, as ES nil processing must take place before the property is applied. Steve has one remaining concern around IBM DFDL's behaviour, and that is whether its dfdl:nilValue='%ES;' behaviour might be taking precedence over 'missing', and needs to investigate further.</p> <p>27/6: Email sent by Steve. dfdl:nilValue='%ES;' is the 1st zero-length rep check, so IBM DFDL is correct. 2nd check is empty rep check. 3rd check is normal rep - an edge case around EVDP. Failing that it's the absent rep. IBM DFDL does not add anything to infoSet for 2 or 3. The currently proposed property name dfdl:emptyElementParsePolicy is therefore not 100% accurate, needs some more thought.</p> <p>11/7: Daffodil has implemented dfdlx:emptyElementParsePolicy in the experimental namespace and has shown that the IBM DFDL schemas for TLog can be parsed successfully using 'treatAsMissing', thereby demonstrating interoperability. Because it is key to interoperability, it should go into DFDL 1.0, and IBM DFDL needs to at least recognise the property and give an error if 'treatAsEmpty' used. Need to agree on any naming refinements, eg, use 'treatAsAbsent' instead of 'treatAsMissing'.</p> <p>8/8: Added to experimental features table. New tracker https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/355. Keeping action open as there will be an erratum on DFDL 1.0. Likely outcome is that 'treatAsEmpty' is an optional feature, as not implemented by IBM.</p>
309	<p>Create example scenarios to illustrate offset & pointer requirements (Bradd)</p> <p>5/4/19: Daffodil have a draft proposal for offset support, TPF have experimental</p>

	<p>implementation for pointer support. Need examples to show the requirement, especially unparsing.</p> <p>2/5: Bradd supplied an example of pointers. On parsing the pointer is used as an absolute address to a piece of accessible memory, and the element is parsed from that location. On unparsing memory is allocated and unparsing of the element occurs into that location and the pointer set to the location (memory allocation is implementation-defined). Note the pointer value does <i>*not*</i> appear in the info set. Looks like a useful and workable addition to DFDL. Could solve the parsing requirements for TIFF image files. Bradd also has extension for offset, which is like pointer but uses relative location instead of absolute. Both are examples of indirection. A further example could be specifying a file to read. Contrast this with what DFDL has used the term 'offset' for in the past, namely as an alternative property to alignment/skip which allows the parser/unparser to jump directly to a point in the current buffer. These are orthogonal concepts. Noted that parsing of ZIP files may need both. Secure implementations may need to disallow use of pointers and/or offsets unless they can guarantee to fill everywhere with the fill byte. Implementations should also be deterministic. Agreed that recursion not needed to implement this. Bradd mentioned a further concept 'overflows', an example being an array unparsed into a linked list. Pointers proposal needs to be written up as an experimental feature.</p> <p>31/5: Bradd to write up pointers proposal as an experimental feature.</p> <p>...</p> <p>11/7: No update</p> <p>8/8: Bradd aiming to get this written up for next time. Also needs issue tracker raising.</p>
311	<p>Move DFDL 1.0 spec to Grid Recommendation as per GFD.152 (All)</p> <p>27/6/19: Steve to create experience document for IBM DFDL usage. Mike to do same for Daffodil. Steve to reach out to the DFDL4S team at ESA for them to do the same. Mike to send email to OGF to inform them of the WG's intent and to establish who to deal with going forward.</p> <p>11/7: Mike has sent email to Steve for review.</p> <p>8/8: Mike emailed OGF and Alan Sill has replied. He has forwarded the email to the Grid Forum Steering Committee with a request for responses and asked Jens Jensen as VP for Standards to help the WG work through the process. Agreed that a draft should be created that fixes all the known typographical bugs (as noted in tracker 233) - Mike will do this. Mike will follow-up with Jens Jensen also.</p>

Closed actions

No	Action
287	<p>Find a way to handle a variable path step in DFDL expression (All)</p> <p>1/3/16: DFDL4S currently using a hack that embeds a regex in a path step.</p> <p>10/5: No progress</p> <p>24/5: Need example from DFDL4S</p> <p>...</p> <p>5/7: Need to ask DFDL4S for example.</p> <p>2/8: DFDL4S sent example. They use dfdl:contentLength() with a path that has a step that contains a regex as a wildcard. Mike has requested the wider set of schemas to be sent, in order to see if there is a viable alternative.</p> <p>13/9: Response received from DFDL4S, not yet analysed.</p> <p>...</p> <p>10/1/17: No further progress</p> <p>7/2: Mike has analysed the schemas and sent a comprehensive reply to DFDL4S. He believes that the variable path step is effectively a way of parameterizing the expression, and has described how this can be done using DFDL variables. DFDL4S have responded and will talk to the contractor that authored the implementation.</p>

	<p>21/2: No response so far from DFDL4S.</p> <p>4/4: Mike has seen a further example of this. Still no response from DFDL4S.</p> <p>...</p> <p>25/7: No further progress</p> <p>3/10: Mike has seen a further example where an expression needed to look back inside an earlier choice, where there was a common element. Discussed whether XPath 2.0 wildcards could be used (currently not supported in DFDL 1.0). This looks to be a good fit, and would involve only a minimal change to the supported syntax. Steve will email DFDL4S.</p> <p>...</p> <p>11/12: ESA will look into this as part of the next round of changes to DFDL4S.</p> <p>...</p> <p>17/4/18: No update</p> <p>15/5: Steve has emailed DFDL4S asking for a progress update. Also, Mike will put together a concrete proposal.</p> <p>...</p> <p>4/9: No further progress</p> <p>16/10: Steve will send chaser email to DFDL4S team.</p> <p>1/11: Marcus Bento from DFDL4S team responded: "I confirm that Action 287, related to using regex as part of the path in our schemas, is expected to be addressed in the early release of 2019. I've investigated the current implementation, and believe that your suggested approach (based on XPath 2.0) is sufficient for our needs. However, only after the release of December will the contractor analyze the issue further and confirm that the implementation works."</p> <p>...</p> <p>10/1/19: No progress likely until January at the earliest.</p> <p>7/2: Steve will reach out to DFDL4S team again.</p> <p>5/4: Not addressed in the early release of 2019, expected in a later release of 2019. Action can be closed once a tracker issue has been created to specify formally the behaviour of DFDL 1.0 XPath with wildcards.</p> <p>...</p> <p>31/5: No progress on tracker</p> <p>27/6: Steve to raise tracker for next call.</p> <p>11/7: Perhaps this is best being considered an experimental feature? If so need to see if it can be made to fit into the proposal in https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/340, or whether that proposal needs updating to accommodate it. And whether this is all acceptable to DFDL4S. Tracker put on hold.</p> <p>8/8: Closed. DFDL4S team agree that this should be implemented as an experimental feature. Added to experimental features table. New tracker https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/353.</p>
294	<p>Converting integer enumerations to meaningful strings in infoSet (Mike)</p> <p>18/4/17: Requirement from Daffodil user for parser to convert an integer enum to a meaningful string value in infoSet.</p> <p>Daffodil has put forward a proposal but it relies on [unionMemberSchema] which is a validation-only property.</p> <p>https://opensource.ncsa.illinois.edu/confluence/display/DFDL/Enumerations+and+Range+Tables+via+Simple+Type+Unions</p> <p>Mike to re-think the approach, and also consider whether this kind of transformation is really a post-DFDL step.</p> <p>Steve to check how XQuery would approach the same problem.</p> <p>...</p> <p>25/7: No progress</p> <p>3/10: Also received same request from a product team at IBM.</p> <p>21/11: Consider whether any additional annotation is not DFDL, for possible wider applicability.</p> <p>11/12: On Daffodil priority list to investigate</p>

...
6/3/18: No progress
17/4/18: Latest proposal is at https://cwiki.apache.org/confluence/display/DAFFODIL/Proposal%3A+Features+to+Support+Table-Lookup . Feedback requested. Review for next call.
15/5/18: Review for next call.
7/8: No further progress
4/9: Steve to review for next call
16/10: Steve thinks there is a major problem with the carrying of the rep properties, as the types are different. Mike to respond to Steve's comments. Need something that is a cross between IVC / OVC and prefixLengthType!
1/11: Mike to think some more. Need to be exact as to which properties can no longer be carried on the element / string type. Steve wondered if the mechanism could be generic, allowing any type to appear as a string in the infoSet via a default toString style mapping.
...
10/1/19: No further progress
7/2: Commercial demand means Daffodil need to implement this soon. Also see action 301 - will be experimental feature.
5/4: Needs to be made into an experimental feature. Daffodil in process of implementing. Becoming more elaborate!
2/5: No progress
31/5: Daffodil working on this as experimental feature, and evaluating it, prior to final proposal.
27/6: Evaluation review planned for 2 weeks time
11/7: Basic mechanism of decorating enums present, and works. Numeric ranges and other complexities not fully baked. Evaluation continues.
8/8: Closed. Evaluation continues. Added to experimental features table. New tracker https://redmine.org/issues/354

Deferred actions

No	Action

Work items:

No	Item	Owner	Target	Status

Experimental Features:

No	Title	Original Action	Issue Tracker	Implementor	Experience Document
1	Experimental feature mechanism	301	https://redmine.org/issues/340	Daffodil	
2	Elements of type 'xs:hexBinary' with lengthUnits 'bits'	292	https://redmine.org/issues/344	Daffodil	
3	Variable Path Step in DFDL expression	287	https://redmine.org/issues/353	DFDL4S	
4	BLOBs as URIs in infoSet	312	TBC	Daffodil	

5	Data streaming layers	304	https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/341	Daffodil	
6	Indirection using pointers	309	TBC	IBM DFDL (z/TPF)	
7	Empty element parse policy	306	https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/355	Daffodil	
8	Integer enums as strings in info set	294	https://redmine.ogf.org/issues/354	Daffodil	