

TeamRoom Plus

IBM TeamRoom

This OPEN document will be filed on: 22-May-09

Meeting about Meetings\OGF

Project	DFDL 1.0
Meeting Date	22-Apr-09 (Wed)
Meeting Time	14:00 - 15:00

Created by Steve Hanson on 09-Apr-09

Last Modified by Steve Hanson on 23-Apr-09

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , April-22-2009

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

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 .

Open Grid Forum : Data Format Description Language Working Group

OGF DFDL Working Group Call , April-22-2009

Meeting opened , 14:00 UK

Attendees

Steve Hanson (IBM)

Mike Beckerle (Oco)

Apologies

Suman Kalia (IBM)

Alan Powell (IBM)

Agenda:

1. Go through actions.

Actions updated below.

2. OGF 26 in Chapel Hill, NC

Not possible for Mike to attend so no DFDL session.

Next OGF is 27 which we should make every effort to attend.

October 12-16, 2009

The Banff Centre

Banff, Alberta, Canada

3. OMG non-XML/XML Information Transformation Standardization (RFI)

This RFI is asking for vendors to put forward candidate non-XML technologies for adoption as standards.

Agreed that OGF should put forward DFDL. Action raised for Mike to mail OGF Data Area chair .

4. Short and long form properties require all DFDL properties to be defined at least twice in the schema for DFDL

Mike sent an email to the mailing list suggesting a meta approach, where the properties are defined once, and an XSL generates the concrete xsd in the necessary form. Action raised for Suman to respond.

5. AOB

There was no other business.

6. Next call 29 April 14:00 UK

Meeting closed , 15:10 UK

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 .

View: ResultDocs

Actions raised at this meeting

No	Action
037	All: Approach for XML Schema 1.0 UPA checks. 22/04: Several non-XML models, when expressed in their most obvious DFDL Schema form, would fail XML Schema 1.0 Unique Particle Attribution checks that police model ambiguity . And even re-jigging the model sometimes fails to fix this . Note this is equally applicable to XML Schema 1.1 and 1.0. While the DFDL parser/unparser can happily resolve the ambiguities, the issue is one of definition. If an XSD editor that implements UPA checks is used to create DFDL Schema, then errors will be flagged. DFDL may have to adopt the position that: a)DFDL parser/unparser will not implement some/all UPA checks (exact checks tbd) b) XML Schema editors that implement UPA checks will not be suitable for all DFDL models c) If DFDL annotations are removed, the resulting pure XSD will not always be valid (ie, the equivalent XML is ambiguous and can't be modelled by XML Schema 1.0) Ongoing in case another solution can be found.
038	MB: Submit response to OMG RFI for non-XML standardization 22/04: First step is for MB to mail the OGF Data Area chair to say that we want to submit
039	SKK: Approach for creating Schema-For-DFDL xsds. 22/04: Resolve issue around multiple declarations needed for DFDL properties , perhaps using

Current Actions :

No	Action
012	<p>AP/SH: Update decimalCalendarScheme</p> <p>10/9: Not allocated yet</p> <p>17/9: No update</p> <p>24/9: Add calendar binary formats to actions</p> <p>22/10: No progress</p> <p>16/1: proposal distributed and discussed. Will be redistributed</p> <p>21/1: add locale,</p> <p>04/02: changed from locale to specific properties</p> <p>18/2: Need more investigation of ICU strict/lax behaviour.</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: AP to complete asap once the ICU strict/lax behaviour is understood.</p>
020	<p>SH: Resolve packedDecimalSignCodes behaviour depends on NumberCheckPolicy</p> <p>22/10: No progress</p> <p>10/12: added how to decide to overpunch and sign position</p> <p>11/02: proposal largely agreed. SH to make minor changes</p> <p>18/02: AP to document unsigned type behaviour</p> <p>25/02: no progress</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: SH to complete last remaining issue, which is the behaviour when logical type is signed/unsigned and the physical type is unsigned/signed.</p>
024	<p><No owner> String XML type</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Need to allocate owner. Work is to describe the semantics of using dfdl:representation="xml" to model a well-formed XML fragment in an overall non-XML document described by a DFDL schema.</p>
025	<p>AP: Escape schemes</p> <p>21/1: discussed requirements</p> <p>04/02: AP/SH to describe behaviour for known length text fields. Need to discuss if comment escapes should be supported.</p> <p>11/02 new draft distributed:</p> <p>18/02: SH up document concerns</p> <p>25/02: SH and AP have refined proposal ready for approval.</p> <p>04/03: SH and AP have further refined proposal.</p> <p>11/03: discussed. suggested a simplified proposal be evaluated.</p> <p>18/03: SH and AP had further discussions on simplified proposal</p> <p>08/04: See minutes, review in detail for next call</p> <p>15/04: See minutes, review for next call</p> <p>22/04: MB mailed answers to the mailing list in response to AP's last few questions.</p> <p>Following agreed:</p> <p><i>1.Should data containing the escapeEscapeCharacater cause escaping to be used if if so how should it be escaped.</i></p> <p><i>EEC alone isn't an active character. it has to be followed by the EC to be interpreted at all. That said, if the pair EEC EC appears in the data, then yes, we must escape the EC, with another EEC.</i></p> <p><i>2.Should we only look for escapeStartString at the beginning of the data</i></p> <p><i>Yes, we will be restrictive/conservative for v1.0</i></p> <p><i>3.Property names (everyone has their own favourite so lets just pick one.)</i></p> <p><i>Only changes are escapeBlockStart and escapeBlockEnd.</i></p> <p>AP to incorporate the agreed scheme into draft 0.34.</p>
026	<p>SH: Envelopes and Payloads</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed explicitly, but recursive use of DFDL is tied up with this</p> <p>22/04: Two aspects. Firstly compositional - do sufficient mechanisms exist to model an</p>

	<p>envelope with a payload that varies. Secondly markup syntax - this might be defined in the envelope.</p> <p>The second of these is very much tied up with the variable markup action 028, so will be considered there. SH to verify the composition aspect.</p>
027	<p>SH: Property precedence tables</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Two things missing from the existing precedence trees. Firstly, does not show alternates (eg, initiator v initiatorkind). Secondly, need a tree per concrete DFDL object (eg, element). SH to update.</p>
028	<p>SH: Variable markup</p> <p>08/04: Discussed briefly at end of call, IBM to see whether there any use cases that require recursive use of DFDL.</p> <p>15/04: Use case was distributed and will be discussed on next call.</p> <p>22/04: The use case in question is EDI where the terminating markup for the payload segments is defined in the ISA envelope segment. The markup is modelled as an element of simple type where the allowable markup values are defined as enums on the type. But we need to handle two cases - firstly where the envelope is present, so the value used by the payload is taken from the envelope. Secondly where only the payload is present. Here we need a way of scanning for all the enum values, and adopting the one we actually find, when parsing. And using a default when unparsing. SH to explore use of a DFDL variable, where the variable has a default, but also has a type that is the same as the markup element - that way we get to use the enums without defining everything twice.</p>
029	<p>MB: valueCalc (output length calculation)</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Action allocated to MB, this is to complete the work started at the Hursley WG F2F meeting.</p>
032	<p>DG: Investigate compatibility between DFDL infoset and XDM</p> <p>08/04: No update</p> <p>22/04: No update</p>
033	<p>AP/TK: Assert/Discriminator semantics. AP to document. TK to check uses of discriminator besides choice.</p> <p>08/04: In progress within IBM</p> <p>22/04: Waiting for TK to return from leave to complete.</p>
034	<p>AP: Remove redundant properties, correct old examples</p> <p>08/04: No update</p> <p>22/04: In progress as part of draft 0.34.</p>
035	<p>AP: Add validation ranges to spec, update specialized annotations in spec.</p> <p>08/04: Raised. For draft 0.34</p> <p>22/04: In progress as part of draft 0.34.</p>
036	<p>SH: Provide use case for floating component in a sequence</p> <p>08/04: Raised</p> <p>15/04: Use case sent and discussed. SH to do further investigation</p> <p>22/04: IBM feedback from WTX team is that alternate suggested ways of modelling the EDI floating NTE segment have significant usability issues. The DFDL principle is that for a problem that can be expressed as two-layered, then two DFDL models are needed. The EDI NTE segment does not fall into this though, as its use is on a per sequence basis. Ongoing.</p>

Closed actions :

023	<p>MB: Review Schema 1.1</p> <p>29/1: AP and SH to talk to Sandy Gao</p> <p>04/02 Call arranged for Friday</p> <p>11/02: Call took place. Identified useful changes. Consolidate with previous list.</p> <p>04/03: decided to stay on Schema 1.0.</p> <p>08/04: Not discussed</p> <p>22/04: Closed. But see new action 037 which has been raised as a result.</p>
------------	--

Work items:

N o	Item	
0 0 1	String XML type (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
0 0 2	Escape schemes (Ian P) - Apr 30, 2008	
0 0 3	Variables - ??, 2008 (Mike)	
0 0 5	Improvements on property descriptions - ??, 2008 (All - split TBD)	
0 0 6	Envelopes and Payloads (Steve) - Apr 30, 2008	
0 0 7	(from draft 32) valueCalc (Mike) - ??, 2008	mostly comple te
0 0 8	(from draft 32) Property precedence for writing (Steve) -	under review
0 0 9	(from draft 32) Variable markup (Steve) - Mar 31, 2008	proposal needs writing up
0 1 0	(from draft 32) Assertions, discriminators and choice, including discussion of timing option (Suman) - Mar 31, 2008 * in progress *	
0 1 1	(from draft 32) How speculative parsing works (combining choice and variable-occurrence - currently these are separate) ??, 2008 (IBM)	in progress
0 1 2	(from draft 32) Reordering the properties discussion: move representation earlier, improve flow of topics ??, 2008 (Alan) * not started *	
0 2 5	Augmented info set and unparsing (Alan)	added but needs work
0 2 6	Remove duration	