Subject: Re: HDF data types on UNIX and windows Posted by hcp on Wed, 25 Oct 2000 07:00:00 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In article <MPG.1460aa00306af952989c60@news.frii.com>, davidf@dfanning.com (David Fanning) writes:

- |> H C Pumphrey (hcp@newsread.ed.ac.uk) writes:
- |> > I have tried a few HDF viewers and readers and found that most are flaky.
- |> > They tend to support the subset of HDF files that the writer uses them on,
- l> > and fail on others.

|>

- |> I offer an alternative hypothesis: the HDF documentation
- > as it comes with the HDF libraries is atrocious.

It certainly is! The documentation they provide for the structure of a HDF file is for version 3.2 while the library itself is up to 4.1r3, which is quite different.

I have the following news direct from NCSA:

<quote>

The 3.2 version is all that we provide right now. However, I am in the process of releasing HDF 4.1r4. We have a fairly complete, draft version of the new specification manual that will be available with HDF 4.1r4.

The 4.1r4 release should be completed at the end of this week (if all goes well). </quote>

.... so the situation is likely to change soon. Whether it changes for the _better_ is anyone's guess.

- > Readers are good for data the writer uses because the
- > writer has spent hour upon hour figuring out what works
- > empirically, not with what works according to the lousy
- > documentation.

Again, agreed. I don't think you have presented an alternative hypothesis, you have presented an (IMHO entirely correct!) hypothesis to explain my statement.

[I continued]

- |> > HDF is too big and
- |> > complex. I get the impression that HDF5 is intended to cut exactly
- |> > this Gordian[1] knot.

[and DF replied]

> Heaven help us. :-(
It may or may not, but will RSI [implement HDF5, that is] ?
Hugh
======================================