

Morpho - Bug #2162

eml versions and dateTimeDomain requirements

07/18/2005 02:34 PM - Callie Bowdish

Status:	Resolved	Start date:	07/18/2005
Priority:	Immediate	Due date:	
Assignee:	Matt Jones	% Done:	0%
Category:	morpho - general	Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:	1.6	Spent time:	0.00 hour
Bugzilla-Id:	2162		
Description			
<p>following error generated: cvc-complex-type.2.3: Element 'dateTimeDomain' must have no character [children], because the types content type is element-only.</p> <p>Conversation regarding the error having to do with two differing eml-versions problem comes when someone adds a datatable to eml-2.0.0 - doesnt specify the bounds and then opens the document in tree editor <sid> and the tree editor enforces eml-2.0.0 <sid> and hence looks for the bound info <sid> which is what happened in Callie's case <sid> Mr. EML-2.0.1 agrees with you - whereas Mr. EML-2.0.0 doesnt <vero> well since 2.0.1 is what we're using now... <sid> Callie - add these to the list of things which will hopefully be fixed in Morpho1.6.0 R C2</p> <p>regarding the dateTimeDomain attribute and inside the bound tags you shud have minimum and maximum</p> <p><sid> that error was probably that dateTimeDoamin cant be trimmed because it is required <vero> it's not required in the NDPW <vero> is it?</p>			

History

#1 - 07/18/2005 02:37 PM - Saurabh Garg

this is a morpho bug... moving it under Morpho

#2 - 11/01/2005 11:30 AM - Callie Bowdish

Test sequence for dateTimeDomain error in Morpho 1.6.0 with documents created in Morpho 1.5.0 that use eml 2.0.0

1. Created an EML file in old version of Morpho 1.5.1

```
<eml:eml packageId="bowdishOldMorpho.4.2" scope="system" system="knb"
xmlns:eml="eml://ecoinformatics.org/eml-2.0.0"
xmlns:xsi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance"
xsi:schemaLocation="eml://ecoinformatics.org/eml-2.0.0 eml.xsd">
<dataset scope="document">
```

Used the data package wizard included the time setting.

```
<coverage scope="document">
<temporalCoverage scope="document">
<singleDateTime>
<calendarDate>2005-01-01</calendarDate>
</singleDateTime>
</temporalCoverage>
</coverage>
```

2. Imported a table that used the MeasurementScale datetime choice and did not include the dateTimeDomain

```
<attribute id="1130871221265" scope="document">
```

```
<attributeName>Date</attributeName>
<attributeDefinition>Date of Record</attributeDefinition>
<measurementScale>
<datetime>
<formatString>MM-DD-YYYY</formatString>
<dateTimePrecision>1</dateTimePrecision>
<dateTimeDomain> </dateTimeDomain>
</datetime>
</measurementScale>
</attribute>
```

3. Saved the data package in Morpho 1.5.1
4. Open the data package in Morpho 1.5.1 with no problems in the editor
5. Open the data package in Morpho 1.6.0 in the editor and get the following error

Unable to trim following nodes:

```
eml/dataset/(CHOICE)/dataTable/(SEQUENCE)/attributeList/attribute/(SEQUENCE)/measurementScale/(CHOICE)/datetime/dateTimeDomain/id,
```

```
eml/dataset/(CHOICE)/dataTable/(SEQUENCE)/attributeList/attribute/(SEQUENCE)/measurementScale/(CHOICE)/datetime/dateTimeDomain/
```

Please check if all the required values are entered and that there are no empty fields

The EML ID and References Parser at <http://knb.ecoinformatics.org/emlparser/parse> says that the document is valid

submitted by Callie Bowdish

#3 - 11/02/2005 09:55 AM - Saurabh Garg

Changing the QA contact for that bug.

#4 - 01/26/2006 11:28 AM - Callie Bowdish

```
<pmark> would you mind trying to nail down exactly what's wrong with dateTimeDomain?
<Callie> yes, we were just discussin it
<Callie> there is/were some legacy issues with the requirements for data time
boundries in 2.00
<pmark> I thought I fixed that
<pmark> on 1.6 release day I think someone found some strange behavior
<pmark> remember that?
<Callie> yes, I do
<will> Looking at the dates, I think that's what Comment #2 is talking about
--> In (~cjones@249-56-178-69.gci.net) has joined #kdi
<Callie> one component of the problem that is kind of tricky to nail down is
where creating or using documents used with Morpho 1.5.1 fits into the problem
<pmark> are we still supporting 1.5.1?
<Callie> that is not the plan
<Callie> everyone we contact is told to upgrade
<will> well, we should support the legacy documents already on the KNB
<pmark> and their old documents are automatically upgraded when opened in
morpho, ja?
<Callie> <eml:eml packageId="bowdishOldMorpho.4.2" scope="system" system="knb"
<Callie> xmlns:eml="eml://ecoinformatics.org/eml-2.0.0"
<Callie> xmlns:xsi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance"
<Callie> xsi:schemaLocation="eml://ecoinformatics.org/eml-2.0.0 eml.xsd">
<Callie> <dataset scope="document">
<-- jhHome has quit (Quit: Client Exiting)
<Callie> seems to be part of the problem that I documented so if that code gets
updated...
<pmark> I'm working on bug 2221 which converts a 2.0.0 doc to 2.0.1 when they save
<pmark> but morpho 1.6 should still use 2.0.0 validation rules on 2.0.0 documents
<pmark> by "should" I mean, that's how it's programmed
<pmark> am I missing the point? :)
<Callie> right so after they save the document it changes to 2.0.1 but not before
<pmark> correct
<Callie> so if they open the editor they could run into problems
<pmark> (well, that's the plan and that's how it'll be soon)
<pmark> no, I don't think so
<pmark> unless you consider 2.0.0 validation a problem
<pmark> maybe the user should be prompted to convert to 2.0.1 when they open an
```

old doc?

<pmark> I think that makes more sense

<Callie> point 3. in my discription does mention saving the document before getting the error, so I guess that would seem to fix the problem

<pmark> because if you edit a 2.0.0 doc with 2.0.0 validation rules, then save and upgrade to 2.0.1 then it may not be valid, right? Or is 2.0.1 less strict in every way?

<will> I think they made it so any valid 2.0.0 document is 2.0.1 valid

<pmark> ok then it's ok to upgrade at save time

<will> yeah

<Callie> I beleive so.

<will> it looks like the problem may have been that Morpho is trying to validate with 2.0.0 schema

<will> which requires DateTimeDomain

<pmark> even 2.0.1 docs get validated as 2.0.0?

<will> I think the issue was that a 2.0.0 doc was getting converted to 2.0.1, but still getting validated by 2.0.0

<pmark> have y'all heard any user complaints in this dep't?

<Callie> no, only me during testing

<will> not that I'm aware of

<Callie> let me check my emails.

<pmark> so there definitely is a distinguishable bug right now?

<will> the other alternative is that the bug resides in 1.5.1 which could be letting people save invalid 2.0.0 docs

<pmark> Is it acceptable to take the easy route (for us) and tell users to upgrade Morpho?

<-- Thomas has quit (Quit: Leaving)

<will> probably

<will> and to force upgrading to 2.0.1 hen the make changes to the documents

<will> *when they

<pmark> there's really no reason not to upgrade to 2.0.1 from 2.0.0

<will> true

<pmark> but currently it's implemented as an option at save time

<Callie> Also I think that when documents are saved and the xsi:schemaLocation="eml://ecoinformatics.org/eml-2.0.0 automatically gets updated that the problem will no longer be there

<pmark> great

<will> yeah, I think forcing the document upgrade will resolve the issue

#5 - 03/27/2013 02:19 PM - Redmine Admin

Original Bugzilla ID was 2162