

EML - Bug #489

eml-protocol changes needed

05/01/2002 05:18 PM - Matt Jones

Status:	Resolved	Start date:	05/01/2002
Priority:	Immediate	Due date:	
Assignee:	Peter McCartney	% Done:	0%
Category:	eml - general bugs	Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:	EML2.0.0rc1	Spent time:	0.00 hour
Bugzilla-Id:	489		
Description			
Changes as decided upon at the Sevilleta EML meeting, April 24-25, 2002: Responsible: Corinna, Chris			
1) Make eml-protocol be an extension of eml-resource as requested by RDIFS			
2) get feedback from RDIFS (benson) on modifications			
3) add additional protocol structure from the ASU model			

History

#3 - 05/16/2002 01:44 PM - Peter McCartney

Ok im having problems with using this thing. i may have to just email it if i hit the wrong button again.

ive attached (twice) a draft of protocol that makes the changes from Sevilleta, although there is still some chaff in the file to weed out before checking it in.

Im concerned about how this module works for individual datasets if we bump protocol up to resource level. if our intent is to have generic libraries of protocols that are abstracted from the individual datasets, then how do we avoid having 200 different protocol descriptions for basically the same operation, but differ only in the source dataset used or in the particular instrument model? in other words, where do we cross the line between "best practices" and "metadata", and can this single module serve both purposes?

It is essential that we be able to describe the specific source datasets,instruments, etc. used in a particular dataset, so whatever we do should not eliminate that possibility.

#4 - 05/16/2002 03:29 PM - Matt Jones

Changes look good, Peter. To keep up my record on long lists of comments, here goes nothing...

1) we agree to nix the "eml-" in the root element, and identifier is part of resource, so I think you could start the whole tree with the "protocol" element, eliminating the extra "eml-protocol" and "identifier" elements.

2) You renamed the namespace prefixes so that they are no longer consistent with the rest of EML. Technically that is fine, but it would be less surprising and more understandable if you were consistent with the rest of EML. In particular, change rsb to res and change "lit" to "cit". Plus, you don't actually use the "soft" and "ds" namespaces, so they should be eliminated from the namespace declarations and the xs:imports).

3) the CHOICE under methodStep/description has a content model "+", so the children of the choice don't need to be repeatable. The methodStep/qualityCOntrol should be handled the same way (so change the CHOICE content model to + there).

4) Indentation & whitespace, as usual.

5) We'll need to make changes based on changes to packaging, which I think will address your issue about being able to reference protocols for individual data sets. I'll write a long tome on this tomorrow.

Otherwise, looks good. We should get Barbara Benson to review this for us before we finalize.

#5 - 05/17/2002 10:04 AM - Peter McCartney

Ok thanks for the comments. Ill clean up the technical things as suggested. But im still troubled by the fundamental question of whether we can do both metadata and a general protocol library using the same module. Any comments on that one? one solution ive thought of is to simply put a recursive link to protocol, to allow one to write a locally specific protocol statement that references a more generic one. that doesnt solve the problem of our protocol "library" being bloated with lots of protocol discussions that are meaningful only for one particular dataset.

#6 - 05/17/2002 10:14 AM - Peter McCartney

Ok here is a copy with most of the changes Matt listed plus the addition of a recursive call to protocol as third choice option under methodStep/description. This would let us make pointers to a more generic protocol in a similar way to how eml-project can point to a related project description.

I still have to clean up the module documentation stuff - not sure i fully understand the new structure yet.

#7 - 05/30/2002 08:03 PM - Chris Jones

Peter,

While reviewing eml-protocol, it all seemed to make sense, although I was confused about the content/methodStep/description/protocol element. There's no inline documentation for it. I see your bugzilla comments, and understand the rationale, but how it's implemented still is confusing. Are you saying that you'd want to "extend" a protocol...i.e. steps 1 through 5 are identical, but this local protocol modifies steps 6 and 7? If that's the case, I could see that work with a content/methodStep/description/protocol/paragraph that describes the relationship to the "other" protocol or protocol reference.

#8 - 05/30/2002 08:12 PM - Chris Jones

Peter,

Lastly, it seems we should not use element refs pointing into imported schema docs...instead follow the convention of creating a new element and Typing it according to the ComplexType in the remote schema:

```
<xs:element name="sourceDatasetUsed" type="ds:DatasetType">
....
</xs:element>
```

#9 - 06/03/2002 09:27 AM - Peter McCartney

Chris-

the recursion of protocol back into itself was a possible solution i'd had to the problem i mentioned of trying to deal with the fact that we want to reuse protocol descriptions, yet also adapt them to our specific dataset. the analogy was with the way we linked project descriptions to other project descriptions. We should probably get some feedback on this before accepting it - maybe its just not so much of an issue as I'm making it.

The ref call to dataset was done simply to get the file to validate -at the time, dataset did not have a complex type due to the problem that surfaced early last week. I just fixed it.

#10 - 06/14/2002 08:23 AM - Matt Jones

Protocol is now a resource. Completed. In CVS.

#11 - 06/27/2002 08:36 AM - Owen Eddins

I'm passing the following comments from Tim Bergsma the data manager at Kellogg Biological Station in Michagen. He made them in a eml-dev email. I posting to bugzilla just to make sure they don't fall through the cracks.

2. There is a great need in the research community to maintain a distinction between 'protocol' and 'method'. In my thinking, 'protocol' is a prescriptive procedure, and 'method' is a descriptive procedure. When interpreting data, it is critical to know whether a stated procedure represents a record of what was done, or is only an

expectation of what should have been done under normal circumstances. For small research efforts where procedures are not repetitive, it is sufficient merely to document that which was done. For large efforts with repetitive procedures, it is convenient to create a prescriptive protocol, but then essential to maintain a record asserting that the protocol was followed, and noting the (inevitable) deviations from the protocol. Beta9 does nothing to sharpen the distinction between protocol and method, using the words interchangeably, as many of us do. Perhaps we should adopt 'procedure' in place of 'protocol', with a required switch indicating whether the procedure is prescriptive or descriptive.

3. In Beta9, <protocol> is modeled as a sequence of <methodSteps> (which can be described by means of paragraphs, citations, or protocol references). This is insufficient. It is quite natural for a protocol to have introductory material (for instance) which is not a method step. It is also possible to write a protocol which is a network of contingencies rather than a list of steps. For example, 'fertilizer recommendations based on soil nitrate tests' properly constitute a protocol, but are better represented as prose rather than as a series of steps. Perhaps protocol (or its successor) should be a series of choice of paragraph or methodStep. At present, I can't use the eml model to represent fully the protocols that exist for our site.

#12 - 09/11/2002 09:37 AM - Peter McCartney

eml-method was created with a procedureType complex type. this is imported into em-protocol and is extended within eml-method to include refs to datasources used

methodological info was extracted from project and put in eml-method. eml-method is imported into dataset, entiy and attribute.

this addresses issues rasied in the June LTER metadata workshop concerning protocol and project descriptions.

#13 - 03/27/2013 02:14 PM - Redmine Admin

Original Bugzilla ID was 489

Files

eml-protocol.xsd	17.4 KB	05/16/2002	Peter McCartney
eml-protocol.xsd	17.4 KB	05/16/2002	Peter McCartney
eml-protocol.xsd	13.8 KB	05/17/2002	Peter McCartney