

## EML - Bug #492

### eml-literature changes needed

05/01/2002 05:41 PM - Matt Jones

<b>Status:</b>	Resolved	<b>Start date:</b>	05/01/2002
<b>Priority:</b>	Immediate	<b>Due date:</b>	
<b>Assignee:</b>	Matt Jones	<b>% Done:</b>	0%
<b>Category:</b>	eml - general bugs	<b>Estimated time:</b>	0.00 hour
<b>Target version:</b>	EML2.0.0rc1	<b>Spent time:</b>	0.00 hour
<b>Bugzilla-Id:</b>	492		
<b>Description</b>			
Changes as decided upon at the Sevilleta EML meeting, April 24-25, 2002: Responsible: Owen			
1) Move ISSN to be a child of "article"			
2) move ISBN to be a child of Book and Chapter			
3) add types for proceedings and for conference paper (follow end note)			
4) add publisher (type=RespParty) to Book, Chapter, Report, Thesis			
5) add PubPlace to Book, Chapter, Report, Thesis			
6) Change thesis/degree to thesis/institution			
7) add "editedBook" type that extends "Book" type by adding a "bookEditor+" field (type=RespParty)			
8) drop pubInfo from thesis			
9) Do a comprehensive review of all types to be sure they can capture the information that is typically put in end note by ecologists and that the content models make sense			
10) Peter's notes also say to add a type for presentation, map			
11) add "totalPages" with content model "?" to report			

### History

#### #2 - 05/15/2002 01:16 PM - Matt Jones

Hi Owen,

Your changes to literature look good. Generally it looks much more comprehensive wrt to EndNote. Here are a few issues I saw from my quick look:

- 1) LitCitation is a sequence containing a single choice. You can get rid of the sequence -- it is unneeded.
- 2) You haven't followed our type and element naming conventions. Elements should always start with a lower case letter and capitalize the first letter of each subsequent word. Types should start with a capital and then capitalize each word. For example, the element "personalCommunication" should be of type "PersonalCommunication", and the element "map" should be of type "Map".
- 3) You are missing lots of documentation. We need the standard tooltip, summary, description, example, and lineage documentation tags to be present for every element and attribute. This documentation is what defines the spec. Without it people will have no guidance as to the contents of each field.
- 4) You broke the file formatting that we use. Please reformat the file with indentations for elements (2 spaces per level) and a maximum line length of 80 characters. This helps the files be more readable in various text environments.
- 5) I'm confused about what happened to "Chapter". I still think it is needed. Is the new "section" element in book supposed to contain the chapter title? Maybe the documentation would clear this up. Doesn't EndNote have a BookChapter type?
- 6) you clearly made some changes that we didn't discuss at Sevilleta. It would be useful if you documented your rationale for what you did in this bug. For example, item (6) was to change thesis/degree into thesis/institution, but you added a university element instead. Describing the changes you made for each of the points (1-11) in this bug will help speed up the review process for the rest

of us.

7) Do you see a need for software? Is that what that final element is with the funny name?

8) Someone who knows endnote better should review this as well before we check it in.

9) The DTD needs to be updated to reflect these changes as well.

10) You made publicationPlace be a ResponsibleParty. I don't think that is needed, and I didn't think we decided to do that at SEV. It just needs to be a simple string. Can you justify the more complex structure?

11) geographicCov should be written out fully as "geographicCoverage"

Thanks.

**#3 - 05/15/2002 02:11 PM - Owen Eddins**

I am in the process of documenting eml-literature right now. That should clear up most of your questions.

The funny software name as the last element is there because I think a case could be made to place software in literature as well, especially if we accept audioVisual as type. So the eml-software module could be plugged in there if folks decide to do so.

Troy Maddux our DBA reviewed all the lit types with me yesterday. He knows endnote pretty well and he currently is in the process of implementing their 'data model' in our sql server rdbs.

**#4 - 05/21/2002 11:10 AM - Peter McCartney**

Ive looked at the latest attachment. here are my comments:

1) remove editors from editedBook. the creators ARE the editors of an edited book.

2)bring back chapter. there is a "bookSection" complex type that isnt being used - im assuming that this is supposed to be for Chapter.

3) publication place doesnt need to repeat. a citation need only reference one publication location, regardles of how many offices a press may have.

4) drop software - we will have eml-software for this.

5) drop personal communication unless this is meant to refer to a written communcation that is actually archived somewhere.

6) drop section from book, editedbook, etc. if the citation is directed at a section of a larger item, then you should use the article or chapter elements, and not cite the larger item.

7. i think we will find it awkward to support the responsible party format for things like publisher, pubplace, etc. Its already being a ROYAL pain to parse and unparse author strings into first, given and last names when going to and from vendor formats like endnote. However, to be consistent with authors, we should use RP for editors as well.

**#5 - 05/24/2002 01:37 PM - Owen Eddins**

still have clean up work with documentation

**#6 - 05/28/2002 02:39 PM - Owen Eddins**

finished documentation.

**#7 - 05/28/2002 02:41 PM - Owen Eddins**

1) LitCitation is a sequence containing a single choice. You can get rid of the sequence -- it is unneeded.

DONE - I inherited this.

2) You haven't followed our type and element naming conventions. Elements should always start with a lower case letter and capitalize the first letter for each subsequent word. Types should start with a capital and then capitalize each word. For example, the element "personalCommunication" should be of type "PersonalCommunication", and the element "map" should be of type "Map".

DONE

3) You are missing lots of documentation. We need the standard tooltip, summary, description, example, and lineage documentation tags to be present for every element and attribute. This documentation is what defines the spec. Without it people will have no guidance as to the contents of each field.

4) You broke the file formatting that we use. Please reformat the file with indentations for elements (2 spaces per level) and a maximum line length of 80 characters. This helps the files be more readable in various text environments.

5) I'm confused about what happened to "Chapter". I still think it is needed. Is the new "section" element in book supposed to contain the chapter title? Maybe the documentation would clear this up. Doesn't EndNote have a BookChapter type?

Answer:

Here's my posting to eml-dev and Corinna's response. This is why I got rid of Chapter and placed section in every type of reference. I just extracted the relevant question:

Question 2:

EndNote has the reference type Book Section which takes care of chapter. Remember we have a reference type in eml called chapter. But Book Section has a finer granularity. So for example the section of a book being referenced could be a section of a chapter. So the reference could be Book chapter 15 section 1 (15.1) rather than all of chapter 15. Or table 15.7 could be referenced and so on. Would this be useful to have this level of granularity. The reason I'm asking is that we've already implied it is because we have a chapter reference type. So if folks think this is useful I'd like to propose that we get rid of Chapter altogether and add an optional <section> element to book, article, edited book, report and so on. This will give us this finer granularity to what we are citing.

Calling it section seems to make it more useful.

Corinna

6) you clearly made some changes that we didn't discuss at Sevilleta. It would be useful if you documented your rationale for what you did in this bug. For example, item (6) was to change thesis/degree into thesis/institution, but you added a university element instead. Describing the changes you made for each of the points (1-11) in this bug will help speed up the review process for the rest of us.

See responses 1-11 below.

7) Do you see a need for software? Is that what that final element is with the funny name?

I think a case could be made to place the softwarePackage module here, especially if folks agree on the audioVisual Type. I can go either way with it. EndNote has a software module. That in of itself not a compelling reason to have software here. Let me know what folks think about putting software here and I can make this element of complex type softwarePackage.

8) Someone who knows endnote better should review this as well before we check it in.

Troy Maddux our DBA at the network office knows EndNote well and he did a comprehensive overview of all my suggested changes.

9) The DTD needs to be updated to reflect these changes as well.

Changes as decided upon at the Sevilleta EML meeting, April 24-25, 2002:

Responsible: Owen

1) Move ISSN to be a child of "article"

Done

2) move ISBN to be a child of Book and Chapter

Done

3) add types for proceedings and for conference paper (follow end note)

Done

4) add publisher (type=RespParty) to Book, Chapter, Report, Thesis

Done

5) add PubPlace to Book, Chapter, Report, Thesis

Done

6) Change thesis/degree to thesis/institution

Endnote uses university, I used this instead of institution. Don't have real strong feelings about this if folks want institution instead.

7) add "editedBook" type that extends "Book" type by adding a "bookEditor+" field (type=RespParty)

Done

8) drop pubInfo from thesis

not sure it was ever there.

9) Do a comprehensive review of all types to be sure they can capture the information that is typically put in end note by ecologists and that the content models make sense

I added three new types that are in EndNote that we did not already have or agreed to add at the Sev.

personnal Communication: Letter, memo, email, discussion with college that is characterized, etc...

audio Visual: this is a composite of EndNote types: audiovisual, film/broadcast, electronic source.

Generic: generic type with a bunch of fields for citations that don't belong in any of the other types

10) Peter's notes also say to add a type for presentation, map

Done

11) add "totalPages" with content model "?" to report

Done

---

10) You made publicationPlace be a ResponsibleParty. I don't think that is needed, and I didn't think we decided to do that at SEV. It just needs to be a simple string. Can you justify the more complex structure?

The example that was batted about at the Sev. where the publisher and the publicationPlace for the World Watch Institute may or may not be the same place. Seems that responsibleParty level information may be applicable for both.

In this example the World Watch Institute is the publicationPlace, it has an organizationName, address, onlineURL, etc... as does its publisher. In every type where a publisher is applicable I made publisher mandatory except for thesis and report and the publicationPlace was left as optional and unbounded because

it seemed to me that the publisher was the more important of the two pieces of information especially if one wanted to get a copy of the referenced book, article etc...

I dropped publication and used institution in report or in the case of thesis, university, because I thought publicationPlace too general when in these cases a specific name like university or institution made more sense. Endnote does it this way.

11) geographicCov should be written out fully as "geographicCoverage"

Done

----- Additional Comments From [peter.mccartney@asu.edu](mailto:peter.mccartney@asu.edu) 2002-05-21 11:10 -----

--

I've looked at the latest attachment. here are my comments:

1) remove editors from editedBook. the creators ARE the editors of an edited book.

Right now we have creator and associatedParty in Resource and editors for an edited book in Literature. Number 7 (see above) of agreed upon changes says to add bookEditor to editedBook type that we have agreed to add. I read this all to mean that creators are the authors of the essays, articles etc within the edited book and that the editors are the editors. Someone set me straight if this is wrong assumption.

2)bring back chapter. there is a "bookSection" complex type that isnt being used - im assuming that this is supposed to be for Chapter.

See above explanation for why chapter was dropped to Matt's question number 5. If we agree to add section to increase granularity of a citation then having a Chapter or bookSection is redundant. I removed the bookSection complex type. If folks do not want this finer granularity then I can remove the sections and/or bring back Chapter or bookSection.

3) publication place doesnt need to repeat. a citation need only reference one publication location, regardless of how many offices a press may have.

See summary/description documentation to citation element to the differences between publisher and publicationPlace. This is how I interpreted the two from the Sev. Discussions.

4) drop software - we will have eml-software for this.

See response to Matt's question [#7](#) above about case for software being placed here.

5) drop personal communication unless this is meant to refer to a written communication that is actually archived somewhere.

I'm envisioning personalCommunication as being either a hard or soft copy that has been distributed or 'published' to one or more recipients.

6) drop section from book, editedbook, etc. if the citation is directed at a section of a larger item, then you should use the article or chapter elements, and not cite the larger item.

See explanation to Matt's question [#5](#) above.

7. i think we will find it awkward to support the responsible party format for things like publisher, pubplace, etc. Its already being a ROYAL pain to parse and unparse author strings into first, given and last names when going to and from vendor formats like endnote. However, to be consistent with authors, we should use RP for editors as well.

PublicationPlace, publisher, university, institution are potentially possessing of the information in responsibleParty and so I would argue we should support it. If all one wanted to put for publicationPlace was Arizona State, for example, then it would only require one sub-element since address, phone etc.. are all OPTIONAL. So for example:

```
<publicationPlace>  
<organizationName>
```

Arizona State  
</organizationName>  
</publicationPlace>

I do not consider this onerous to construct from endnote for example.

by defining publicationPlace, publisher etc... as responsibleParty all the address, phone other optional info can be placed in the proper sub-elements if one chooses.

**#8 - 06/14/2002 08:21 AM - Matt Jones**

Changes incorporated. However, the last comments from McCartney have not been addressed (both here in Bugzilla and his recent email. These are substantial proposed changes, so we opted to not make them until we could discuss them with Owen. Moving milestone for this module forward.

**#9 - 06/14/2002 10:40 AM - Peter McCartney**

Just to beat the horse again, here is my current list of changes

- a. Drop section from book
- b. Drop editors from edited book
- c. Add bookChapter or bookSection
- d. Drop conference proceedings. If these are published, then they are a book. The information about the event and venue is part of the title.
- e. Drop publicationPlace – the locational information is already in publisher
- f. Drop presentationPlace. Move the proceedings information from conferenceProceedings to this module.
- g. Drop institution from report. Institutional affiliation of authors is already in the RP information of the authors.
- h. Make report number optional. This may be part of the title or non-existent
- i. Drop publisher from thesis. If it is published then it is a book.
- j. Drop software package. This is covered under eml-software
- k. Drop the unnecessary sequence element containing access and project.

**#10 - 08/30/2002 08:26 AM - Matt Jones**

I agreed to handle this during the last conference call, so I'm reassigning the bug to myself.

**#11 - 08/30/2002 02:37 PM - Matt Jones**

Completed revisions to eml-literature. Here's a review of what I did (there's a special surprise at the end :)...

- a.  
Drop section from book

DONE

- b.  
Drop editors from edited book

DONE

- c.  
Add bookChapter or bookSection

Added Chapter complex type and "chapter" element as a reference type.

- d.  
Drop conference proceedings. If these are published, then they are a book. The information about the event and venue is part of the title.

DID NOT DROP IT. Kept it to maintain compatibility with EndNote. It extends book chapter and adds the few fields needed for the EndNote conferenceProceedings type.

- e.  
Drop publicationPlace – the locational information is already in publisher

KEPT it. Publication place may very well differ from the mailing address of the publisher. The address in RP seemed like an inappropriate place to me to put the publicationPlace. I did, however, convert this to a string, as a "publicationPlace" itself can in no way be construed to be a person, organization, or role (which is what RP represents).

f.  
Drop presentationPlace. Move the proceedings information from conferenceProceedings to this module.

PRESENTATION type dropped altogether. No corresponding type in EndNote.

g.  
Drop institution from report. Institutional affiliation of authors is already in the RP information of the authors.

Kept it. Again, the address of the authors may not correspond with the institution sponsoring the report. For example, many SFI reports would have "Santa Fe Institute" as the institution, but the authors are not from SFI. Same could go for NCEAS, or NSF, etc.

h.  
Make report number optional. This may be part of the title or non-existent

DONE.

i.  
Drop publisher from thesis. If it is published then it is a book.

DONE.

j.  
Drop software package. This is covered under eml-software

DONE. it was gone before.

k.  
Drop the unnecessary sequence element containing access and project.

DONE. project is gone.

In addition to these changes that were suggested above, I also had an epiphany and went for it... I made each of the reference types include the ResourceGroup directly, rather than having ResourceGroup be part of CitationType. This is minorly more verbose in the schema, but makes much more sense in instance documents because all of the fields of a reference are included inside of the type element, like this...

```
<citation>
<article>
<title>fake title</title>
<creator>...</creator>
...
<journal>Ecology</journal>
...
</article>
</citation>
```

I personally think this is much cleaner and more understandable than before.

Finally, I reworked the documentation for the whole module, created a test instance documented, and verified that everything validates under the schema using "ant test". I think this takes care of all outstanding issues with eml-literature. Will someone review it please? Thanks.

**#12 - 08/30/2002 04:06 PM - Peter McCartney**

re: technical items.

So how do i cite a paper or poster presented at xxth annual meeting of the Ecological Society of America, Spokane, August 1999 that is not published in any proceedings volume? is that what you are calling a proceedings? i've always understood (and ive been around a little longer than EndNote) a proceedings to be the publication of papers presented at a conference, which to me is a book -

"Proceedings of thexxxx" might appear as part of the title, but if you look the thing up in the library, its a book. Many presentations are not published, so i cannot use your structure for conferenceProceedings to cite them - i dont have an entry for the require fields publisher, editor, or publisher place. Nor can i use audioVisual because i dont have the required publisher information nor is there a place to put the conference name, venue and date (its gratifying to see that i can indicate a "performer" in case someone else read the paper for me)

I follow youre argument that a report has two main parties - the instituion that produces it and the one that sponsored it, but i still think the only one that really matters for bibliographic reasons is whichever one actually published it - the particulars of who reported to who is usually embedded in the title and im not sure we need to define a structure for sorting them out (sort of like URLs?). In any case, but i dont see it there even though you say you kept it.

regarding epiphany:

Steven Stevens had this same epiphany over a year ago and I liked it then for the same reasons you do now. The problem was, it broke tidiness of the resourceBase extension that you all had introduced at the time. Up until now, all of the elements found in resource base were exactly in the same place relative to the document root. Now they are not which means we cannot do searches with root-relative paths without looking first to see what kind of xml document it is so we know where the resource group is imported. For example, in Xanthoria we use a simple config file to tell the search engine that schema x and y are both extended from schema z and that any xpath expression that works for z will also work for the others. If we we've changed the rules, then I have to be more explicit and say that schema x extends z at "/" and schema y extends z at "/citation/" and i cant send out exactly the same message to targets that have eml-citation as i would to ones that have eml-dataset.

So what is a resource - a schema who's root extends resourcebase or one that contains nodes that extend resourcebase? why does spatialVector not extend resource base, instead of being a choice undeneath dataset? for most GIS users the concept of a dataset containing an entity is as foreign as citation containing article. I think these are decisions that shouldnt be made in double-digit betas.

I agree that this arrangment is more readable visually, but I do remember distinctly someone telling me in another context that EML is meant to be machine parsed and that readability of the instance file was not important. Given that sentiment, i would say that a change that affects machine parsing in favor of readability is inconsistent with this philosopy.

### #13 - 08/30/2002 05:54 PM - Matt Jones

Thanks for the comments. I had not realized the technical implications of my epiphany, so I'll change it back to the way it was (after I wait for any further comments on the issue). I thought it would just be cleaner. We don't have as much of a reliance in our software on absolute locations of elements (we use a lot of relative XPath searches), so it didn't occur to me to be a problem. Given that it is a major change, and it will cause some problems, I think it best to change it back to having ResourceGroup as a part of CitationType. When I change it back, instances will look like this:

```
<citation>
<title>fake title</title>
<creator>...</creator>
...
<article>
<journal>Ecology</journal>
...
</article>
</citation>
```

This is less attractive to me, but the same information is present so we won't have any trouble making our software deal with it.

As far as conferenceProceedings go, they are intended for proceedings which are in fact published in some written form. If I can photocopy the proceedings of conference X, then I think it is citable here (cardinality issues notwithstanding). If I assume that a conferenceProceeding is something that has been published, then can I take your argument to mean that you would like to see Presentation added back in as a reference type (I was removing at your request



in the first place :)? I think I misunderstood your original request in Comment [#9](#).

I'd be happy to change cardinality in conferenceProceedings and elsewhere. As I was going through literature I felt that cardinality was somewhat arbitrary, but for the most part I didn't make changes except where your notes indicated explicitly to relax the restrictions. I'd prefer that everything be optional in literature unless it is absolutely fundamental to the particular reference type. Is that reasonable? But, what is fundamental in each reference type? In EndNote every field is optional, so we could go that route and I think it would be fine. I'm open to suggestions.

#### **#14 - 09/03/2002 07:55 AM - Scott Chapal**

I'm trying hard to follow this bug's issues, but I'm struggling.

Running diffs on eml-literature.xsd 1.32 against 1.33, the entire file diffs because 1.33 uses CR-LF EOLs. Is there one file format or the other which is standard in the archive? Most seem to be UNIX format, w/ CR EOL's.

So, I stripped CR-LF's to diff.

See other comments below:

So how do i cite a paper or poster presented at xxth annual meeting of the Ecological Society of America, Spokane, August 1999 that is not published in any proceedings volume?

I'd be happy to change cardinality in conferenceProceedings and elsewhere. As I was going through literature I felt that cardinality was somewhat arbitrary, but for the most part I didn't make changes except where your notes indicated explicitly to relax the restrictions. I'd prefer that everything be optional in literature unless it is absolutely fundamental to the particular reference type. Is that reasonable? But, what is fundamental in each reference type? In EndNote every field is optional, so we could go that route and I think it would be fine. I'm open to suggestions.

Why don't you consult some other well-established sources, in addition to EndNote. BibTeX uses the following Entry-Types, for example:

See:

<http://www.ecst.csuchico.edu/~jacobsd/bib/formats/bibtex.html>

for a brief summary, including description of fields.

@article - An article from a journal or magazine.

@book - A book with an explicit publisher.

@booklet - A work that is printed and bound, but without a named publisher or sponsoring institution.

@inbook - A part of a book, which may be a chapter (or section or whatever) and/or a range of pages.

@incollection - A part of a book having its own title.

@inproceedings - An article in a conference proceedings.

@manual - Technical documentation.

@mastersthesis - A Master's thesis.

@misc - Use this type when nothing else fits.

@phdthesis - A PhD thesis.

@proceedings - The proceedings of a conference.

@techreport - A report published by a school or other institution, usually numbered within a series.

@unpublished - A document having an author and title, but not formally published.

BibTeX has been in use for almost 20 years and is used in a broad array of science and humanities disciplines. I'm not advocating the use of BibTeX, just that the data structures have been debated and determined...the point is, lots of people have thought about citation issues, why do we have to re-invent the wheel in EML? BibTeX is a standard output format of EndNote. Also, there are nascent XML representations of BibTeX, and BibTeXXML <-> DocBook efforts eg.: <http://bibtexml.sourceforge.net/>

Look at the distinctions (regarding required elements) between the Book, Proceedings and InProceedings data structures (OPT fields are optional, ALT are alternate, others are required).

```
@Book{
  ALTauthor = {},
  ALTeditor = {},
  title = {},
  publisher = {},
  year = {},
  OPTkey = {},
  OPTvolume = {},
  OPTnumber = {},
  OPTseries = {},
  OPTaddress = {},
  OPTedition = {},
  OPTmonth = {},
  OPTnote = {},
  OPTannote = {}
}
```

```
@Proceedings{
  title = {},
  year = {},
  OPTkey = {},
  OPTeditor = {},
  OPTvolume = {},
  OPTnumber = {},
  OPTseries = {},
  OPTaddress = {},
  OPTmonth = {},
  OPTorganization = {},
  OPTpublisher = {},
  OPTnote = {},
  OPTannote = {}
}
```

```
@InProceedings{
  author = {},
  title = {},
  booktitle = {},
  OPTcrossref = {},
  OPTkey = {},
  OPTpages = {},
  OPTyear = {},
  OPTeditor = {},
  OPTvolume = {},
  OPTnumber = {},
  OPTseries = {},
  OPTaddress = {},
  OPTmonth = {},
  OPTorganization = {},
  OPTpublisher = {},
  OPTnote = {},
  OPTannote = {}
}
```

Some of the issues which are addressed below are solved in BibTeX with higher-granularity definitions, ie. address, note or annote.

Similarly, the entry-types 'Unpublished' and 'Miscellaneous' cover the broad array of unorthodox citations without specifying all the details. So, PersonalCommunication would simply be an instance of

'Miscellaneous' with the note field tagged 'Personal Communication'; likewise for audioVisual, etc. etc.

- e.  
Drop publicationPlace – the locational information is already in publisher

This is called 'address' in BibTeX. And apparently there are some usage conventions:

address

Usually the address of the publisher or other type of institution. For major publishing houses, van Leunen recommends omitting the information entirely. For small publishers, on the other hand, you can help the reader by giving the complete address.

Drop presentationPlace. Move the proceedings information from conferenceProceedings to this module.

PRESENTATION type dropped altogether. No corresponding type in EndNote.

Would fall under miscellaneous.

- g.  
Drop institution from report. Institutional affiliation of authors is already in the RP information of the authors.

Institution is a standard field in 'Technical Report' in BibTeX.

```
@TechReport{  
author = {},  
title = {},  
institution = {},  
year = {},  
OPTkey = {},  
OPTtype = {},  
OPTnumber = {},  
OPTaddress = {},  
OPTmonth = {},  
OPTnote = {},  
OPTannote = {}  
}
```

- h.  
Make report number optional. This may be part of the title or non-existent

- i.  
Drop publisher from thesis. If it is published then it is a book.

```
@PhdThesis{  
author = {},  
title = {},  
school = {},  
year = {},  
OPTkey = {},  
OPTtype = {},  
OPTaddress = {},  
OPTmonth = {},  
OPTnote = {},  
OPTannote = {}  
}
```

regarding epiphany:

The decision on something like this ought to be determined on its merits or lack-of. Although the difficulties addressed by Peters comments are real, there would be clear programmatic solutions to

those.

A better criteria might be:  
Is EML's clarity or utility enhanced by this proposition or not?

```
The eml-resource module contains general information that describes
dataset resources, literature resources, collection resources, and
software resources. It is intended to provide overview information
about the resource, including title, abstract, keywords, contacts,
and the links to associated metadata and data for the given
resource.
```

But in the case of eml-literature, many of the bibliographic references might be completely external to the the data/projects being documented in that instance. The current structural relationship between eml-resource and eml-literature presumes involvement of the 'creator' in the dataset, doesn't it? A work being cited, however, wouldn't necessarily be by a defined 'creator' in EML, but just as likely could be an author of a relevant document, who has no reason to be defined in EML beyond his authorship status in that particular cited document (a methods paper; a seminal work defining a research theme, etc.). So, extending creator in this way to provide an 'author' in the various entry-types is kind of mutant.

Or am I totally misreading this issue?

**#15 - 09/05/2002 04:25 PM - Matt Jones**

OK, undid my epiphany. ResourceGroup is back as a child of CitationType.

Still need to create a "Presentation" type as agreed on the last conference call. Then literature will be done.

**#16 - 09/06/2002 03:28 PM - Matt Jones**

Presentation type added back in as requested. Changes for literature are now complete. Marking bug RESOLVED FIXED.

**#17 - 03/27/2013 02:14 PM - Redmine Admin**

Original Bugzilla ID was 492

**Files**

---

eml-literature.xsd	35 KB	05/15/2002	Owen Eddins
eml-literature.xsd	85.7 KB	05/24/2002	Owen Eddins
eml-literature.xsd	87.6 KB	05/28/2002	Owen Eddins