EML - Bug #637

attributeDomain should be required

10/17/2002 02:48 PM - Matt Jones

Status:	Resolved		**Start date:**	10/17/2002
Priority:	Immediate		**Due date:**	
Assignee:	Matt Jones		**% Done:**	0%
Category:	eml - general bugs		**Estimated time:**	0.00 hour
Target version:	EML2.0.0rc3		**Spent time:**	0.00 hour
Bugzilla-Id:	637			

Description

The RC2 release shows attribute/attributeDomain as an oprional element. This used to be required, and as far as I knew we agreed that it should be required. It is a problem if it is optional, as people can leave out this truly fundamental part of an attribute definition. Does anybody remember consciously changing this? Can I change it back?

I'm reviewing an EML submission from an LTER site and they have omitted it for all of their numeric attributes, which is clearly a problem! They also consistently omit precision, which is also a problem, but I don't think it can be required because it doesn't apply to nominal data.

History

#1 - 10/18/2002 08:09 AM - Peter McCartney

In hindsight, i wish we had thought to put all of these things (domain, precision, unit, etc, nested under the appropriate measurement scale element since that is the one property that is truely relevant for all attributes. that way if the data were nominal (eg site name) nominal, we wouldnt have to force them to put in non-answers for things like unit and precision. If they are requred, then we have to have a clear option for when the element is not relevnt. what is most useless is a required field that has some uncontrolled text in it that means "not relevant" , but cant be interpreted without reading it. my gut feeling is that few people really define a domain for attribute and if you make it required you will get 10 - 20 entries where someone put "no domain defined" in the textDomain element for every one that actually thinks about their data and puts in something meaningfull.

Why dont you contact the person to see if they simply missed the point or see if they would have simply answered "none" had they been forced to fill in a domain field? do we have any sense of what proportion of attributes have any meaningful domain restriction beyond whats implied by the scale, units and storage type?

#2 - 10/30/2002 12:22 PM - Matt Jones

Done. AttributeDomain is now nested within measurementScale, so it can be required across the board, and the right type of attributeDomain (numericDomain, nonDumericDomain, DateTimeDomain) is possible depending on the measurement scale. Unit and precision are similarly dependent onthe measurement scale.

#3 - 03/27/2013 02:14 PM - Redmine Admin

Original Bugzilla ID was 637