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A Miscellany of Fine Discontent
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The Humboldt extension looks like it will be very useful for the ALA’s extended data model (EDM). It gives the EDM a formal, consistent, exchangeable model for describing the sort of datasets (and sub-elements) that the EDM is supposed to service.

# Big Stuff

The ALA is highly reliant on machine processing when it aggregates data. To do this well, we tend to want clearly labelled data that does not require further parsing; particularly if it requires some sort of semi-natural language processing.

Most of the comments in this section are motivated by the desire to structure data in a machine-processable form. This does not diminish the importance of human-readable data since, at the end of the day, inventories are meant to be examined by someone looking for suitable data.

## Inventory Identification and Structure

An *inventoryID* term is needed, so that the inventory can be referenced, if necessary.

* YMG: I think I can agree with this

Inventories implicitly have a parent-child structure that shadows the event hierarchy in an event core archive. A *parentInventoryID* allows an explicit linking of parent-child inventories, with the same sort of restriction that the child represents a subset of the parent that is present in event hierarchies.

## Multiple Inventory Statements

An event could have multiple inventories. For example, a survey that links insects in ground cover and birds in the canopy layer would be better served by two inventory statements linking the target taxon and habitat. The *parentInventoryID* described above can be used to disambiguate between multiple sub-inventories.

* YMG: Please see my comment under Multiple Inventories for Different Purposes below

See also, Multiple Inventories for Different Purposes below.

## Lack of Identifiers and Semantic Interoperability

Within the general Darwin Core structure there is a tendency to allow an identifier to be associated with a more general textual term. For example, *datasetName* and *datasetID* from Darwin Core or *measurementType* and *measurementTypeID* from the extended measurement or fact extension. The *measurementType* would contain a string such as “area” and *measurementTypeID* would contain the URI “http://vocab.nerc.ac.uk/collection/P24/current/AREA/”

If a description can be unambiguously associated with a semantic URI, the inventory can be used by machines to aid search and discovery. A resolvable URI also aids user comprehension since it allows a user to locate additional contextual information about a term.

As a general principle, any term that is associated with a formal vocabulary should have an associated ID-term. For example, *identifierTypes* and *identifierTypeID* Similarly, anything that might reference an external definition should also have an associated ID-term that can be used to locate a formal description of the definition. For example, *samplingEffortProtocol* and *samplingEffortProtocolID*.

* Please see similar/related issues raised:
	+ Request to include iri terms in IPT - <https://github.com/gbif/ipt/issues/1947>
	+ Why we deliberately chose not to mint the \*ID term - <https://github.com/tdwg/hc/issues/83>

## Inventories as Generated Description

The extension documentation specifically disavows inferred inventories constructed by aggregating data holdings. The idea appears to be that inventories should reflect statements of intent and statements about how close the survey activities are getting to the intention. Statements of intent and completeness require explicit, supplied data, since they essentially describe the state of mind of the people designing the survey.

This is a good distinction to maintain. However, the concept of an inventory happens to nicely fit the sort of search facets the EDM would like to use – and already uses and generates. There is no point in building a parallel model to keep the Humboldt extension conceptually clean, so it is likely that the EDM will simply reuse the extension model. It would be good to be able to identify inventories by purpose: intention, actuality and description and allow generated description without restrictions. See also, Multiple Inventories for Different Purposes below.

## Multiple Inventories for Different Purposes

In analysing the extension model we identified three possible uses of inventories:

* Statements of intention. This is the scope of what the activity is intended to cover.
* Statements of actuality. This is the scope of what the activity has actually covered, based on comparison with a statement of intention.
* Statements of description. This is the scope of the data collected.

The current Humboldt extension appears to link statements of intention and actuality into a single record. Term names reflect this, with *targetTaxonomicScope*, rather than *taxonomicScope.*

In some cases, it is hard to determine whether the term refers to an intention or an actual result. For example *eventDuration* could mean either the intended duration or the actual duration taken.

* YMG: I understand where they come from. There is probably nowhere to specify the **intended** eventDuration in Humboldt Extension at the moment. In my opinion, the definition of eventDuration is clear. “The numeric value for the duration of the dwc:Event.” Where dwc:Event is defined as “An action that occurs at some location during some time.” To me, this means the **actual** duration.

We propose a different way of structuring inventories, with *inventoryType* describing the intended purpose of the inventory. This would involve the following changes:

* Terms such as *targetTaxonomicScope* would be renamed *taxonomicScope*. Whether the scope is a target, measure of completeness or a description would be dependent on the inventory type.
* Completeness inventories and description inventories can be linked to target inventories by use of a *targetInventoryID* using the *inventoryID* discussed above.

The changes proposed would allow the presence of descriptive inventories without ambiguity. It would also allow a cleared relationship between intention and actuality; terms such as *hasVouchers* can either represent the intention to collect vouchers or the fact that voucher specimens have been collected.

* YMG: I appreciate the idea to split out the intent and actuality, but I am also feeling a bit uncertain and the worry of different ways to represent these ideas and how to be clear and explicit in the term’s definition. For example, the term can have the possibility of referring to the intention or the actualities. It is intention if its inventoryID is in targetInventoryID of another record, otherwise assumed to be actualities.
* YMG: The dwc:Occurrences link to the dwc:Event also represent the actualities. For example, I have the impression that we can disambiguate the taxonomic scope of the actualities with the targetTaxonomicScope using all taxa in the dwc:Occurrences associated with the dwc:Event which is linked to the Humboldt record that contains the targetTaxonomicScope.
* YMG: I am also a little wary of the use of the combination of inventoryID, *targetInventoryID* with parentInventoryID and parentEventID especially inheritance was mentioned and expected. Would we want to consider the use of resource relationship extension (<https://rs.gbif.org/extension/dwc/resource_relationship_2022-02-02.xml>) here?
* YMG: I must admit that I could be missing something here … Is it possible to have concrete mapping of datasets for such use case to evaluate such approach?

### Multiple References to Inventories

A survey design that has multiple visits to the same site, with a survey conducted according to a common protocol and intended inventory would seem to be a common occurrence. As far as I can see, the expectation is that the inventory is simply copied with different completeness results. Splitting out intention vs result goes some way towards describing this behaviour, as would allowing inheritance of common inventories, but would require an event structure that groups events by protocol.

Assuming that we didn’t skip over this somewhere, some recommendation on how to structure this sort of thing would be helpful.

## Things that Should be Measurement or Facts

The term i*sVegetationCoverReported* suggests that the cover is reported in *verbatimSiteDescriptions*. Why not use a *dwc:MeasurementOrFact* (MoF) extension and report the metric in a machine-parsable way?

Similarly, *reportedWeather* and *reportedExtremeConditions* will tend to require embedded JSON to properly report. Again, these could be MoFs.

If the values actually apply to the inventory, rather than the event, introducing a *inventoryID* would allow MoFs to be linked to inventories in the same way that occurrences are in the extended measurement or fact extension.

* YMG: Please have a look at the attempt to generalize occurrenceID to resourceID (or add add dwc:relatedResourceID)in this GitHub issue. I feel like this is related. It may have considerable impact, at least on OBIS side: <https://github.com/gbif/rs.gbif.org/issues/103#issuecomment-1532983566> Will this be part of Humboldt ratification issue or the Darwin Core issue? Please also see this thread: <https://github.com/gbif/rs.gbif.org/pull/102>
* YMG: I also mentioned this in the early days of our meetings which we noted that we need to come back for controlled vocabularies after the extension is finalized (<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1A1EOKt_95c9cUD_t_U1WSJ5jRt_PW5bp0Bn0jyoqcn0/edit?usp=sharing> please see minutes from 2 Feb 2022) I copied the notes over here:

***reportedWeather***

* *A list of weather or climatic conditions present at the time of the sampling event(s) referred to in the record. Meant to provide a mechanism for structured content.*
* *RG: an attempt to provide a mechanism by which surveyors can report weather/environmental conditions potentially useful to the end user of the inventory data.*
* *May require a controlled vocabulary to be truly useful and prevent the attribute from becoming a rubbish bin of information. —> to be addressed after the extension is finalized.*
* *Why not use measurement fact extension here instead? – but would that be more appropriate at the occurrence level or the event level?*

# Small Stuff

A collection of queries, requests for clarity or niggles.

## Including Units in Terms

Including units in term names causes problems. It induces either over precise values or rounding errors. (Eg. is 1 mile 1.609344, 1.6 or 2 kilometres? the choice can lead to quite misleading results if multiple lengths are added together.) It’s also inconsistent with other terms, such as *eventDuration* and *eventDurationUnit*. *geospatialScopeAreaInSquareKilometers* embeds the unit into the concept that is being described. Why not *geospatialScopeArea* and *geospatialScopeAreaUnit*?

* YMG: Good point. I think not limiting it to be square kilometers could be advantageous. I also think that having controlled vocabularies for geospatialScopeAreaUnit could be really helpful to avoid the users from populating it with various ways (e.g. m^2, metres square, meters square, m2)! From the OBIS side, we use BODC vocabularies: <https://vocab.nerc.ac.uk/search_nvs/P06/>

## Duplicated Terms

The terms eco:*identifiedBy, dwc:identifiedBy* and *eco:identificationReferences, dwc:identificationReferences* appear to be duplicated. We think that it may be because it is intended for use at a higher level that occurrences however that is not clear from the definition in <https://eco.tdwg.org/terms/#identification>

* YMG: Addressed in the following GitHub issues:
	+ <https://github.com/tdwg/hc/issues/56#issuecomment-1709121481>
	+ <https://github.com/tdwg/dwc/issues/492>

## Missing Terms

Is there a reason why there is a *targetLifeStage* but not a *targetSex, targetReproductiveCondition, targetVitality* or other occurrence terms?

* YMG: Good question, I don’t know

## Plural Terms

The terms *protocolNames* and *protocolReferences* are plural but *protocolDescription* is singular. Similarly, there is a *compliationType* but *inventoryTypes* We expect that, in most cases, there will be a single *inventoryType, protocolName* etc. If multiple terms are included, they are separated by vertical bars. As a result, we prefer the singular form.

## Dates and Duration

Should there be a *targetEventDate* or *targetDuration*?

Should there be a *targetSchedule* that describes the level of broad/actual time in the same way as the geospatial scope?

* YMG: Is there any reason why we can’t use dwc:eventDate, dwc:eventTime from dwc:Event core? I am expecting every record in Humboldt Extension has to be associated with a dwc:Event core record, as defined in the Darwin Core Archive star schema. Or is the question here to intended differentiate intent and actuality?

Should there be a *verbatimEventDuration* or *verbatimTemporalScope* for times as reported (eg. “one day”)?

* YMG: Would the use of dwc:sampleSizeValue (<https://dwc.tdwg.org/terms/#dwc:sampleSizeValue>) and dwc:sampleSizeUnit (<https://dwc.tdwg.org/terms/#dwc:sampleSizeUnit>) suffice?

Does the *eventDuration/eventDurationUnit* refer to the expected or actual duration?

* YMG: actual duration, based on my interpretation. Because its definition refers to dwc:Event “The numeric value for the duration of the dwc:Event.” And dwc:Event is referred as something that has already occurred “An action that occurs at some location during some time.”

Since *dwc:eventDate* explicitly allows for start/end dates and times (eg. 2019-07-02T12:03:00/2019-07-02T12:15:00 has an event duration of 15 minutes, it would seem that the *eventDuration* is the expected duration.

* YMG: I have the impression that the dwc:eventDate means interval and not duration. Example from dwc:eventDate (<https://dwc.tdwg.org/terms/#dwc:eventDate>) “2007-03-01T13:00:00Z/2008-05-11T15:30:00Z (some time during the interval between 1 March 2007 1pm UTC and 11 May 2008 3:30pm UTC)” seems to imply that an dwc:Event can happen **anytime** between 2007-03-01T13:00:00Z/2008-05-11T15:30:00Z I gonna use the excuse that English is my third language, please correct me if I am wrong :)

Should *eventDurationUnit* be removed and the duration always be in the form of an ISO 8501 duration?[[1]](#footnote-1)

* YMG: This sounds sensible to me

## Inventory Types

The purpose of inventoryTypes as opposed to compilationType is unclear. This seems to be a common problem, as <http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/BCO_0000047> contains a similar comment.

## Scope Type

The examples given for *targetTaxonomicScope* are broad taxa at the class level, such as *Aves*. This looks like broad, descriptive information, rather than a specific inventory of expected species. Having a more specific inventory would allow users to infer absences, even if we don’t do so ourselves. A t*axonomicScopeType* of, say, “descriptive” or “normative” would indicate the intended level of the scope.

## Miscellaneous

“This term is only relevant if the *dwc:Ev*ent represents an inventory.“ appears in a number of places. However, the examples tend to attach inventories directly to an event like a survey. What does this mean?

What happens if the *samplingEffortValue* and *samplingEffortUnit* require multiple values? Eg. “2 hours over 100m2”

* YMG: Good point. I have a feeling that this is again related to eMoF <https://github.com/gbif/rs.gbif.org/issues/103#issuecomment-1532983566> and <https://github.com/gbif/rs.gbif.org/pull/102> Do dwc:sampleSizeValue and dwc:sampleSizeUnit have a similar challenge? If we are to provide recommendation for this, perhaps we should align the practice across other general terms like dwc:sampleSizeValue and dwc:sampleSizeUnit?

The terms *protocolNames* and *protocolReferences* are split. Should *samplingEffortProtocol* have the same treatment?

Should *targetCompletenessReported* allow a measure, such as “50%” rather than a vocabulary term?

Terms such as *isSamplingEffortReported* seem to be inferable from other terms. And having *isSamplingEffortReported: true* and *samplingEffortValue* empty makes no sense. Why are these terms needed?

JSON tends to make a value somewhat opaque. If a term contains embedded JSON, then it should be in JSON-LD format, so that the resulting data is comprehensible.

1. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISO\_8601#Durations [↑](#footnote-ref-1)