

Mon, Sep 22, 2014

Input as requested.

We missed a field for the "convention"s in the research domain used that describe the actual data; (multidimensional) rows and columns.

Also the scientific instrument used that generated the data. (And the metadata belonging to that instrument, such as build version number, etc)

For examples look at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4121/uuid:0e38dcc8-d524-4abf-ab59-5c9a38075dc3>

Vriendelijke groeten / Kind regards,

Maurice Vanderfeesten

Research Data Officer

3TU.Datacentrum

TU Delft | Research Data Services

=====

The two primary comments from the "materials" group were:

- provide definitions for each of the spreadsheet terms, perhaps posted as a comment to the cell
- provide examples of completed spreadsheets for real use cases

Regards,
Chuck Ward

=====

Tue, Sep 23, 2014

Thank you for two excellent sessions today (Metadata and this one, great to see the progress in both since Dublin). Attached is a revised use case template for the CIARD RING example (see <http://ring.ciard.net/>). You should have received an earlier version from Imma Subirats following the MIG session.

In our DICIG review of this case study, our discussion focused on the meaning of the terms, mainly in the template but also in CIRAD RING itself. While it is generally impressive in its use of RDFa etc and other relatively advanced technologies, CIARD RING's simple choice of terms seems anomalous at times, deviating from the DC equivalent for no apparent reason for example. However, this made for an interesting real world example, as we tied together these different terms - from the template to the example via DC - that were grasping at the same concept.

There seemed to be no getting away from the fact that the terms in the template could be vague, just what temporal information do we want and how do we present it for example. Indeed, should we propose there should be more metadata elements; but then we hit the issue that arose in the end of session discussion; for if we are too prescriptive, and/or produce too onerous a list of elements to complete, then we'll end up with NO metadata because contributors will not engage with the process at all. Tricky. But then you know that already ;-)

The conclusion then was that the template was an imperfect start, though given some extra guidance (and completed use case examples such as we were producing, of course) it would make an *appropriate* start for exploring just what is practical. Thank you to all involved in pulling it together.

Cheers
David King

=====
Mon, Oct 6, 2014

Here is the spreadsheet we discussed at the RDA session in Amsterdam. Apologies for sending it a bit late. I've tried to fill in a few more of the fields, but quite a lot are unclear.

Here are a few comments:

1. Use case priority – it is hard to assign a priority without knowing what the other use cases are.
2. What are the scenario IDs in the second section? How **does** this relate to the use case?
3. What are the examples in column H?
4. What is risk/care/cost? These seem like different things so not clear why they are in the same field.
5. Use case goal – why isn't this in the first section?
6. I'm not really sure how to fill in the Provided column.
7. The Others row is a bit unclear – are you expecting additional metadata fields or something else?

I hope that's useful.

Best Regards,

Simon.

Dr Simon Waddington
Research Fellow
Centre for e-Research
King's College London
Strand Campus
26-29 Drury Lane
London
WC2B 5RL