VTC Notes - 2010-06-16

Published on *LTER Information Management* (http://im.lternet.edu)

VTC Notes - 2010-06-16

Thu, 06/17/2010 - 10:10am — jconners

VTC June 16, 2010: Unit Registry Update

Moderator: Mason Kortz
Attendees: James Conners, Mark Servilla, Ken Ramsey, Mary Gastil-Buhl, Hap Garritt, James Moss, Yang Xia, Kristen Vanderbilt, Hope Humphries, Linda Powell, Duane Costa, Jason Downing, John Vande Castle, Don Henshaw, Sven Bolhm, Karen Baker, Jonathan Walsh, Margaret O'brien

Overview -

Goals of the this meeting: Code migration and discussion of NIS contributed application protocols or standards.

The Unit Registry web interface is just one functional example of possible clients that can be built using the registry

Sven Bolhm visited CCELTER, San Diego, a few weeks ago to develop a Ruby API wrapper
for integration of the Unit Registry into local information system

Management interface is up and working. Management practices need to be developed.
There are funds available for future working group focussed on this topic.

Management Interface Details:
- Changes to units are tracked/logged
- Units from mutliple EML versions, CCE, PAL, FCE and PIE have been uploaded
- Uploading of site units can be done through the interface or by being sent to Mason Kortz

Updated documentation is available on the Unit Working group page:
http://intranet.lternet.edu/im/news/committees/working_groups/unit_dicti... [1]

The Unit Registry application source has been checked into the LNO subversion repository and is available for checking out:
https://svn.lternet.edu/svn/NIS/contrib/unitRegistry/ [2]

Code/Applicaton Migration -

Very smooth. Single virtual machine for application hosting. Code was checked into network-wide subversion repository.

Who is managing the virtual machine?

System updates are handled by LNO sys-admin. Code maintenance is the responsibility of LTER community.

Identification of errors with the current release of the web interface

Send OS and browser version number for fixing.

At this point, the ability to integrate site-specific applications into the NIS has been identified as dependent on applications having a web-service interface. This may change and will be the primary topic for discussion in the Web Services working group.

This discussion could take its initial form as a web service standards document for development within the Web Services working group.

To begin, an idea would be to circulate topics of discussion that would lead to the document's content.

Major milestone was the service interface, not the web-baased interface. The web service interface serves as an integration point to the rest of the NIS information architecture.

Sven, could you describe the development of your Ruby api wrapper

The Ruby api wrapper makes calls to the registry and stores the results locally for use in the local architecture. Updates to units will be

obtained from the unit registry. Some questions about the api interface arose.

These questions about the api interface can be discussed within the web services working group as a topic of standardization and integration for the NIS architecture.

Unclear: Are the units that are in the registry already vetted?

The only units that could be considered vetted are the units from the EML unit dictionary. All site units have been uploaded and possibly corrected, but should not be considered "officially" vetted.

Are there plans to involve the domain scientists in the vetting process? Some of these unit question seem to be beyond the scope if the information manager's expertise.

Tentatively (from Unit working group discussion): There would be two tiers that would approach syntactical and semantic question, respectively. A running list of domain scientist could be compiled for those who are willing to recieve emails or notifications to involve them in the vetting process.

Curious about the vetting process. The process of involving the domain scientists in the vetting process has not been clearly defined. Maybe an involvement through the site information management seeking advice would be the best method to begin.

Web interface works fine in Google Chrome. Some advice would be for the information managers to start thinking more seriously about web services. Question: Can units maintain multiple scopes? What is the planned usage for these scope assignments?

Currently, the scope primarily designates origin. It is really up to the community, specifically the Unit working group, to decide what the best way to utilize these scopes is.

The maintainence of site-specific scopes could be useful even after a site has been vetted and assigned a scope that designates a post-vetted state.

There are mainy benefits to maintaining provenance information during the vetting process.

Timeframes? Any goals, possibly set for the upcoming IMC in September?

A useful resource would be a link to the best practices from the registry's management interface.

Are there plans for unit discussions at the IMC?

There is time allotted for any IM working groups, and the unit group is on the list of potential groups.

- Unit [3]

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Cooperative Agreement #DEB-0236154. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in the material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.
Please contact us with questions, comments, or for technical assistance regarding this web site.

Source URL: http://im.lternet.edu/node/606

Links:
[1] http://intranet.lternet.edu/im/news/committees/working_groups/unit_dictionary
[2] https://svn.lternet.edu/svn/NIS/contrib/unitRegistry/
[3] http://im.lternet.edu/taxonomy/term/49