Recommendation

Recommendation to decompose metadata according to community-recognized frameworks

Description

Status: Under development, Date: 2025/07/07 10:18, Version: 001

Motivation for this Recommendation:

Many metadata categories consist of several components. A variable such as “air temperature (°C)”, for example, does not only describe the measured quantity (temperature) itself but also contains additional information: the measurement context (air), and the unit (°C). Since for almost all metadata categories - such as Variable or Method - there is room for interpretation about which specific information about the dataset is meant, it is important to establish binding standards for their structure. It is crucial to define which elements should be included in a data description (i.e., in a given metadata categorie) and to provide a clear specification of what exactly is meant in each case.

Furthermore, if consistent naming is to be ensured, for example in a data portal, a syntax should be defined that specifies the order and phrasing in which the individual components of a given metadata category are combined. For instance, one could decide that the metadata category Measurement Instrument must always include the device type, manufacturer, and model as fundamental components of the data description. When naming the Measurement Instrument, these three attributes should consistently be listed in the order Type, Manufacturer, Model (comma-separated). This would ensure that identical models are always represented in the same way.

Recommendation

[shortened from below]

[Format: Wer! macht was! wo! wann! unter welchen Voraussetzungen!]

Binding Convention:

	mandatory	**conditional**	**optional**
Helmholtz FAIR Principle			

Precondition for Implementation:

Related Recommendations

Parent:

Dependent:

Other: none

Contributors

Names of contributors to this recommendation

Content

1. Explanation of the Background and Benefits of the Recommendation

About

History and structure

Current Use of ...

Motivation

2. Possible alternative solutions

3. Consideration of the advantages and disadvantages of implementing the recommendation

(quality of content, limitations, interoperability, sustainability: expected future dissemination / technical availability / funding)

4. The Recommendation

[Format: Wer! macht was! wo! wann! unter welchen Voraussetzungen!]

5. Naming of communities that have already implemented the recommendation

6. Documentation of the test to validate correct implementation

7. Examples of Instances

8. Further Information

References

Relevant Community Recommendations

9. History of this document