

Issue71

Title <decision> element in verification and training results

Priority feature **Status** chatting

Superseder **Nosy List** dburke, dburnett, eburger, oran, sarvi

Assigned To dburnett **Topics**

Created on **2006-03-24.20:49:56** by **dburnett**, last changed **2006-03-27.20:50:52** by **dburnett**.

Messages

[msg138 \(view\)](#)

Author: dburnett

Date: 2006-03-27.20:50:52

From Dave Burke on March 25:

I'm OK with you proposal (I understand the need for content model flexibility to permit the different use-cases). However, don't we need <decision> under each voiceprint given the identification / multi-verification cases? i.e. at any given point of time there is a decision state associated with each voiceprint being considered?

[Dan's reply]:

Yes, but by the nature of verification/identification I think we can assume that only one voiceprint will be accepted at any given time, right? All the others must be rejected or unknown.

Do you have a use case that would give different results?

[Dave's reply back]:

I was thinking of two points:

1. Even if only one voiceprint was accepted at any given time, the others would either be rejected or undecided and that the results ought to be explicit in expressing that (i.e. there would be a <decision> for each voiceprint). My understanding is that your proposal implies that an omitted <decision> is the same as <decision>rejected</decision> or <decision>undecided</decision>?

2. The (perhaps edge) case in multi-verification where more than one voiceprint is accepted.

[msg124 \(view\)](#)

Author: dburnett

Date: 2006-03-24.20:49:56

Supercedes [Issue 65](#)-14.

From [Issue 65](#)-14:

14. What kind of values does <decision> take when (a) training has been performed or (b) for multi-verification (can more than one voice-print be "accepted"?)

[Sarvi>>] For training, I don't think any of the <voiceprint> elements should contain a <decision> element. For multiverification result, the value would could be rejected, accepted and undecided. I believe there should be only one <voice-print> with a decision element of the above possible values.

DB> Sorry - my query is only relevant to training. Perhaps 11.5.4 should then have a sentence clarifying that <decision> is not present for training results?

From Dan Burnett on 3/24/06:

...

To accommodate all of the use cases presented over the past few years, I have the following proposal:

We permit <adapted> under only the first <voiceprint>, and make it optional. As in -09, it is only returned for a verification (and not training) result.

We permit <incremental> and require <cumulative> under all <voiceprint> elements.

Both <incremental> and <cumulative> can contain the same set of elements under the first <voiceprint> (which I'll temporarily name "Set A"), and both <incremental> and <cumulative> can contain the same set of elements under all but the first <voiceprint> (which I'll temporarily name "Set B").

Set A:

- may contain <decision>, <utterance-length>, <device>, <gender>, and <verification-score>. <verification-score> is required. <decision> is required under one or the other of <incremental> and <cumulative>, but not both. It is only returned for a verification (and not training) result. All other elements are optional under both <incremental> and <cumulative>.

Set B:

- may contain <utterance-length>, <device>, <gender>, and <verification-score>. <verification-score> is required. All other elements are optional.

Consequences of the proposal:

- the content model is more permissive than what both the text and schema permit in -09, except
 - 1) it limits <decision> to only occur once in the entire result, and that only in a verification result (as opposed to training), and
 - 2) it requires <verification-score> under all <incremental> and <cumulative> elements anywhere in the result.

History

Date	User	Action	Args
2006-03-27 20:50:52	dburnett	set	messages: + msg138
2006-03-24 20:49:56	dburnett	create	