| What is ONE item you feel we should concentrate on in the near-term (i.e., years 4-5)? This could be the ‘most important item’, a ‘correction’ we should make in our emphasis, or a 'new emphasis.' |
| --- |
| Formally defining relationships with other data portals (especially GBIF and BISON among others) |
| Most important item: Continue our efforts to reach out to the collections community and convince more institutions to digitize their collections and provide specimen-based data and media to iDigBio. |
| We should develop and strengthen our partnership and collaboration with GBIF and BISON. |
| Establish a strategy for project renewal that includes identification of factors likely to be important. I imagine that this will include a need for us to present a plan that is a blend of incremental improvements and innovation. The incremental improvements might be relatively easy to identify, but the innovation might be more difficult. |
| A consensus of the sessions I was in that I agree with is to move forward in developing a strong collaboration with GBIF and BISON, finding ways to enhance the data served by both entities, capitalizing on their infrastructure, and moving data aggregated by iDigBio to global providers. |
| As Alex wrote in a recent email, sometime over the next 2 years we will be done with the "easy" data. "After this we'll have to set about converting institutions from DIGIR/TAPIR to IPT, or otherwise mobilizing data sets where no existing publication methods exist." My own opinion is that we can also differentiate ourselves by focusing on mobilizing data that is not yet in GBIF or BISON. |
| I think the most important item in the near term to focus on is to demonstrate the impact of idigbio in the community - including both what has been accomplished, and potential impact moving forward in years 6-10. I think this is key to position ourselves for renewal. This, in some areas, we'll have more evidence of having ramped up (workshops, data ingested), and in other areas we are still ramping up (usage) but need to push to show a compelling trend. This also requires us to position/differentiate the project with respect to GBIF, BISON. |
| Increase participation of minorities and under represented groups, and under representative collections (vertebrates) |
| volume of data. iDigBio needs to add in its volume of data so people can start using it, rather than just talk about what we can do once the portal is 'useful'. |
| Figuring out how to get data efficiently: offering an IPT like VertNet does for providers who don't have the resources. Simply asking them to provide their data (which is their obligation in their proposals) is not having enough effect. VertNet should be compelled to work more closely with us to support Audubon Core. Divide the work between VertNet and iDigBio more efficiently. Let them do the data improvement (with re-integration), we do the ingesting/serving. This new inter-group dynamic could be kicked off with a technical meeting between all parties, including NSF, to create a new vision and working relationship. I'm assuming E&O and Research, other areas of focus, will pick up and fulfill their goals. |
| I feel we should begin to shift focus off of ingestion rates and portal development and truly take the time to understand the challenges of chasing the long tail of data mobilization. As we near the end of low hanging fruit, both technical and social challenges will arise that will require community driven solutions. These solutions can be leveraged with iDigBio resources, although, to truly be faithful to the ADBC vision, these solutions will be driven by transformative projects realized through the TCN's, RCN's and others. We must not let the goal of aggregating data cast a shadow on the vision of advancing digitization. The long tail must be iDigBio's focus and we should rally around "We ingested more data today that wasn't digitized at all yesterday than we ingested today of all the data that was ingested yesterday by other aggregators." |
| Unfortunately I was unable to make the retreat, so my apologies if any of this was already brought up. iDigBio has made so much progress since its inception! As a relatively recent addition I'm impressed by the accomplishments to date.  Now for the near-term emphasis. In recent conversations with a couple of iDigBio staff and associates we discussed ways iDigBio could present themselves as the high-tech organization that we are. I am as guilty as the rest, but often our presentations are simple PowerPoints, our displays and posters are straightforward 2D, and the majority of our high-tech factor lies in the interactions we have with partner organizations. I don't know that we have the staff on hand now to assist in this, or if individuals are capable of making their presentation more high tech (I for one would need at least some assistance with this), but I do think it would set iDigBio ahead and allow us to stand out in a way that we should. For example, maybe we could use Prezi instead of PowerPoint sometimes and include video, animated visualizations, or models. |
| Example uses of data in iDigBio and how those uses are different/possible/better than what can be done with other sources of data or the kind of data we have. |
| One of the issues that came up in our discussion was the need to make sure that the IT infrastructure was still perceived as being relevant once the data is digtized. Most people want information about all specimens, not based only the ones based in the US, and will prefer to use GBIF to access this information. |
| Continue "reaching out" broadly defined--meaning small, medium, and large collections, different kinds of collections, different research communities, professional organizations, other initiatives, different experts, etc. |
| Increase participation and leadership in informatics and information sciences to where the community looks to us for guidance. We have made some headway in this area, but in many ways we are still the new kid on the block. We’ve gone gangbusters in supporting digitization activities (and citizen science), but we, and our constituent communities, are slow to develop, support, and adopt interoperability requirements on which digitization, data mobility, and research applications depend. |
| Focus on the non-low-hanging-fruit with respect to data: increasing the scope of data to enable linked data, increasing the quality of data to make it easier for research use (e.g., automatic feedback), and making it easier for data to flow in (e.g., self-service). This has the potential to differentiate us from other systems. |
| ONE. Coordinate currently independent efforts across the 5 sectors at iDigBio.  Description: Have the Research, Cyberinfrastructure, Digitization, Education-Outreach, and Administration groups work together to harmonize our talks, webinars, symposia, demos, etc.  Example: Plan a series of webinars / demos - together. IF the goal is Data Quality, have a series of webinars on Data Quality. Advertize them as a coordinated cohesive set across iDigBio.  1. From the Field (Pam and Bruce): What can be done to improve data quality from this sector? [From the field to the researcher's database to publication].  2. Into the Collection Mgmt Database (Pam and Greg (Gil and Deb) and Bruce): How does the data from the collector get into the database - and what's done about Data Quality at this point?  3. Stepping out. (Jose - ACIS - Cyberinfrastructure). What about data quality at the point of Aggregator import / export?  4. Data Mgrs and Project Mgrs (Larrry, David, et al) - envisioning quality data. What is the role of management in realizing the goal of quality data? What influence do we have as managers?  5. Coordinate with relevant community groups on this topic: GBIF, BISON, TDWG, Data Mgmt Interest Group, VertNet, SPNHC, SCNet, ALA, EU BON, DINA, Synthesys3, ... to include their voices.  While we are doing bits of this already, we each are doing our own part. But, the above requires we coordinate our currently excellent, but somewhat independent efforts.  and/or  TWO [couldn't help it David]. For sustainability. Develop a central post-TCN expertise list. Perhaps a sort of “Craigslist,” think of a matching / dating service. Coordinate this with EU project doing the same thing on the other side of the pond. Needs development now as 1st set of TCNs are almost done...  and/or  THREE hire someone (fulltime?) whose job it is to re-organize the massive (and growing) documentation we are amassing. [near and long term]. Goes with number 2. |