

# Regional Meeting of the GBIF Participant Nodes in Europe 4-6 April 2011, Paris, France



# Participation:

<b>Participation:</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
National Nodes	10	15
Associate Nodes	2	1
Invitees	FaEu / SP2000 eu / LifeWatch	LifeWatch / ViBRANT
GBIFs	Nodes, DIGIT, ECAT	DIGIT, Informatics liaison
Total participants	24	33

Currently 22 European country participants  
15 associated Nodes



# Focus on

1) Where do we stand in Europe at this point and how is the decentralisation / regionalisation proceeding? Subsequently how are the European Nodes proceeding?

2) Where are we aiming at as European Nodes for the next phase of GBIF (2012-2016)?



## Things we had to achieve in Paris:

- Decide on a **governance structure** for the European Nodes, including identification of the **tasks and requirements** for these tasks.
- Select a European **representative for the NSG** at GB18.
- Decide on how to **communicate** in the future (currently it doesn't really work), internal as well as external.
- Prepare for the mid-term GBIF meetings (Copenhagen, May 2011)

Means:

Forwarding our **perspectives and activates** we want to see in the workplan 2012.

European Nodes **response to the new TOR for the Nodes Committee.**

Formulating recommendations for the GBIF Secretariat, SC, EC and the GB.



## Things we had to achieve in Paris:

- Get a very good overview on where the European Nodes are at the moment and their **perspective on the future**.

Means: use the Nodes presentations to identify status, problems and future ambitions and distill this information for communication amongst Nodes and with SC, EC and GB.

- Set a (realistic) forward **strategy** for the European Nodes.

Means: An inventory of the thoughts about this issue and coming to some kind of consensus based on practicalities, current situation and ambitions.



## Results:

Governance: Keep it simple and informal

Representation: NLBIF + France support

Regional meeting 2012: Germany

Communication: Inventory community site, communicate issues, then decide, establish **website** for GBIF Europe

ToR: O.k.



# Informatics priorities:

	Subject	Specification
1.)	Indexing / HIT	<p>Indexing is a very serious problem for a long time now.</p> <p>Indexed data is the first GBIF “service” data providers experience and has a strong communicative and PR aspect.</p> <p>Problems are: ghost datasets, long roll over intervals, incomplete metadata, etc.</p> <p>Central GBIF indexing should be reliable, consistent and immediate.</p> <p>Proper indexing at the Node level should be possible, 8 of the 15 Nodes would like to implement the HIT a.s.a.p.</p>
2.)	Informatics architecture focusing on data quality (incl. tools)	<p>Data quality becomes more and more an issue as Nodes start to interact with data users. Two levels recognized: 1) data capture 2) portal level</p> <p>1 = Tools for taxonomic, geographic and technical data validation prior to GBIF data publication 2 = Services at portal level (data input and data output);</p> <p>e.g. proper indexing report and possibility for dataprovider to correct and improve data e.g. filtering of duplicates (based on GUID’s) in aggregated datasets, or name validation against different taxonomic systems</p>



# Informatics priorities:

	Subject	Specification
3.)	Citation at record level	Technically facilitate the citation of individual records.
4.)	Need for “killer application”	An application that makes people want to use and contribute to the GBIF infrastructure. The NPT is the most likely candidate for this application.
5.)	Use statistics reporting	Data providers want to know how their data are being used! - Accumulate use statistics from mirrors - Turn current event log data in user friendly service





# Content priorities:

	Subject	Specification
1.)	Tagging of datasets and data annotation	Objective tagging of datasets would be a great step forward and an do-able option; which DwC/ABCD fields filled, completeness of the data, validation history, last update, continuity of the data, indexing report, etc. Possibilities around annotation should be examined. How to capture and forward the experiences of data users.....
2.)	Improve data quality by data providers	Data providers should receive proper information on the quality and / or errors in their data sets to allow improvement of the data
3.)	Thematic datamobilisation	Revival of the GBIF campaigns? Functioning of Nodes will be more focused and less opportunistic when there are clear themes (e.g. food security, invasives, pollinators, etc). Themes are also very much related to data quality issue and PR aspect.
4.)	Clarification and documentation GBIF data workflow	Identification of data aggregators vs. primary datapublishers. Where do data come from, role of LSID's etc.
5.)	Communicate and showcase the importance of collections digitization	E.g. show role of GBIF data in initiatives like SciColl (Scientific Collections International)
6.)	Link GBIF content to all taxonomy initiatives	What Nodes need here is a clear road map, what can we expect and what can't we expect (... expectation management)



# Participation priorities (Europe):

	Subject	Specification
1.)	Improve communication	Specifically; improvement of the use of the community site. European Nodes make inventory; discuss with Secretariat and decide on next steps.  Establish GBIF Europe website
2.)	Establishment working groups	Cooperation that starts through the community site can / should be formalised. Groups with clear theme and aim.
3.)	European Campaigns	For example mobilising data in the scope of BioFresh.
4.)	Positioning	Position of European Nodes should be described by a group of Nodes.
5.)	Include none GBIF countries as observers	Next European Nodes meeting we will invite potential new participants.



# European strategy and (work)plan

Strong need to demonstrate use in order to maintain the support of the key funders

Pressure on Europe to demonstrate these benefits since the majority of the data exist for this region and there is a large amount of technical experience and a genuine requirement to work across borders.

Strategy needs to be focused around a need or application and such applications tend to emerge from the research sector. Europe is fortunate in having an opportunity in the **BioFresh initiative**

“A programme of European research collaboration to explore the biodiversity of freshwater across Europe and identify the factors affecting it with a view to influencing the overall policy in this area”



## Approach:

- 1) Encourage and facilitate the publication of data with particular focus on this emerging application
- 2) To facilitate the integration of the available data within potential uses either nationally or at broader geographical scales

## Need:

Mobilisation / digitisation of sources: Actions:  
search for funding  
Thematic mobilisation

Quality assure records being published: Actions:  
Collate an overview of the  
methods and tools



## Need from GBIFs (Informatics) :

Simple publication mechanism

Efficient indexing routines

Providing feedback to providers



2) To facilitate the integration of the available data within potential uses either nationally or at broader geographical scales

2.1) Maintain an overview of potential applications

2.2) Ability to identify sources and records of interest

2.3) Build a thematic cache

2.4) Validate / verify data

2.5) Analyse / present data



## Potential other themes for joint European collaboration:

- Urban ecology data and services
- IUCN Guiana shield project

