

Document Contents.**Order of Events.****Background and Context.****Summary Feedback from PI's and Steering Committee on Scope Items.**

Order of Events: Scope Questions for Georeferencing – Need Prioritization.

1. Original documents produced at the iDigBio IT Standards workshop March 2012, by the initial Georeferencing Working Group of Reed Beaman, Nelson Rios, John Wieczorek, Deborah Paul, Dennis Xu and Elizabeth Martin. This initial group expanded to include David Bloom, Una Farrell, Mary Barkworth, Paul Heinrich, Gil Nelson and Carol Spencer, all of whom contributed to the content of these documents.
2. Cost estimates added at the request of Pam Soltis and Reed Beaman.
3. Context and Prioritization (see next) added by working group at the request of Larry Page and the Steering Committee.
4. Steering Committee Feedback Summary from Steering Committee / PI meeting 17 August 2012.

Background and Context.

At the IT Standards workshop, March 2012 in Gainesville, the initial members of the iDigBio georeferencing working group met to coalesce the current georeferencing needs of the nhc community. At the meeting, a list of items was created and Jose Fortes requested we prioritize the list. *You can see the entire list* at <http://www.goo.gl/x4TVY>

From that list, the group created a list of **action items** presented at the IT Standards meeting that needed Steering Committee input to determine if the items were in or out of scope. Next, Pam and Reed asked the GWG to put hard dollar costs with the items. Then, Larry has stepped in to ask that we prioritize the items and provide some background and context on each item.

Note items are now in Priority Order.

The Steering Committee and PI's met with 2 members of the working group, Deborah Paul and Reed Beaman to discuss the prioritized items and associated funding requests. Next is a summary of the discussion of each item in the list.

Summary Feedback from PI's and Steering Committee – 17 August 2012

Item 3 – Train the Trainers Workshop – *in scope and funded* and plans for this workshop are in progress. Note there are funds to do a second workshop within this fiscal year.

Item 5 – "Does iDigBio create online training content?" The working group asked for a funded meeting after the above workshop in order to use the outcomes of the workshop and workshop surveys to create a materials development plan. This syllabus is intended to guide the working group and outline needed funding to accomplish creation of the training materials. The steering committee agrees this is within scope and funding exists to cover the expected travel, lodging and per diem costs for key members of the working group to meet for this purpose. <\$6000.00

Item 8 – "Does iDigBio prepare/improve/organize existing non-software materials?" The steering committee would like to have us revisit this item after the Item 5 meeting.

Item 1 – " Does iDigBio make recommendations for effective practices?" In essence, this is a request for support to update the Best Practices Guide for Georeferencing. The committee would like us to re-evaluate this item after the workshop. The steering committee asks if the persons involved are open to a wiki-type version (non-static) that could be updated and also if a partnership with GBIF to work on this is fitting? It is not in the scope of current budget. A supplement request for the funds would need to be submitted and the committee finds this is likely feasible but they'd like feedback about the wiki question and GBIF participation.

Item 7 & 6 – "Does iDigBio develop a geographically-based georeferencing expert/support network? Does iDigBio maintain a training expert base/support network with qualifications/skill tracking?" The committee agrees that Version 1 of this is to be an outcome of the 1st (upcoming) workshop – as a list of participants. The funding question was not addressed thoroughly and some were not sure of the need for funding. The steering committee would like to know more about how vetting of the people on the list would happen? Some suggest an open community-based model for vetting, encouraging the community to vet itself.

Item 4 – "Does iDigBio develop outreach materials associated with crowdsourcing?" Please re-evaluate after the workshop and discuss with Specify and Symbiota b/c of their plans to be involved in crowd-sourcing.

Item 11 – "Does iDigBio develop a georeferencing cost calculator?" The steering committee likes better the idea of a table or sort of checklist and asks if that might be a possible outcome of the 1st workshop? The checklist would be a list of items that need to be considered when computing possible costs. They liked the idea of creating a table showing prior projects with costs/specimen – that could be added to by new projects.

Item 5A - " Does iDigBio create testing sites?" The steering committee has more questions about this. It would be down the road – more discussion is needed. The committee asks if it's possible / probable for the a partnership from someone like Robert Hanner for Distance Learning / Distance Education materials development? And would he participate perhaps as a member of the working group? or would funding need to be considered for his participation?

Item 10 – " Does iDigBio repatriate community-provided georeferences?" – This is an item to be revisited in the future.

Item 9 – "Can iDigBio work with GBIF to get the data cleaned?" GBIF code is not ready for sharing yet – so not in a state that is easily usable by iDigBio. Others suggest BISON may help with this or perhaps CRIA?
(dlp 7 September 2012)