

## **Feedback from Workshops**

### **1. Blockages to sharing**

- Concern about sensitive species
- Lack of recognition/ feedback/ encouragement
- Stealing – using the data without attributions or publishing earlier than the owner
- Lack of awareness of benefits to sharing
- Wrong use – against nature conservation or without understanding the limitations that apply to the data.
- Data might be misrepresented
- Lots of work needed to share (data recorded in personal notebooks, not in the right format etc)
- Lack of understanding on why other people need to have access to the data
- Absence of the will to share the data with governmental institutions through lack of trust, because (i) they didn't support the production of data, (ii) want to use it freely, and (iii) they asked for permits for the collection of data and sometimes they don't issue the permits.
- Sharing is seen as selling national treasury (for Turkey regarding international data sharing)
- Intellectual property rights
- Data is knowledge and hence power!
- Individuals may be happy to share but data gathered under contract may be restricted
- Some countries ban sharing of data on threatened species (eg Estonia)
- Databases should allow different levels of access for sensitivity and embargo on some uses

Sharing – we are not good at sharing it back to the recorders either! (in terms of quality control)

### **2. How can we mobilise holiday records?**

- Promote the value of sharing
- Promote info on how to upload records easily
- Improve ease of access (too many alternatives/platforms, barrier to starting using them)
- Improve ease of use – observer specific applications or excel tables – e.g. CEH portal making it easy to enter your records
- iNaturalist – Observado –link them with national systems
- Improve online data entry systems and ease of uploading data and photographs (eg in batches)
- Knowing your data is used for the right purpose, useful.
- Provide acknowledgement, information, and feedback
- A portal which links different national databases to one another – instead of a single system (like hotel searching engines, eBird)
- Persuade holiday companies to record their data in the national schemes
- Communicating with local owners – contacting the BCE key contacts for suggestions
- Ensuring the translation of national portals to English
- Direct sms message when you cross a border, directing you national databases / key contacts you can use to enter data.
- Good field guides in all regions
- Ask BCE partners to remind recorders 3 times a year to submit records
- Alert National coordinators of holiday records

### **3. How can we best verify data?**

- Automate verification by location, time, altitude, date, species id (those hard to identify) – Flagging anomalous records but recognizing shifts in ranges due to climate change might be possible (not to make automatic exclusions)
- Flagging/filters/traffic light system for easy/hard to identify species
- Have a group of national experts who will actually verify the anomalous records

- Have a group of national and European experts who will agree on which species we need to be careful to verify
- The method to verify hard to identify species could be demanding photos of both sides, taking into account the reputation of the recorder, etc.
- Using also species recognition softwares (esp. for moths)
- Asking for photos especially from inexperienced observers
- Developing a software which can supply the observers with a short list narrowing down the spp. you are likely to observe at this time and place.
- Feedback messages as prompts to the observers to confirm their observation (e.g. earliest record, most southerly record for this spp.)
- Swarovski binoculars – showing the spp. ID at the location they look
- Phone application where photographs of similar species are shown to help identification.
- Effort to verify should relate to use (some uses do not need verification if datasets are large and depending on margin of error needed)
- BCE Partners to identify local verifiers

#### **4. How can we identify sensitive species and how can we protect their records?**

- May not be necessary for any European species but may be necessary to protect sensitive sites (local BCE Partners to suggest)
- If necessary chose from Habitat Directive spp, Red list spp (local and EU), Restricted range spp., low population size, endemics (local, or to a single country), Species which are known targets for collectors (e.g. sold on ebay)
- BCE to come up with sensitive spp lists, EU with local sensitivity.

##### **Solutions:**

- Blurring the data to 10\*10km or even bigger (50\*50 km)
- Exclude the record completely
- Identifying criteria for deciding with who you share sensitive data, and who has the right to decide?

##### **Comments**

- Is there any evidence that released data has caused harm/ has it helped to protect from development/ bad management?
- Collectors know where species are without accessing public data
- Social media may make things worse
- Teaching local people that they have sensitive species can help them protect them - in Italy
- There is a trade-off between risks and benefits