Draft | p3

~~Principles~~

~~Probably the~~
The challenge to the above idea would be nests: They require a structure such as
twigs or dense growth to build, but ~~it is~~ for the most part they are their own structure.
Some nests built in hollows blur any attempt at ~~simplification~~ definition. I would
assume that there is a nest monitoring scheme for the ornithologically inclined that would be
worth examining. As far as 'habitat structures' rather than all structures, one might have to
clarify habitat structures as ~~either relatively static~~, in some way, while ~~allowing~~
accounting for overlapping use by certain species (e.g. ringtail possums that build dreys); otherwise
the attempt at making a robust monitoring protocol turns into monitoring all biodiversity.

Structure Identification is important.

Principle 3: Structure Identification is the glue to a monitoring protocol.

A clear identification of what structure one is looking at is the ~~basic~~ point, but the nuance it
I think this is clear enough, that I won't discuss the
leads to is quite interesting. A system that ~~starts~~, say, starts at one and goes up in number
is very limited, because it becomes hopelessly confused if groups are working in
parallel. Nesting a numbering system within groups is better - but the associations
in the realm of biodiversity care are too complex, and many groups are informal or
themselves layered with others. (If at this point you are thinking of an app that can keep IDs in
order, and could even ask for photo-validation ... that would solve many challenges. Digital workflow
and interaction is worth discussing - just at a later time in developing this protocol.). A potential
nesting structure is physical location - They do, after all, reflect ~~ecosystems and~~ habitat and the movements of
wildlife. ~~I suggest that some high level~~ In each area, the id of a nest-box can be
done using a number, and the potential for cross over is limited to that area. Another
advantage of using area is that you get an idea of where the nest box is - and therefore perhaps the system - just
by the Unique Id. Informal names ~~are also descriptive~~ can be descriptive - incredibly so to locals - but do
~~not necess~~ ~~one no~~ may not be robust. For instance, 'Old Coach Rd 10' could be used to describe
Probably hundreds of nest boxes in Australia. ~~As[illegible]~~

I propose an ID system that uses three variables: Post code, location, number.
5035.DemoSite.#1 means #1 at the Demo site in the start upper reaches - this is a site
managed by the start upper reaches Land care group. For arguments sake I am making up a nearby neighbo[ur]
who doesn't want to be in the landcare group for some reason, but still puts up nest boxes. Their
nest boxes could look something like: 5035.GumBridge.pp.#1. Their property is called
Gum Bridge; p.p means at private property, in case a public reserve bears the same name. This person has been
able to name their nest boxes quite independently of the land care group, but in a way that is descriptive
and extremely unlikely to be replicated accidentally.