

From: [Pip Brewer](#)
To: [Aslak Kappel Hansen](#); [Astrid Blok van Witteloostuijn](#)
Cc: [Anders Alexander Illum](#); [Jan Pedersen](#); [Sree Gayathree Selvantharan](#); [Alexey Solodovnikov](#); [Laura Pavesi](#)
Subject: RE: Meeting notes about transcribing Danish dung beetles (with collection managers on 15/09/2024) involving changes to Specify UI
Date: 11 September 2024 15:53:00

Hi Aslak,

Thanks for this. Alas, and I am sure this is just an oversight, but this is the first time that I have heard that collecting date is essential for this specific project. I can add it to the requirement, but all estimates to date have worked off the assumption that only locality and verbatim locality are required. This will obviously add a more time and resources to the task, but I will check with Joaquim and update you further.

Best wishes,

Pip

--

Pip Brewer
DaSSCo Project Leader
Natural History Museum of Denmark (NHMD)
University of Copenhagen
Universitetsparken 5, DK-2100 Copenhagen, Denmark
pip.brewer@snm.ku.dk

From: Aslak Kappel Hansen <akhansen@snm.ku.dk>
Sent: 11 September 2024 10:06
To: Astrid Blok van Witteloostuijn <astrid.blok@snm.ku.dk>
Cc: Anders Alexander Illum <andersaillum@snm.ku.dk>; Pip Brewer <pip.brewer@snm.ku.dk>; Jan Pedersen <japedersen@snm.ku.dk>; Sree Gayathree Selvantharan <selvantharan@snm.ku.dk>; Alexey Solodovnikov <asolodovnikov@snm.ku.dk>; Aslak Kappel Hansen <akhansen@snm.ku.dk>; Laura Pavesi <lpavesi@snm.ku.dk>
Subject: Re: Meeting notes about transcribing Danish dung beetles (with collection managers on 15/09/2024) involving changes to Specify UI

Hi Pip,

I don't have much input regarding the field in Specify, but sounds like there is a general agreement about what is needed.

I would like to reiterate that the data is only valuable for us when date AND georeferenced locality is present. Our project aims to look at changes of the fauna in time and space, therefore these two components are essential. Would it make more sense to have this data transcribed in a single go, instead of needing to go back to the labels to get the second data field transcribed?

Just to update all on the locality information drop down for georeferencing. I have sent my datasets to Anders and Jan and they will merge with the data they already

have. The goal is to generate a unified locality look up list, that can used for current and future digitisation of Danish entomological collections.

Cheers,
Aslak

On 11 Sep 2024, at 09.27, Astrid Blok van Witteloostuijn
<astrid.blok@snm.ku.dk> wrote:

Hi Anders,

I can answer your question about the Alias field. The answer is yes, it will be possible to add multiple aliases pr. locality record, and it will work in the same way as with adding multiple determinations (using the plus icon).

Best wishes,
Astrid

Astrid Blok van Witteloostuijn
Assistant Data Coordinator
DaSSCo & Specify
Digital Collections

Natural History Museum of Denmark
Zoological Museum
University of Copenhagen
Universitetsparken 15
2100 København Ø

DIR 35337689
astrid.blok@snm.ku.dk

<image001.gif>

From: Anders Alexander Illum <andersaillum@snm.ku.dk>

Date: Wednesday, 11 September 2024 at 09.22

To: Pip Brewer <pip.brewer@snm.ku.dk>, Jan Pedersen
<japedersen@snm.ku.dk>, Sree Gayathree Selvantharan
<selvantharan@snm.ku.dk>, Astrid Blok van Witteloostuijn
<astrid.blok@snm.ku.dk>

Cc: Alexey Solodovnikov <asolodovnikov@snm.ku.dk>, Aslak Kappel Hansen
<akhansen@snm.ku.dk>, Laura Pavesi <lpavesi@snm.ku.dk>

Subject: RE: Meeting notes about transcribing Danish dung beetles (with collection managers on 15/09/2024) involving changes to Specify UI

Hi Pip,

The additions to Specify look good to me, as long as the Collecting Information section doesn't become too cluttered. I do have a question regarding point 3, specifically about the validated locality records. What do we plan to do with the

localities that are already in Specify? Would we automatically consider them validated? Perhaps we could apply this only to georeferenced records, or do you have any ideas for criteria we could use for validation? Or are we only considering the locality list we provide as validated?

Regarding point 4 and the Alias field, I agree that it's a useful addition. Would it be possible to allow multiple aliases for a single location, similar to how multiple determinations can be linked to one specimen?

Lastly, I agree with Jan that collecting date is an important field, so I hope it can be implemented quickly as well.

Thanks for the update.

Best regards,
Anders

Best regards,
Anders Alexander Illum
Collection Manager
Entomology

University of Copenhagen
Natural History Museum of Denmark
Zoological Museum
Universitetsparken 15
2100 Copenhagen
Denmark

DIR +45 35334178
aaillum@snm.ku.dk
<https://samlinger.snm.ku.dk/>

<image002.gif>

From: Pip Brewer <pip.brewer@snm.ku.dk>

Sent: 10. september 2024 14:44

To: Jan Pedersen <japedersen@snm.ku.dk>; Sree Gayathree Selvantharan <selvantharan@snm.ku.dk>; Anders Alexander Illum <andersaillum@snm.ku.dk>; Astrid Blok van Witteloostuijn <astrid.blok@snm.ku.dk>

Cc: Alexey Solodovnikov <asolodovnikov@snm.ku.dk>; Aslak Kappel Hansen <akhansen@snm.ku.dk>; Laura Pavesi <lpavesi@snm.ku.dk>

Subject: Meeting notes about transcribing Danish dung beetles (with collection managers on 15/09/2024) involving changes to Specify UI

Apologies for the delay in getting these notes to you.

Meeting notes about transcribing Danish dung beetles

Date: 15/08/2024

Present: Jan Pedersen and Sree Gayathree Selvantharan

Absent: Anders Illum (needs to check he is happy with what has been agreed here)

Additions to Specify needed to support the DaSSCo transcription project (NHMD Entomology only for now, but these requests will probably be the same for all/most other collections)

1. Add a new **verbatim locality** field to Collecting Information table

in **object records** with additional related field giving the **source of the verbatim data** (e.g., specimen label). The latter will be a look up list with values pre-populated which can then be selected.

2. Add check box to **locality records** so we are able to flag when a locality record needs checking/validation. Should be called "**Record requires validating**" or something similar. The wording of this needs to be decided upon. This box would be checked for example when a new record is created via the transcription platform but still requires checking and georeferencing.
3. Tag **locality records** that have been validated / high quality records and which can be pushed to the transcription platform. How do we tag these? Do we have another check box that says "**Validated locality record**"? Or do we combine this with no. 2 (above) and have radio buttons, e.g., Requires validating, unsure, validated?
4. Add **Alias** field to **locality records** to facilitate name changes and different spellings of localities (with the hope that in future Kansas will enable the searching of this field too)
5. Add **unknown:missing** as a value in the locality table for when data on locality is not available (e.g., it is unknown)
6. Add **unknown:indecipherable** as a value in the locality table for when it is not possible to interpret handwritten data (e.g., on a label) to ascertain locality

In addition to being happy with the above changes, Jan also mentioned that collecting date should be captured at the same time. It is agreed that this will be the next field implemented after we have tested the locality fields for a subset of the data. We will have more discussions about general requirements for NHMD entomology after we have transcribed locality data for this subset of records for Aslak/Alexey as a first test.

Astrid is working on the above and is quite happy to field discussions and questions, although we would like to agree and get these changes implemented ASAP (next couple of weeks). She could do a mock up of the above suggestions in Specify test for you all to look at. Would that best? You could then have a look at the mock up and see if we need to tweak it slightly.

Best wishes,

Pip

Pip Brewer
DaSSCo Project Leader

University of Copenhagen
Natural History Museum of Denmark
Digital Collections

København K

pip.brewer@snm.ku.dk

<image003.png>

[How we protect personal data](#)