



Advancing the Accessibility of Digital Media for Biological Research in the 21st Century:

What should be preserved?

Gil Nelson

Institute for Digital Information and Scientific Communication
Integrated Digitized Biocollections
Florida State University

Laboratory of Ornithology

Cornell University

5 May 2015

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Cooperative Agreement EF-1115210. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.



Are media specimens?

Must “specimen” be defined to include only physical objects?

Are media recordings (images, video, sound) sufficient as vouchers?
Ivory-billed Woorpecker?

Are media recordings sufficient to support research?
How are they worse or better than physical specimens?

Which media should be preserved? (type and content)

Are there standards or best practices for determining what can/should be discarded?

Can anything be discarded?

What are the evaluative criteria/standards for determining what should be preserved?

Should legacy analog media be preserved or only their digital derivations?

How to treat camera traps and long-term remote recordings?

Is the potential for future tools an important consideration?

Should legacy (analog) media be digitized?

Are their preservation dangers associated with digitized data?

How about analog data?

Should we rely only on “modern” digital formats?

What are the criteria/conditions that determine whether to digitize?

What are the priorities?

What levels of access should be provided? (from both infrastructure & authentication perspectives)

What are the best methods for providing access to various media types?

What are the limitations?

Does access differ between media, their metadata, and the data associated with the featured organism(s) (e.g. locality of record).

