

Attending: Steve Baskauf, Matthew Nielsen, Neil Cobb, Randy Singer, John Oswald, Jorrit Poelen

Regrets: Boyce Tankersley

Meeting notes:

Notes added during the meeting and from the chat are in red.

- I. Introductions
- II. Review (Steve): our task.
subjectPart values spreadsheet:
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/12r_xfa69dwjKIYh1Faj1DS1PBGGf4mRPfd5JzxnfTs/edit?usp=sharing
grouping of parts by organism group:
<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Gg3Tdk4PW8wL2X-UyDNpXdudxFdnY4Y9jc6l-3MfTqs/edit?usp=sharing>
- III. John Oswald (TAMU, Neuroptera, Megaloptera, and Raphidioptera image dataset with views. See new folder "oswald-neuroptera" in the Google Drive (Access db tables, screenshot, and explanation). Link to folder:
<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1TRP1Cx2V5Oyh-F8qe3FjchktiW37bHFO?usp=sharing>
He has a lot of data from 30 years of collecting data. Wing venation data are in the literature, so wanted to document and make them findable. His system captures bibliographic data 15000 references. His dataset has 97000 images, a large percentage of the available images. We saw how his database was set up. He had two summaries that the system would produce that seemed particularly interesting to the group. One showed the subject parts and the number of images in the database that fell into that category. The other was the views, also with number of images associated. Both are strings with the hierarchy separated by commas. So the various levels of granularity could be extracted from these strings. He can give us an export of any of the data we want. There are also a number of view types that he captures besides organism views, such as habitus shots, maps, and information about how the images are oriented on the page. He mentioned capturing data on the rotation of the images - something that would be very useful and which we had not previously discussed.
- IV. Question to address in the future (from Matt): Can subjectPart be a list of entries from our vocabulary, or does it need to have a single value?
- V. Comment emailed from Boyce: Just wanted to chime in and suggest that we might want to include a view for the specimen 'in habitat' at the full organism view level. In our image collections, these differ from the full organism scale images by including the 'setting'; whether that be in cultivation or in natural settings. Helps us to return to the same

specimen locale, if needed. Important for DNA, seed, vegetative propagation, herbarium voucher, image, etc. recollections.

- VI. Links shared by Jorrit (from chat): There's various anatomical ontologies in use like <https://oberon.org>. Mungall, C.J., Torniai, C., Gkoutos, G.V. et al. Uberon, an integrative multi-species anatomy ontology. Genome Biol 13, R5 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2012-13-1-r5> Uberon and many other ontologies maintain the ontologies via the OBO foundry infrastructure/process (<http://www.obofoundry.org/>).

Note from Steve added after the meeting: See also

<https://github.com/tdwg/ac/blob/master/views/background.md> for a list of other potentially relevant OBO Foundry ontologies.

- VII. Next meeting time: We basically ran out of time, so we will meet again in two weeks to pick up the conversation where we left off. At the next meeting, we can try to map out the next steps for actual vocabulary development. Same time (15:00 UTC) on Wed. May 27.