

iNaturalist Identifier system good and can be very fast

Ability to discuss id with recorder and other Identifiers is good, albeit could be better utilised

for us it is the ability for a wider group of people to give us data beyond the honey pot locations most visit.

Quality of ids on iNAT very good for caddis

user friendly encouraging new recorders

Species dictionaries seem to be updated fairly frequently

projects for specific geographical areas very useful

location mechanism avoids inaccurate grid references

For some taxa, like angiosperms, the AI and community support leads to a high level of correct IDs

The crowd-sourced verification helps to cut-down the work of the iRecord verifiers as they only receive Research Grade records

the AI generally detects when a species is unusual for the area.

Thinking about the quality of individual iNatUK records, what's already good or working well?

Non-recorders really like it and can quickly understand and participate.

iNat records of species outside of the normal UK inventory have been useful for tracking the intentional release/escape of exotic pets in Britain and Ireland.

interactive with generally good feedback to encourage more recording

it enables us to engage with new recorders and encourage them to get involved and become more active.

It enables us to reach a wider range of users who would not otherwise submit records

It is all working very well for me. iNat to iRECORD. Data looks good too.

it's useful for species that can only be verified visually or by sound

Where experts devote time to identifying things on iNat it works well

There is a visibly increasing quality of AI ID over time as more records of each taxon group are entered

The inclusion of some species aggregate groups for slugs in iNaturalist and the AI learning to use these for species that can't be done confidently from photos has been helpful

As someone working for an organisation running lots of citizen science from a distance, the ease of it is helpful to first time users. Don't know how good their records are though!

Excellent for encouraging newly-interested people to get involved in recording, understand more about the natural world around them and feel more connected to it, especially younger generation

Prioritisation of ID based on 'confirmed' records nearby

As a recorder it allows me to make photo records of species in groups I am not familiar with.

You can check back to the original record/photos to check it and amend ID if needed

Having photos with all records makes verification much quicker in iRecord than for many 'native' iRecord records.

Species that can be readily photographed by image alone, i.e. distinctive species.

generally good level of AI id. great support from other users. often the same few though.

usual issue of is there any general feedback to iNAT

We have some international verifiers who are very experienced identifiers active on iNaturalist, that would not be active on iRecord.

Interaction with some of the experts on iNat (e.g. George Greiff) has lead to scarce species being recorded (e.g. *Pezoloma marchantiae*).

it allows to flag records that are invalid (captive/zoos, etc.)

You get a lot of records for common / charismatic species

I've catalogued photos for a long time and tagged with gridrefs. Extracting info for import to the database is tedious. On iNat I can just drop them on and get corrections very quickly

photo better than no photo records in many cases

Records remain open to peer review over time as they all have photos

The suggested identification is generally good even from poor photos

Stage/method aren't mandatory fields which can make verification harder

A location name isn't required by default. This means its difficult to verify that grid references are correct

Still getting species ID'd as US species and not UK.

no feedback from irecord verification

What are the issues that are limiting the value of individual iNatUK records?

Too few agreements to reach 'Research Grade' - this is a misleading term

User-name equivalence and taxonomic equivalence between both systems needs to be worked out

Location names given on iNat often do not "catch up" with the geolocation, so are insufficiently vague or incorrect for verifiers on iRecord

iNat users sometimes not checking their old observations and agreeing with new IDs, maybe reminders could be sent to Mavericks?

Technically challenging to get photos of id features some taxa

The fact that people do not check the location and narrow the circle of accuracy when inputting records - particularly when using the App.

Where experts don't engage with the ID on iNat then they won't get good data into iRec

Lack of an expert opinion weight

As the two systems were originally unlinked recorders may have added the same record to both iNaturalist and iRecord (including me!)

Lack of certainty regarding location data

Very poor quality photos of subjects too far away, out of focus or blurred (e.g. from a moving vehicle).

Loss of any permissions the recorder assigns to other iNat users when records are exported/transferred to NBN

Where data is ID'd by me I want those to go into iRec as verified

The AI learning from incorrect IDs and pushing all records of a cryptic species to a specific single species.

Recording species interactions through the observation fields has a lot of potential, though the observation fields are an uncontrolled space, not available for the app, and not clear for new users.

There have been examples of records being added with dates and locations taken from the photo EXIF data, and that do not represent the actual date and location where the species was seen

Species which cannot be identified visually (or by voice)

Having to go back to iNaturalist to correct ID mistakes so that recorders learn

IDs by experts aren't ranked higher than by (incorrect) novices

The AI (Computer Vision) can be trained incorrectly by incorrect identifications of past records.

Does not give any indication of characters needed in the photo for successful ID

some species just can't be id from a photo. some move too quick to get a photo.

The annotations could be more specific, e.g. Fruiting -> Ripe fruit or Developing fruit

'Competitive' element of iNat encourages people to check 'agree' to a record even if they may not really know.

Poor quality or not enough photos (e.g. photo taken at an angle not suitable for ID)

iNat not understanding which species it is suitable for and which it is not.

Some species regularly misidentified at research grade (e.g., bluebells) because they appear easier to a non-specialist than they actually are

Recorders not being aware that the license they choose may restrict the usefulness of their data

Poor at species that can't be separated by photos obviously - but identifications still get research grade

Clearly it only works well for species that can be ID'd from fairly poor photos

AI IDs are just in list form, rather than given any probability (compare ObsIdentify, which works much better for this aspect)

Difficult to use data in record centres because certain values are missing, grid references aren't accurate enough, confusion around licencing agreements etc.

People only recording larger, common species as they are easily found. May not have as much value for recording schemes as the smaller or more rare species.

Reliance on initially accurate GPS - user is not prompted to 'check' location is correct when entering record

No issues for me so I must be missing something, or just lucky

most people don't realise licencing restricts useability

Licences for most records restrictive - should volunteer verifiers be verifying records they can't use?

Most observations have the default licence type CC BY-NC that is unacceptable to our recording scheme.