


Project Roadmap



Key:


L-C DX = Local to Central Data Exchange
 C-L DX = Central to Local Data Exchange
 Local db = Member Program database

*Confirm priority with member programs


Data Exchange Epics To Incorporate Into Broader Roadmap.

- On Demand DX Not ranked
- C-L DX: Dist. data Not ranked
- DX w/ non-Biotics Not ranked
- Mgt. rel data sets Not ranked

These items will be incorporated into the roadmap when their scope is better defined.



Other epics that have not yet been prioritized



How to Interpret the Roadmap

- This is focused on our plans for managing software development activities, as well as planning periods that will require significant time from the same people (both developers and testers).
- There are three lanes of capacity available. This is done to limit overall complexity at a given point in time.
- The items on the roadmap are our broad areas of development, known as epics.
- In order to be included on the roadmap, an item must have a definable scope. It must be possible to reach a point at which we can declare the item to be complete. Additional improvements can be made, but they will likely be handled as part of [ongoing development](#).
- The size (total area) of each roadmap item represents our best guess at the total effort to implement it. However, sizes are approximate and reflect the general magnitude rather than a very specific estimate. But roughly speaking:
 - For a single development lane, 1 pixel of height represents 2 hours of effort
 - For an epic spanning two lanes, 1 pixel of height represents 4 hours of effort
 - For an epic that is taking up some of the Ongoing Development lane, 1 pixel of height represents 1.33 hours of effort
- An epic can be split into multiple roadmap items in order to front load some higher priority aspects.
- Gaps are used to indicate places in which all items above the gap will be completed before continuing on to the next items on the roadmap.
- Each roadmap item is hyperlinked to a page that provides further details about the epic.

Immediate Priorities

Here is the rationale for why some items have been included the list of immediate priorities.

[Observation Conduit](#) - alleviates pain points until a broader solution is available.

[Observation Data Management System](#) - at a minimum, we need an immediate budget proposal for research that is necessary to determine an estimated cost.

[QA for Partner Provided Edits](#) - the inclusion assumes that we can come up with a fairly low cost solution.

[Ecological Integrity Assessment \(EIA\) - Element Level](#) - this is something we have been trying to advance for 10 years. Need to understand how much is supported through extensible tables, and hope to identify lower cost ways to implement the highest needs.

Additional Priorities

These are listed in no particular order.

[Extensible Tables](#) - Shelley suspects a lot of programs are being quiet until an easy solution is available. Possible candidate to present the SQL workarounds in a webinar?

[Streamlined UI](#) (per instance) - could be elevated if funding were available

[Custom Views/Data Access](#) (per user) - could be elevated if funding were available

[Data Visualization](#)

[Central Biotics Map Viewer](#)

[Other Identification Integration](#)

[Taxonomy Service](#)

[Dashboards](#)

Long Term Priorities

These are listed in no particular order.

[Habitat Climate Change Vulnerability Index \(HCCVI\)](#) - viewed as long term priority if Kristin can confirm the existing extensible fields are capturing the data that needs to be captured

[Red List for Communities](#) - Same rationale, also need to confirm with Kristin

[Species Climate Change Vulnerability Index \(CCVI\)](#) - Same rationale; need to confirm with Anne

[Red List for Species](#)

[Data Exchange with Non-Biotics programs](#) - we need to discuss impact with conservation services, but there is some reluctance to prioritize functionality that doesn't benefit Biotics users. Perhaps there are specific ways to alleviate pain points? One main complication is missing data and impact on MJD quality.

[Data Management for LAC](#) - assumption is that observation data management solution would go a long way toward meeting their needs. Less need for EO data. Cost (for individual programs) and technical approach (subnational agency focus) are other issues.

[Eco Obs](#) - assumption is that observation data management solution would meet a lot of these needs, and would like to try to shape overall needs into something that would better fit into what might be available.

[CMECS data management](#) - could potentially be moved higher if work is funded

[Topology/Precision/Tolerance/Geometric Complexity](#) - not broad impact; portions might be handled through spatial import.