

## Posters Session

7019926

Virtual

Room: Virtual

EN

## Landscaping results and recommendations for improving eDNA-based data published in biodiversity archives

### Authors

**Katrina Exter** (Flanders Marine Institute (VLIZ) • Belgium)

**Emilie Boulanger** (OBIS • France)

**Peter Woollard** (EMBL-EBI • United Kingdom)

**Antonio Picazo** (University of Valencia • Spain)

**Antonio Camacho** (Spain)

**Christina Pavloudi** (EMBRC • Belgium)

**Frederic Rimet** (INRAE • France)

**Pascal Hablutzel** (Flanders Marine Institute (VLIZ) • Belgium)

### Abstract

eDNA data in the form of occurrences (taxonomic identifications) are increasingly being included in biodiversity data archives (e.g. GBIF, OBIS); more types of eDNA-derived results will inevitably follow (e.g. functional annotations). This process makes data readily available to be used for biodiversity research – studies of ecosystems, biodiversity, invasive species, monitoring, etc. The biodiversity data publishing community has been addressing issues related to integrating eDNA-based data into their archives, thus making them understandable and (re-)usable by interested scientists who may not have any background in genomics.

eDNAqua-Plan is an EU Horizon-funded project that is investigating the eDNA “data ecosystem” in Europe. With a focus on the aquatic, we are analysing the (meta)data standards, (meta)data interoperability and reusability, and the harmonisation and interconnectivity of eDNA reference libraries, DNA and biodiversity data portals, and biobanks: by landscaping this ecosystem we will identify the gaps in the smooth flow of (meta)data, and make recommendations for improvements. Our focus is on making it easier for the different types of audience – researchers, policy makers, monitoring scientists and agencies, analysts etc – to find, access, and use these data.

In this poster we will present the landscaping results and recommendations for the eDNA-based data published in biodiversity archives and eDNA material and metadata held in biobanks: how well-connected are the various stakeholders, what standards for data and metadata are used, how consistently and commonly are they used by the various stakeholders, how is eDNA-based data included in the different repositories, and what recommendations could improve the smooth flow of widely-understandable eDNA-derived data to all possible users?