Home > IM Exec > IM Exec VTC 2011-12-01

IM Exec VTC 2011-12-01

Wed, 11/02/2011 - 3:42pm — mobrien [1]

1 December 2011 -- 10:00 AM Mountain

Participants
Members: Don Henshaw, Margaret O'Brien (co-chairs), Dan Bahauddin, Sven Bohm, Emery Boose, John Chamblee, Jason Downing
Ex officio: James Brunt
Guests: Linda Powell, M. Gastil-Buhl

Topics
1. Meetings
2. NISAC Report (Gastil)
3. Proposal Reviews
4. EB Report

1. Meetings

IM-Exec winter meeting. Meet at LNO. LTER renewal proposals are due Feb 6. CWT annual meeting is Feb 7-8. BNZ annual meeting is Feb 17-18. Try to schedule meeting for last week of January or sometime in February, possibly in conjunction with the ECC workshop. Nearly all of IM-Exec would be interested in attending the ECC workshop. IM-Exec members submitting renewals should check with their site management about traveling the last week of January. Set up Doodle to schedule meeting.

IMC meeting report. Notes are posted online. Need a volunteer to compile into a single PDF (does not need to be concise). Dan compiled report last year.

IMC meeting survey. Required by LNO operational plan. Last year Don created survey with help from LNO. Anonymous responses are preferable.

Water coolers. Recommend skipping December water cooler. Set up Doodle to schedule January water cooler. Planning topics is IM-Exec's responsibility. List of potential topics on IM website. Recommend same time on Monday and 1 hour later on Tuesday. Consistency in schedule is important.

IM-Exec VTC. Set up Doodle for mid-January meeting.

2. NISAC Report (Gastil)

Action items from the recent NISAC meeting:

1. Gastil and Linda to join this call.

2. The EB asked NISAC to consider archiving Linx data. NISAC recommends that the LTER network host data but not curate to best practices. Linx to contact IMs for advice on options. Maybe discovery-level EML in the LTER system. Data currently in spreadsheets only.

3. Bob Waide will provide a document to NISAC describing low-hanging fruit to improve data availability. NISAC will use the document to create a white paper for the EB outlining the roles of sites, scientists, and LNO.

4. NISAC will recommend to the IMC that sites conform to EML best practices.

5. Decide on a standard definition of an LTER dataset. Granular vs. lumped. No consensus yet. Also no definition of what it means for a dataset to be online.

6. Decide on a time and location for the NISAC meeting. Maybe a joint meeting with IM-Exec? Was last year's meeting effective? Depends on the agendas for each group. No agenda to date for NISAC meeting.

"Online" is still a vague concept. "Pasta-ready" is more complex. Possible definition of "online": EML is available in a network catalog and a URL exists that returns data. IM-Exec could propose a definition to NISAC. Margaret will forward a candidate definition to IM-Exec for comment.

3. Proposal Reviews

Linda and Gastil joined IM-Exec for review of workshop and buy-out proposals.

In late November, individual members reviewed each proposal and circulated comments to the larger group. In preparation for this meeting, Don compiled these comments into a single document. At the meeting, members discussed the merits of each proposal and suggestions for improvement. A member was assigned to write up discussion points for each proposal. Don and Margaret will assemble these comments, circulate them to the group for final comment, and then forward them to proposers and to LNO.

4. EB Report

EB conference call on Oct 17.

1. Report from NSF (Saran and Matt). The 30-year review was commissioned and accepted by the BIO Advisory Committee. Recommendations will include defining uniquely what LTER does and identifying research questions that cannot be answered without long-term data. Other recommendations will address IM, cross-site activities, inclusion of social science, education, resources, and a leadership role for LTER among other observational networks. The LTER working group does not agree with all of the report recommendations and is preparing a response.

Renewal proposals. Language about IM deliverables and milestones in the proposal guidelines refers to the IM review criteria. The IM review criteria were provided to site review teams last summer and can be used to help structure the IM section in renewal proposals. Keep in mind that reviewers will go online and try to find data. NSF is keen on milestones and deliverables right now.

Data accessibility. Not all site data are available through the LNO Metacat. Sites are variable in

how data are presented and accessed. The NIS will help to address this concern. Sites can indicate a timeline for materials not yet online. Saran has not yet discussed user access forms with the LTER WG.

2. Pilot data project. IMs from SGS, BNZ, and CWT are gathering information for the RFP. An inventory of all LTER-related data will be created for each site, including status, priority, work required, data format, metadata, QA/QC completed or needed, special requirements, PI or contact, and estimate of contractor time required. The EML congruency checker is in development but will not be completed in time for the pilot project. The contractor may perform additional QA/QC checks.

3. LTER publications. What constitutes an LTER publication? Some sites do not distinguish funding sources. It is good to be generous but not good to be seen as padding publication lists. The LTER publication list is often used at NSF but this is awkward where LTER is not acknowledged. Discuss this issue further at the meeting with NSF next winter.

EB conference call on Nov 7.

1. Report from NSF (Saran). The LTER working group has finished its response to the 30-year report and the BIO AD is reading and commenting on the WG report. Lots of interest in LTER across the Foundation. The fact that a 30-year review was done has led some at NSF to think about taking a look at the LTER program. Questions have been raised about the 6-year funding cycle, the legal basis for putting sites on probation, the use of supplements, the configuration of the LNO, etc. Maybe rethink approach to data management. In general, make LTER more compliant with other NSF programs.

NSF Science Board has strongly recommended re-competition across the Foundation: synthesis centers, major equipment facilities, etc. Possibly to include LTER sites (not just LNO). This is an opportunity for LTER PIs to assert the science leadership role of LTER, e.g. via the LTER mini-symposia.

NSF is assembling the LTER review panel for next spring and the LNO site review team for next summer. Also developing guidelines on how to write LTER annual reports.

2. Discussion of information management. Ongoing concerns about data availability were highlighted in recent video by Bob Robbins (a sophisticated computer user but not familiar with LTER). The video was instructive about how people look for things on the web and the need to make everything crystal clear.

The LNO Metacat is not as effective as it could be. Some issues could be addressed by making improvements to the default style sheets.

A network survey is needed to identify which datasets are available online and the reasons why some datasets are not available. Need to clarify what is meant by a "dataset." The congruency checker might help with the survey.

According to Saran, reviewers will be charged with going to individual websites to look for data. Which projects have data available? Do the data represent the full spectrum of work at the site? Can reviewers find the data they expect to find given the site's history?

The LTER WG has discussed user access forms. Are there other options for getting an idea of how data are used? Login forms restrict access to LTER data from some search engines.

Need to clarify the role of site-based information managers vs. LNO. Also need to clarify site vs. network IM commitments. Currently IMs are asked to do everything.

Also need to clarify the role of derived datasets. So far the primary responsibility of sites has been to raw or minimally processed data. Who will curate derived datasets?

Linx datasets. This is a good time to rescue the data and make it available. At present the data exist as a series of dedicated spreadsheets while the metadata is in publications only. IM was not written into the project because of cost constraints. NSF has asked why the data are not online.

3. Pilot data project. Site documents are nearly ready. Bob will check the language of the RFP based on Saran's comments. Still need to write a proposal.

Attachment	Size
2011_ECC_requirements_workshop.pdf [2]	20.83 KB
2011_SiteDB_product-oriented_proposal.pdf [3]	64.49 KB
NIS_Data_Portal_Prod_orient_WG_Proposal_12.pdf [4]	89.35 KB
EML_mentor_buyout_2011.pdf [5]	21.65 KB
personneldb_compensation_proposal_2011_11_28_final.pdf [6]	85.73 KB

Meeting Notes [7]

Source URL: http://im.lternet.edu/node/935

Links:
[1] http://im.lternet.edu/user/27
[2] http://im.lternet.edu/sites/im.lternet.edu/files/2011_ECC_requirements_workshop.pdf
[3] http://im.lternet.edu/sites/im.lternet.edu/files/2011_SiteDB_product-oriented_proposal.pdf
[4] http://im.lternet.edu/sites/im.lternet.edu/files/NIS_Data_Portal_Prod_orient_WG_Proposal_12.pdf
[5] http://im.lternet.edu/sites/im.lternet.edu/files/EML_mentor_buyout_2011.pdf
[6] http://im.lternet.edu/sites/im.lternet.edu/files/personneldb_compensation_proposal_2011_11_28_final.pdf
[7] http://im.lternet.edu/taxonomy/term/3