Notes from the 2018-02-27 meeting of the IM Exec

Zoom channel: https://ucsb.zoom.us/j/8058932071

Attending:
Gastil (Chair); Stevan Earl (notetaker); Wade Sheldon; Suzanne Remillard; Jason Downing (unable to attend); Marty Downs

EB report (W. Sheldon w/input from Marty):

Texas group
There was additional discussion about the self-funded group from Texas interested to join or collaborate with the LTER. Frank Davis contacted the NSF program team, who came back with a "we will see" type answer. Collaboration is very welcome, but there is concern on the side of the LTER about potential NCO resources that could be required to support such a relationship.

Possible additional focus on data at future science council meetings
Marty noted that the EB is thinking about how to make the science council meetings more productive. An area of consideration is to place greater focus on data. As such, IMs *could* be tapped to provide information in advance of future council meetings.

A unique EDI skin for LTER?
Marty added that Corinna had reported how the EDI's advisory board met, and, as we have heard, are not supportive of separate LTER and EDI skins for the data repositories. As such, now would be a good time for IM Exec to weigh in with thoughts on this matter. Wade suggested that this is entirely about branding, and is not related to code or effort. This could be a discussion point when we talk about aggregate repositories at the upcoming VTC with the IMC. Gastil suggested that losing the LTER skin could be seen as one less reason to choose the EDI repository. Marty mentioned that Corinna raised the point that groups other than just the LTER contribute to EDI, and they [EDI] could run into a situation where some of the other groups (e.g., OBFS) may then also want their own skins. Marty: Most critical is that people can find the data. Gastil - what about resources, does EDI have the resources to provide extra services just to LTER?

Stevan suggested that IM Exec needs to consider how to explore this topic further.

Wade suggests that we should broach this issue during the VTC on the emerging multi-repository landscape.

Action item:
● Wade will raise this issue during the March IMC VTC.

EB rep

Recall that Wade's term as EB rep ends in May 2018.

Gastil: we need to ascertain who would have interest in this position.

Wade: According to the IMC TOR the IMC EB rep's term ends prior to the SC meeting in May and the elected successor's term starts at the SC meeting following their election, but we identified that this is not practical because: 1) the EB expects the IMC rep to offer expert and informed advice on current topics the EB is considering and a new rep wouldn't be sufficiently informed; 2) EB members terms end after the SC so the IMC rep's term should ideally coincide with this rotation. An election was also not held during the 2017 IMC meeting, so no successor has been identified for this year. Wade suggests having an electronic election (e.g, by survey) to elect a new EB rep in the spring prior to the ASM.

Suzanne asked why we could not elect the new EB rep at the ASM, and have them start after that meeting.

Wade responded that this would be possible, but having the EB rep elect start earlier would give them a softer ramp up.

Gastil: Asking if Wade is EB rep and a member of IM Exec? Group: we think so. Confirmed.

Suzanne indicated that, per the bylaws, the EB rep can be a member of IM Exec, but, if they are not, then they would be an ex-officio member of IM Exec.

Separate but related, IM Exec will need to elect two new members at the upcoming ASM: terms of Wade and Gastil will both end.

Generally decided that IM Exec will work now to have a spring election for a new EB rep, and address the two IM Exec positions at the ASM.

Possible candidates for EB rep: Stevan, Mary, Dan, Emory. Mary has not been on IM Exec, therefore ineligible. The group had a separate conversation suggesting that we should consider revising the bylaws to remove this constraint - the rule is to ensure the EB rep has experience but, in reality, a sufficient number of years as an IM would be just as appropriate.

IM Exec will reach out to targeted individuals who they feel would serve the position well (noted above), and will put out a broad call for self-nomination.

Action items:
- Gastil will reach out Dan.
- Suzanne will reach out to Marty

- Gastil will put out the call for self-nomination

Though it is universally agreed that Emory would be an excellent EB rep, we will not target him specifically owing to his already many years of excellent service, and instead will allow him to respond to the general call if he is interested. Note that the same sentiment applies to others, such as Don and John as well.

Once elected the EB elect would start with the June VTC.

Gastil suggested that the electronic election be held after the March VTC

EB does have to approve the EB rep elect, but Wade suggested that this will likely be rubber-stamped.

Post-meeting updates:
- from Gastil: Dan B. will consider nomination for the position of EB Rep.
- from Suzanne: Mary Martin says that she has not served on IMEXEC, but is willing to be nominated for IMEXEC.

Working group reports

Congruency checker

Gastil: date time checks were added to staging but implementation issues caused us to remove them, and are now only on dev. The group is looking into alternative ways to implement this functionality.

Gastil: the group discussed how we will address funding checks in light of EML 2.2, which has a different structure. The check looks to see if funding metadata are detailed, but how do we check against the previous position (i.e., in < EML 2.2) and the new, recommded position and structure (in EML 2.2)?

DEIMS

Did not contact this group, and did not receive an update. Unsure who is the contact for this group - Wade suggests it is probably best to contact Yang. Unsure how much Hap and Jim are involved. Eda is involved but she is dealing with difficult conditions in PR.

Post-meeting update:
- from Gastil: The DEIMS group reports that they have not met since their October 2017 meeting, which was cancelled due to the hurricane. Eda is leading the DEIMS working group.

ToR/By-laws

Suzanne: The working group needs to go through the draft that is in Google Drive to address and rectify comments.

WiRED

Suzanne: This group will meet 2018-02-29. Marty will lead the discussion as to what options are available, and how we will interact with the NCO website.

Marty: Will have a debate as to whether to continue the IM site in its current state (in Drupal 7), or consider how we would roll it into the LTER WordPress site.

Suzanne suggests that once options are identified, that we should have a VTC to identify new participants to contribute to the effort.

LTER Website Recommendations

Mary and Marty are trying to coordinate schedules. There is a draft of proposed changes, some additional discussion is required, then it can go out for a RFC.

Gastil suggested that this group needs to consider whether the RFC will go to the sites (site leadership) or the IMs, or both.

EML 2.2

Gastil suggests that we have an out-of-band VTC to ensure that all sites IMs are informed that a new version of EML is in development and will be implemented soon.

Suzanne: Who would lead this meeting?

Gastil offered to moderate, and Margaret offered to provide content and Q&A.

Suzanne: Why would this have to be in March?

Wade agrees with some comments by Marty that getting ahead of the release would be prudent. There are components of EML 2.2 (e.g., more structured funding metadata) that are likely to be very welcome and of great interest to some groups.

Wade recommends that we should have an email reminder timed with the release, and that there will be resources for Q&A. This will give IMs an opportunity to review documents before the VTC. With that approach, we could do this in a regularly-scheduled April or May VTC.

Per Wade's suggestion, this **will be** a topic for a regularly scheduled VTC in April or May, whichever most coincides with the release. (Not an extra vtc in March.)

Future VTCs

March topic: aggregated repositories

Action items:
- Wade will send an email in advance of the shared repository VTC to set up the discussion
- Wade will lead and vette discussion topics on the discussion
- As noted above, Wade will raise the issue of maintaining the separate EDI, LTER skins that are part of the EDI repository during the March IMC VTC
- Gastil will reach out to Matt to see if he can participate in the VTC
  - Update: Matt is willing to participate March 12th.

Future topic: EML 2.2

Action item:
- Wade and Gastil will prepare an email to the IMC regarding EML 2.2 in advance of the VTC that will coincide with the release.

Miscellaneous:

Marty: Organic matter dynamics is an upcoming future science council topic. IMs should be prepared for possible requests for data of this type. Unclear if this was a general statement, of if Marty intends to do something formal about this point.

Marty: Sites IMs have edit write to their profile on the LTER website, and will soon have csv upload capability. The website syncs with LDAP.