

## **Notes from LTER Virtual Water Cooler of the Information Managers**

**2019-02-11**

### **FAIR (Dan presenting)**

Dan provided an overview of the proposal to become a FAIR signatory.

Hap inquired as to the governance of FAIR, and if there would be future mandates? COPDES is the organization but we are unsure of how they govern themselves. Marty noting that it is larger than LTER, EDI, or DataONE. We could always withdraw from the coalition as it is entirely voluntary and we would not have to address mandates over which we have no control. We are already adhering to the current FAIR framework.

Corinna noting that it an effort to get data-related communities to a common table.

The Information Managers in attendance voted unanimously to forward the proposal to the Executive Board.

### **Tim providing an overview of using Zotero to manage citations**

Coinna asked why Zotero over Mendeley? Tim responded that Zotero has better documentation.

Sarah inquired whether there is a way to automate changing default tags, such as the thesis types? Tim is editing the BibTex file by hand but there are some programmatic options outlined in the best practices document.

Jenn Rudgers suggested that we should complain to NSF about the difficulty of the Research.gov website given, particularly, the challenges of uploading every single PDF.

### **Marty providing an overview of the LTER Network Bibliography**

Unlike NSF, the NCO is allowing bibliographic entries for technical reports, manuals, and other miscellaneous documents.

Marty indicating that the LTER site designation in our BibTex output can be a keyword tag.

Marty chose BibTex as that seems to be the most common format among the sites; the NCO will continue to use Zotero to manage publications (so a Zotero output is acceptable also).

NCO has a search alert for any publication acknowledging LTER funding, so the NCO can maintain those relatively easily.

Please consider Marty's recommendations for acknowledging LTER support in the acknowledgements of LTER-related papers.

Jenn asking about the pipeline for looking up each DOI via crossref? Marty indicating that they have in-house tools to address that.

Marty noting that Zotero has de-duplication tools.

Jenn has a policy at SEV where they do not cite grant numbers in the papers owing to the large number of grants that could be relevant. Marty indicating that this does not need to be in the text but in the metadata.

John raising the issue of what is/not a LTER publication. This is a difficult issue. NSF is aware that sites submit publications that can be quite far afield with the link to the LTER site being somewhat grey.

Wade indicating that investigators have self-identified what is a GCE publication. Difficult to tease that apart.

Marty indicating that they know this will be a challenge, and that we have to try to address this. Should be more discussion about the criteria going forward. We need to be offering consistent guidance to the LTER sites and investigators.

Hap indicating that perhaps we could be more explicit about what should NOT be included as a site publication.

Wade adding it would help to get the PIs involved in contributing to the filter tags.

Don suggesting that looking back to pre-1980 papers, for example, and distinguishing what is a LTER or not a LTER publication would be nearly impossible.

Marty generally suggesting to do what we can in those cases, and considers filter broadly.

John noting to be sure to include conference talks in the annual report as VCR's was returned for not having included those. However, someone, not sure who, indicated that was not the case with their annual report.

John providing an overview of the new requirements to provide the PDF-A of all peer-reviewed publications to NSF.

Hap asking is we could have a cross-talk between the major ref. managers (EndNote, Zotero, etc.) and what NSF is requesting.

Marty suggesting that we should possibly just stick with thesis as the primary category then add a type or tag detailing the level/type (Ph.D., M.S., etc.). Sites not submitting those to NSF but we do want them for the Network bibliography.

Hap indicating that we need to agree on the naming of the thesis types to facilitate consistent searches. This may already be noted in the emails and instructions provided thus far.

Marty will send an email providing guidance about the thesis types.

Stevan asking about the metadata mentioned earlier in the call concerning grant numbers and how those are associated with papers. It seems that WebOfScience, for example, is scraping the funding details from the paper and putting those details in a more searchable format. It is immensely helpful for NCO to have those funding details in a searchable format. Unclear that sites need to do anything about this other than to be very explicit about acknowledging funding in the paper acknowledgements. To be sure, Marty is not expecting grant numbers to be in our BibTex citations; rather, this information should be explicit in the acknowledgements section of papers.

Marty is requesting the list of citations by March 15th.