Q4: Please comment on the segment of the meeting that was most effective
VTC with Saran

Open group discussion time

having the NSF discussion period early in the day, followed by a plenary discussion period. Even given our frequent video and phone discussions, it's often the case that not everyone is fully aware of network-level issues that affect the IMC. This year the "issue" is re-competition of a central office. But the organization of our one-day let everyone be heard on this.

I thought the open morning discussion regarding the vision of a new data center was effective and directly fed to one of the day's last working group breakouts on a proposal to NSF to consider the RFP for a new data center, which was highly productive.

Planning discussions

planning the data center scoping proposal

In this time of uncertainty, it was very effective to have an organic meeting that was able to take shape as we discussed things.

The group discussion on IMC planning for the future and smaller working group breakouts were the most effective

The call with Dr. Twombly and the discussion immediately following.

The breakout session for developing the funding planning workshop to work on the advising NSF for the future of the network office(s). Also, the phone call with Saran was helpful as usual.

Getting Saren's comments early provided useful guidance for the rest of the day.

The open discussion of the whole IMC regarding the future of the LNO was very good.

break out groups were good

Q5: Please comment on the segment of the meeting that was least effective
planning for future without enough information not productive

Time spent designing the agenda

It would have been very useful to have a report-back after our late-afternoon breakouts. But I understand that this was impossible. Perhaps the 3 groups can post summaries at im.lternet.edu, in this year's meeting area?

I think the early afternoon concurrent breakouts on a vision of the new data center might have been the weakest, but was still useful.

Timekeeping

talking about nisac.

There could have been more pre-meeting preparation. It mayhave been more effective to hold a

series of "update" VTCs ahead of the meeting for those working groups that were not able to report out. There were no nominee statements or sitebytes.

conflicting schedule on the Tuesday(July 8)

I think some of the prolonged plenary discussions could be handled better with breakout sessions.

Only having one day for our meeting limited discussion regarding our response to the changing network office and the needs of NISAC.

Seeing the posters and the variety of metadata standards and database solutions. EML and metacat is only a small player.

Most of ESIP was for programers since the theme was sustainable software. Not something I have time for.

The breakout groups were allot of the same discussions and I don't feel their output was worth the time spent in the discussion groups.

The working group follow ups about data centers was GREAT but would have benefited by having more time to have additional discussion, although perhaps everyone was burned out at that point.

the planning of the agenda part, and I would have liked to have heard reports from working groups.

It was great to have the flexibility to work on what came up and was deemed most important rather than having a fixed pre-planned schedule.

Q6: What format or logistical changes would you suggest to make the meeting more effective?
more IMC meeting time with less joint meetings except ASM

More time for discussions and working group activities

none. I don't think I would have organized the meeting any differently.

I think planning one single session for working groups to report back at the very end of the day would be more effective. For example, we could have reported from both breakout sessions all at once and collectively produced an action item list as a reminder for the next steps forward.

I missed hearing the reports from working groups.

For this type of meeting, the free-form style worked well.

I would like to NOT have our IM meeting coupled with a larger conference/meeting with the exception of the LTER ASM.

We may need to put in place more formal mechanisms for participation so that certain members of the community do not dominate or sidetrack a given discussion. A greater focus on breakouts that have a clear charge and more time for formal (and written) reporting back, followed by

brief plenary discussions, might be all that is necessary.

Meeting at a LTER site or field station

I would have liked to attend some of the other sessions that were going on at the same time as the IMC, so if future scheduling could prevent that overlap that would be great!

Need more time

1. have a good agenda. 2. stick to it... 3. wish we had a mixer the night before (although our group was good). and we didn't have site bites or any time to really identify issues that sites are dealing with.

Q11: **Please use the space below to provide additional comments about the 2014 IMC meeting, or suggestions you have for improving future meetings?**
great IMC (whole group) discussions, but need to work on demonstration of use of PASTA to support Science Counsel research projects (ANPP this year). more time needed to maximize investment of annual IMC meeting time. 2-1/2 day annual IMC meeting would be preferable with primary focus of supporting SC initiatives. more lead time on SC science focus would also be useful (what is next year's science topic? - another core area?)

Have the IMC meeting at the end of the conference or the last day. This includes the ASM. This gives the IM's a chance to start the conference listening, and by the time the IM meeting rolls around there might be more productive conversations to leverage from. Serve beer or other drinks at the meeting.

It was a very productive meeting. A final recap session would be very useful.

It would be good to have LTER represented at other ESIP meetings.

I think it would be great to meet with ESIP every year, but I think we benefit greatly from meeting for 1.5 days on our own. Maybe this sentiment will change with the new LNO structure.

The place selected by the ESIP community was awful. Too high making people sick and facilities didn't provide for group of people to meet and work together.

An agenda that, in the absence of tasks to accomplish Network projects, such as EML, NIS, etc. will accommodate individual sites' issues. That is, take into consideration what the sites' needs are. Maybe there is more common issues that we are aware of.

Thanks for your effort, overall, It's a great meeting, and learn a lot.

I think it is important for those that want to attend outside meetings to have some kind of support (money) to do so but would like the IM Meeting to be a stand alone meeting (except for the LTER ASM). Given the discussion with Saran regarding a Data Center, it does seem important to make those outside connections so support for those IMs who'd like to attend conferences and invitations to outside guests would be a good start.

The ESIP meeting was interesting and I am glad we tried it once. However, unless there is another informatics group whose interests align much more closely with ours, I cannot imagine a justification for the expense of collocating with such a meeting again. We do need greater outreach to other communities, but this should be a targeted effort with specific goals in mind.

A followup or closing meeting after attending the rest of the ESIP sessions would have been valuable, I think the LTER community has allot of parallels with other groups that attended ESIP and the things I learned would be relevant to our IMC meeting discussions.

I think the IMC needs more time at both ASM and co-located meetings to have self organized working group meetings outside of the 1 day IMC meeting. These have been scheduled during dinners often but are not as productive as a dedicated time slot during the day.

ESIP was not a very welcoming group from my perspective. I did a session and got blank faces from folks. That time would have been better spent working on working groups, or discussing things with IM's. I went to a couple of interesting presentations, but I had trouble finding things that interested me. I don't think I could name one person from ESIP after the week. Not sure what collaboration occurred after/during the meeting, but none from my view. I can go to my professional meetings on my own, I want to spend my LTER time with other LTER folks working on LTER stuff.

the first option under 9 'Invite guests ..' is not really an option due to financial/payment limitations.

Other Comments:
I think the IMC should try to meet with ESIP again, and further, we should send a few representatives to ESIP in years when we don't formally hold our meeting with them.

There were many road maps presented before the IMC on potential directions they could take to handle the challenges they will face coming in the future. To help make the lter imc less 'lter centric', the data exchange could help, use of ISO, many different options of data center and publication systems that could be adapted to eml but present ISO to the world.

This might be just because of the current circumstances in the network, i.e. the LNO uncertainties, etc. I'm not sure we could have done much more with additional time. I think it depends on what's going on with the group. Some years we need two days and some years one is sufficient. This might just be something we have to consider for each meeting we plan.

 here seemed to be a good deal of confusion as to how long rooms were to be reserved for.

I would have liked to have more time for working group oriented IM activities.

Considering the short time (1 day) allotted for the IMC, I thought it went very well. Time constraints dictate what we can accomplish, so what do IMs expect to accomplish in 1 day vs 2 day IMC meetings?

I dislike going to a meeting where we waste valuable time discussing the agenda. we had two vtc's to plan the agenda, and I expect IM Exec to do that.

we came up with good discussion, but see above.. we could have gotten there if you all were more organized.