# May 2011 - ideas for EIMC “Birds of a Feather” sessions

Published on *LTER Information Management* (http://im.lternet.edu)



---

## May 2011 - ideas for EIMC “Birds of a Feather” sessions

Mon, 05/02/2011 - 1:13pm — mobrien

Introduction:
https://eim.ecoinformatics.org/eim2011 [1]
http://im.lternet.edu/news/meetings/2011 [2]

Birds of a Feather sessions are 1-2 hour open session that allows a group to meet and discuss or work on many types of activities, such as discussions of new technologies, demonstrations of software and systems, coding sessions to work on some new software or feature, technical tutorials, and many other things. The BoF sessions could partly replace our working-group breakout sessions, for topics that are of interest to all meeting participants. BoF sessions will be reviewed by the EIMC programs committee as for oral presentations and posters.

Proposals for BoF sessions are due July 31. IMExec wants to identify who will propose the BoF sessions of interest to LTER.

Monday, May 2: Present: Don, Emery, Margaret, Gastil, John P, Kristin Mark S, Jamie, Suzanne, Philip, Theresa
This group identified 11 ideas, and each person chose 3 from the list. They

thought that the Tuesday group might want to consider this list as a starting place.

Tuesday, May 3: Present: Wade, Margaret, Corrina, Yang Xia, Dan, Ken, Aaron
This group started with the list created on Monday.

Ideas:
1. value-added databases for synthesis, with ClimDB as a model. Tools. Are there databases that we should be putting together with other folks? Is there a community models for Question-driven synthesis databases? 2 aspects: tools to use to construct, 2: share experiences constructing these. An ecoinformatics-rich environment, not a science environment. e.g., ClimDB might be the answer to somebody else's problem.

ClimbDB may be too LTER specific. Perhaps combine with #2a - how to relate spatial data to other database models.

2a. managing spatial data, particularly large datasets like LiDAR.

2b. internet mapping, devel for web.

3. use of LTER sites as repositories for other types of data, such as Macrosystems Ecology. Or a general discussion about DataONE, who are the nodes? Vision for federating data. How do we make all of our data cross-searchable? Might be best led by someone from DataONE.

Perhaps combines with #9. How different groups can interoperate and find places to manage and store data, not necessarily in KNB. How to grow IM programs to support new groups. Should groups look internally for IM systems, or look to external groups such as those associated with DataOne?

4. web services. the question which needs in common, systems to help meet those needs. Unit Dictionary useful by others. Outsiders may have WS useful to us.

5. Drupal as a framework for developing IM tools. Broader community may be interested in DEIMS. 5 or 6 of us work on it - would be nice to have outside input. there were some OBFS folks working on this, talked in Sept. KV - yes, obfs and USGS. Kyle Kwizer.

6. Quality Assurance. QA of streaming data, as followup as what we did before. Not the actual streaming data itself. Presentation and fast delivery. no common framework for getting sensor data on the web. some would be interested in how you go from realtime to archived data product.

7. Metadata quality. wrt EML, could include discussion of congruency and checker.

8. Managing and archiving models

Development of workflow systems to input, process, and output. Create metadata for process. Sharing of code. Relates to #10

9. different IM paradigm of data management, where value-added products are produced centrally, rather than at sties. Less processing at our site and more in the system. Has a lot in common with #1, #10

There may be a lot of info management needed for various projects that might justify people coming together as networks.

10 Scientific work-flows

11 practices for sharing knowledge definitions and logic, especially where want to combing knowledge from many domain and not reinvent the wheel. Could include controlled vocabs and ontology.Has features in common with web services in general, #4

12. Community standards and practices development. Creation of community data models and date federation schemas. ODM. Relates to #1 and #3. How general should models be? Finding balance between allowing for diversity of data and allowing for specific needs of specific types of data. Focus on specific models as a starting point for discussion. Using web services related to #4.

Poll (which would you attend?):
Don - 7, 3, 1 (1 + 9 + 10)
Emery - all - 8, 3, 6, 7
Margaret - 2a, 4, 7, 11
Mark - 3, 4, 9, 7
John P - 6, 1, 7
Theresa - 2a, 2b, 8
suzanne - 1, 4, 1+9+10
Jamie - 2a, 2b, 6
kristin - 2b, 6
Philip - 2, 5, 8
Adam - 2b, 6, 11
Gastil - 3, 4, 7, 9

- Virtual Updates [3]


This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Cooperative Agreement #DEB-0236154. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in the material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.
Please contact us with questions, comments, or for technical assistance regarding this web site.

---

**Source URL:** http://im.lternet.edu/node/873

**Links:**
[1] https://eim.ecoinformatics.org/eim2011
[2] http://im.lternet.edu/news/meetings/2011

[3] http://im.lternet.edu/taxonomy/term/169