

Notes from January 14, 2019 IMC VWC:

Participants: Gastil, Suzanne, Emery, Marty, Jason, Margaret, Kristin, Corinna, Mark S, Tim, Chris T, Sven, Hsun-yi, Kris Hall, Sarah Elmendorf, Duane, John P, Stace B, Hap, Dan Bahauddin, Colin.

Overview of Review process (Marty): NSF approached NCO and SC about a 40 year review; need to be clear about the value of the program; timeline is the review with external committee (LTER performance and NSF management) will be constituted in Fall 2019 with reviews spring 2020. Trying to gather info for document within next couple of months in prep for SC in May. The 30 year review highlighted some issues with IM; although we know that it is very strong. This 2 pager is an opportunity to describe how important IM in the network really is.

Address concerns from the 30 yr review

Last 10 years not possible without the previous 30 years

CG: Don't focus on products, but what came out of them and how it supported science. Emphasize how we have improved our data in the repository, the quality checks, accessibility of data.

MOB: Do we have a primary message? We are now able to converge on the way we do things and this is due to being apart of a network.

JP: Our message: More data, more sharing, easier sharing. Each decade has seen a revolution in accessibility to data.

HG: We should demonstrate how our capabilities have increased/advanced over the past decade. What can we point to that we could site as examples? Synthesis working groups?

CG: Yes, we need to come up with examples and maybe say what we will do in the next decade.

JP: The proof will come through data citations.

MD: Synthesis working groups are using data, but we don't know where they're getting the data.

CG: It may be OK, if we can just find the dataset in PASTA.

JP: They have done a good job in informatics; using workflows.

HG: Emily Stanley's request for cross-site publications, created some hand work. Is there a way to know what data publications are using?

If they are citing the DOI.

Should we play up the data DOI's?

We should convey a sense of excitement; talk about cool, neat stuff.

SE: Maybe frame it in the FAIR principles and how we conform to these principles.

HG: Other things to highlight? Can we showcase how we are broader than LTER?

EIMC, ESIP; we should definitely take credit for EDI.

We need to also credit the first 30 years and what it has enabled.

Peter Groffman is especially enthused about EDI and wants to write about how the IMC has really led this development.

The quality checks have really improved our data.

There are outside testimonials.

We need to strike a balance between emphasizing our data quality versus the cost.

Really best to come up with examples of how we have improved the science.

Code generation provided with datasets has been greatly admired.

Highlight the experience and knowledge of the community; we've seen so many datasets and have worked with many datasets.

Highlight how we are informing the next generation of information managers.

Anything from the PASTA development end (Mark S and Duane): Hugely informed by IMC to develop requirements and use cases in development; most of feedback still comes from LTER IMC. The ECC is an ongoing collaborative effort that should be highlighted.

EDI gets a lot of inquiry about how to do data management from other groups.

How was it for the new sites to get started with IM? Where they able to take advantage of products that already existed?

Web services from PASTA are extremely valuable.

Help writing (working group):

Kristin would help with DEIMS; Margaret, John, , Emery, Corinna, Chris T (editing), Sven (editing)

Process: Create a working group with IMEXEC members to move these ideas forward. Send out the Google Doc URL via email.