

Notes from the 2018-04-24 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; Marty Downs

EB Report (Wade Sheldon)

They discussed the sensitivity of presentations and dialogue at the upcoming ASM. There is a general tendency toward openness, and there is an onus on presenters if they are interested to restrict the extent to which presentations are shared. A Code of Conduct might be written. The default would be presentations are open, ok to share, with the onus on the presenter to inform otherwise.

NSF is interested to be made aware of formal reports of harassment. NSF should be made aware of lawsuits, but there are a lot of moving pieces and much discussion yet to be had about this issue.

Be aware of the May 30th deadline for ASM workshop proposals.

Formal discussion on the NCO-LTER-EDI relationship, and anything that IMExec or IMC would like to contribute should be funneled through Wade in advance of the science council meeting. Wade suggests we make an announcement about this to the IMC. This is the time to offer praise or concerns.

EB is discussing the 40th annual review but nothing concrete to report at this point.

Regarding the NCO-LTER-EDI:

Marty adding: There will be a time during the EB and Science Council meetings where Frank, Marty, and Corinna will recuse themselves.

Wade adding that structured feedback from the IMExec/IMC is important. EB recognizes that this was a huge transition, and that there would be tremendous costs to yet another change.

Gastil noting that there are profound returns on the investment, and Wade seconding that this is an opportunity to advocate for additional and/or consistent funding for these efforts.

Wade will draft an email to the IMC list noting that this discussion is happening, and that IMs should send comments to him/IMExec that IMExec will then collate. Wade/IMExec can anonymize input.

Gastil asking if we should inquire about specific points or issues? Wade generally suggesting not, and that we should leave the discussion open so that IMs can offer any comments on any topic about which they would like to contribute, though later suggesting that inquiring about particular points or issues could be helpful. Wade will leave the email generally open but offer a few prompts.

Suzanne asking about the EDI proposal, and the things that were lost in the transition from NIMO to EDI - are those details available?

An assessment report was provided to EDI, Wade will inquire if it is possible to provide this report to IMC/IMExec.

Suzanne suggesting a formalized discussion between IMC and EDI to discuss what support there is for LTER specifically.

Wade commenting that there is a perception that LTER IMC does not need help, and EDI resources should therefore be focused on nascent programs. However, there are some opportunities, like the Hack-a-thon/code-sharing, that could greatly benefit LTER, but that those are in the early phases; not included in those is any compensation for coders/IMs to contribute to these efforts. Remains to be seen whether there will be user buy-in.

Suzanne: how can we, as a community, help with efforts like EML 2.2?

ACTION ITEM: Wade will draft a message regarding NCO-LTER-EDI that he will send to IM Exec for review.

ACTION ITEM: Wade will inquire if it is possible to share the EDI assessment report with IMExec/IMC.

EB Rep. vote

ACTION ITEM: Stevan will inquire with Philip regarding poll results. If any less than a few have not responded, we will send a reminder. [Update: two reminders were sent]

Meeting report

Suzanne provided a draft that Wade will review.

ASM planning

Seems that we are at a point where we should be prompting for proposed sessions. As in the past, the suggestion is to establish a Google Doc for IMs to offer and assess ideas.

We need to plan for our one-day IMC meeting, and consider ideas for workshops.

Marty noted that the Education Committee used a similar approach where they established a Google Doc where people could post ideas, and distinguished whether the proposed topic would be most appropriate for the community meeting or for the general meeting.

ACTION ITEM: Suzanne will start the Google Doc.

Water cooler

Discussion of the ASM will be the topic for the May water cooler.

ACTION ITEM: Jason will lead the discussion, and will coordinate with Suzanne about the Google Doc and the meeting announcement.

Working group updates

ECC

The date-related checks are on the horizon now that Duane has identified solutions, and ECC is working on a check for the funding element.

ACTION ITEM: Gastil will send an email to the IMC alerting them of upcoming checks, and general information about PORTAL-S and -D.

DEIMS

Minutes from a DEIMS meeting supplied to Gastil after the IM Exec meeting:

Agenda Items:

1. Development of DEIMS 3
2. Enhancement of DEIMS 2

Discussion: Each participating site representative talked about their experiences with DEIMS 2, expressed their opinion about the suitability of DEIMS 2 as their site's content management system (CMS), and talked about the future developments they would like see in DEIMS 3. All 7 DEIMS-user sites were presented, including SEV, whose information manager is Kris Hall. Corinna participated as the representative of EDI and informed us of some of the features that PASTA offers to the sites' information management systems (IMS).

Consensus: The consensus of the group was that given the adequate functionality of DEIMS 2, sites that are planning to keep DEIMS as their IMS, will continue using the current version (2) for at least 2 more years. In the meantime, we will be enhancing the current version and will plan for the development of DEIMS 3. Particularly, we will collaborate among us to install modules patches developed by Jim and Ken.

In regard to the development of DEIMS 3, Ken and Eda are willing to look into Drupal 8 to explore the compatibility of it with Drupal 7, the CMS that DEIMS 2 is based on. Finally, we decided to continue communicating via email about the progress done in enhancing DEIMS 2 modules (i.e patches) and we will call for another meeting when consensus is needed.

ToR/By-laws

Vote on revisions is in progress, to conclude April 27.

WiRED

Nothing to report at this time.

LTER sites website recommendations

RFC about websites is currently in progress. Most feedback from the RFC thus far has been positive. Marty is collating responses to present at the EB.

Gastil inquired as to whether these guidelines would serve as a guide for reviewers. Gastil seems to think so but Marty suggests not as there is a tremendous amount of flexibility, and few required elements.

All-site bibliography status (guidelines for site bibliographies)

The old system for updating bibliDB no longer exists as that format did not come over well to the new NCEAS IM system, and EDI did not want to maintain it. NSF suggested that we did not need to maintain a Network-wide bibliography. However, NCO may still provide that infrastructure. Zotero is still being considered as a possible solution but programming assistance would be required. Site IMs should talk with their site PIs about their take(s) on a Network bibliography.

Jason: (1) local bibliography, (2) a bibliography that we provide to NCO, and (3) what we report to NSF. It would be helpful and efficient if all or, at least two, of these were duplicated.

At least initially, there will be a manual process to updating/maintaining the personnel database until a more formalized LDAP system is implemented. Marty will send an update this week.

Suzanne: information managers should discuss website guidelines and a Network bibliography with their respective site representative(s) who will be attending Science Council?