



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

[Home](#) > [IM Exec](#) > IM Exec VTC 2012-06-11

IM Exec VTC 2012-06-11

Mon, 06/04/2012 - 9:01am — [mobrien](#) ^[1]

Monday, June 11

Topics

1. EB report (Emery)
2. supplement funding
 - proposals due Friday June 15
3. IMC meeting
 - 3.1 One Day IMC
 - 3.1.0 First night mixer? at cabin? farewells (Nicole, John)?
 - 3.1.1 Closed AM: Topics
 - Elections
 - Production oriented working group proposals, buy-out proposals, training proposals
 - EML metrics reporting, data access issues, data availability plan discussion?
 - Working group reports?
 - ?
 - 3.1.2 Open PM: Topics
 - ?
 - ?
 - 3.2 2012/ASM working groups (proposals due Aug 1)
 - Whitepaper, data packaging, sensor networks - ??
 - ?
 - 4. Upcoming Water coolers
 - July #1: July 2/3 ASM proposal ideas
 - July #2 Metrics WG: PASTA v1 checks list
 - August #1 6/7 LNO update
 - August #2
 - September ?
 - 5. Metacat 2 release (scheduled for late June)

Meeting Notes

In Attendance: Don Henshaw (IMC- Cochair), Margaret O'Brien (IMC Co-Chair), Emery Boose (EB Representative), Sven Bohm, John Chamblee, Jason Downing, James Brunt (LNO CIO).

ASM Liason Update: Jason Downing will be covering logistics in Dan's absence. John Chamblee will be providing any updates from the planning committee, since there are planning committee members at his site.

Executive Board Report (Emery Boose): The EB met for a full day at Andrews prior to the Science Council. Matt Kane and Saran Twombly attended and there were other issues that came up during the meeting that are covered in greater detail elsewhere in these notes. Included in the discussion were the EB's Annual Review of LNO and a discussion of LNO site review.

Bob Waide gave a detailed report of LNO's activities. The full text of that report is available here:

[LNO Annual Report, 2012](#) [2]

The EB also discussed the future of the Education Committee. This committee has become increasingly active and has put in two proposals – the first is for a full-time educational director, and the other is for support for an annual meeting, regular VTCs, and a permanent EB representative. The committee has put together some terms of reference that are based on those of the IMC.

Although the EB voted to recommend that the Science Council vote on a permanent EB representative and approval for regular VTCs, the Education Committee was encouraged to go and think about how to best self-organize. There is a question as to whether they should be site based, or instead organized around themes and target audiences. The Education Committee is more heterogeneous in mission than the IMC because people are focused on many different kinds of education. Some are deeply focused on undergraduate and graduate education, while others focus on K-12 and still others focus on outreach. In this last instance, the case of outreach, there may be some overlap with communications, which is discussed in greater detail below. In the coming years, the education committee will need a plan for dealing with this heterogeneity.

There was discussion of data availability and the value of efforts focused on synthetic databases. The EB view as that synthetic databases should be driven by science questions. For example, does the LTER need a separate eddy flux database, when there is already an existing one for Eddy Flux participants?

The EB also discussed strategic communications within the LTER. It is clear that there is need for more effort in this area. For example, LTER is not as good at promoting itself as NEON is. The goal of the EB is to find a way to create a new position and get a senior person in strategic communication. This person would have more autonomy than the folks in our current communications positions at LNO and would not replace those persons. The job description for this person has not been written yet, but the thought is that this person might even be located outside of any site – perhaps in Washington, D.C. At present, there is no funding for either communications or education coordinators. For communications, HFR will look into the possibility of hiring a consultant.

The subject of site buyout time for IM Co-chairs was likewise raised and Emery made it clear that this was not salary augmentation, but site compensation. There is support for the idea, but at present compensation for IM co-chairs is competing with the need for an Educational Coordinator and the new senior communications consultant. At this point, EB needs to wait and see how LNO site review went and see expects.

The EB also conducted a discussion of EML metrics. Both the EB and the NSF found these metrics to be extremely useful. It should also be emphasized that these were not used in the evaluation of sites during the current renewal cycle and had no impact on the outcomes.

EB and the NSF engaged in a discussion of supplement requests. Specifically, the network

asked that we consider different approaches, for example, how we could do something with \$50K -- \$70K over a few years.

There short discussions of the LNO re-competition and the future of the network. NSF will be soliciting feedback from LTER community and beyond. Phil Robertson will be one of several people who will be heading up the group receiving feedback on LNO.

It was noted that budget cuts might change LTER funding model. Several models are being considered including one in which new science is not funded by core LTER funding another more along the NEON model in which more core funding goes to core measurements, and some that separate operational and research costs. There was also passing mention of the idea that maybe not all LTER sites continue. However, Saran mentioned these models only in passing and there are no firm directions at this point. It is also worth noting that there was discussion of having IMs give presentations at the NSF symposium. IM was even suggested as a topic for the mini-symposium during the Science Council discussions, but was rejected as a bit "too soon."

IM Exec EB Report Discussion

After a brief discussion of the EB report, IM Exec agreed that the IMC should take seriously Saran's request for feedback on supplement fund structure and that we should seek input from the entire IMC on this topic.

Moving forward, coordinating IM work, including work with the current supplements, is going to take more time and energy. IM Exec should be prepared to do this and to keep the IMC informed of developments.

LNO Site Review

James Brunt provided a brief update on the LNO site review, indicating that feedback so far was generally positive. A lot of attention was given to the NIS. LNO expects concrete and serious recommendations concerning next steps. One piece of feedback may be that a production version of the NIS may be expected sooner than current target dates.

ASM Planning

Jason is putting out an email for the IM-Cabin. There will be room for about 16 people and the goal should be to include as many new members as possible. We will also begin thinking about ways to celebrate our members who are transitioning away from the LTER.

The main components of the IMC meeting will be two halves – one closed to non-IMC members and one open to everyone.

The closed portions of the meeting focus on a discussion of recent developments with regard to the IM supplements, data availability metrics, changes to the LTER Data Portal, and PASTA and the NIS. Prior to the IMC, each member of IM-Exec will contact 2 – 3 Site IMs for one-on-one conversations regarding site concerns related to network activities. These calls will take place after the July IM-Exec VTC (July 11) and we will discuss the details of topics to be discussed during the calls at that time. However, the main purpose of the calls will be to understand site concerns and understanding what topics will require discussion at the IMC. The goal is to gather feedback and focus discussions ahead of time, since our time in Estes Park is limited.

After a prolonged discussion, the following topics were suggested as a preliminary agenda for the IMC, but these will need further refinement and some may end up in Working Groups scattered throughout the ASM.

Business Meeting (0830-1200 closed meeting)
Elections
IMEXEC [3- 4]
IMEXEC Co-Chairs [2]
Governance Issues Discussion
EML Metrics Report/Discussion
Preview of IM Organized ASM Working Groups

Discussion Topics (1300-1700 open meeting)
Data Availability Issues
Permanent Identifiers Discussion
DEIMS Overview & Pitch
Metabase® Overview & Pitch
EML Problems and Solutions
SensorNIS Discussion/Update
Workflows Demonstration

Two topics that will definitely be covered in working groups will be workflows and a work group focused on a white paper that will help to outline potential future directions for LTER Information Management. Don and others are still contemplating a SensorNIS-based workgroup. Workgroup topics will be the topic of the next IMC-wide VTC and Sven will lead the call for ideas to support organizational meeting regarding ASM workshops. Once we have a general idea of the topics that are of interest for the workgroups, that will help to clarify needs for the open, afternoon portion of the meeting at ASM on Sunday.

Meeting Notes [3]

- Copyright © 2012 Long Term Ecological Research Network, Albuquerque, NM -

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/news/committees/im_exec/notes/2012_06_11

Links:

[1] <http://im.lternet.edu/user/27>

[2] <http://intranet2.lternet.edu/sites/intranet2.lternet.edu/files/documents/LTER%20Network%20Office/Annual%20Reports/LNO%20annual%20report%202012%20smaller.pdf>

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