

notes from the 2018-08-28 meeting of the IM Exec

zoom channel: <https://ucsb.zoom.us/j/8058932071>

Attending: Gastil (Chair); Stevan Earl (notetaker); Suzanne Remillard; Dan Bahauddin; Marty Downs

Executive Board report

Discussed the 40-year review extensively. Dan Thornhill and Gayle Pugh will lead the review. They will prepare guidance and a template for site self-assessments. NSF will form an internal review committee that will include members from GEO, POLAR, and BIO. Forming a committee to develop the self-assessment, and they may want EDI to be involved, and they may ask for an IM to be on the committee. Marty has been hunting down old documents (including, for example, emails) to uncover aspects of past reviews. Interested to learn if there was a specific information request to the LTER sites in any of the past reviews. All of the reports are archived, but the process is not well documented - NSF is having difficulty finding relevant documents as well. There was a brief mention of coming up with data metrics, a topic that would be of interest to the IMC. Somewhat related, the inventory of data sets in the EDI data portal that sites up for renewal included in their proposals was very well received by NSF.

Continued work on the agenda for the ASM, especially considering what questions they have for NSF.

Suzanne inquired if it is typical to have two Science Council meetings during a year given that Science Council meeting at the ASM would be the second this year? Marty was not aware of the history of previous ASMs, and there is need for more discussion among the group so it is an opportunistic time for Science Council to meet again during the ASM.

Dan provided an update of IM activities, notably preparing for NSF and working group reports during the virtual water coolers.

Corinna gave an update about EDI, especially their activities at meetings. Corinna noted that many people have commented to her independently about how much they appreciated the list of data sets (in EDI) that LTER sites included in their renewal proposals.

Marty noted that some of the flavor around the discussion of data metrics is indicative of the importance of data to NSF, and possibly considered with an eye toward use in the 40-year review.

(Gastil/Marty) For future discussion: how the tools that the ad hoc working group that developed the format for including an inventory of data sets in EDI in renewal proposals could be used by sites or entities for other purposes.

(Gastil) Separate but related, has there been any communication with Thompson-Reuters about indexing LTER publications? No one is aware of this at this time.

working group reports

WIRED

Presented at the recent virtual water cooler. Suzanne working with Margaret to move things to GitHub but it is a complicated process so is progressing slowly. Margaret has created an example of how to archive past WGs off of im.lternet, with some BP. Margaret is adding a note to pages on the IM website when they have been archived.

DEIMS

Group has not met recently, nothing to report at this time.

ECC

Group has not met recently, nothing to report at this time.

new IM Exec membership

Gastil to include in the call for proposals those that have already been nominated, which, at this time, includes:

- Mary Martin, IM Exec
- Renée Brown, IM Exec
- Tim Whiteaker, IM Exec
- Suzanne and Stevan, IM Exec co-chairs

Action item: Gastil to put out a call to the IMC for nominations

ASM planning

Julien Brun and Mark Schildhauer will be attending; Mark will be the NCO representative at the IMC meeting.

Questions for NSF: discussed merits of draft questions, the results of which will be reflected in modified version(s) of those questions.

ASM plenary

There was lengthy discussion on this topic given recent news that reviews from the recent round of renewals would not be released by NSF until at least the end of this fiscal year, so October

1st at the earliest, which is too late to be of use for a plenary session focused on proposal preparation, at least not one that hinges on details of the recent round of proposals.

An alternate topic, though very much related in the interconnected sense that all of our activities are more or less geared toward successful proposals, is to focus on engaging questions that have been raised during the tea-with-the-chair sessions. A possible format is to pose three or so questions from those sessions that would be of interest to the community, including answers to the questions that may have already come to light, and discuss them as a group. General plan is that Gastil will take a first pass at selecting questions from those sessions that she feels would be most of interest and relevant, then IM Exec will pare the list (if needed) and provide input toward crafting them to best suit the venue and goals.

Breakout session: discussed merits of proposed content and questions, the results of which will be reflected in modified version(s) of the content and questions.

Generally, the tasks and approaches at this point are for the IM Exec to craft final drafts of the questions to the NSF, the annotated agenda, and breakout session content to present to the IMC at the September VTC. Hopefully, this will include also the draft questions to be used for the plenary.

Action item: Gastil still needs to confirm with EDI regarding presenting at the ASM.

Action item: Gastil to take a first pass at identifying questions from tea-with-the-chair to use for the plenary.

Action item: Gastil to confirm with Jess Zimmerman (representing LUQ at the IMC meeting) that he is aware that the PI meeting is at the same time as the IMC meeting.

Action item: IM Exec to craft a final draft of the question to the NSF to present to the IMC

Action item: IM Exec to craft a final draft of the breakout topic and questions to present to the IMC

Action item: IM Exec to identify questions and format to discuss during the plenary

Action item: Suzanne to craft a final draft of the annotated agenda to present to the IMC

saturday night social event

Suzanne has identified a venue for an IMC dinner that Saturday evening, and will continue to work on the details.

VWC topics

September VTC will focus on ASM planning.

tea-with-the-chair

Gastil commented that the questions have been very thoughtful, and the discussions profoundly enriching. They are forming a working group, and will consider whether this continues as tea-with-Gastil or tea-with-the-chair. Overall, it has been much appreciated and a very positive experience. The next meeting will focus on reviewing guidelines.

IMC perception of EDI

Through the grapevine, EDI has been made aware of some grievances harbored by IMs and would like to address them. To do that effectively, EDI needs details of any concerns, and has asked IM Exec to solicit IMC input regarding EDI.

IM Exec stresses that we need to keep an open line of communication between the IMC and EDI, and that it must always be professional. While IM Exec is very sympathetic to this issue, it is not clear what IM Exec can do to ameliorate these concerns or how to facilitate the communication.

We will strive generally for better communication and keep this issue in consideration but, at this time, IM Exec will suggest to EDI (via Corinna) that EDI could address these issues during the EDI update at the ASM if they feel it is appropriate.

IMC working group membership

A question of whether working group membership must be completely open was raised. The general consensus is that working group leaders should have discretion over the composition of their working groups. However, IM Exec is not making a formal recommendation at this time, particularly as the question was raised in a general sense and not in light of an acute issue.

EML as a community standard?

It came to Gastil's attention during a tea-with-th-chair session that Axiom is writing their metadata for NGA in ISO-19115 (not EML). They publish their datasets to the ADC, not to EDI. The ADC is a Metacat so it accepts all sorts of xml, and this means they bypass the checker.

Though it is now generally accepted that LTER data do not necessarily have to reside with EDI (e.g., the ADC is a suitable alternative if relevant), IM Exec was adamantly in agreement that LTER data must be described using EML. Using a common framework (EML) is absolutely essential for interoperability, capitalizing on resources (e.g., error checking with PASTA+), ensuring that data can be described with the same levels of granularity, and to adopt community approaches inherent in EML (e.g., units) among many, many other reasons. Using a framework

other than EML has potentially profound ramifications for the success of the information management component of future proposals.

Action item: Gastil will express the IM Exec's concerns to the NGA IM

summary of action items

Action item: Gastil to put out a call to the IMC for nominations

Action item: Gastil still needs to confirm with EDI regarding presenting at the ASM

Action item: Gastil to take a first pass at identifying questions from tea-with-the-chair to use for the plenary

Action item: Gastil to confirm with Jess Zimmerman (representing LUQ at the IMC meeting) that he is aware that the PI meeting is at the same time as the IMC meeting.

Action item: IM Exec to craft a final draft of the question to the NSF to present to the IMC

Action item: IM Exec to craft a final draft of the breakout topic and questions to present to the IMC

Action item: IM Exec to identify questions and format to discuss during the plenary

Action item: Suzanne to craft a final draft of the annotated agenda to present to the IMC

Action item: Gastil and Suzanne to contact IMs who have not yet provided details of their travel itinerary for the meeting

Action item: Gastil will express the IM Exec's concerns to the NGA IM