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

IM Exec Winter Meeting 2013-02-20/21 -- AGENDA and NOTES

Mon, 01/14/2013 - 2:13pm — mobrien [1]

Wednesday-Thursday, February 20-21, LTER Network Office

Present: John Chamblee, Margaret O'Brien, Dan Bahauddin, Emery Boose, Jason Downing, Adam Skibbe, Philip Tarrant, Kristin Vanderbilt. On Wednesday, Paul Hanson, NISAC co-chair will join the IMExec meeting.

Agenda

Wednesday 20 Feb 2013
8:00 AM Arrive, greet, review agenda

Morning: Annual IMC Meeting
8:30 AM: IMC Meeting Logistics Report (Jason Downing)
8:45 AM: Review of budget and travel plans for IMC Meeting (Brunt, Chamblee, and all)

9:00 AM Working Group Reports
*Reports noted with an asterisk (#5, 6, 8) will require an active VTC connection.
Reports are in preparation for IMC Annual Meeting, and #4-8 pertain to PASTA Implementation
Two working groups are currently inactive and will not provide reports: IMC Website, and Unit Dictionary

- 09:00 1. GeoNIS / GIS (Adam Skibbe)
- 09:15 2. Web Service (James Brunt, on behalf of Rick Clark
- 09:30 3. Matlab / Metabase (John Chamblee)
- 09:45 4. DEIMs (Kristin Vanderbilt)
- 10:00 5. SensorNIS (Don Henshaw)*
- 10:30 6. EML Best Practices (Wade Sheldon)* see below for docs
- 11:00 7. EML Metrics and Data Reporting (Philip Tarrant)
- 11:30 8. Controlled Vocabulary (John Porter)*

Noon: LUNCH

Afternoon: PASTA Implementation in the Network

- data catalog portal
- timeline for expectations from site contributions

- Other material to be provided

5:30 PM ADJOURN

Thursday 21 Feb 2013
Morning: Detailed IMC Annual Meeting planning

- 8:00 Elections and Call for Nominations (EB Rep., NISAC Representative, IMC Co-Chair)
- 8:15 General Schedule Breakdown (business meeting vs. workshops, breakouts)
- 8:30 Workshops and breakout planning

- 11:00 Conversation with Saran Twombly, NSF

Noon: LUNCH

Afternoon:

Continued detailed IMC Meeting planning, as necessary
Planning for IMC visit to NSF

4:00 PM Action Items, Wrap up

5:00 PM ADJOURN

IM-Exec Meeting 2013
LTER Network Office
20-21 February 2013

Notes by E. Boose

Attending: Margaret O'Brien, John Chamblee, Dan Bahauddin, Philip Tarrant, Kristin Vanderbilt, Jason
Downing, Adam Skibbe, Emery Boose
Guests: Paul Hansen, Yang Xia, James Brunt, Bob Waide, Mark Servilla

20 Feb 2013

IMC Meeting (John)

• Original budget was $34k for IMC meeting (from Bob).
• Original estimate for BNZ was $39k (includes 15% for airfare increases).
• Current estimate for BNZ is $37.6k base cost (without 15% error). Kristin and Inigo would be funded separately. Total of $40k with 15%.
• Current estimate for VCR is $26k (including %15).
• Reasons to go to BNZ: Neon site, unique remote sensing issues (power, sunlight). Need to justify the extra expense. Only a few sites preferred VCR.
• Look at numbers and revisit tomorrow.

Geo NIS (Adam)

• Met at LNO in January. Hired programmer to complete work.

• GeoNIS will be a series of services that can be called from PASTA.
• System will check file type (raster, vector), coordinate system, coordinate boundaries, etc.
• Current best practice is to submit spatial data as zip file.
• What are the anticipated use cases?
• Create service to load data directly into GIS software (as opposed to downloading file and opening separately).
• GIS software (e.g. ArcGIS) has the ability to use these services.
• GCE Toolbox includes tools for exchanging shape files and KML.
• Programmer at AND works with Theresa.
• Some sites have GIS expertise, other sites can take advantage of that expertise.
• GeoNIS and GIS working groups are essentially the same.
• Maybe create an email list to reach at least one GIS person at each site.
• Current GIS email list includes at least 22 sites.
• FGDC will go away, ESRI is a moving target. Spatial standards are a challenge.
• IMC meeting: demo. Training, etc will come later.

Web Services (James)

• Programmer working on Personnel DB (20 hrs/week). Introduced at water cooler last fall. Focus on creating web service interface.
• Worked with Mark to solidify security side (authentication, authorization). This information is passed in the request header. Standard session protocol. Also improved roles.
• Installed in test system. Front end uses web services.
• Schedule conference call of interested parties in April. Most code development will be done by April.
• Go live in June 2013. Early adopters can begin to develop code.
• Programmer must finish by August (ARRA funding).
• PASTA will use roles defined in Personnel DB.
• Web services for all major functions (insert, delete, etc). But no information is actually deleted.
• The web services WG will continue to work on other databases (site DB, etc).
• IMC meeting: demo.

GEC Toolbox / Metabase (John)

• Workshop last November. Listserv for toolbox users.
• Wade is working on toolbox updates. Refactoring how data goes in, updating QA/QC tools.
• Toolbox has good support for streaming data. Need to write harvest script if a particular sensor is not supported by toolbox.
• Upcoming: refactoring metabase data model to work better with toolbox, upgrading toolbox user interface, improving knowledge base for users.
• Richard Kerry (CWT assistant site manager) is writing up detailed documentation for Campbell data loggers.
• Need to finish current development efforts by end of April. Then move to maintenance mode.
• Several LTER sites are current users of toolbox (AND, CCE, SBC, NWT, SEV).
• New metabase users: SBC, CCE, NWT, HBR. SBC and CCE ported to PostGres.
• Toolbox survey. Some sites indicated an interest in using toolbox for selected datasets. Matlab licensing is an issue for some sites.
• LNO might provide a MatLab process server if licensing is a problem.
• Currently there is a single developer for the toolbox (Wade). Code is modular and well written. No copyright issues for toolbox (Wade secured a GPL).
• Subversion repository for source code at GCE.
• But core functions are known only to the developer (Wade).

• A slow process toward a few common systems in the LTER Network.
• Some backup knowledge of these systems at the LNO would be good in the future.
• IMC meeting: reconvene group?

DEIMS (Kristin)

• In last two weeks, LNO has signed contract with Palantir (Drupal consultants).
• By end of April, a fully-featured product should be available.
• Migrate at least 3 sites by end of May: SEV, LUQ, NTL.
• No arrangement at present for support after the one-week trial period. Maybe contract with a less expensive company for support.
• Code will be released to community and can be redistributed without restriction.
• LTER will have input on data model for metadata.
• Create documentation for how to extract (or input) data to the backend database in Drupal.
• A tool exists for reading existing EML into DEIMS.

EML Best Practices (Wade)

• See recent emails from Wade.
• At last IMC meeting a need was identified to update EML best practices document. Reasons included: new information from PASTA, EB recommendations, new EML user cases (workflows, etc), new thinking in ecoinformatics community on taxonomy and keywords.
• Also need to assemble a broader suite of best practices documents in general.
• Does current use of EML align with what we need from EML?
• All but 2 earlier members will continue, plus 3 new members. Total of 12 members. Updated email list.
• Early discussion of where to go next. NIS production proposals last November. Effort redirected to later in 2013 to allow other projects to mature. But continue effort on EML and workflows.
• Workflow proposal by Wade, John P., and Corinna funded by EB. Ties to Climb DB, Veg DB, etc. Still working on scheduling. Looking for opportunities to meet at LNO or Madison in June or July.
• Evaluate EML and PASTA as a mechanism for scientific synthesis.
• Issues will include: EML data congruency and workflow readiness, optimizing EML for NIS data portal and DataONE (help address EB concerns about data visibility), how to generate EML for synthetic datasets (output from workflows to go back into PASTA).
• PASTA can generate provenance as an XML fragment.
• Some WG recommendations may be directed toward EM developers (not just best practices).
• EML schema became stable with EML 2.1. Enhancements in the future.
• IMC meeting: pull together reports and findings from other working groups, maybe breakout groups to discuss recommendations for EML. Some unstructured or breakout time for the WG to meet. Most of the WG effort will follow the IMC meeting.

Sensor NIS (Don)

• Training proposal by Don & Corinna was funded by EB. See recent emails. UCSD is co-funding so announcement was circulated more broadly.
• 15 applications received to date (half of these are LTER). Slots for 24.
• NCEAS (Kepler) not involved this year. Participants this year: GCE toolbox, Data Turbine, R, CUAHSI, NEON.
• Sensor NIS workshop at LNO in early April. Follow-up to NERC workshop at HBR in 2011. Invite some external folks. Good to invite someone from NEON.
• Focus on QA/QC tests, archiving streaming data into the NIS, metadata flags, dataset quality

descriptors, sensor life cycle events, available software systems.
• Create a best practices document to be posted online.
• Focus on real-time data, but some results will be applicable to other time-stamped sensor data.
• Possible survey to get status of sensor networks across the LTER network.
• Old methods for QC no longer work on new streaming data.
• Compare analysis of MODIS data at Goddard (ocean column data).
• StreamChem DB. Programmer has developed a relational database. Many of the same components as Site DB (watershed information, etc).
• Current system extracts discharge data from Hydro DB and concentration data from StreamChem DB to calculate stream nutrient fluxes. Essentially a workflow.
• How could this programmer be used to pursue a network project? Maybe consider a redesign of Site DB to support this effort. Several LTER and FS sites have long-term stream chemistry data.
• Perennial question of how Clim DB / Hydro DB will be integrated into PASTA (or not).
• How should relational databases (like this one) interact with PASTA?
• Other solutions are possible. E.g. CUAHSI database is designed to handle watershed information.
• Develop cross-walk between Water ML (WML) and EML.
• Schedule water cooler for Matt (programmer) to demo work to date on StreamChem DB. Maybe in March?
• IMC meeting: get feedback on best practices draft, maybe breakout groups.

EML Metrics (Philip)

• VTC with good feedback on mockups last year.
• Recent working group VTC with Mark and Duane (Duane is member of WG). Concerns about how reports will be used (e.g. for site reviews, etc) and how reports will be generated.
• Who should run reports (LNO or sites)? Mark was reluctant to take this on. But it's a network task. Reports should be automated.
• Maybe add a metrics database to PASTA. More efficient than re-running checks each time a report is needed.
• How will metrics be used? How to prevent misuse?
• No pressing call for metrics at present. But that might change.
• Work out details with Mark and Duane on how metrics would be collected.
• Generate reports from early adopters in time for IMC meeting?
• Reports are stored with ingested data packages. But a separate metrics database would facilitate analysis.
• Metrics measure what can be measured. Showing metrics to others also leads to suggestions about how to change them.
• Some summary statistics (e.g. number of ingested datasets) are available now.
• Audiences for metrics: Site PIs (for site data) – quality of datasets. Network report for more general audience (NSF, EB) – measure of network progress.
• Focus on relative (rather than absolute) metrics. E.g. graph of our site relative to other sites (where other sites are not identified by name). Percentage of warnings, etc.
• IMC meeting: share proposed metrics (plenary session).

Controlled Vocabulary (Margaret)

• Current list of about 600 primary terms (with some synonyms) has been in place for a couple of years.
• Workshop scheduled for May.
• Subgroups are finding definitions for each keyword (inviting experts, esp. grad students, to help), soliciting additional terms from sites, identifying relationships among terms, locating

exogenous resources (e.g. for taxonomic trees).
• Need guidelines for how vocabulary should be used. E.g. text searches on websites, keywords for datasets, etc.
• How to use related terms? Which EML fields should be searched? Best practices for EML keywords?
• Interface to vocabulary in TemaTres (code by John P.).
• Metacat logs could be used to analyze keyword searches.

NISAC Discussion (Paul)

• How many LTER members know what NISAC does?
• Original goals: bring IMs and scientists together, provide guidance on NIS development, etc. What might NISAC do in the future?
• Important points (from Paul): LTER is a learning organization. LTER is a model for doing science. We will never arrive. The journey should be fun and productive. Connect the people with vision, policy, process, and structure. At the network level, the feedback loops can be long and slow.
• LTER was not designed (originally) to be a network. What is the nature of the organization now?
• Is LTER a federation of sites or an integrated network? LTER PIs are evenly split.
• LTER IMs have worked toward an integrated network for more than two decades.
• NISAC is trying to engage more with people across the network. Need to improve and maintain communication lines.

PASTA Discussion (Paul)

• Assume that PASTA is here (for better or worse).
• Discuss questions related to PASTA (from Paul).
• What do IMs expect to get out of PASTA? DOIs for data citations, better search capability, replication at other locations, improved access to LTER data for other scientists, possible reduced need to post data & metadata at site level, workflow capability, tools for validating EML, provenance tracking for synthetic datasets, single point of access for LTER data and for synthesis, all data in one place, presentation of data in a consistent way.
• Accelerated release of PASTA means that some features are not ready yet (e.g. better search capability).
• PASTA will be a collective accomplishment that the network can be proud of.
• PASTA currently lacks capability for metadata only postings. Some sites need to archive data in other repositories as well as PASTA.
• Some anxiety at sites about preparing data for PASTA. The deadline for submitting data was accelerated when the PASTA deadline was accelerated. Few sites have all the necessary skills.
• LTER has not yet found the right questions for synthesis. Not just a question of mapping patterns. E.g. what are the driving forces that define ecosystems (e.g. food webs, etc).

• What do scientists expect to get out of PASTA? Only a few scientists at each site know what PASTA is.
• Need to talk with scientists in more general terms (not EML, PASTA).
• Various attitudes among scientists: (1) we have to do it (but don't want to), (2) I'll be able to access other people's data, (3) this will make it easier for others to find my data, and (4) this will make it easier to combine my data with other people's data to address a science question.
• Largely a question of age. Graduate students are most engaged.
• Switch attention to network information system (with PASTA as backend).
• The PIs do not want to look bad. So they want PASTA to work. But they are happy to relegate

this task to us.
• Need to bring these issues to LTER governance. Venues are LNO, NISAC, and IM representative on EB. The message to EB and NSF needs to be well coordinated.
• Bosses like to see their employees come with solutions, not problems.

• Where do we want to be 6 months from now?
• PASTA participation may figure in proposal submissions next year. Possibly also in site reviews this summer.
• PASTA submissions. Sites need to able to demonstrate a process for readying their data for PASTA. Mid-term reviews = 11 sites. Proposal submissions = 7 sites.
• What will NSF expect? Good question for discussion at EB next week.
• How far out is the endpoint (or 90%, etc)? Likely step function (first technical challenges, then social challenges).
• Misperception that inclusion in Metacat implies trouble-free ingestion into PASTA. PASTA is a higher standard.
• PASTA establishes a standard for a high quality dataset (from a structural standpoint). Content is a different matter. Before PASTA we had no reliable way to check for data and metadata congruence.
• Not all IMs are able to prepare datasets for PASTA. For the most part these are IMs who are not paying attention (attending VTCs, etc). Resources include Margaret, Sven, and Gastil. May not be enough. Need to lead by example.
• At present: about 440 datasets in PASTA, 6,000 datasets in Metacat.
• Need to demonstrate steady progress across the network.
• PASTA development endpoint is April 2015 when funding expires.
• Dark data is a different issue.
• What can we promise to users? Step 1 (data accessibility via the Metacat) is available now. When will step 2 (additional advantages through PASTA) be available?
• PASTA will be useful for synthesis when most sites have submitted most of their data.
• Possible science payoffs: integration of Clim DB and Ecotrends data, new Veg DB and StreamChem DB data, etc.
• Building a NIS goes a long way toward immortalizing LTER data. We should take credit for this now.

• What needs to be done to make data more accessible?
• Authentication and access are not a problem for PASTA. Some policy issues remain to be resolved.
• NISAC meeting sometime this spring. 30% in NISAC membership turnover this year.

• Data tracking remains an issue before the SC. Need to support pros and cons with solid evidence.
• Who is using the data? What are they using the data for?
• Authentication might be required for data only (not metadata).
• If access is different for different datasets, it may reflect poorly on the LTER as a network.
• A majority of scientists may support unfettered access (possibly with voluntary registration).
• What to do if there is no consensus in the SC? As seems likely.
• Voluntary system avoids some of these problems. May yield better information. Carrots include emails when data are updated.
• Authentication checks that the user is who he says he is. Authorization determines what the user is allowed to do.

Data ONE (D1)

• PASTA will likely become a D1 node by this summer. Publicly accessible data packages will then flow from PASTA into D1.
• Still lots of questions regarding PASTA, Metacat, and D1.
• Current data policy states that metadata should be made available immediately.
• LTER Metacat will not go away until requested by the LTER community. Still working on a replacement.
• Metacat in PASTA backend will go away ASAP.

Milestones

• 2013-03. Replace Metacat in PASTA backend. This change will be transparent to users.
• 2013-06. PASTA will become a D1 node.
• 2013. Complete PASTA data portal. This will be focus of development effort in 2013. Need to outline requirements. What to do with metadata only? E.g. datasets too large to replicate or download.
• 2015. Metacat will no longer be supported by its developers.
• Continue this discussion tomorrow.
• Date for PASTA submissions? At some point PASTA will become the go-to place.
• Core datasets might be a priority. Sites were asked to identify signature datasets several years ago by the EB. Long-term time series data might also be a priority.
• There is a psychological issue with PASTA: submitted datasets receive a DOI and are permanently archived. So sites may be more concerned about data preparation.
• Set deadline for submission of core datasets to PASTA at 1 year? 18 months?
• Businesses often use bronze, silver, and gold targets (stretch goals).
• IMC meeting 2014. Invite NISAC and scientists for data summit.
• Summer 2014. Bronze = core datasets, silver = more, gold = even more. And /or set different dates for bronze, silver, and gold.
• How to engage scientists in PASTA development?
• GLEON online database is used mostly by outreach and education, not by scientists.
• Graduate students might be the best group to explore how PASTA could be used for science.
• ESA graduate student long-term study group.
• Maybe propose a session at an ESA 2014 meeting?

Action Items

• Create list of pros & cons for user tracking (with supporting numbers) for SC meeting in May 2013. Gartner report, etc. Assemble numbers from a few sites (BNZ, CAP, CDR, SBC). (John)
• Create list of benefits from tasks already accomplished. (Paul)
• Develop timeline for PASTA population. (Margaret)
• Contact our site grad student reps re: session at 2014 ESA. (all)
• Canvas IMC via one-on-one phone calls from IM-Exec members. Try to develop consensus on plan for PASTA population and present results to EB before SC meeting in May. Complete by next IM-Exec meeting (Mar 18).
• Assign individuals to call. (Dan)
• Create & finalize list of questions for the phone calls. (Philip)

21 Feb 2013

EB Report (Emery)

• Outline of EB meeting next week.
• NSF is forming an LNO visioning committee, to be chaired by Diane McKnight and Tim Kratz,

and to include members from outside the LTER community. Tentative schedule: report submitted early 2014, proposals due early 2015, decision announced summer 2015.
• NISAC white paper. Recommendations #2 and #3 approved unanimously. EB evenly split on issue of user tracking. Change in policy would require a vote of the SC.

PASTA Timeline & Data Portal

• March 2013 – IM-Exec members call IMC members. Before summer 2013 meeting – develop network plan and timeline. Jan 2014 – mid-year status check. Summer 2014 – stretch goals (bronze, silver, gold).
• Bronze = 40%, silver = 70%, gold = 90% of datasets. Or some combination of core and percentages.
• NIS data portal tiger team was put on hold because of other priorities.
• Current data portal is good for inserting data. But not well-developed for general searches.
• Backend Metacat is causing problems. Needs to be replaced ASAP. Mark is looking at other options (including eXist). Problems with the Metacat code.
• Updates to PASTA are rolled out on a weekly basis.
• No current plan to deprecate the LNO Metacat (data portal). A straw man date would be the end of this year (2013).
• PASTA data portal needs to be polished up a bit.
• There needs to be some provision for metadata only postings. Or maybe not?
• Reasons for metadata only postings: embargoed data (but PASTA can handle with access rules), advertising for new projects (is this reasonable?).
• LNO Metacat causes problems and needs regular attention. LNO staff are not able to troubleshoot the Metacat code.
• D1's adoption of Metacat has propagated the problem.
• Maybe discontinue metadata only postings and sell this change as repackaging: fewer datasets, but better quality and data included.
• Planned obsolescence for LNO Metacat. Users will be notified well in advance.
• Other data portals could be created using the PASTA API. Need to find someone who is good at GUI designs.
• Replacement of Metacat in PASTA should be completed by next summer. Sooner if possible.
• DOIs can be deprecated (thought this is discouraged). It should be possible to deprecate datasets in DataONE.

Centralized IM

• LNO visioning committee. Commissioned by NSF. Chaired by Diane McKnight & Tim Kratz.
• ASM workshop report is pragmatic. A different solution, if proposed, would need to be justified.
• Steady progress toward centralized IM in recent years.
• The LTER Network is gradually adopting common solutions for common problems. E.g. content management systems (Metabase/Matlab, DEIMS, PASTA, common data portal, Personnel DB), web services.

Questions for Saran

• Site reviews. What criteria will be used to evaluate IM? Current IM review criteria need to be updated (2004). Will review teams look at site web pages, LNO data portal, and/or PASTA?
• Supplements for this year?
• Our primary focus is on getting data into PASTA.
• Do not mention EML checker reports unless asked by Saran.

Conference Call with Saran

• Focus of our meeting: PASTA population schedule, plans for IMC meeting next summer.
• No funds for supplements this year (except for education). Budget situation is still very fragile.
• LNO visioning team. 4-5 people. Chairs = Diane & Tim. Others from outside LTER.
• Preparing for site visits next summer.
• Questions from Saran: The state of the NIS from our perspective. ASM WG report on centralized IM.
• PASTA population schedule. Production version of PASTA went live last month. Sites are entering data now. Focus of site IMs is on preparing data for submission (funded, in part, by last year's supplements).
• Discussion of timelines at this meeting. We have a good idea of the technical issues. The accelerated timeline was helpful in spreading awareness of PASTA.
• Seven sites have submitted 439 data packages to date.
• IM-Exec members will contact IMC members before next IM-Exec VTC on Mar 18.
• Develop and finalize PASTA population plan by IMC meeting next summer.
• The current Metacat portal is nearing the end of its useful life.
• Some minor (and medium) bugs discovered in first month of PASTA production.
• PASTA web services (backend) is nearly complete. More work to be done on front end (user interface).
• Mark Servilla is scheduled to give a presentation at NSF next week.
• Workflows WG is looking at how to use PASTA and workflows for synthesis.
• Inclusion of an IM is not always a top priority for synthesis workshop organizers.

• ASM WG report on centralized IM. Survey to IMs and site PIs. Response rate of 47% (high or low?). Short turnaround time (about 10 days) may have limited response rate.
• Opportunities for centralization: Development of tools and methods to solve common problems. Promoting network use of tools developed at sites.
• But a component of IM must always be done at the site.
• No one is actively developing a centralized IM plan at this point.
• Constant change in IM is driven by changes in technology and methods for handling information.
• Perception at NSF that PASTA will solve the IM challenge!
• Saran needs to be able to make the case for ongoing challenges in LTER IM.
• Some IM challenges are social; e.g. getting data from scientists. Gradual cultural change. Young scientists have a very different idea about sharing and using data.
• Changes in analytical tools can change how science is done.
• Possible focus on graduate students as early adopters for using PASTA for synthesis.
• A day-long workshop for graduate students at ESA on using LTER data would be a great idea (Saran).
• Additional resources may be needed to help some sites prepare data for PASTA. Saran hopes that these sites will let NSF know.
• The ASM workshop was a first, frank discussion of the issue of centralized IM.
• Saran hopes that Diane & Tim's group will speak with us (IMC) about a future LNO.
• Some will expect PASTA to be populated overnight. Saran realizes this is not possible.
• Many sites are using this migration as an opportunity for house cleaning.
• Ongoing management of data as technology changes. The idea of revisiting a dataset is fairly new. Datasets are not static, like published papers.
• The ASM WG report will be used at NSF.

• Site reviews. IM review criteria came from the LTER community. Each review team will include

an IM (some LTER, some non-LTER). How should IM review criteria be shaped?
• A different set of IM review criteria will be needed in the future. Saran would welcome feedback from us.
• NSF approach to site reviews has evolved. Mixed messages from discussions with EB.
• NSF will use site reviews to make sure everything is on track (in light of past proposal). E.g. is site well managed, are data available, etc.
• Ideally IM reviewer will discuss data availability with site IM. Where are the data? How much data are available in PASTA (and why)?
• Site review reports can be as helpful to the sites as to NSF. E.g. lack of resources is why data have not been uploaded into PASTA.
• Henry used to meet with the site review team the evening before the review. This practice will be continued. Lead PIs have been given site review templates.
• IM reviewers will be given the current IM review criteria and an update on PASTA.
• Send questions about the IM review to Saran. What questions would we want a site review team to ask us? In our role as reviewers, what questions would we want to ask?
• Saran may circulate an email to IMs asking for suggestions on site reviews.

Elections

• May 1 = nominations. Jun 1 = statements from nominees. Jun 15 = post nominations.
• IMC co-chair, IM-Exec, NISAC, EB rep.
• John will coordinate nominations.

EIMC Meeting

• Support for EIMC meeting may be waning. Strong support for meeting at sites.
• An alternative would be a long meeting at a site with selected invitees. One of the motivations for EIMC meetings was the desire for greater interaction with other groups and the large number of requests to attend IMC meetings.
• Wade & Corinna have been charged with looking into an EIMC venue in 2014.
• It might be possible to apply for separate travel funds to send IMs to conferences.
• Comments from last meeting (ASM): too much plenary, more time for WGs, add another day, make short meetings more focused.
• Dan will discuss with Wade & Corinna. Follow up in IM-Exec phone calls.
• Planning for another EIMC would need to begin shortly.
• Funding for IMC and IM-Exec meetings is in LNO operational budget (not ARRA).

IMC Meeting

• Dates: 24-25 July 2013.
• Field trip to watershed (NEON site). Maybe 4 hours total.
• Plenary: NSF VTC, field trip, elections (2nd day), PASTA population plan, EML metrics.
• Breakouts: EML metrics, controlled vocabulary, IM review criteria, GEO NIS.
• Demos: DEIMS, web services, GEO NIS, Toolbox.
• Cross-workshop: EML best practices
• We need more unstructured time for informal discussions (esp. evenings).
• Demos might be implemented as 15-minute conference papers.
• Spread plenary discussions over two days.
• Not all workshops need a report-out period.
• Preparatory VTCs: GEO NIS, EML metrics.
• Business meeting: elections, PASTA population plan, 2014 meeting venue. IMC members will have information on these items well in advance of the meeting. But also announce on the first

day
• Schedule Saran for start of the second day (because of time difference).
• First day (7/24): agenda review, 2014 meeting, demos, Metrics plenary, lunch, PASTA plenary-breakouts-plenary.
• Second day (7/25): PASTA vote & elections, Saran, workshops w/o report-out, field trip (3 pm).
• UAF vehicles available for transport. Apartments could be used for breakout groups.
• Need final housing list by May 1.
• Post tentative schedule for comment. Finalize by next IM-Exec meeting.
• Need to work out payment method for non-site-reps.
• There may be other housing options on campus for spouses or families.
• Apartments include full kitchens, bedrooms, and bathrooms.
• Another model would be: half day, full day, half day (because of travel schedules).

PASTA Population Plan

• IM-Exec interview questions. Note that the LNO Metacat is nearing the end of its useful lifetime. Note that the LTER Science Council has committed to implementing and populating PASTA (as part of the LNO operational plan and SIP).
• Philip will circulate questions to IM-Exec for comment.
• Leave issue of data package improvements vs. timely progress to phone discussions.
• Datasets might be prioritized for submission (core, etc).
• Milestones expressed as stretch goals.
• 1st milestone: create an inventory of datasets for inclusion in PASTA. An inventory consists of datasets (core or not) with priorities. Sites can identify their own core datasets (as a function of site science). Also resources, site & network inhibitors.
• Project management plans often include: (1) issues (in our control), (2) risks (not in our control), and (3) dependencies.
• This approach could be applied to both site and network plans.
• Prepare a questionnaire to help shape site plans. Maybe in April.
• Even a rough timeline may help to reduce anxiety at the site level.
• Include a positive and forward-looking 15-minute presentation on PASTA at the IMC meeting.
• Schedule a water cooler on the PASTA population plan. March = StreamChem DB. Maybe April? Include one or more site examples.
• Prepare draft framework for PASTA population in the next couple of weeks.
• If appropriate, let EB know of efforts to create and implement a PASTA population plan.
• Leave remaining water cooler slots open for working group demos, etc. May need to double up beginning in April or May.
• Use grad student workshop as a dry run for IM visit to NSF. Or schedule IM visit for next spring.
• Start thinking more about what we want from IM centralization. See table in ASM WG report.
• Susan Stafford is interested in writing a paper on results from the two ASM workshops. Currently in discussion by Susan, John C., and Nancy Huntley.

Action Items

• Prepare and post meeting notes. (John)
• Prepare questions for IM-Exec phone calls. (Philip)
• Assign individuals for phone calls. (Dan)
• Discuss EIMC with Corinna & Wade. (Dan)
• Continue logistical preparations for IMC meeting. (Jason)
• Write up working group reports. (Adam)
• Initiate planning for grad student workshop. (Kristin, Margaret, Philip)
• Send out call for nominations. (John)

• Finalize IMC meeting agenda. (Margaret)

Attachment	Size
WADE SHELDON: EML BP3 Working Group Report to IM-Exec Feb2013.docx [2]	18.84 KB
WADE SHELDON: Syntheis_workflows_proposal_oct2012.pdf [3]	120.47 KB
March 11 DRAFT: working_group_reports_summary_draft1.docx [4]	19.72 KB

Meeting Notes [5]

Source URL: http://im.lternet.edu/2013_02_20_IMExec_Agenda_Notes

Links:
[1] http://im.lternet.edu/user/27
[2] http://im.lternet.edu/sites/im.lternet.edu/files/EML BP3 Working Group Report to IM-Exec Feb2013.docx
[3] http://im.lternet.edu/sites/im.lternet.edu/files/Syntheis_workflows_proposal_oct2012.pdf
[4] http://im.lternet.edu/sites/im.lternet.edu/files/working_group_reports_summary_draft1_0.docx
[5] http://im.lternet.edu/taxonomy/term/3