



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

[Home](#) > [IM Exec](#) > IM Exec VTC 2010-03-18

IM Exec VTC 2010-03-18

Wed, 03/17/2010 - 11:04am — [mobrien](#) ^[1]

18 March 2010, 1100 - 1300 Mountain Time

Participants

Members: Don Henshaw, Margaret O'Brien (co-chairs), Sven Bohm, Emery Boose, Hap Garritt, Corinna Gries, Suzanne Remillard

Ex officio: James Brunt (LNO)

Guests: John Porter (VCR)

Topics

1. IMC Meeting
2. Controlled Vocabulary
3. EB Report
4. Miscellaneous

1. IMC Meeting

Should we add a third day? This idea came up during the last water cooler. Third day could be optional, e.g. for working groups. Cost is not prohibitive since room & board at KBS are about \$100/person-day.

An optional third day on Friday with travel late Friday or Saturday. IMs will need to decide before making travel plans. IM-Exec will meet Friday morning. Ask working groups to write up proposals for a third day. Get commitments from individuals ahead of time.

Closest airport is Kalamazoo. But Grand Rapids or Chicago are less expensive. Corinna will make recommendations.

2. Controlled Vocabulary

See John's proposal on the IM website. Current list of keywords was derived from LTER sites (2 or more) and/or NBII and GCMD, with review by IMC. Higher-level words will be needed for a future polytaxonomy.

Should IMC or IM-Exec manage the list? Is there a need to have words vetted by PIs, etc (other than IMs)? Presumably the PIs provided the current keywords. The EB may be happy to pass this task on to the IMC. There are no restrictions on site keyword lists.

Get buy-in from scientists where possible. Perhaps a joint committee (scientists and IMs) to consider the current plan? This was included in original ASM proposal but later cut out.

A common keyword list would avoid the CO₂ / carbon dioxide problem. But it might not meet the expectations of sophisticated users (e.g. auto-completion of terms as entered).

The purpose is to facilitate searching for data at multiple LTER sites. Support browse as well as search. For that we need consistent coding in EML documents without worrying about a lot of synonyms.

Who can give permission to authorize a standardized list? The EB could delegate to the IMC. The IMC should be able to ask LNO for resources (in consultation with NISAC). Need to incorporate into the LNO operational plan (only peripheral mention now). How and when to integrate into Pasta?

A good solution might be for the EB to authorize IM-Exec to move the project forward. Corinna will get this on the EB agenda.

A database structure is needed to store the official list. An Ajax tool to pop up keywords would be helpful.

The keyword list is accompanied by a synonym ring. Essentially a list of existing synonyms. A tool could be built (perhaps at LNO) to replace synonyms with preferred terms in an EML document. Also tools that might suggest keywords based on other EML content (title, abstract, etc). Duane is interested in this problem.

John is in favor of stealing whatever we can. No perfect match with NBII, GCMD, etc. About 30% of our list is in NBII so we could use their hierarchy for these words. The HIVE project is focused on tools rather than actual vocabularies. Much of what we're looking for is already in the plan for Pasta.

The current proposal is not a vision document. A hierarchy would require locking in the highest or lowest levels. Current list is scientific keywords. Locations and taxonomic terms are not included.

Recommend that John make minor revisions and forward to EB. Remove "proposal" section. John will revise and send to IM-Exec. IM-Exec will move it forward. Corinna will represent this issue in EB discussions. Clarify need for a common list and associated tools.

What are next steps if EB sends back to IMC? John recommends stamping current list as LTER 1.0. A stamped version would create a focus for improvements. Subgroups of the WG will work on existing polytaxonomies. If there is pressure to add other words (e.g. social science) another subgroup could work on that. Get together with LNO to discuss migration tools.

The best test will be actual searchers using the keyword list. The WG may need to be reconstituted after Barbara's retirement. Possibly include scientists.

3. EB report

Meeting at NSF with LTER mini-symposium. Todd gave a report. No budget yet for supplements. Schoolyard funding is probably guaranteed.

30-year review is coming along. Todd will write charge to committee. Forward looking, little site involvement, no site visits.

NSF BIO AD search was unsuccessful. Joann Roskoski will continue as AD.

NSF received budget increase but most went to GEO for climate change research.

LNO reverse site visit was grueling but went well. Official report to come.

New focus at NSF on standardization of methods and data collection.

How will LTER and NEON collaborate? In the past NEON has had to distance itself from LTER. But now LTER and NEON will work closely together. LTER will be the first NEON customer. LTER Legacy Data Prospectus is going well.

Meeting with Dave Schimel (NEON CEO). \$430M for construction, \$70M/year for operations, 250 staff. Build out by 2017. Collect 180T of data per year (raw & processed). Two airborne systems to fly sites; third for PI requests, disasters, etc.

Meeting with NAB (national advisory board) and Joann. Budget is less optimistic than at ASM last year. How to move ISSE forward? ISSE was received lukewarmly at NSF. Joann believes LTER needs a strategic plan. Moving to the next level (e.g. analysis of tipping points) will require a change in how we do science. Must integrate with NEON and implement some standardization (required for continental models).

Examples of other strategic plans were circulated and discussed. The EB will write a straw-man plan for discussion on 2nd day of SC meeting.

Mini-symposium was very well attended. Environmental sciences and LTER are still the center of attention. Representatives from the Hill, NGOs, etc.

Nominations for the next LTER chair will be forthcoming.

4. Miscellaneous

Don & Margaret will draft IMC report to EB and forward to IM-Exec for comments.

How to get final documents to LNO archive? Send to James.

Margaret will draft message to IMC regarding 3rd day of annual meeting.

Attachment

Size

[From John Porter: Controlled Vocabulary LTER Datasets.pdf](#) ^[2] 89.71 KB

[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/2010_03_18

Links:

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

[2] http://im.lternet.edu/sites/im.lternet.edu/files/A_Controlled_Vocabulary_LTER_Datasets.pdf

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