

Meeting Notes - LTER Executive Board

March 27, 2017

Approved: April 28, 2017

Attending:

Peter Groffman (chair)
Sherri Johnson-AND
Steve Pennings-GCE
Eric Seabloom-CDR
Dan Reed-SBC,
Sally Holbrook-MCR,
Charles Driscoll-HBR?
Wade Sheldon (IMC-rep)
Frank Davis (NCO)
Marty Downs (NCO)
Anne Giblin-PIE (delayed)

Guest presenter: Kristin Vanderbilt

Not attending: Kari O'Connell-EOC rep, Michael Gooseff-MCM , Michelle Mack/Roger Ruess-BNZ

1. Approve February minutes?

Question -- were corrections made to January minutes? Yes, and posted to the web site.
Motion to approve February minutes, made, seconded, and approved.

2. Report on Science Council planning (finalize agenda?)

Have the sites gotten a template yet? Will do this week.

Discussion Items for March 2017 (2017.03.27)

Time sensitive:

- EDI-NCO-LTER coordination meeting in April (April 11-13)
- Review of LTER IM Guidelines (Kristen Vanderbilt)
- Discuss options for restructuring committees - deferred from February
- Dates/location/planning committee for ASM 2018.
 - YMCA is available Sept 6 onward (YMCA developing proposal for Sept 9-12). Also exploring other options. One possibility: <http://www.visitasilomar.com/>
- Debrief from NSF symposium
- Discussion of updating LTER logo

Evergreen:

- Deferred: Prepare for meeting to talk with NSF about renewal proposals (update: new solicitation expected in the summer)
- Deferred: NSF's desire for formal funding acknowledgement v. open data and spinoff papers

Science Council Meeting

- Executive board begins at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday. Are we planning to meet at Hubbard Brook or at Loon Mountain that day? Had assumed at Hubbard Brook, but will look into the possibility of Loon Mountain.
- Have the sites gotten a template yet? Will do this week.
- EDI is on the agenda, but were not on the invitation list. Marty will invite Corinna Gries and/or Paul Hanson. Other possible options:
 - Can bring them in by teleconference? Not enough bandwidth.
 - They provide presentation and Wade takes questions.
- Sherri and Peter will lead “Nature of the Network” discussion.
- Topics for the Business meeting:
 - New LTER IM data policy,
 - committee structure,
 - bylaw revisions
- Friday site PI meeting: Peter will send a note out to Site PIs asking for agenda items.
- Are the new sites coming? Yes -- all are coming.

EDI-NCO-LTER coordination meeting in April (April 11-13)

- The purpose of the meeting is to iron out any remaining issues around roles and responsibilities, as well as identify opportunities for synergy. Each group contributes a presentation addressing the following points:
 - Identify areas of overlap and missing links.
 - Identifies interdependencies
 - Contributes a vision for how we could divide the workload
 - Suggests discussion points for the meeting
- The most obvious gaps are the things that the network office used to do -- site DB, climDB, personnel DB, hydrodb. The first two days will be a fairly technical discussion among repositories about interoperability. The last day (Peter and Frank will attend) should be a meaty discussion about who is (and should be) doing what, and agreement about how decisions are made.
- There is excitement about the broad mission of EDI, but also a need to make sure that the needs of the LTER IM community are being met.
- Will NSF attend? (Yes, Peter McCarney will be there in person. Other PO's by VC). It's important to identify what NSF is requiring for the LTER's. Will this be different by Division? Should we verify it with the Division PO's? DEB is most liberal in the requirements -- but that also is the source of some confusion.

Guidelines for LTER information management (Kristin Vanderbilt)

- The information managers are updating the “Guidelines for LTER Information Management,” which were developed under Henry Gholz and then resurfaced under Saran Twombly. Originally intended as a guide for sites preparing for review, but evolved

as a standard for the IM's. Should be useful for both new sites and sites preparing for review. It's unclear where they stand in relation to NSF, but it's important to establish our own standards in any case. Working to get community consensus to update guidelines.

- The EDI-NCO-DataONE discussion in mid-April may bear on this effort, especially with Peter McCartney involved. Decision to table further discussion until after the April meeting. We do need a clearly written documentation of what the expectations are for sites.
- When will we discuss the proposed changes to the data access policy? May need another EB meeting before Science Council.

Proposal for committee reorganization

Reviewed key elements

- Smaller formal committees, with rotating membership, similar to executive board or to IM exec
- Complemented by larger community of practice to maintain communication channels and professional development opportunities
- Annual opportunity to request funds for in-person meetings and projects

Thoughts and questions:

- Be aware of the work that the committees have done.
 - Proposal does not eliminate the role for working groups/project teams. Participation would be organized through committees, but wouldn't all fall on committee.
- Could be a chance to energize people at the sites. Need some feedback from the committees.
- IMs really like to meet once a year.
- Education committee -- definitely functions as a community of practice. Meet once a month remotely. Dedicated to the idea of a large group that meets regularly.
- Rotation would encourage more uniform engagement across the network.
- But IM positions vary widely in professional level. There's unevenness across the sites, so the ability to engage varies widely
- Some sites might want to skip their turn if they don't think they can contribute effectively.
- A handful of sites do most of the work now. Not sure this proposal changes that dynamic.

Should revisit in May, after some discussion/reflection with committees and sites.

Mini-symposium debrief

Talks were excellent. A practice session contributed to developing a more cohesive set of talks. Event was well-attended by NSF program officers in BIO, Geoscience, OPP. Very consistent message from NSF: we think this is an important program and we support it very strongly.

Paula Mabee, DEB division Director, attended the entire mini-symposium.

The event was successful with NSF focus. No strong push from NSF right now to attract a broader audience too this event. It's possible that Agency/public/media audience should be a separate event. Let's see how things develop over the next year.

All-Science Meeting update:

Have contacted YMCA and are soliciting proposals from them and other possible locations.
Better food? Easier to get to?