

University of New Mexico

UNM Digital Repository

Long Term Ecological Research Network

Long Term Ecological Research (LTER)

9-1993

Coordinating Committee Meeting, Estes Park, Colorado, September 1993

Long Term Ecological Research Network

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/lter_reports

Notes from LTER CC Meeting - Estes Park

J. Edwards commented on the LTER 10-year Review and LTER 2000. Over the next year, we need to come to closure on several of the recommendations. NSF's role = open an dialogue with the CC regarding implementation and evaluation of several recommendations.

NSF feelings about the recommendations: Pleased at the response toward idea of expansion/enhancement of LTER sites. Also agree with prioritizing maintenance of original sites. NSF doesn't want to preclude sites from initiating new areas, but they don't expect sites to continually add on new activities to remain competitive. NSF agrees with CC that pressure to generate new activities with each proposal does not serve the objectives. They will work with CC to determine optimum award size. Re the suggestions for improvement of review procedures: NSF has tried to do this in new guidelines. NSF agrees: core areas still have value and shouldn't be dropped till something is developed to take their place. Agreed: development of common data sets needs improvement. Re comparability: agree with importance of improved quality-control procedures. NSF applauds interdisciplinary activity and hopes to fund it. Re specifying biomes in future RFP's: NSF has no consensus on whether to do this or how to do it.

NSF would like input on what sites feel is missing, without being too specific and losing quality control or earmarking. First-rate science comes first. CC didn't feel 10-year review gave enough emphasis to expansion: NSF feels this is an extremely important component - identify and connect with other types of agencies. NSF and LTER can productively work together as with the NASA connection.

A connection with other types of sites that arose with the Taiwanese: Taiwan feels it would be extremely useful for their LT sites to go through an LTER review, and to write a proposal to their science organization for funding. To consider: whether it is feasible and desirable for foreign sites to have some type of membership in LTER.

Governance issues: it is imperative over the next year to come to closure on what LTER's governance activities will be.

NSF agrees that a coop agreement should be considered in the next funding proposal for the Network Office. [JF: many PI's have not realized how many Net. Ofc. activities are in response to requests from NSF.]

CC didn't feel the role of LTER internationally had been dealt with adequately. NSF feels clear guidelines have been given in directions to develop the International Summit. 2 hopes: 1) That a Steering Committee composed of interested countries and LTERs will develop ways to interact and to be an informal communications vehicle. 2) Official computer networking can be established with interested countries. NSF can help fund development of Internet connection with countries that don't have means. If more happens, great - these are minimal objectives to help move forward on International goals.

the next Exec and CC meetings, which will be closed meetings.
The Exec will solicit opinions from all PI's before getting together to discuss governance issues.

Discussion of CC meeting format.

Future meetings (proposed dates):

Exec Jan 29-31

Limited CC Apr 22-24 (DC; combined w/ meeting of CC w/NSF. Will be entirely work-focused)

Full CC Fall '94 (VCR? CWT?)

JF will solicit feedback on these proposed dates. They are over weekends so as to save money.

Publication of Synthesis volume: Springer-Verlag is eager to publish a series of LTER synthesis-related volumes. CB and D. Coleman propose working on one volume and seeing how it goes before committing to a series. JF will route Springer's proposal to PI's for consideration. Shall CB proceed with negotiations with Springer? CB suggests discussion be tabled till Jan. Exec. Feedback can be given in the interim. Decision: CB will prepare a prospectus to be reviewed by a group of 3 appointed by JF, to make recommendations to Exec. [Following this, a discussion led by Hobbie ensued, indicating to CB that there was a lack of consensus to proceed. She and D. Coleman have since rescinded their agreement to edit.]

Discussion about future meetings included the potential for a "Some Scientists" meeting - at least a smaller meeting to encourage cross-site work, perhaps even more science included at a CC meeting.

The next CC meeting in spring of 94 will be used to address future directions of LTER, policy on election of a new Chair, etc.