

University of New Mexico

UNM Digital Repository

Long Term Ecological Research Network

Long Term Ecological Research (LTER)

5-1-2003

Coordinating Committee Meeting, Kellogg Station, May, 2003

Long Term Ecological Research Network

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

Recommended Citation

Long Term Ecological Research Network. "Coordinating Committee Meeting, Kellogg Station, May, 2003." (2003). https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/lter_reports/71

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Long Term Ecological Research (LTER) at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Long Term Ecological Research Network by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

756
7717

Spring 2003 LTER Network Coordinating Committee Meeting
7-8 May 2003
Kellogg Biological Station
Phil Robertson, Principal Investigator

Table of Contents:

List of Attendees

Photos

Discussion Topics

- NSF Report
- Network Office Cooperative Agreement report
- Strategic Planning Development
 - intro
 - Network Information System Advisory Group planning
 - Bylaws Review
 - Breakout Groups
- Education Strategic Planning development
- ILTER assessment
- Plenary on Breakout Group discussions on scientific questions
- Motions
 - resolution to support nceas
 - ilter recommendations
 - neon activities
- All Scientists Meeting status
- NSF Symposium (Feb. 2004)
- Santa Barbara CC/NCEAS Synthesis workshop (spring 2004)

Steve Chopin
771-9455

Coordinating Committee meeting 7-8 May 2003

Jim Gosz: Greetings and introductions
Phil Robertson: Welcome and logistics announcements

Jim Gosz: A brief look at the agenda-
We've been meeting about the SP for some time now and this mtng will be all about this effort

NSF report (Henry Gholz):

- Happy to acknowledge presence of grad student reps

Very exciting year for LTER – This Strategic Planning process is being mirrored by processes at NSF

LTER feeds directly and importantly into environmental research in the Foundation so it is very important. There's a tremendous amount of research contributing to science and society –

Note here the successful “minisymposium” that focused on the interface between ecological science and other sciences at the sites.

Note the cover of BioScience—congratulations to John Hobbie and all the authors.

Noting the ASM this September – will be exciting.

With an ever increasing emphasis on educational and global and international issues and synthesis at the Foundation, I'd like to note the many important contributions LTER is making

Addressing budget issues:

We don't have a 2003 budget in BIO yet- looks like NSF and DEB will do well- there's not a lot of slack in the LTER budget because of the ASM this year. LTER is part of the 'Centers' program at NSF so my budget reads ZERO after all increments and renewals are met- the core budget flashes thru very quickly –

The supplements have now all been processed for SLTER and REU and extra 25k *

* ASK HENRY WHAT THIS IS

– In the future what we do with supplements will depend on what happens here today. I've had a couple of RET supplements- and if you are interested in this program you should act quickly. But out of Environmental education and research report there's a 'venture fund' which comes from program officers- so I have to nominate proposals to this fund. If you are interested in this program, get these into me very soon.

For 2004 ? who knows. The OMB budget is on the Hill, but there's a long way to go- In the 2004 budget – the Biocomplexity program is scheduled for a 70 % increase. NEON is in the President's budget for 2 sites at \$12 million w/the prospect of ramping up. Of course, it's been there before... Requests for HYPER (for NCAR) and EARTHSCOPE are both in there as well.

For 2006 we are looking at ocean observatories – could be interesting to LTER Network

NSF's budget overall in 2004 in OMB is higher- but Bio-- LTER's directorate-- is slated for a decrease. Could be 3 percent. But important thing is to keep in mind Strategic Planning effort because 2005 focus as whole will be on “Cyber-infrastructure”- and you'll have to consider where LTER is as far as it's ability to accommodate network-wide large initiatives for the 2005 budget.

Most important decision re: LTER this year was to renew Network Office-and this was done based on several assumptions – one is that neither LTER Network or LTER NET Office can function separately. It looks like the NET is integral to Network- and their SP is integral to the Network as a whole, too.

We're looking closely at developing better communications, expectations, focus of programs on facilitating synthesis, mtng organization, NIS, and leading technology development.

We think of NET w/3 main foci –

- 1) leading integrative research,
- 2) serving larger even global scientific community and cross-site research, and
- 3) to serve individual sites in technical assistance. All three of these areas are critical, must become more visible, and require buy-ins by larger community.

We would like to build the public relations aspect- Patty needs to hear about news, Cheryl Dybas (OPLA at NSF) needs news, Henry needs 'nuggets' – while these overlap and there has been no coordination so far but we will be sending you reminders, perhaps quarterly, to enhance this activity.

We do get the annual reports but it's one thing to get scientific findings and another to get highly digested verbiage, which is valuable for a variety of uses

Note the NSF Strategic Plan report – it follows on the NRC report, which covered the entire federal govt; this Report brings it down to only NSF . It's a very important document which we should all be looking at.

The theme 'the decade of synthesis' is obviously extremely right on as far as where NSF is and in terms of this report. There are 3 areas in which they focus on environmental synthesis

Coupled natural and human systems

Coupled biological and ____ systems – GET THIS FROM HENRY OR REPORT

Coupled people and technology

The cross-cutting themes are educational and communication infrastructure.

A group organized out of Rita Colwell's office on environmental observatories. It's earthshaking because the far and wide directorates at the Foundation have rarely talked to each other.

Including engineering, for example.

They're all looking at information management and synthesis. They were excited to hear about things like EML. So far it's just a discussion group, but there's an expectation that LTER is a model in a wide range of new programs, such as information management.

W/in DEB there's a new Center for Evolutionary Synthesis, which is very definitely built on the NCEAS model. The Foundation is clearly looking at ways to foster synthesis and your discussions here bear on the discussions at NSF surrounding this issue. What happens at LTER feeds back, definitely.

Another thing that's going on – the likely initiation of 2 or 3 LTER sites in near-coastal marine environments. This could be in 2004, with funding from Geo.

This would focus on coral reefs, mangroves, continental shelves- marine LTER sites have been discussed for a long time and in the MRE this year there's a formal request for marine observatories in 2006 so this process in initiating these coastal systems fits well into the scheme.

Another area that feeds into synthesis is the development of EML – this is a major contribution from LTER and allied communities—it's a huge step forward and needs to be used and promoted.

The other thing is the ramping up of the Hydro and ClimDB – it's essential and long overdue that all sites be fully engaged in these databases. It's often assumed by the community out there that because it's LTER all this data is readily available and it's a shock sometimes to find out that's not true.

Starting with the climate data is an essential step. One thing I've talked with Doug Ryan at the forest service to get their perspective on this – the Forest Service and NSF would love to have all those datasets combined so you only have to look in once place for all of them. There's no concern about protection or offense and we need to accomplish this and move on.

We've also talked about the USGS participating in the HydroDB

Renewing NET office is a major component of synthesis effort as well.

The question is: "How does LTER maintain its core ID in all this relationships: to NEON and other initiatives?" There's a lot of talk of how things *could* be, which is positive- rather than how things *shouldn't* be, which is negative.

On the global context, it's extremely important time for ILTER as well

Jim Gosz has developed a network that now encompasses 25 countries. The question is now what do we do?

You all got a copy for a plan for NSF's support for ILTER sent out from Francis Li

We'd like to use it for the basis for discussion on the following:

We have a network that's been formed and coordinated at NET thanks to Jim Gosz and Bob Waide and his staff at the Network Office. But now this entity is sitting there and is ripe for use. Coincidentally a new International Programs office and director is a good place for potential for building on. So what do we do? Concerted discussion between

(new INT program directory) Cary Ann Jones and Mary Clutter will be discussed further this afternoon.

Jim has asked to resign as chair as ILTER. Hen Bau King will be interim person. ILTER meeting is scheduled for Beijing this September, which may or may not happen. The plan is to provide full support for a coordinator for ILTER. Also for a training session for IM –one week/year roving around the globe, includes travel for US scientists, and most significantly, looking ahead, mary and cary ann looking at a research initiative in the 2005 budget focused in cross-site research for International work. To address collaborative international research, using the coordinator.

Questions:

Phil Robertson: As a site PI, I get questions about cross-site competitions. How should I respond?

Henry: looking back there were 3 spaced 3 years apart. There hasn't been any analysis for their success, but they seem to have been good. They were established in a way that utilized flexibility in the core programs. That has disappeared because of lean funding and the percentage of core funding has been low and the opportunity is not as readily there as it was. It would take a new initiative for funding. Under the current circumstances, it may be received well, now, but counter to that, as LTER moves along and the new sites become more incorporated and perhaps adding new sites, it may be less justifiable. But there are other mechanisms that accomplish x-site research. Many of these proposals are coming from you. Right now there is no immediate plan for specific x-site funding. But do not ignore other NSF programs for doing research you want to do.

Mark Harmon: NEON: why should congress support genomics and other stuff at NSF when it's just doubled the NIH budget?

Henry: Can't forget that BIO has had good increases recently
NSF budget is increased in 04 scenario

Question: Has there been any interest in homeland security and is there any interest in involving the Network in it?

Answer: So far it's been separate and there has not been earmarking for any funding. So far the focus on cyber infrastructure is in large part is driven by security in the federal govt. in their relative stage of development it happens to coincide. Certainly in engineering directorate there is a lot of direct connection but not so much in BIO.

Scott Collins: The Evolutionary Synthesis Center Program announcement is out. We have to understand that when NCEAS was established it had an 11-year life span. While there is a lot of pressure to keep it going, it would be important for this group to express concern for NCEAS. This new Center is not going to infringe on the NCEAS money but we need to hear from this group about the importance of NCEAS.

Jim Gosz: You can read about original support from this group [the coordinating committee] for NCEAS in the 1989 SP document on the web site, which attests to the power of this group to make things happen.

Dave Tilman: I would like to support NCEAS as well as the concept of a similar effort in evolution. To me evolution and ecology are the same thing. The more magnanimous we can be in supporting the whole discipline the better off we all are.

Gosz: At every session between Mary Clutter and Rita Colwell, LTER is mentioned, is used as a positive example. Our reputation is used as a model and it's timely that we step up to the plate and develop ourselves to suit this reputation. We must develop the SP to make this model work.

INSERT LINK:
RETURN TO TOP

Bob Waide: Going over briefly details of NET coop agreement. So you will understand how goals for NET are being developed with the NSF.
Before we submitted a proposal it was vetted to this group. It was submitted to NSF and there was a site review visit, some back-and-forth, a revised scope of work, and new coop agreement was established. See DEB-0236154

INSERT LINK HERE TO "Terms of cooperative agreement.html"

Discussion:
Grant= little fed govt involvement anticipated with recipient
Coop Agreement = substantial involvement is anticipated between Fed govt and the recipient

Slides # 6 and 7 were developed by the coordinating committee and will be discussed at length at this meeting here. And for 8 and 9 [education and ILTER] we will do whatever comes out of these discussions.

Also included extra funding for NIS and advisory group, which met Mon and Tues here, and will be reporting back to you later on in this meeting.

Henry: As far as the International LTER– the options in terms of the LTER Network involvement as a whole is in discussion here, not just the Network Office.

Bob: depending on what we decide here future involvement of the Network, and the Network Office will be determined.

Coordinating Network SP with NET Ofc SP is very important. We have an obligation to present a document to NSF.

Introducing Jack Jeckowski. He is facilitating the SP for the network office. This effort is funded by Univ of New Mexico. We're open to questions and comments. NET is meeting w/him June 5-6.

Timeline for development of SP has shifted. Coop Agreement says 2 years- our plan is to finish w/in 12 months. And present it to the coordinating committee a year from now.

There are several pts in the coop agreement in which NET is invited to submit supplement requests to NSF should the Network deem necessary. This is why I'd like to finish in 12 months so we can get into budget processes as soon as possible.

Terms of COOP Agreement, cont

Must develop better bi-directional communication.

The by-laws we have developed and will be reviewing later on will be important especially a mechanism for feedback on net ofc activity. I would also like to visit all the sites so please let me know when the best time for NET staff to visit. I would give a short presentation to the site on what NET is doing and ask for input as to what could be done better.

We'd like to bring NAB into operation. Both previous NET proposal and renewal shows NAB oversight to operations of NET. Has not been strictly enforced so far- we would like to bring NAB into the process of SP, will probably occur in jan or feb of next year. That's it- those are the major terms of coop agreement.

Questions:

Gus Shaver: You had an ambitious proposal, does this mean that the whole thing has been restructured?

Waide: No, we had modularized the proposal into discreet items- the first 5 items were accepted- these are our 'core areas.' We requested addl funds for synth, including science theme meetings. NSF did not accept that proposed activity in whole- they gave us 50k of 200k we asked for but said if it's successful they'd consider upping that amnt. We also requested 200k for NIS and they gave us 100k - so those both represent increases. We also requested addl funds for ILTER and Educ, which were not well received. All in all we got about 200k more than we were told was our bottom line.

Mark Harmon: are there milestones or a timeline for the IM tasks coming up so we can evaluate progress?

Bob: yes but we're still in the process of developing these with the NIS Advisory group and the coordinating committee

Dan Childers: sometimes new initiatives require supplemental funds. Is there any flexibility in the SP for this? are there restrictions?

Bob: it's a living document and it's important that if we continue to run operations from supplemental funds we shouldn't do it on a month-to-month basis

Henry; there's also a big nebulous area that you all need to work out, like, what is the specific role of the NET in site science, etc. NSF doesn't want to dictate it but the LTER community needs to wrestle with it.

Gosz: time line. SEE SLIDE must integrate all strategic planning efforts. We must get something to NSF that might be the basis for increased level of support. If we get this in 2004 it might get into 2006 budget – we have to target jan/feb of 2004 to get into the 2006 budget. We'd like to get on a faster track for this, so we'd like to get the NET SP going faster to facilitate this effort.

Henry: you must also be opportunistic. If there are opportunities for submitting to a "cyber-infrastructure" program in 05 you don't want to wait til 06 to get on that wagon.

Francis Li: (referring to Gosz's 'timeline' slide) its unrealistic to expect a SP from ILTER by June of 03

Gosz: yes, but they should all evolve together, including education, IM, etc.

Francis: and they must be flexible

Aron Ellison (HFR): Are you talking about NET SP or LTER Network SP?

Gosz: YES - we're talking about all of them together

Shaver: But they must not be confused

Gosz: And they must all be part of a whole. We're making it up as we go along so we don't know what it will look like yet but it's important that it all be coordinated. It's probably confusing if we use these terms loosely- the goal is to come up with an integrated overall Network SP.

INSERT LINK HERE: RETURN TO TOP

--

STRATEGIC PLANNING

Now we'll start talking about elements of IM and other parts that will be included in an SP

We are “charting a course for the LTER program” – these are not new words- this has been talked about since we first started talking about behaving as a Network. Site science is important but we must be interacting w/whole community – I have been consulting with others on this effort –

[LINK TO LTERvision1pager.html](#)

Network level vs. site-level bridge

We must evolve from a set of sites to a network of sites and the SP effort is to create an organizational structure to create a level of science that isn't being done currently

[LINK TO StrategicPlanningCCmtg.html](#)

[LINK TO: RETURN TO TOP](#)

NIS advisory group report

MARK HARMON

Why this group exists- this idea has been around for a while- the ideal is free access to data and integration that is largely machine assisted but this has been a long time coming and info mans have been working on it for a while and then there was a proposal and some more ideas largely coming from IM folks but we wanted more input from scientists

[LINK TO NISAG_CC_May2003.html](#)

DISCUSSION:

We all got together last fall and came up with some ideas

Primary goal – synthesis at network level. Our motivation and main driver

Also- legacies will be addressed, which is a major goal of LTER

What is NIS? Data, analytical and collaboration services and products that enable LTER synthesis

Must be a partnership between scientists, information managers and Net Ofc. This diversity is reflected in our Advisory Group but also has to be reflected in entire process

-approaches to synthesis

-modeling

-empirical induction

-specific hypothesis comparison of multi-site data

-conduct multi-site experiments de novo, tapping into inter-site network we have

all these can benefit from improved NIS structure

What are the impediments?

- site specific priorities
- time commitments of scientific leadership
- data availability/access/comparability (compare magnuson et al variability project in 1987 w/ knapp et al productivity project in 2001) magnuson asked for data, people brought information on disks in hand- when alan knapp tried it, he was able to do some on-line but largely it was the same old thing and we realized we must do something!

How can NIS help?

Data discovery – telephone/e-mail now – should be searchable via the net

Data access- paper/site webpages now – should be seamless online across sites

Data aggregation (harmonization)—manual ad hoc now – should be assisted and standardized

Collaboration tools – e-mail/phone now – should be video conferencing and sharing applications across the net.

LIDET example- trying to do it before LTER e-mail aliases- very difficult to communicate. Now, with the small advance of getting the LTER aliases, it helps a lot

Role of structured metadata (e.g. EML), it's a universal translator

- Can we structure our metadata to facilitate -
- data discovery – keywords, creators, title, abstract
- enable data access – file ;locations, formats, permissions
- facilitate data aggregation

(please see slides)

It's important to realize that to improve the functionality of our network we have to raise everybody up- not just bring up the bottom to meet the middle.

Intital goals for NIS

- 1 science theme database per year
- finish climate hydrology and site databases
- develop generic solutions for network-level databases
- raise functional tier-level at each site

Criteria for deciding priorities

Will it enhance network level synthesis?

Balance between short term products and long term tool development

Example – Knapp ANPP synthesis project- GET SLIDE FROM HARMON

Two-pronged emphasis of NIS – GET SLIDE

One of the things we're not doing specifically is develop global-level applications, but we have to realize that there are global-level IT developments- and folks who are involved in those will be involved with this project and keep us apprised of progress but we are definitely not developing global-level applications.

Funding issues:

Site level – supplements?

Network level- science themes?

Funding opportunities – biological databases and informatics

Information technology research

Roles and partnerships

Coordinating committee- science theme selection, etc

Site Scientists – use system, generate data and do synthesis projects

Net Ofc- infrastructure support and development

Information Managers – Local implementation

NIS Advisory Group- communications, strategies, assessment

Constituencies:

Individual LTER scientists

LTER sites

LTER Network

Greater scientific community

Education and outreach

Policy makers

Assessment of NIS implementation

Have goals listed in SP been met?

e.g., degree of site participation, number of datasets created, improvement of synthesis tool functionality

Has NIS contributed to synthesis? Such as numbers of projects, impact of projects, etc.

NIS advisory group membership– GET SLIDE

Don Henshaw presenting “CLIMDB” – GET SCREEN SHOT

Participating climDB sites – 21 sites have climate data in the system. You can sort by any headers across the top. Extracts the most recent met data in the system. The stations are shown here- there are 113 met stations in the system and 42 hydro stations in system.

Queries allow sorting by station as well as parameters. You can download or graph any variables against each other. Does include USGS sites as well. We are asking sites to at least produce temp and precip for one met station to get onto this site. We asked them to do that for one station for all years on record. We would like to go to level one and two parameters and those parameters are already in ClimDB and many sites are doing that.

This advanced tool was able to be extended easily to include 7 more sites with no effort from those sites. We are asking for some metadata describing conditions and instruments

Henry: I spoke with Doug Ryan about this and he said that USGS has in their statement that the data they produce is available for free re-distribution. USGS is very happy to see other groups use it.

Don: Another project is with SDSC uses ClimDB explores webservices technology which facilitates web harvesting – can pull out data on the fly from other databases – we have it as an alternative on this site. WE hope to continue this collaboration – they do provide expertise that we can't offer on our own.

In this issue of LTER “data bits” there are several articles describing many important aspects of this project [NEED DATA BITS WEB SITE LINK]

DISCUSSION:

Question:

What are plans to bring in USGS data? Are you downloading data that hasn't been qa/qc'd?

Don: You can actually ask for historic data – get older, quality checked data – as well as real-time data.

Gus Shaver: I like the idea of capturing a dataset per year but John Hobbie distributed a note talking about different kinds of synthesis from conceptual modeling, to scaling, etc. How much thought has been given to different ways and different kinds of synthesis activities?

Mark Harmon: This will be a feature of the SP – an example might be that modeling might like some validation and verification, but will also be dependent on hydro or climate data to run the models, and there will be some decisions to make. I do believe that many of these aspects of discovery – where is the data? Where do I get it? How can I aggregate it? Will be very useful for many things- If you're setting up an experiment then you might look for background information – which might be quite a different use and you'd be using the data for 'scoping' but we need to figure out how to maximize it for each one of these things.

This selection of projects (one dataset /year) should depend on the community.

Peter McCartney: Gus's point is important – we are building features to address. SiteDB is a summary of information about sites – not looking for primary data but looking at results (“...here we study this, our major findings are that...”). This is designed to capture results, but we also recognize that synthesis goes on ad hoc site-to-site level and while we're trying to working question driven activities, we also want to get data on line so we can respond to ad hoc queries. Right now you can't get much out of it, but we recognize the importance of a multi-level approach, focusing on a few discrete question-

driven things to prove the concept, as well as try to answer high-level questions such as 'what's going on at all the sites and why'

It's a range of products, short term and long term, and it's a process of progression. Won't arrive in a box -- all complete.

Henry: Don was understated in his comments about HydroDB and ClimDB, considering enormity of what could be accomplished. The Minimum climate data required to participate is virtually nothing – This is an enormous benchmark to get this far and it's a good place to start

Mark Harmon:

Recommendations:

Where we are in process – we fought thru issues we want to make sure they're captured, IM committee will meet in June and start looking at 'Tiers' and will be working on an SP for this that will fit into overall SP

Decision Points: (PLEASE SEE SLIDES)

It's important for the CC to make these decisions. We believe this is the best body to make these decisions.

'Tier trajectory' – recognizes that we are all in different stages or tiers of a system. We need to recognize that and move ahead. We have a minimum standard- it's whatever the lowest amount of metadata a given site has online. We will try to basically get everyone advance forward, rather than to make everyone uniform right now- buying into the strategy rather than trying to level everyone out right now.

Question: What's the content of SITE DB?

Ans: Just the general characteristics of sites- describing the biome, it's the 'electronic blue book'

Question: How specific should we be about what these 'tiers' are? There has to be a general consensus about what each tier is.

Ans: the SP will have to define these. We haven't done it yet.

Tiers will ultimately be defined as synthetic functionality that is available at the site. We were deliberately fuzzy but they are defined by functionality that is available – software and hardware.

Question: does everything rely on importance of collecting these datasets? I see very few syntheses that require such broad data – we want to do our synthesis on already synthesized data –not harvest raw data.

Ans- but if you're doing a modeling exercise you do need that raw data

Gosz: this body [the coordinating committee] would create a motion to impinge upon sites to raise level of information management toward a common goal. Currently there are no metrics to decide whether these data are comparable. It's fundamental and we have not done this before – functioning like a network and creating commonalities.

Question: There needs to be a mention of how these 'tiered trajectories' will be defined. Because simply saying we've adopted a strategy is great- but who is going to do this? it will facilitate communication at the site level. Defining the tiers will help the effort

Harmon: Information managers will develop tiers and will be voted on in the fall. If we delay on these decisions, then how do we make progress now?

Q: have you polled Information managers as to where their sites are in this process? Do they think this is do-able?

A: yes, they've been active throughout. We will continue to do this, so we can determine costs, etc.

Henry: it's a critical question and will be part of the process- whether the sites can move independently or if there needs to be a network wide initiative that will require additional resources and can aim toward the 2005 'cyber infrastructure' program.

***Moving to next point on slide – PLEASE SEE SLIDES

Harmon: All databases are in various states of development. Basic motion is to commit as a network to get these databases completed. Where it is applicable sites must participate. We're not going out creating these things- where a new db is needed the CC will address it, vote, and we will move ahead as a network. We're assuming that the science theme databases is agreed upon and a good idea.

James Brunt: Site DB – the information will be used to drive site pages on LTER page – the information will be controllable by you.

Dave Tilman- what is the cost to implement network wide data management? I hope we leave a good legacy. This is very important. I'd be willing to vote yes for all this but it will require more resources.

Harmon: if you vote for this here, it will oblige the sites to participate.

Other comment: Right now it isn't in the renewal guidelines, but if it appears in the future, it will be the 'big stick' sites use to actually do these things. Right now there are no metrics or methods of assessment. Those criteria are in the sites' review and renewal guidelines but we have not had the metrics for assessment.

Peter: EML and SITE DB – there's a communication role for the info mans- they all go to mtngs every year and they know what these things are- if you don't know what it is,

you need to get together at your site and get on the same page. Spend some time with your information manager to get up to speed.

Dan: propose to vote (on paragraph number 2)

Tilman: second

Hollibaugh: language needs to be stronger.

Gosz: do you want to address these motions now or restructure them and vote on them later.

Shaver – it's too vague to vote on right now. It's a good process, it's good that you have developed goals and a plan to proceed, and the process involves continual feedback from all components of the Network. This is not the adoption of some large major goal of how to do it but just to go ahead and proceed – definition of the steps will come along the way. I support the general philosophy but we need to know what the first steps are. Give the NIS advisory group a pat on the back and proceed and ask them to move ahead.

Tilman- wording conveys philosophy and I move that we vote.

Harmon- don't want to create an endless list of cross site databases that we'd like to have because if we don't have the buy in from the scientists it won't happen.

Phil: it is vague but we're agreeing in principal and we want to empower this group (the NIS advisory) to move ahead. It does involve the commitment of some resources and this is good investment given the potential value

Harmon: we are trying to create a process where the CC is empowered to approve and move ahead on this. Site DB has been talked about for 5 years. We're just trying to implement it.

paragraph number 2 approved with only one negative vote.

Dan Reed – wants to add verbiage to paragraph one to direct NIS advisory group to identify metrics needed to accomplish tasks.

motions to pass 1st and 3rd paragraph voted and passed unanimously

INSERT LINK: RETURN TO TOP

Gosz: Discussion of by-laws

Concern re: "affiliate members" – we currently have no metrics of evaluation for working with affiliations

LINK TO DRAFT? WAITING FOR WORD FROM GOSZ/WAIDE

Pickett: there is no 'sunset' in this text—and there's quite a bit of flexibility – we need a term limit

Harmon: we should have a term for the review process

Hobbie: one possible problem is that it gets so big it becomes unwieldy- do we have to vote every time? Can we take a gradual attitude? Do we review each partnership after a term? Do these affiliations make them eventual LTER sites?

Phil: it could come back to bite us eventually – many of those who fashion themselves as affiliates but can't find a sponsor- I think we need to approach it carefully- outreach is different- in Michigan alone there are perhaps 30 organizations who may one day approach me for 'sponsorship.' Each of us will be asked to sponsor these affiliates to the coordinating committee- it's too clumsy.

Gosz- we may have to have a special committee to address these

Henry: I have a problem with the 4th line section two – “an indefinite term”

Gosz- should be “undefined”

Henry: ILTER or Networks – are we addressing sites individually or networks?

Gosz – word was “site” here

Steward- what do we want out of these things and what are the commitments on both sides? We have a lot of relationships that have the flavor of affiliation but we are not cluttering up with a lot of details- we really have to ask ourselves what do we get out of it? I think we should leave it up to the sites

Dave T. – 20-some years of LTER work has shown the incredible advantage of having all these data-rich sites and we should be moving toward doubling or tripling the number of sites there are like this – and international – we should seriously consider some very viable sites as 'affiliates'

Scott C – we should strike this affiliates program part and deal with it later- it's hard enough to deal with our own network now.

Francis – what is the relation of the US to the ILTER sites? Do they have to adopt our bylaws?

Gosz – no --?

Gosz – The general sense I'm getting is that we shouldn't address this right now- perhaps we should create an adhoc committee to get to this and come back to it

Hobbie: What we should be doing is taking longer than this and give jim time to explain what each section means.

Steward – there were no standing committees listed

Shaver: Want to add three things: 1)clear definition of chair, 2)who sets agenda for coordinating committee? And 3) where is point of contact between network and NSF and the network and the outside world-

Phil- there's no term and no times to meet for National Advisory Board

Gosz- has been ad hoc and as we need them. Says in Net Ofc literature it would be every two years. I will print it out, you take it back to your sites, and review it, and will address it again at the September CC meeting in September.

Gosz will send out changes electronically

Bob- we're bringing the SP to the NAB in June and asking for comments so keeping up with that time line is appropriate.

INSERT LINK: RETURN TO TOP

Strategic planning: break out groups

INTRODUCTION

February 2003 started process at executive committee meeting

The science in the LTER SP will address:

INSERT LINK: [StrategicPlanningCCmtng.html](#)

EDUCATION PRESENTATION get slides from sonia and robert

Question: Education assessment?

Answer: We must do it- must get funding for it which may involve applying to a program in EHR for it. Write a proposal to EHR for it.

Must treat it like a science project: identify needs, goals, funding sources, and get on with it.

NSF is interested but is looking for a proposal to do it.

Like the DM committee, we have a dedicated group of people and it will happen.

Education is an "LTER Goal" so it is incorporated in the SP

Sonia: Education is a standing committee, right?

Gosz: Education will be one of the standing committees we identify in the bylaws. The education committee has a strategic plan and it's presented to the coordinating committee, which may or may not adopt it verbatim.

Francis Li

ILTER

Insert link: draftILTERProposal.doc – WAITING FOR WORD FROM GOSZ/WAIDE

Process- discuss “strawman A” [draft proposal] with LTER CC here today

Discuss LTER CC comments within NSF

Revise “Strawman A” during Summer of 2003

Discuss revised strawman (“B”) w/ILTER reps in Sept 03 at the ILTER mtng at ASM

Discuss ILTER comments within NSF

DISCUSSION:

Main points –

ITLER grew from idea at 93 ASM and it has caught on rapidly with much enthusiasm thanks mostly to J. Gosz, and to his colleagues. We now have 25 countries around the world and see opportunity for more collaborative research for x-site and US scientists for more collaboration outside the US.

Like LTER, ILTER has sprung up sort of ad hoc w/out a lot of formal machinery, or financial support. We can't keep track of what's happening or what might happen in the future. At this point we have a rather “robust adolescent” and we think we'd like to have a long term plan- what are you going to do when you grow up?

Now recognizing a real need for dedicated coordination function. So far NET ofc has done it as they can and it's not fair to them or the networks to go on this way.

In this proposal we recognize this is a new phase and we'd like more formal relationships. Perhaps the US should not be in the drivers seat but the other countries should be more active in leadership of the network.

We also have Jim saying he'd like to hand over chairmanship to someone else. So this is a good opportunity to get other networks more strongly involved.

We'd like to propose a coordinator that involves travel, of course. We also recognize the need for data sharing. We are prepared to provide some defined piece of IM training. We are also interested in collaborative research. We have a hopeful new regime in NSF INT which is looking forward to a large infusion of funds to do things with and strengthening the ILTER program is in the sights. We think its' a great opportunity to reach developing nations-

Probably in 2005 we are looking at a significant chunk of money for promoting collaborative research that will get everyone interested and looking for opportunities.

And for the next few years- for the long term we are hoping the ILTER can be expanded and supported more broadly. Right now the ILTER sites are supported in country or by intl agencies, but there is no other support for the ILTER 'network' We believe it would be beneficial for the Network for more broad support. We're looking forward to that day, but mean time NSF is happy to do that.

ISSUES: For us: lay more track, or move more freight?

- Role of US in ILTER
- Relation of US LTER to ILTER
- Role of Net ofc in ILTER
- Role of coordinator- relations to US rep to ILTER
- IT Training

Francis li would like to know how many PIs at sites have done ILTER work. Please send e-mail to fli@nsf.gov

[Francis asked PI's to tally at sites and send her a count]

Questions:

What is ILTER?

Ans: they are countries that have adopted the model under some natl fed organization that commits that country to this kind of research. Only when they get that commitment from a govt funding agency are they allowed to join the Network.

Question: I saw no overlap between the science I do and the list of science done at the ILTER sites on the Website. Who decides what science gets done?

Ans: it depends on the country. Just like here in this country.

Francis: sometimes they are working on their governments to go through the long process to get the buy into this concept. It's a lot of work, a long process to build that list.

Question: What's not clear from this discussion is what has actually been accomplished – what has been produced? How many PhD theses, how many papers? Has the focus been only on building this structure?

Ans: there have been a fair number of exchanges between US sites and certain partner countries. A coordinator would be able to keep better track of these things- products and activities, etc.

The intl sites themselves can produce their own publications. Presumably the countries are producing their own publications, as well as the US/collaborative publications.

Question: what would remain if the US backed out?

Ans: NSF has not put much into it in terms of hard resources and we're offering some w/this proposal.

This would be a valid question in 5 years from now after a significant investment.

Gus: a lot of work has already been done. But there is no mention of research productivity or how many PhD's have been affected.

Waide: so far effort has focused on building infrastructure. We have not set out to produce papers or PhD's so far. Must go back to origin of effort and measure results so far on those.

Gholz: what about you, gus? You've participated in it? what have you gained?

Aron: is the point to set up sites for US scientists? Or for everyone to collaborate.

Response: The latter

Aron: how much has been invested by other countries? How much track have they laid?

Francis: the respondents to these questionnaires said ILTER membership has helped them get more funding, more stability, more visibility. Has helped them very much in country.

Henry: we have not had anyone to chase down and distill information like this.

Gus: I think we should keep better track of inputs and outputs of this system.

Francis: until now, ILTER has not had a staff person to do anything.

Waide: Chris French did this kind of thing for 3 years, but that was 2 years ago. Since then nothing has been done.

Gus: there is no category in this report for 'publications.'

Gosz: there was no category in the US LTER network for several years, either. We proposed an assessment, NSF declined the proposal, but did a little survey of their own.

Tim H.: one value of laying more track is the organization joins and gains some benefit. So laying more track is cheap and easy and somebody gets something out of it.

Bill: map shows 25 countries have joined, and other countries that are interested and/or in the process of joining. Question is whether do we want to stop now or laying more track to add those that are in process?

Francis- I consider those in process to be a part of it. We don't need to spend more energy trying to get more countries to join, but to getting more collaboration going on.

Waide: it may not be an either/or activity. Whether more countries should be added is up to the ILTER committee, not the US LTER CC. Now is the time to move it along if desired.

Gosz: other countries like Taiwan are active in bringing along other countries on their own.

Tim Hollibaugh: so far support has been one way and perhaps we should inspire more two-way participation.

Francis – we want to have a little more latitude. INT only supports the US side of the research. In terms of supporting specific collaborations it must have a US focus.

Tim H. : the way it's set up now, the ILTER model is to add field sites in other countries for more opps to do science.

Francis: there's an annual mtng at which they do get together and discuss details.

Scott Collins: in a sense ILTER has been successful. We have to be careful, Gus, about imposing US academic standards about what is being accomplished in other countries. Now do we direct more money into research or into schmoozing?

If the sevilleta or konza or florida wants to do international research they can do it if they want- they just write a proposal and they don't need the network office to do anything.

Henry: a coordinator could be anywhere- but it is not a US coordinator of international programs, it's a support position to ILTER. The chair would be anywhere but Nsf is saying we would still provide a secretary function for ILTER.

We're putting that position fwd. Because it's NSF this person will be a US citizen. Will be a facilitator for increased activity

Tim: this person would also gather the kinds of information we're asking about here.

Gosz: its important to not judge other countries on our standards.

Waide: we have a group going to france to get their perspective on humans in the environment.

And it's more than just individual-to-individual effort- scott is right, it's more than that- it's network to network. An example is LIDET and that's the kind of thing we hope will come out of this.

Harmon: in east asia we went there and led them through a processes so they could do it on their own.

Francis Li: -role of US in ILTER- what should be the role? So far it's been Jim preaching the gospel around the world, selling it well, setting directions. As Jim steps back and other country becomes chair and as it becomes more mature perhaps it's time for someone else in the US to become more responsible. Referring to a formalized US rep.

Gus: if the US steps back from the leadership role will the whole thing fall apart?

Henry: there have been other countries that have expressed interest. We're saying we'd like to maintain that posting and try to move ILTER to the next phase. We've had other countries say they are interested in stepping up to bat.

Aron Ellison: w/in ILTER does the US have one vote? Yes.

Henry: we have not addressed budgeting issues at all in this proposal. But about the US rep it's been said that support is needed for release time to attend meetings- with some incentive to be involved.

Harmon: we shouldn't underestimate our role in setting standards – for example the soils book I have heard is used frequently in other parts of the world, such as south America.

Francis: Maybe the ILTER may want to consider developing terms of reference, looking into future funding. How would US LTER get these questions on the table? How would they get those issues on the table at an ITLER meeting?

Gosz; it's patterned closely after the US model. The U.S. rep would attend US cc meetings and collect recommendations who then takes them to the ILTER meetings.

Francis: to what extent does the US rep speak on behalf of the US

Gosz: he/she would have to. That 's what the other countries do- they speak on behalf of entire country.

Harmon: how informed are they of the sites' desires? We would want somebody who is informed of the group.

-role of Net Ofc in ILTER – where the coordinator would be located? Where the IM training would be run from? Or take place? How do we promote cooperation among ILTER sites w/US LTER sites? It is my sense that ILTER has been funneled through the network and developments and opps do not get disseminated thoroughly through sites.

Harmon: we are changing the mode we are trying to develop in. so when we're laying more track the NET was pretty crucial – chris French made a lot of opts open to folks but when in research, NSF needs to advertise the opportunities.

Waide: a lot of what goes on is pushing information.

JVC: there were almost a hundred ILTER reps at the last ASM who were interested in participating w/US scientists.

Tim H. – this position will travel?

Francis: yes- and money will be given up front rather than through constant supplement request as is done now.

Gus: there must be some way of evaluating what we want from ILTER and some way for keeping track of what has worked and what hasn't

Francis: that's a valid point that we should add to the role of the coordinator is to track accomplishments.

Gosz: we have not addressed ILTER projects in SP. This is outreach and should it be a part of the SP ?

Henry: the language of the current SP is self limiting in that regard. We're talking about marine sites that could be in international waters, we've got Antarctic sites, and the questions are the same around the world. Here we're doing the same thing but we're providing a network of potential collaborative sites.

Francis: are we asking for x-country accomplishments or w/in country accomplishments?

Gus: I went to an ILTER mtng in Taiwan and there were a lot of papers and data and I was surprised that it wasn't part of this report.

Bruce H.: we need to look ahead 5 years to see what relationships would be then- scientists to scientists or network to network proposals. We may have to change the way intl collaboration is done.

Phil: Question is how best to manage this activity- the key uncertainty is role of coordinator. Will a post-doc be effective? No- this group should consider a 1/2 time or 1/4-time faculty to work with a post doc. I'd like to see how the rep and coordinator roles are being structured.

Francis: the reason we designed the coordinator as mid-level is that it should be subordinate to the US Rep. That this person will be staff of ILTER.

Henry; we're anticipating that this may not be permanent- that this position may move elsewhere as other countries step up. And it's an experiment.

Francis: the coordinator is from the US and would do more work for the US rep than anyone else.

Phil: what is line of supervision?

Francis: good question
Current idea is immediate staff for ILTER chair

Tim H. primary function of US rep would be liaison between us cc and ILTER cc. If coordinator is only a secty it should be in the Network Office.

Henry: But it's for ILTER- we could say we're not going to do it but now we're willing to say we're putting up the money for this.

Aron: this should be presented to ILTER. Saying we are willing to host the ILTER office and a staff. They might say 'great' but they might say we'd rather have it in Geneva and staff it w/someone from the EU. Maybe we shouldn't spend too much time on it before we get their feedback.

Henry: yes we'll present it to them.

Francis: the concern with someone else hosting and funding it is the time it will take to get this going in some other country. We are prepared for this interim period to keep it together.

Henry: the US has been the 'secty' for it and that's been great but something needs to be done now.

Francis: we don't want the ILTER to become a highly structured international organization.

Francis: IT training: has become a very important part of what makes ILTER useful and meaningful. The goal is to have completely accessible interoperable data across sites – that s' why we want a network and we can all benefit from work that's going on around the globe. The most important thing is the data. There has to be training so we're all using the same procedures. NSF sees this as very important. WE are willing to provide some minimum level training i.e. two one-week sessions/year – just to get a ball park budget information. One at some other country and one in the US, like in New Mexico. But should training be done combined w/US participants or should it be integrated into particular projects?

Henry: The proposal has no financial support for trainers. We are cognizant of the cost and time and resources for conducting this kind of training and are prepared to provide appropriate support.

Gus: should have question-based workshops that end up talking about data.

Insert LINK: ILTER proposal review- EC consideration – waiting on word from Gosz/Waide

Dan Reed; is involvement by US scientists in ILTER restricted only to US LTER scientists?

Waide: generally supps have specified the work would benefit US LTER network. But no, it's not exclusive.

Dan R: If the rep is of the LTER community -- is there any way for Non-LTER scientists to be represented?

Gosz; it's up to the country. We can do it whatever way we want.

Deb Peters: when we sent a proposal to INT it's very restricted on what it can be used for – no salary, etc. are you going to adjust your rules for how the money can be spent so we can do more collaborative research? i.e. Tuition for grad students is restricted right now

Francis: we are reviewing how we operate.

Jim Rusak: the coordinator should be charged with identifying funds for research.

ACTION ITEMS FOR CC (motions requested) GET FILE

- 1) FORM ILTER committee (standing) – charge to be developed
Voted in favor unanimous
- 2) nominees for chair – motion was withdrawn pending further discussion and will be made at next CC mtng. Jim Gosz elected 'interim' chair until then
- 3) open competition for location of ILTER office – motion was withdrawn pending further consideration

INSERT LINK: RETURN TO TOP:

Day 2

Jim Gosz Announced that ILTER meeting in Beijing has been cancelled.

Plenary on Breakout Group discussions on scientific questions

Discussion:

What are the Scientific questions we should be asking as a Network? We would like to present some science questions to NSF in regard to LTER's unique ability to address them.

We are trying to get a sense of what everyone is thinking.

Henry: you have a SP process then you have proposals for addl support that derive from that – are these questions part of that?

Gosz: from each of these questions we need to address all the Goals in the SP.

Henry: these questions need to address the unique aspects of LTER.

Francis: it may be of interest to this group to know that the environmental research and education program, which is a ‘virtual program’ at NSF, decided this season that “Water” as an example of Biocomplexity would be the theme for the first go-round of this program.

Science Themes: INSERT LINKS TO THESE? WAITING ON WORD FROM GOSZ/WAIDE

Jim Rusak Group – outreach -

Peter McCartney group – information management - get slides

Alan Knapp- legacies

Bruce Hayden- education

John Hobbie- Synthesis

Gosz; continue to think about why the LTER network is best poised to answer these questions.

Target is feb 04 w/at least a white paper that addresses these issues and then we’ll see how they want to handle it.

INSERT LINK: RETURN TO TOP

-Motions

-resolution to support nceas

Resolution statement by Dave T. re: continued support for NCEAS and for the new ctr for evolutionary synthesis

Henry: should separate out NCEAS support in this document from center for evolutionary synthesis

Gosz: will be sent to the AD’s at NSF saying the LTER CC is in favor of support.

Motion made and seconded

Steward P: don’t we want to say continued support rather than just continuation?

Mark H. should we put ‘important’ scientific and societal impacts – to relay their value somehow?

Other: is it obvious that there is no other place to do this? if this is gone then there is no alternative for this kind of work?

Hobbie – how much of the total synthesis do they do? I mean, they foster it but...

Gosz: this is just physically indicating our support for that organization. Is there an option to open the competition to move it?

Henry: that's one of the options...

Gosz; I guess we're saying this is successful, keep it going

Scott: We could also suggest modifications, but we must realize the tremendous overhead in moving such a facility

Gosz; this just says we support a national synthesis center- that there should be one

Dan Reed: should we be specific to LTER in our support?

Scott: that could be in the cover letter

Waide: we should include some numbers-

Gosz: we should create a cover letter for these details. The resolution should be short and sweet.

1st paragraph - resolution passed unanimously

discussion on 2nd paragraph

Scott: since NSF has already issued a program announcement calling for proposals for a synth ctr I'm not sure this is even necessary

Henry: could indicate broader support for this kind of support in a cover letter.

Gus: it's important to clarify that we want both- not to be viewed as a choice between as one or the other

Scott: it's different money to do the evolutionary synth ctr –it's not a direct competition with NCEAS.

Henry: don't indicate support only for this mechanism- we are looking at all kinds of possibilities for synthesis- not just for a large synthesis ctr-

Gosz; question is whether we need the second paragraph at all

Gus: I'm sure the evolutionary community would appreciate the support

Mark H: we shouldn't just view this as going to NSF- it's important that we reach out and let them know we support what they are doing

Gosz: we can easily do this in the cover letter

Bob: Do we want to ask for this effort to be expanded? I'm not sure how many of you had proposals turned down because there's not enough funding

Scott: I don't think NCEAS should be expanded --it should be competitive and keep the quality up and make sure it continues to be a good quality experience

Also these docs can be put on the LTER web site to show our support

Gus: it's much stronger to make a resolution passed by the CC rather than a letter from one person

Gosz: all you have to do is make a motion and we'll second it and show our support

Jim Rusak: add three words- just recognize the fact that they funded they evolutionary ctr and that we appreciate it

Tim H.: just say "the LTER cc applauds NSF's decision to support the new ctr..."

Gus: I think this sounds too defensive now- are we worried that we may lose NCEAS as a result of funding the new center? It's a politically weak way of expressing this.

The first paragraph is fine- it's nice also to have a strong statement in support of another center

Phil: part of issuing appreciation for support of a 'done deal' is that we may lose support for other done deals- I think it should be made publicly available.

Gosz: I propose a motion be made that we express our support for the proposed center in a cover letter, along with our current resolution, which infers that we will not write a further resolution -(wordsmithing to come)

Vote=All in favor – unanimous passed.

INSERT LINK: RETURN TO TOP

MOTIONS:

-ilter recommendations

ILTER- we passed this one yesterday – there will be a committee, we will start working on its membership- I've already had some interest, then there are several recommendations

INSERT LINK: draft of ILTER proposal? –waiting on word from gosz/Waide

First thing we need to do is elect the person who will be the rep from the US

-An open competition to be performed by NSF

-Any LTER rep that we elect to the ILTER network doesn't have to be at that institution

-There will be some support for the rep, including salaries, for IM trainers, which was not in the proposal but was committed to by NSF here yesterday, and support for these processes is going to be important

And that they put that process in the network office- continue as we have done so far - but the elected chair not need be there

3rd alteration to the recommendation- change wording to "support for ILTER process" rather than "office"- so that all the people involved are in the same office ????? THIS DOESN'T MAKE SENSE – I MISSED IT

Mark H: I'm confused by hierarchy- but 'secty' name helps – do they answer to the US ILTER chair? Or to the overall ILTER chair? The sectry- [GLAD I'M NOT THE ONLY ONE WHO IS CONFUSED]

Gosz: we would have to construct by-laws, but my assumption would be secty would report to ILTER chair- support for Network rather than the US Rep- who may or may not be chair of the entire network

Henry- will the US rep need support different than the secty? Your recommendations don't have to be formal but we would like it to be clear- rep may move around year to year- they will need some local secty assistance or something- think of it this way and it may clear it up.

Harmon: it would not be helpful to have someone in-between that secty and the overall chair of the ILTER Network.

Francis: there are cosmetic implications in having the coordinator at the NET ofc- maybe too easily confused with the interests of the US Network- could be same situation with the US Rep.

Bob W. one issue that will come up is issue of supervisory- it's impractical to have it at another institution than where the person is physically located.

Gosz: if we have an open competition there has to be a PI and a location.

Henry: we envision that if it is openly competed that the person would have some background. We're trying to improve the situation w/obvious constraint. I'm not convinced that moving around to follow a chair is a good idea- there will be constraints.

Tim H: is this long-term arrangement or is it finite?

Gosz: the ILTER Network could agree that the US is a good place for it, but this is a stop gap solution to get organized for the next 2-3 years

Scott- cosmetic probs – is it from the LTER community? Or the International community? Or is it NSF that we're trying to deal with ?

Francis – Intl community doesn't know about this- we're trying to change a situation where all the energy/leadership/issues/etc. comes from the U.S. At least for the interim trying to provide the administrative glue to hold it together-- but we're concerned that it doesn't look like we're FIRST serving the U.S. and THEN the ILTER- we want to be sure that it's perceived that it's for THEM

Phil: is this an activity that the Network Office would LIKE to assume?

Bob: that would require a complicated answer. We proposed to do it in our proposal but there are some unknowns- one includes the supervision of the coordinator. The other issue deals with the IM training – an important function but we would need more details about personnel and time to be dedicated- and support.

Henry: we also want to keep those issues separate – they are negotiable

The supervision is not an issue --we're asking for your feedback. The IM training would be offered as a service. Right now we are looking at previous training programs that have been run by IM participants. If there is no interest in the future, we will make decisions based on that. But right now, this is what we envision and want to know what you think.

Bob: we don't want to stand in the way of someone else who could do it better.

Henry: we don't envision going outside of the LTER Network to do this

Dan C: re: appearances: So far the support has been from the US LTER network and I suspect they would appreciate the NSF supporting it formally until the ILTER network can take it on themselves.

Mark H: change wording from 'continue' and ignore that issue and say the secty would be located at NET ofc but qualify it by saying the function is to help the ILTER network and the Chair of that Network so it's clear that that person is not working FOR the US Network Office. At my site, we have a lot of US FS supervised by me – and we have agreements on communication for evaluation – it's solved "off the books" basically.

Scott Collins: Do Henry and Francis have enough feedback on this issue?

Answer – yes.

Movement- recommend that continued support of ILTER network be at the Network office – it's as simple as that. Representative can be anywhere else. We have to work out how the NET ofc supports that person –with sub awards or participant support costs
Passed unanimously

Eliminates recommendation that ILTER office be openly competed
Also- we've given NSF a recommendation which they will take to the ILTER mtng in September,
Henry – time frame depends on actions taken to keep ILTER functional and your recommendations will help in that.
Gosz: we will leave it to you and Bob w/the NET ofc coop agreement to do that.

Insert link: return to top

Motions:

- NEON

insert link from Michener presentation?

Discussion:

Create an ad-hoc committee to address ways of supporting NEON
Orchestrating visits to D.C to work w/Appropriations Committee members and sub-committee members- we have a number of members on those committees that are in the states that NEON's would be in

We also talked about a strong thing physical sciences does it to get money from private sector to do lobbying which was used effectively to lobby in favor of their activity and against ours. There are many private industry folks who would benefit from NEON and we could rally their support in this effort – such as instrumentation manufacturing
So question is --do we create a committee?

Harmon: do we just draw from LTER community or do we go elsewhere? Since It's ad-hoc can we draw broadly?

Bob W. we can do a split effort- broad based –but could make coordination difficult.

Gosz: we are using our organized effort to move this along

Phil: we need to name it something different other than NEON. We should have a group to promote large infrastructure which would be more in line with LTER goals- a committee to promote large biological infrastructure

Hayden: How do we do our best to get a NEON activity funded- but should that not happened we need to still need to deal w/ global-scale ecological research and further down the road we should be prepared to deal with these issues.

Bob – It's called “scenario planning”

Jack: to deal with uncertain events- rehearsing what those events might mean for the entity or organization- it's become much more popular since 9/11 looking at indicators that might lead to them was started in the 1970s after the ‘oil crisis’ such an idea is useful. We should look at what the Sites look like 50-100 years from now = we could use their process to deal with this.

Gosz; if the committee title is “Major Biological infrastructure” -- and the SP is looking ahead many years-- it could have a major infrastructure component – and then we have convergence.

Movement is to create an ad hoc committee to develop infrastructure w/immediate goal for support for NEON w/ continued support for future preparedness

Hobbie: we need leadership by people who have been at NSF who understand these processes

Gosz; we have a lot of expertise but we have not used it a lot

Hobbie: we have more going on and more opportunities to take advantage of—such as ESA and AIBS, etc.

Henry: shouldn't focus just on NEON- should focus on upcoming opportunities

Motion: Passed unanimously

Insert Link: Return to Top

—

-All Scientists Meeting status

ASM report: see revised agenda on web site

Thanks to Dan Childers and his committee for organizing all-day ERF/LTER joint session

Program is fairly traditional

Please sign up for PI lunches with graduate students

There is not enough room for us in one bldg so we will be moving around—please keep in mind.

Will 'roll out' strategic planning on Saturday late afternoon. Will be in a small room based on turn out from last time (we called it "town hall meeting") but we could move it to larger room if necessary

Full day workshops should be on Sunday—when we have large rooms available so we don't have to move around

We believe most people will want to be leaving on Sunday

ILTER/NSF meeting on Monday- may include a business mtng pending further developments

IM meeting will also be on Monday

Web site is complete – we will send msg to all_lter saying please register now.

We must have more workshops registered – I have offered money for planning and a deadline of June. There will be 75 total and 15 concurrent

Hotels: NET ofc will pay for lodging for 9 people from each site- at least 5 students, an IM, and Educ and two others- please send list of people who will attend and their desired roommates. Everyone must register. We will pay for double rooms and we need to use 85% of rooms in Renaissance or they will charge us...

Henry: spell out LTER on web site somewhere because it's an 'open' meeting. Supplement has been approved and should show up soon.

Francis: Please have ILTER people look at state dept travel advisories.

Every one must register for meeting- regardless of whether they are paid by NET ofc.

Everyone else must contact hotel directly and make their own reservations. We are not taking credit card payments for anything.

We are not paying per diem – we are just paying for the hotel.

We have estimated a pro-rated airfare and that can be negotiated at your level to save money per person and bring more people.

We should make the CC rep one of the 9 people and use the CC mtng money for 'synthesis' activities, such as follow-up working groups.

We will pay for EXEC comm air fares

You must register for both meetings if you are attending both mtngs. (including ERF)

Registration for LTER mtng covers coffee breaks and mixers. You must pay for registration yourself. It's \$45

We're assuming people will stay 4 nights. If you double up and come early and stay late you have to tell the hotel. If you have a roommate and decide to leave early you should work out costs with your roommate. This has been a problem in the past.

Make your reservations with rio grande travel- you don't have to work w/rio grande—you can take your allocation and buy your own tix and submit travel reimbursements.

We have asked for nominations for Educ, ILTER, and sociologists to attend. We need more recommendations for sociologists.

Please send me the list of 9 people asap and then make your reservations

ILTER participants: We will ask for a letter from their network to recommend them for a visa to attend this meeting. We don't want maverick attendees w/no site associations

There's money for 30 people in the supplement – about one from each country --and we have asked them to provide support for others. Last time each one paid for about one more attendee on their own.

INSERT LINK: RETURN TO TOP

-NSF Symposium (Feb. 2004)

-Santa Barbara CC/NCEAS Synthesis workshop (spring 2004)

NSF Symposium – 6 months away – we should start planning now
We will have it- question is theme and someone to orchestrate it

Henry: person who is organizing will bear brunt of commitment

Contact Nancy Grimm as she has the experience from organizing the last one.

Should we identify a theme now? Is anyone here interested in doing this?

Henry: we need to update our invitee list- you all have a lot of connections in DC so we need to get more people coming. Our list is about 75 people and about 50 people come. Please help us update this list.

Jim Gosz: Congressional staffers?

Henry: WE can't invite them

Gosz: can we invite them?

Henry: have to talk to OPLA at NSF to suss out details.

Gosz: we could move it to the Hill if we need to

Theme Possibilities: water, ILTER,

Harmon; Applications – how are LTER findings being applied by others

Chuck: it's touchy – it's desirable to build connections w/other agencies to interface with LTER somehow. There's always a prob w/the way we talk vs. the way they talk- and if we describe our applications they might be very different than what other agencies consider to be applications

Harmon: there are others who could do this – such as the Forest Service- perhaps others?

Henry: NSF Is the only agency w/out an application mission

Harmon: we could find someone

Phil: what about LINX and the channelization of streams? LINX is telling us that N is cycled more completely when the stream is not channelized

Chuck: NOAA would not be interested in N15 uptake research

Harmon: If you learn something really fundamental about an ecosystem its often easy to apply it, if you're the right agency – we have to make the case that some of this stuff is so basic that it changes your reference for how to manage the ecosystem.

Gosz: PR has a good one- water use and shrimp migration. There area also Fire examples. We need 4-5 of these.

Scott – many sites have state scientists working on them. They could present this.

Harmon: Fred Swanson could be the person you're looking for. He's done this a lot and he might really be interested in it.

"Applications of LTER science to Mangement" include: water, ag, streams, management, plague, everglades

INSERT LINK: RETURN TO TOP

Santa Barbara Synthesis workshop: Dates: last weekend in April 2004– we have to block dates asap at NCEAS

Possible synth themes from last time- based on expectation that there would be money for a post doc in the NET ofc to deal with it- but this money is not in NET ofc budget anymore –we have about \$15k – for a grad student or info man- so we need to readdress this.

We could ask for proposals and committee on scientific initiatives [COSI] will review and select them- even though there's nothing to give away except \$15k –

Hayden- why NOT do it?

Bob: ok- I'll send out a call and the COSI will vet these things.

Thurs Fri Sat- last weekend in april 2004

Summer 2004 Coordinating Committee planning-

Alaska – can't make any decisions now because there is no rep from BNZ

But we must decide how many people we will take. Busses hold 40 people

Aliases will be created for breakout groups [for SP development]– and the leader will need to fleshout final evaluation aspects and will get them to us by 1st of June so we can get them to the NAB by the 20th of June and they will come back to you at the meeting in September, so we can go to the NSF with them next February

Meeting adjourned – 12:19 p.m.

Insert link: return to top

Attendees:

John Vande Castle

Henry Gholz

Bob Waide

Jack Jekowski

Donald Henshaw

Sonia Ortega

Berry Lyons

James Brunt
Gus Shaver
Eugene Kelly
James Gosz
Alan Knapp
Steward Pickett
Tim Fahey
John Hobbie
Bill Michener
Mark Harmon
Langdon Quetin
Dan Reed
Dan Childers
Peter McCartney
Patty Sprott
John Blair
Tiffany Gann
Ted Gragson
Doug Goodin
Emery Boose
Aaron Ellison
Charles Hopkinson
Frances Li
Scott Collins
Mark Williams
Jim Rusak
Jason Kaye
Bruce Hayden

Insert link: [return to top](#)