

NutNet Meeting Notes 8/1/2017

(1) Add-on projects

- a. Add-on data management
 - i. Problem: There are many versions (or sometimes no version) of add-on data circulating among NutNet members
 - ii. Goal: Be able to provide quality data to larger group.
 - iii. Proposal: Integrate add-on data to NutNet dataset at the time of data analysis. Allow an embargo, i.e., time for publication or dissertation/thesis completion. Keep data in UMN server but make Metadata available from day 1.
 - iv. Thoughts from the group:
 1. How to enforce embargoes?
 - a. EB: wait for go-ahead from add-on PI before adding to dropbox
 - b. ES: Important distinction: Dropbox does not equal database. Adding to database does not mean data access is universal.
 2. Even with an embargo, metadata will be helpful for group
 - a. Kim & Jen Firm are working on creating comprehensive metadata for add-on projects. Stay tuned.
 - v. Group accepts proposal.
- b. Access to one's own site's add-on data
 - i. Problem: Someone wants to access add-on data generated at their own site. Usually add-on project PIs want to provide this – can we streamline process?
 - ii. Goal: Provide this more quickly to participants of add-on projects
 - iii. Proposal: Centralize data management within NutNet HQ (Ashley). Ask add-on project PIs whether they would like sites to access their own data when it is incorporated into database.
 - iv. Group likes this idea.

(2) Data Publication

- a. Problem: Publications want NutNet data available online, but “definitive” version will never exist as long as we continue to collect new data.
- b. Thoughts & suggestions from group:
 - i. Jon Bakker: Also noticing requests for *code* & data
 - ii. EB & Kim La Pierre: when publishing papers we have generally provided the dataset on which the analysis was actually performed (i.e., aggregated data).
 1. (What has not been shared are all the observational data up to a certain time)
 - iii. Laureano Gheradi (sp): Let's limit this to observational data. EB agrees—year 0 data.
 - iv. Kim La Pierre: Agrees that raw data publication should be limited to observational data. Re: experimental data, metadata/special considerations often clear to project PI are not obvious to those outside the network. Kim agrees that observational data are more straightforward.

1. Ellen Esch: Some "Notes" are especially helpful. What about a flow chart? Is your question about litter-> then look out for these problems.
2. Ashley Asmus likes this idea. Will explore this year.
- v. ES: Can use "Creative Commons" licensing/attribution style (e.g., "CCBY" license type).
- c. Decision: Core group/HQQ will formalize data publication of 3 -year rolling window for observational data

(3) \$oils

- a. Problem: Eric & Elizabeth have spent > \$100K on soils. How can we maintain this while still keeping analyses in same lab?
- b. Solutions
 - i. Kim: crowdsourcing?
 1. EB: Probably Too much money to ask from a crowd.
 - ii. Laura: Mail costs for non-US participants are exorbitant. International collaborators already have a high financial burden.
 - iii. Average cost around \$500/site (? EB/ES check this)
 - iv. ES: Ask for contributions at the time soils are set up. Maybe new participants will be writing grants for new projects, they could write into their proposal.
 - v. ES: Is there some other agency we could get \$ from?
 1. EB makes eye contact with Phil Fay.
 2. Phil: Well, what about LTAR (not LTER) network. Could propose to them that soil data provide ecosystem function data.
 3. Phil will explore options.
 - vi. Carlos: what about the old sites? New ones might kick in money, but old ones might not
 1. EB: We are not desperate yet, but this is not sustainable in long term.
- c. Decision
 - i. Status quo continues for now.

(4) Website!!

- a. Announcement: University of Minnesota has updated the website to DRUPAL! Wow! Should be online in about a month. HQ will send around an announcement to all when it is live, will ask for people to explore the website and report any bugs.

(5) Publication practices: Things that should be in every NutNet Paper

- a. Keywords: Nutrient Network (NutNet)
- b. Acknowledgements text is standard (e.g. IonE at UMN)
- c. Authorship table w/ each author's contribution.
- d. Site Table: Contributions of Site PI (one step down from authorship)
 - i. This also takes care of when Sites have certain acknowledgement requirements, like LTER sites.
- e. Data versions! Say in methods "Data were downloaded on DATE." This should serve as version number (date in name of .csv on dropbox)
 - i. Versioning system with minor/major updates numbered?
 - ii. We could do this...

1. Ashley can explore this, pending interest.
 - iii. Log of changes?
 1. ES: Easy enough to do this with a track-change in R
 2. More periodic reports to group: send more periodic updates via email when data are uploaded
 - f. Action Item: Ashley will update website with these requirements. Ashley will keep a log of changes to data in text form and send quarterly (ish) emails as the dataset is updated.
- (6) Code Checking & Code Repository
- a. Electronic code scrap bin?
 - b. Checking code is a lot of work!
 - c. NutNet mailing list could be a source of analysis help
 - i. Elizabeth Borer is already wary of spamming whole group with annoying questions.
 - d. Proposal: Code checking should count as authorship contribution
 - e. Proposal: Former lead authors should perhaps compile list of to-dos that have helped move papers forward (ex., compiling the authors table takes a long time!)
- (7) NutNet 2.0
- a. EB: This is in Progress
 - i. Kim & Elizabeth have promised to each other to write proposals this fall
 - ii. At least, network is enthusiastic about continuing the project/experiment.
 - iii. “NukeNet” -- vegetation removal w/ and w/o nutrients – and cessation are two strong avenues
 - iv. Laura Y.: What about mowing? EB: This was also an option.
- (8) NutNet Grad Student Network?
- a. No interest in leading this in the room, but always on the table.
- (9) A better way of communicating with network. What about a forum? – Laura Yahdijan.
- a. NutNet email sometimes includes only site PI. What about a more open forum within the NutNet community, more open to answering questions, eg about analysis?
 - b. Perhaps more helpful would be a table of people on the website
 - i. The problem with this idea is that we don’t have a good accounting of all of the students, techs involved in the Network (Lauren Sullivan has a partial list).
 - c. Proposal: “personnel tab” on experimental data sheet? This will be added to current year’s data sheet (Ashley, nutnet HQ)