

Marine Geoscience DMS Advisory Committee Meeting October 13-14, 2005, LDEO

Advisory committee membership:

Russ McDuff – Chair

Mike Perfit, Karen Stocks, Steve Cande, Geoff Abers, Emily Klein (absent), Steve Holbrook (absent), Chris Fox (ex-officio), Tim Ahern (ex-officio, absent).

Summary Advisory Committee discussion and recommendations

Role as envisioned by Dave Epp on initiation of committee was that committee should provide advice to three communities: the LDEO data group, R2K and MARGINS communities, and NSF.

Advice for R2K and MARGINS community

It appears that data submission has worked quite well for Ridge2000 and we should send the message to this community that this has gone well. There appears to be less buy in from MARGINS community and this needs to be encouraged.

Advice to these communities is that Data Policies need to be enforced. These communities need to figure out how to monitor and enforce staggered data submission requirements as outlined in program data policies.

Advice for NSF

It is not efficient for the data team to go chase PIs for data that can come from ship operators (i.e. ship navigation, bathymetry). Methods to enforce compliance of NSF Data Policies need to be established. Perhaps data submission should be a requirement for approval of both annual reports and final reports.

Scope of activities and how they should be funded:

The advisory committee recognizes that the data activities encompassed by the Lamont projects are serving three core functions:

1. Harvesting data and making it available to the community. This is a facility type function and should be run under more of a data center model.
2. Tools to enable scientists to access data (GeoMapApp). This function does not fall under the same facility type function as (1) and should be funded via peer review.
3. Education activities should also be proposed and pursued as peer reviewed activities.

LDEO Data Group

There appears to be a significant gap in knowledge of data system users and potential users. Need to better engage the user communities. We need to understand what they are after and how they want to use the system.

Advisory committee membership needs to be evident on website along with committee recommendations and annual presentations.

The DMS team needs to consider and articulate what kind of advice they would like from the Advisory committee eg science user advice, advocacy in the community. Current committee composition is entirely scientists. There may be a need to have more CI expertise on committee.

MARGINS

Database efforts to date do not cross the water line. The terrestrial side is important for MARGINS and needs to be addressed.

Foreign Data

This may be a good time to pursue access to foreign data and the committee encouraged this. In addition to bathymetry, Steve Cande emphasized that gravity and magnetics data are also important (including aeromagnetic data). He suggested that perhaps magnetics data could be tackled through the IGRF body. Chris Fox emphasized that obtaining access to foreign bathymetry for the global bathymetry compilation might be best done through GEBCO.

Demonstration Project

Karen Stocks recommended thinking about a demonstration project to show benefit of data system. This could be based on a research question with a demonstrated result to show strength of an approach based on an integrated data system. E.g. A source to sink approach EPR to Costa Rica trench.

User feedback and communication

The DMS needs to better engage the user community. We should consider ways to solicit feedback. Part of the role of the data center is to gather information on how the community is using it. Karen Stocks emphasized that user input will help us build a better system.

Possible ways to improve communication with user communities were discussed. Announcements of new data updates could be distributed through a ListServ. Perhaps monthly or quarterly "What's new" could be posted through the R2K and MARGINS email lists. Mini-sessions on using the Data Systems at annual meetings could be useful. Kerstin noted that they will hold a short course on PetDB at the next GoldSchmidt conference.

How can DMS efforts be evaluated?

Proposal review is the standard method.

How it contributes to science through citation in publications is another measure. However, this can be difficult to measure (eg many do not cite data source for a bathymetry location map).

Chris Fox noted that NGDC relies on the obvious measures of number of users visiting their site, data volumes downloaded, and number of users with unique IPs. If data is downloaded at an increasing rate, then they are successful.

Kerstin noted that tracking number of hits and download volumes is not very useful for PetDB as users tend to download the whole thing to their desktop and then work with it in their own spreadsheets.

The geophysical databases are too large for users to manage this way, and tracking data downloads and # hits will be more relevant measure for this activity.

Should there be a separate advisory structure for geochemistry projects and geophysical/field data projects?

Kerstin discussed the newly formed EarthChem advisory committee and the need to have dedicated expertise in geochemistry to provide advice for the geochem projects.

Rick Murray noted that there has been a lot of benefit to IODP in merging 3 formerly separate measurements related panels into one. Rick suggested we have a single advisory structure and select working groups for very specific advice/problems.