

**LTER-EUROPE
REGIONAL GROUP MEETING,
NATIONAL NETWORKS REPRESENTATIVES CONFERENCE
(5TH NNRC)
MINUTES**

Stara Lesna (Slovak Republic), 18/08/2008

M. Mirtl, 2008-08-22

Recorders: Elli (Morning), Christiana (lunch), Jan (afternoon tea), Kinga (notes throughout the meeting), Michael (Tuesday afternoon)

1 Introductory statement

1.1 Background material, products of the meeting and photo documentation

All documents relevant for and produced at the meeting are available in digital format. This includes background documents, presentations, pictures of flip charts and photos. As all other LTER-Europe material they were included into a data base and named according to the following scheme:

Archive + ID + VersNr + Author/Topic + free_text:

- ~~AAxxxxxx~~ Author/Topic_free_text
- **ArchiveIDVersVersNr** Author/Topic_free_text
- **I3040v03** Krauze Research_priorities.pps
- **I3035v05** LTER Bylaws.doc

Square brackets indicate referenced documents:

[I3058v01_pres_Mirtl_LTER_Europe_RegGr_Slovakia_KeyNote_2.ppt]

The products of the 5th NNRC were assigned the archive ID "I30058". They are available at

<http://www.ilternet.edu/events/ilter-coordinating-committee-meeting>

and

www.lter-europe.net

--> ANNEX 1 GIVES AN **OVERVIEW OF THE CONFERENCE DOCUMENTS**

1.2 Hint for the busy reader

All major decisions and requirements for action are marked GREEN in the protocol

2 Agenda

The „item numbers“ used in the protocol refer to the item numbers of the agenda:

1. **Outcome of national LTER meetings**, especially with respect to the questions agreed on in Sevilla/Donana (possibilities of closure in gaps in the coverage of Europe´s socio-ecological regions, qualified feed-back on the proposed standard observations, LTER-criteria and LTER-Europe bylaws etc.).
2. **Completion of the LTER Infobase** (where the above gaps in coverage are due to shortcomings in the documentation of sites)
3. Planning for the **December LTER-Europe conference** (LTSER focus, formation of proposed expert panels, combination with an open space event allowing researchers to present scientific projects to the scientific site co-ordinators in order to build project teams with a strong in-situ component, division of tasks for preparation)
4. "LTER-Europe **best examples book**" and "LTER-Europe best practice guidelines" (s. emails sent by K. Krauze)
5. Experiences with the **Multi-site trampling experiment** (MSE) and the **2008 vegetation re-survey** work (Klotz; Parr/Groner)
6. Status of the **Meta-analysis** to test the hypothesis about changes in community composition (Groner/Krauze)
7. **European ecological ontology** (SERONTO) and how to contribute to the global ontology process (Peterseil)
8. Update of **level of activity of national networks**
9. Key note presentation by RO "**Starting to organize the national LTERs in compliance with the structures of LTER-Europe**" (Vadineanu)
10. **WEB site** presentation (Krauze/ Mirtl)
11. **Logo** discussion & decision (Krauze)
12. **LTER-projects**: proposals, initiatives, ideas...: Life+/DivEurope (Petriccione)
13. Implications of **LifeWatch** for the work on national ESFRI roadmaps (Mirtl/Parr)
14. Brainstorming on interface **UNESCO/BiosphereReserves – LTER**: preparatory action for the complementary exercise in the ILTER part (strategic partnerships) (Mirtl)
15. **ToDo-list for national networks [Mirtl]**
16. **Beyond 2009-03 [Mirtl]**:
 - 16.1 LTER-Europen conference 2009-12 ??
 - 16.2 LTER-Europe management plan
 -
 -
 -
17. Other busines
 -
 -
 -

3 Monday 18 August 2008

3.1 Morning 10:30

3.1.1 Welcome and introduction

MM (Michael Mirtl): Thank you for the hosts for a lovely place. We are 43 people from a large European community, and we have made a fast progress. But we are here to discuss what needs to work. We are here to find out what we need to do. The response of the community is very poor, e.g. about 20% for the request to allow publishing of contact data on the WEB.

To take up the thread:

On the website of the last LTER-Europe conference 64 documents (background documents, presentations, flipcharts and posters and products can be found.

In Seville we worked on the bylaws. Consistency was examined by 2 members (Finland, Austria) and we have to agree on them today. The LTER-Europe research agenda will be called research strategy.

Spain and Portugal are in the process of being accepted, Bulgaria are in an advanced stage.

A backbone presentation lead through the entire day. This presentation contains all major information given at the meeting:

[I3058v01_pres_Mirtl_LTER_Europe_RegGr_Slovakia_KeyNote_2.ppt]

It is also an annex to this protocol.

3.1.2 ITEM 1: National Networks and their response

There is not enough response from national networks, and perhaps there really is no action that is happening according to our decision, so we have to ask ourselves, why do we need to exist, as a continent network. Only 4 countries update the full package. We can do much better. We have people who have the expertise, but they are not being used enough. We are missing an opportunity. This is damaging our future abilities and success.

3.1.2.1 Filling the conference questionnaire and FlipCharts

15 minutes time to fill the conference questionnaire and work on FlipCharts/Posters, where national networks are asked FIVE QUESTIONS

- Has a national meeting already been held in 2008?
- What is the level of commitment of your country?
- What is the level of implementation of your country?
- What is the level of activity of your country?
- Has your country already delivered the complete documentation of sites to LTER Infobase?

3.1.2.2 Brief presentations of delegations and national networks (NNs)

All heads of delegations are asked to present their delegations and current status of national networks by reporting the major "goodies" and "badies".

Italy - Bruno Petriccione: Italian delegation includes me and Cristiana Cocciufa. The situation is quite good, we have 17 sites, some new, some include microsites. The most critical point is that we do not have a proper budget and it is run by voluntary basis of each institutes.

Hungary - Miklós Kertész (Micky): Hungarian coordinator, since 1995. We have 3 sites. I am also a site coordinator. The 3 sites are active a lot of time. Many researchers are involved and more social work is entering. No bylaws, so no legal commitment. One of the sites has a problem of power and heading. The continuity of national support is poor. With me working on Lake Balaton is Voros Lajos

Poland - Kinga Krauze: I am the representative of Poland. The good thing is that it has history, lots of people involved who are keen. It depends too much on me. We don't have a good stake holder. We cannot rely on ministries or academy of science.

Portugal - Santos-Reis Margarita: I am the representative of Portugal. I work in Lisbon, no sites yet, we have commitment of the science community and the ministry. Baseline funding is a problem.

UK - Terry Par: From xmass, someone else is in charge. Funding is safe, database is good and a variety of ecosystems. However, we have not used this data to this potential. Hopefully the new coordinator will be taking this further. Here with me are Jan and Andrew.

Israel - Elli Groner: we have a new information center. David Blankman is heading it in the last year and it is progressing well including a new website. We also have a new biodiversity monitoring center which is progressing very fast. Still no long term funds and too few people doing everything.

Germany – Stefan Klotz: THE german. I will be replaced by ... we have good meeting, and working groups, we are progressing with the german database. We do not have genuine real funding, so we have to establish different funding

Czech - Vrba Jaroslav (Yarda): A lot depends on myself, no legal entity, no funding, we are not sure who we should belong to and we are lacking proper management, but the new Cz society of ecology can get involved. We may have some sites for monitoring. We may start a LTER platform which will be bi-lateral with Germany in Bavarian forest. Krenová Zdenka is the SS coordinator, does not always have enough time, because she is managing a nature park.

Spain - Diaz-Delgado Ricardo: Spain is new from this year. We are just starting, it is difficult to get the feedback from all the sites. But we have the basic monitoring for every site. We follow the recommendation of the LTER Europe, to implement the criteria from LTER-Europe. We are 4 people including Bonet Francisco, Carro Francisco and Marañón Teodoro, coming from Seville and Andalusia

Slovakia - Ľuboš Halada: Slovakia, there are 5 people here including 3 LTER site representative. We have working sites. University of Bratislava and forestry dept are joining and bringing new sites. Funding is a problem. There is no long term and short term funding. No one is paid to coordinate, which is a problem.

Latvia - Svazas Saulius: we have a long history, 3 terrestrial sites, 2 aquatic sites. Funding is still a problem. The stakeholder is council of science, but the ministry is not supportive. The ministry is complaining that our monitoring is too scientific. We had 5 sites.

Lithuania - Saulius Svazas: I will be replaced by someone else at the end of the year. We have data of 30 years including ecology, geology, geography. We are publishing our data via California. We had 47 participants in the national meeting. Our scientific network has no connection to monitoring. We are not an ALTERNet partner and this creates a problem for us.

Finland - Forsius Martin: Martin is the national coordinator. One more person will come. The Finnish network is new. We got money for climate change. The sites are good. There is no central funding. We have a national infrastructure and we have a link to Lifewatch. Karasti Helena is coming later this week.

Romania - Angheluta Vadineanu: we have not succeeded to get more scientists involved, especially economics and social. We need more facilities in our sites. The association of LTER experts is part of the ecological society, and with the grant from BES, we can progress. We are developing the database information. We are involved in Lifewatch. The partners in the network are volunteering. We need to support the partners financially.

France - Baudry Jacques: the 3 main research institutes in the platform, we lack staff for website, database, coordination. We have support from CNRS as long as they exist. The platform are recognized and our research is successful in getting proposals funded and we have more PhD and postdocs. We finished our paper for the book. We do not have long term data. We work together with historians and archeologists. We have data on biodiversity and land use.

Austria – Michael Mirtl: We are an association legally, and the ministry of env is supporting this association. We will write a white paper on biodiversity and nature conservation, socio-ecological research. It is written as an LTER paper and will be introduced in a conference in 2009. Foundation for scientific for funding. This will be a new attitude of examining research area. We will have an umbrella module for the platform done by a good scientist. Not enough people are involved and they are too busy. If the evaluation is not good, LTER-Austria can be damaged.

Serbia: we have promises from our ministry that we will get support. The main problem is that we do not have experts on water, air and ecosystems. We have to convince our government.

3.1.2.3 Discussion

MM: Hopefully there will be a Balkan meeting at Bulgaria. Slovenia are not present but will be back when the baby will be 1 year old. Turkey is still in the process.

Miki: are you legal entity ? are you association Romania, Austria, lithathuania, Latvia,

Yarda: I support information to be shared and recorded. It is important to report exertinally. We should fill in a report every year.

Micky: we need to report in reports, but also orally.

MM: The questionnaire is a first step of getting information quickly and assessed. We wil have a questionnaire and also one idol and around the table for oral reports.

Yarda: report can be sent in advance and can be filled by countries who do not come.

Elli: an electronic report every year to provide. 15 in favour – no objections. Martins seconds.

Micky: I propose to do an oral report every year for each country. 16 in favour, no objections. Kinga seconds.

3.1.3 ITEM 2: Completion of LTER Infobase

The result from the short review we can see that some countries are fully committed but have not provided information to the Europe LTER Infobase.

Bruno Petriccione: update takes time. If it is easy (like the Mexican) then we can do it. If it is complicated, then we are not always ready.

MM: This feedback, is important to the IT group (Johannes Peterseil). In any case we are in a transition phase from very basic metadata documentation (ILTER site database) to more comprehensive and semantics based documentation of sites AND contents (ontologies and ontology based information systems). This is not to be achieved in a years time. But we have entered the process. Will discuss feedbacks later today together with the presentation on IT issues.

3.1.4 ITEM 3: Next LTER-Europe conference

MM: December 1-5 in Majorca RIU Palace Bonanza Playa

Invitation: National rep, site coordinators, key people, alternet expert group. 89 E per person a day. Staff coordinators

Open space, scientific projects, LTSER, scientific strategy, NNRC, excursion, LTER core group

Open space to be announced at the EURECO conference (folder in the conference map)

LTER-community asked to communicate the Open space event wherever possible to support a reasonable number of projects to be presented at the open space event.

Stefan: we need involvement of conservation personals. the federation of Could be involved. We need amangement and scientific plan for the agenda. We need it urgently.

3.2 Afternoon 2.30 pm

3.2.1.1 ITEM 4: LTER Europe best examples book and LTER Europe best practice guidelines (Kinga Krauze)

Kinga Krauze gives a presentation about the preparation of two books about i) "LTER Europe best examples" and ii) "LTER best practice guidelines".

She explains the main differences between the two books: i) it is intended as a presentation of LTER Europe to scientific community, policy makers and other stakeholders; ii) it is regarded as a guidelines book or "manual" and it will be mainly dedicated to national representatives, site coordinators, Institutions, accessing countries.

Preliminary guidelines for authors are provided (approximate number of pages, inclusion of reports, posters or different materials etc). It is foreseen to publish the books under Elsevier umbrella.

LTER Europe people have been approached in order to register their willingness to participate. Further efforts will be done in the coming two weeks.

Questions and a discussion follow.

Jaroslav Vrba comments the nature of the manual book as an ALTERNet I3 final report. Kinga agrees but she says it will be a richer product than a report. Jaroslav Vrba explains the need for a common cooperative chapter, at least as introduction to the book, stressing the importance of cooperation among people to produce also other chapters.

Elli Groner asks Terry Parr his opinion about the intention to publish the book with Elsevier, Terry answers it will not collide with other initiatives, citing the publication of a series of contributions by Oxford.

Stephan Klotz underlines the importance of giving the book a European dimension, skipping a focus on strictly local examples. There is a general agreement about this idea.

Jaroslav Vrba says that a joint work requires much effort and needs time and asks about the provisional time schedule. Kinga Krauze answers there is still a need to collect contributions to understand the whole design and/or gaps and that the more time people have the more they will use so time available will be used.

Stephan Klotz comments on the manual book, he sees the strong focus of this book on methodologies, standardization, it could take much time, ad hoc meetings and workshops. Michael Mirtl suggests that accessing countries, as Spain and Portugal, could help explaining if and how LTER Europe background documents supported them in site selection and joining procedures for Network implementation. Ricardo Diaz Delgado explains how site coordinators in Spain missed indications about standardized protocols and asks whether there will be space for this topic in the manual book. In this regard, Kinga Krauze and Bruno Petriccione recognize a link with ALTERNet Task Group 2 work about parameters. Bruno Petriccione offers LTER Italy contribution in this regard. Martin Forsius asks if these products will be considered as formal products of ALTERNet rather than LTER. Michael Mirtl and Kinga Krauze answer that the two views are totally harmonized. There is still a request from the audience (Lubos Halada, Jaroslav Vrba) for a provisional deadline. Kinga answers contacts and contributions will still be collected until October, meanwhile direct contacts and joint working groups are highly desirable.

Stephan Klotz asks for a list of at least 2-3 topics during this meeting. Michale Mirtl takes the floor to close the discussion, saying available time for this issue will be set in coming days.

3.2.2 ITEM 5/1: Multi-site experiments (Stephan Klotz)

Stephan Klotz gives an oral presentation about the multi-site experiment experience and first outcomes. He says the experiment was intended to assess, in a short time frame, selected ecosystems (forest and grasslands) resilience at European level under biogeographically and anthropogenic influences and preliminary results are available. Experimental sites were partly included in LTER sites and this was the very first experience of research experiment at LTER Europe level. It also could be one topic for the example book. Thanks are expressed by Stephan to colleagues who participated in the experiment. Then a short discussion starts. Terry Parr asks whether any publication about the experiment outcomes are foreseen. Stephan answers that they are on the way. Terry asks further if there is a clear scientific success in the preliminary outcomes and Stephan answers that scientific sound is very good, it was an exercise that made no value difference between monitoring and research, as monitoring gives observations that research can explore and manipulate to answer questions, and ALTERNet was a very valid tool for this experience. Terry Parr thanks the multi-site experiment team. Stephan stresses once again the importance of the expression of the European dimension through exercises like the present one, BioAssess and so on.

3.2.3 ITEM 6: Cross-site meta-analysis (Elli Groner)

Elli Groner gives his presentation about the state of the art of the cross-site meta-analysis.

He gives an explanation of the background motivations of this activity: i) going on with current monitoring activities but ii) perform meta-analysis in the meanwhile.

Then Elli explains the meta-analysis procedure. At the end of the presentation, Elli stimulates further contributions.

Kinga takes the floor to explain that a post-doctoral call was launched to commit one person in this exercise, but the one who was selected later on rejected the task in favor of another involvement; so it is very important and urgent now to select another person soon: he/she should be ecologist, communicative and data analysis skilled, willing to travel also to Israel at least at the beginning of the job. Closure of data collections is foreseen for October 2008, analysis of data should last for 4-5 months.

3.2.4 ITEM 7: European ecological ontology (Johannes Peterseil)

Omitted as Johannes Peterseil was stuck in a traffic jam due to an accident and could not reach the meeting in time: see 19th August, afternoon.

3.2.5 ITEM 8: Update on activity of national networks

Is covered by ITEM 1. An overview is given in the FlipCharts:

3.2.6 ITEM 9: Romania LTER Network Management Plan (Mihai Adamescu)

Mihai Adamescu gives his presentation regarding the contents of Romanian LTER Network management plan.

There is a large appreciation by the audience on the issue, people asking Mihai to have a copy of the presentation. Michael Mirtl assures all conference presentations, included the present one, will be made available on line.

3.3 Afternoon tea 16:00

.....

3.3.1 ITEM 10 & 11 Web site presentation and logo discussion and decision

Kinga Krauze, Poland introduced the new LTER Europe web site. The site is currently only in demonstration mode but she announced that the site will go live for one week (date to be broadcast by

email) when everyone will be invited to view the site and send comments. Kinga asked for contributions in order to make the website a useful information dissemination tool. She ask specifically for

1. National representatives to provide the web address of the national LTER in order to establish a reciprocal link with the new LTER Europe website.
2. Contact details for national coordinators (CC)
3. References of published works produced under LTER Europe umbrella
4. Any forth coming events for the web calendar
5. Any current projects of interest.

She stressed that the desire for the web site was voted for by the ?? and urged people to contribute constructively

3.3.2 ITEM 11: Web site presentation and logo discussion and decision

Kinga Krauze explained that in order to finalise the website design it was necessary to agree on the shape and colour of the LTER Europe logo. She presented some suggested logos and explained the rational behind their design. She suggested that the representatives present vote for their preferred design. She explained that printed versions would be placed on the wall/table in the auditorium and country representatives should place their votes and comments directly on the paper.

Elli Groner, Israel asked about the legality of putting .pdf files of published papers on the web site. Kinga Krauze replied that while there were copyright issues to consider it was ok to link to the journals website or to an email address of the corresponding author of the paper so people could request and copy for their own individual study.

Burno Petriccione Italy questioned the sense of LTER Europe independently agreeing a logo now rather than waiting for an ILTER agreed design (whom he considered the parent body) as they where due to discuss this issue in the next few days. A discussion ensued

Michael Mirtl pointed out that some other regions already have their own logos. He further commented that many people in LTER Europe had requested a logo and there was implications for the web and poster design.

Terry Parr (Chairman ILTER) agreed with Burno Petriccione and suggested that a discussion at ILTER level was preferable in order to get a sensible choice.

Michael Mirtl said it has already been agreed so he did not want to reopen the discussion.

Stefan Klotz, Germany agreed on the need for an eye catching logo now and supported the suggestion to go forward.

Elli Groner argued in favour of waiting as ILTER were going to discuss a logo this week

Michael Mirtl explained that he was happy for ILTER to link with LTER-Europe was did not favour waiting for their decision and experience led him to believe it was unlikely they would get agreement on a logo this week.

Burno Petriccione - agree needed to make progress now but with the proviso that LTER Europe consider changing in the future as the logo would primarily be used in the electronic format initially.

Michael Mirtl asked for vote a simple yes/no with the proviso that the logo agreed at this meeting could be changed in the future if that was the democratic will of the CC.

A vote (show of hands) was taken and the result was Yes 13 No 2 in favour of going ahead now.

Burno Petriccione asked about the management of the site.

Michael Mirtl explained that the technical organizing committee for ILTER and LTER-EU was the same person based at CEH, Lancaster, UK

3.3.3 ITEM 12: LTER-projects: proposals, initiatives, ideas

3.3.3.1 Life+/DivEurope (Petriccione)

Burno Petriccione Italy presented DivEurope

FUTMon –approved

FUTDiv – not approved

CEFES – submitted this year

3.3.3.2 Cost actions

Kinga Krauze explained the progress with the two Cost actions

The one centred on forestry had not been submitted. While the one concerning

transdomain action had been rejected. The two referees had disagreed one in favour and one against.

Kinga explained that 26th Sept 2008 was the next submission date and invited help in re-writing the proposal.

3.3.4 ITEM 13: Implications of LifeWatch for the work on national ESFRI roadmaps

Michael Mirtl gives a brief overview of LifeWatch and how it could affect funding for national LTER networks:

LifeWatch is:

- is a formal network of networks
 - network of observatories ("sites") from different realms (marine, terrestrial, aquatic)
 - will promote a network of data producers and collections
- has a focus on data management and provision
 - will provide access to distributed data sources, also building on GBIF
 - will provide analytical and modeling tools PLUS computational capacity
- develop infrastructure for improved biodiversity and ecosystem research
- will – as also for the other planned large European infrastructures - mainly be based on joint national funding in accordance with LifeWatch concepts
- depends on the lobbying for national LifeWatch networks and their consideration in the respective national ESFRI road maps
- will estimate the realistic costs and work on a legal framework enabling all the above
- 9 work packages, complex structure, comprising national networks and topical networks (ALTER, MARBEF) represented in the policy and science board

LifeWatch needs use cases

- What do potential clients of LifeWatch expect of LifeWatch products and services in the mid- and long term? (e.g.: what data search, access and analytical support should LifeWatch have enabled? For what purposes?)
- What infrastructural and technical framework shall LifeWatch have conceptualized (pilot phase) and implemented (after 2010)?
- What interaction between the networked elements and their data/knowledge shall be enabled?

Implications for the national level (LTER):

- Significant overlap with the national mind maps of LTER (as recently updated at the LTER conference in Spain)
- Most of these national LifeWatch consortia are currently established
- Might be highly synergistic if the national LTER representatives contacted the LifeWatch responsables in their countries
- List of national LifeWatch contacts will be provided
- The implementation of LifeWatch will mainly be realised through national fundings according to concepts developed on the European level
- For that reason it is crucial to achieve a good recognition and consideration of LifeWatch in the national ESFRI roadmaps as ESFRI projects are competing amongst each other – a clear incentive to join forces with all other LifeWatch relevant actors in your countries.

Michael Mirtl called for contribution of case studies and said he will send email with details of the type of response required..

Terry Parr commented that the Lifewatch fund was an opportunity to develop observatories.

3.3.5 ITEM 14: Brainstorming on interface UNESCO/BiosphereReserves – LTER

As for the interface with the network “Integrated Monitoring of Ecosystems” of the UNECE a strategic note for the UNECE/Biosphere reserves will be elaborated at a meeting with the European office in September 2008 (M.Mirtl).

The group is asked to brainstorm aspects that can support the definition of the interface:

- synergies
- experiences in cooperation with BRs
- joint monitoring efforts (division of task)
- complementary research to the management & conservation tasks of BRs
- potential critical points in cooperatoins
- options for formalisation of cooperation on the local/national level

Preparatory action for the same exercise in the ILTER part (strategic partnerships)

Michael Mirtl commented on links with other networks and the need to merge site activates

Yarda commented the possibility to cooperate with ICSU (pdf document will be provided). National committees supposed to commemtn – he thinks it is necessary to mentioned LTSER Thinks this could help in obtain funding)

3.3.6 ITEM 15: ToDo-list for national networks

Michael Mirtl presented the list (refer to PowerPoint doc)

The full ToDo list for national networks is [*I3059v01_NatNetworks_TimePlan_2008_2009.xls*]. This document was provided by email to all national reps on Tuesday evening for comments and feedback still during the conference. Until Friday 22nd, 12:30, no comments were received, so the ToDo list can be considered as accepted and adopted.

3.3.7 ITEM 17: Other business

3.3.7.1 Communication paths from LTER-Europe to networks and individuals

Necessary clarification

Michael Mirtl asked for clarification on the best person to contact in every country as the response to questionnaires was very poor. He further comment that only a core group of individuals were doing the majority of the work and called on greater support from the majority of the group.

The meeting was brought the a close at 17:30.

4 Additional Session on Tuesday, 19th August,

4.1 Afternoon, 18:30-19:45

4.1.1 Decision: Plead for support for the core group

Bruno: LTER core group should be identical with the EC

Discussion: Formal changes of EC membership now?

Vote (14:1 in favour): Chair have shall the mandate to include on an ad hoc basis active LTER members into the EC to formalliy reflect the real situation

Issue to be put into the agenda for the December NNRC

- composition of EC: shall it respresent the "core group" of the active or shall a core group be able to exist on an ad hoc basis separately

4.1.2 Logo

Majority for:



4.1.3 ITEM 15: ToDo list for national Networks and Timeplan

adopted

4.1.4 ITEM 7: Report on Information Management of LTER-Europe (Johannes Peterseil)

Presenation

4.1.5 ITEM 4: Best examples book

- Krauze will tonight send out all the material
- people look through it and come back to KK still during the meeting
- feed back is in the ToDo-List
-

4.1.6 ITEM 12: DivEurope project

- FIRST: Italy to provide a proposal for changed overview chapters and introduction in reaction on changed call text
- still try to go for 2008 proposal
- in first run no change of activity chapters
- updated proposal by end of September

4.1.7 ITEM 1

- The current verision of the bylaws with minor wording changes was circulated amongst the CC members with a deadline for comments (15th September).
- CC members either explicitly accepted or did not respond.

- B. Petriccione from Italy made a motion to reconsider the constitution of the Executive Committee of LTER-Europe. This was put on the agenda for the next LTER-Europe conference in Majorca.
- They currently valid version of the LTER-Europe bylaws is therefore: I3035v09_LTER_Bylaws

5 Annexes

5.1 Documents of the meeting

ID	Version	Name	Content	Date	Source
I3035	9	I3035v09_LTER_Bylaws_draft_before_Slovakia_1.doc	Update of bylaws with full text for items that were left as bullet points in Sevilla	20080817	Mirtl
I3054	5	I3054v05_ANet_2008_WP_I3_final_annual_report_mirtl.doc	Contribution of WP I3 to the ALTER-Net 4th annual report in 2008	20080817	Mirtl
I3056	1	I3056v01_ILTER_Slovakia_RegMeeting_questionnaire_1.xls	Second attempt in developing a LTER-Europe "questionnaire" to support consistent reporting from national networks. Will be further developed into a standard national networks report	20080899	Mirtl
I3057	1	I3057v01_Overall_TimePlan_2008_2009.xls	Overall time plan for ALTER/ LTER-Europe 2008-2009. For the specific timeplan for the national LTER networks see I3059v*.xls	20080899	Mirtl
I3058	1	I3058v01_pres_Mirtl_LTER_Europe_RegGr_Slovakia_KeyNote_2.ppt	Backbone presentation leading through the entire meeting, following and referring to the items in the agenda. This presentation also includes the proposed logos and the outcome of the voting.	20080819	Mirtl
I3058	2	I3058v02_pres_Krauze_BestExamplesBook_1.ppt	Structure and contents of the LTER-Europe best examples book: basis for discussion	20080819	Krauze
I3058	3	I3058v03_pres_Krauze_LogosDrafts_1_read_only.pdf	Logos to be put on vote	20080819	Krauze
I3058	4	I3058v04_pres_Petriccione_DivEurope_1.ppt	Overview of the DivEurope project proposal	20080819	Petriccione
I3058	5	I3058v05_pres_Petriccione_LIFEplus_Call_update.doc	Overview of the DivEurope project proposal	20080819	Petriccione
I3058	6	I3058v06_pres_adamescu_LTER_Romania_ManagementPlan	LTER Romania and its management plan: an idle for LTER-Europe	20080819	Adamescu
I3058	7	I3058v07_pres_peterseil_LTER_Europe_InformationManagement	peterseil	20080819	Peterseil
I3058	8	PRES not yet re-named	Multi Site Experiment	200808	Klotz

				18	
I3058	9	I3058v09_pres_Mirtl_ILTER_LTER_Europe_status_3_final.ppt	ILTER-Europe status report to the ILTER CC	20080817	Mirtl
I3058	11	I3058v11_LTER_Europe_RegGroupMeeting_participants.xls	European participants of the ILTER conference in Slovakia/ Stara Lesna 18th August 2008	20080817	Mirtl
I3058	12	I3058v12_LTER_Europe_RegGroupMeeting_agenda_final.doc	Agenda	20080817	Mirtl
I3058	13	I3058v13_LTER_Europe_RegGroupMeeting_minutes_draft*.doc	Minutes, first draft	20080822	Groner..
I3058	14		Minutes with incorporated comments as background document for next meeting		
I3058	15		Minutes as adopted at the next meeting		
I3058	16	I3058v16_fc1_national_meetings.JPG	Flipcharts and Posters	20080819	Mirtl
I3058	17	I3058v17_fc2_implementation_only_present.JPG	Status of implementation (present members) of NNs	20080819	Mirtl
I3058	18	I3058v18_fc3_implementation_with_non_present.JPG	Status of implementation (all members)	20080819	Mirtl
I3058	19	I3058v19_fc4_commitment.JPG	Level of commitment	20080819	Mirtl
I3058	20	I3058v20_fc5_activity.JPG	Level of activity of NNs	20080819	Mirtl
I3058	21	I3058v21_fc6_metadata_reporting.JPG	Status of metadata reporting of NNs	20080819	Mirtl
I3059	1	I3059v01_NatNetworks_TimePlan_2008_2009.xls	Specific timeplan for the national LTER networks: for the overall timeplan (including all ALTER tasks) see I3057v*.xls	20080819	Mirtl