

February 13, 2020 Partners Working Group Call

Attendance: Diana Dalbotten, Kira Sullivan-Wiley, Kathy Gerst, Jody Peters

The group went over the Terms of Reference (ToR) and made updates. We want folks to look it over before the next call as we need to move forward to ratify it. On a previous call, Kathy had brought up a point about the Standards section in the ToR. We talked about being sure to make a distinction between “technical readiness” standards, which may be more along the line of work the Theory/CI group is doing, and “partnership standards” which would focus more on recommendations about Team Science and co-production. This could involve creating a Reference Library (could be small) to get people started, even a list of keywords for getting people into the team science and co-production literature. For example, the NPN has been evaluating their efforts using this [Tamara Walls et al 2017](#) paper about indicators of good co-production.

Chris - we spent time looking at the User Experience diagram you shared. Perhaps in the next call, you can tell us how your colleague has used this figure with their user groups.

Finally, the group also spent time discussing Kira’s survey which she developed as a way to find out who is working with data, models, forecasts, decision tools, and decisions related to ecological forecasting and how they use these components in their work (e.g., what ecological context/systems). This would then be used to develop a database for a matchmaking service to connect EFI members. We talked about how to make it clear in the survey that people who fill out the survey will not have their contact information automatically shared. Moving forward we want to give people the opportunity to be included in the matchmaking service (if they want) but provide a way where their contact information is not broadly shared. The group will need to determine how to accomplish this. A number of people have made suggestions about the survey which Kira has incorporated. She will be working on it a bit more and then will send it out for the next round of reviews by the group. The next call is on March 12. Here is [the Agenda](#) for that call.

Agenda

- Updates
 - EFI-RCN Boulder Meeting May 12-14, 2020. **Applications due Tomorrow, Feb 14**
 - STC Proposal
- Terms of Reference and Work Plan
 - Kathy: We should clarify/ think more about the role of the partners WG in standard setting. Especially when it comes to “technical” standards for forecasts

- and forecast readiness versus “partnership” standards for building and managing collaborations.
- Today’s notes: Technical readiness - having standards for communicating between partners/forecasters for the knowledge transfer. Our group should be involved with this, but not sure if it is core for what this group does or if we provide input to other groups (perhaps the Forecasting Standards group?)
 - We want to hear from Chris about his experience
 - Getting decision making/usability side of things (the people part) rather than the technical part. This is the second bullet in the Terms of Reference on the Standards section
 - There is a lot of literature on team science.
 - We could provide a library of literature about translational ecology literature
 - The second bullet point in Standards - is really going to differ depending on what partners/community that people are working with (e.g., government, Native Americans, academia). These recommendations would go in multiple different directions
 - What we mean by Partners for this group - as broad as possible. The User community can be very large. But we haven’t been explicit about this in the Terms of Reference
 - The Standards setting is contingent upon the full range of potential partners
 - Need good language on communicating language with partners that are not academics.
 - How to reach out to people/groups that function differently (e.g., engineering firm vs county agency)
 - Team Science - Diana has done a lot of lit research on this (this is more within academia - how do you create a functioning academic team)
 - Native Americans are a special group. Their treaty rights allow them a lot of say in non-reservation area. There is a lot of research that could be dug into about work on tribal lands.
 - There is a suite of literature on co-production. NPN has been using indicators of good co-production (Tamara Walls paper - see: <https://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/10.1175/WCAS-D-16-0008.1>) as a way to evaluate. Good standards for doing a project where you are co-producing end products with Data producers.
 - Communicating science to user communities
 - How to do good Knowledge Transfer, which may evolve into co-production
 - If we come up with a Reference library - it can be small. Just something to get people started. It could also be getting a list of keywords for getting into the Team Science and co-production literature.
 - Try to figure out what our EFI cohorts need to know. This can be a tricky question because it can be a huge issue. But maybe if there are some higher-level reviews or basic articles. Melissa Kenney may be useful for knowing what this literature is

- Be cognizant of working with global partners
 - In follow-up call - have folks look at it, especially the Standards section.
- Graphic on User Engagement from NOAA. Share with the full group - from Chris at NOAA . The “UX” at the top of the image refers to User Experience. This is a way to give us ideas. It doesn't have best practices, but is good to be aware of.
 - To Do: Reach out to Chris to see if we can get more clarification about this figure and how it has been applied.
- Update on Kira's Survey
 - The goal of the survey is to get a handle on the players in the forecasting space:
 - Who is working with data, models, forecasts, decision tools, and decisions related to ecological forecasting
 - How they use these components in their work (in what ecological contexts/ systems)
 - How the component is stored/ managed/ shared/ linked with other components
 - Identify potential partners (wide net approach) and figure out how to get the information to them.
 - Survey is for anyone involved in any aspect of the forecasting cycle (even people who are not doing forecasting, but who work with data or models).
 - Get a handle on who the people are and then how are they connected to each other. To identify missed connections.
 - Want Diana's lab group to fill out this survey (geoscientists, chem engineers, hydrologists). This would be a good way to expand the net.
 - There are people collecting good ecological data but aren't using it in forecasting models. Build a database so people can find each other and connect. Then let people's data be used.



NNGROUP.COM NN/g

- Would be good to have Diana read the Intro text to give feedback on it. Want to make sure it capture everyone who is relevant
 - Other user community to target - people who use datasets to make decisions rather than collecting the data
 - If we can create a successful database, then it would be nice to create a matchmaking service
 - Next steps for this - get it out to people.
 - Be able to define what the purpose of the survey and why people should participate. Ideas for this:
 - Get people in the database that is searchable. Want to create something that provides an opportunity for people to network. This is important for people at the early stages of the pipeline to know who to connect with.
 - It is networking opportunity. Not for EFI to directly connect people, but provide the opportunity for people to find folks to connect themselves
 - As we have projects/proposals and bring in collaborators or as EFI has workshops have collaborators take the survey - ask people to fill out the survey to become more enmeshed in the community.
 - It isn't for social networking. It is for finding the nodes in EFI. EFI is the hubs and then provide the nodes or the opportunity to find nodes
 - Potential to write a paper. If you are collecting data, how do you share it, do you know how people are using it.
 - Want it to be a quick survey to take to get as many people to fill it out.
 - Be clear that if people fill out the survey, they will be put into a database. They will not be required to share their data.
 - This is quite far down the road but could use Expert Database at MN - could be a good example to look at. People may be reticent to put their email/contact info about. But if we set it up as a matchmaking option, then emails will not be shared publically
 - To Do: Diana to look at Kira's survey and provide feedback on intro language
 - Then Kira to make updates and will ping Jody and send it out to the group to see if we can get a second round of reviews.
- Agenda for next time:
 - Follow-up on things discussed in this call
 - Jody to talk to Quinn to get feedback about what kind of input the Partners group should think about for the RCN