

# **2001 NATIONAL DROSOPHILA BOARD MEETING**

**March 21, 2001, Washington, DC**

**Maryland Suite C, Marriott Wardman Park Hotel**

<b><u>INTRODUCTIONS, APPROVAL OF THE 2000 MINUTES</u></b>	<b>2:00 - 2:10</b>
<b><u>MEETING FORMAT AND ORGANIZATION:</u></b>	<b>2:10 - 2:50</b>
<b>2001 PROGRAM COMMITTEE (Mariana W., Mike G.)</b>	2:10 - 2:30
<b>SANDLER LECTURER COMMITTEE (Lynn Cooley)</b>	2:30 - 2:35
<b>2002 PROGRAM COMMITTEE ( Ken B., Chuck L. )</b>	2:35 - 2:40
<b>MEETING FORMAT &amp; WORKSHOP DISCUSSION</b>	2:40 - 2:50
<b><u>MEETING SITE SELECTION:</u></b>	<b>2:50 - 3:15</b>
<b>GSA COORDINATOR (Marsha Ryan)</b>	2:50 - 3:05
<b>DISCUSSION ON 2004 MEETING SITE</b>	3:05 - 3:15
<b><u>FLY BOARD FINANCES:</u></b>	<b>3:15 - 3:50</b>
<b>TREASURER (Steve Mount)</b>	3:15 - 3:25
<b>BOARD DISCUSSION OF FINANCES, SPONSORS</b>	3:25 - 3:50
<b><u>FLY BOARD COMPOSITION</u></b>	<b>4:00 - 4:15</b>
<b>ELECTION COMM (Gary K.) AND DISCUSSION</b>	4:00 - 4:15
<b><u>COMMUNITY RESOURCES:</u></b>	<b>4:15 - 5:00</b>
<b>STOCK CENTER ADVISORY COM. (Hugo Bellen)</b>	4:15 - 4:20
<b>BLOOMINGTON STOCK CENTER (Kevin Cook)</b>	4:20 - 4:30
<b>STOCK CENTERS: PAST, ONGOING, AND NEW</b>	4:30 - 4:50
<b>DIS (Jim Thompson)</b>	4:50 - 4:55
<b>FLYBASE (Bill Gelbart)</b>	4:55 - 5:00
<b>PATENT ISSUES IN KNOCKOUT PROJECT (ALLAN S.)</b>	<b>5:00 - 5:30</b>
<b>SUPPORT OF INT. CONG. GENETICS '03 (BATTERHAM)</b>	<b>5:30 - 5:45</b>

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**5:45 - 6:00**

## DRAFT REPORTS

### 1. REPORT OF THE 2001 PROGRAM COMMITTEE (Mariana Wolfner, Mike Goldberg)

**Registration** - Preregistration for the meeting has been stronger than anticipated. To date (as of 3/12/01), 1430 people (a record high!) have registered for the meeting; the breakdown is provided below. An additional 100 participants are expected to register at the meeting itself. This represents a strong increase in attendance relative to the prior year (994 preregistered plus 189 on-site registrants, for a total of 1183). We believe the increase is mostly the result of a more popular venue (Washington, DC as opposed to Pittsburgh, PA), although it is possible that the completion of the *Drosophila* genomic sequence may have attracted new scientists into the field. The increase in attendance has occurred in spite of several complaints about the price of rooms at the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel. Though the attractiveness of the venue seems to be more critical in the formulation of decisions to come to the meeting than is the cost of the hotel rooms, every effort should be made to keep lodging costs affordable.

Regular/Advance = 907 (GSA members = 563 Non-members = 344) + onsite 25 = 932  
Students/Advance = 477 (GSA members = 233 Non-members = 244)+ onsite 11 = 488  
Complimentary = 10  
Total to date = 1430  
(onsite : registrations received after the preregistration deadline)

**Plenary Speakers** - Eleven plenary speakers were invited; this is the same number as in previous years, and allows time for the business meeting after the first plenary session. Plenary speakers were chosen for their excellent science and for their ability to communicate in talks. We made efforts to cover a broad range of current topic areas, and to have junior as well as senior investigators as plenary speakers. We also aimed for gender and geographical balance, to the extent possible. Gerry Rubin was invited to be the keynote speaker for the opening night, and will give an overview of fly genomics past, present and future. An updated List of Speakers is appended to this report that includes the year 2001 invited speakers.

**Abstract Submission-** Abstracts were solicited under twelve areas of primary research interest. This is a smaller list than that employed during the 2000 meeting. The list of 2001 topics is appended to the end of this report, including the number of abstracts submitted in each area. In total, 966 requests were made (versus 802 in 2000). There were 377 requests for slide presentations for 144 available slots, allowing accommodation of approximately 38% of the requests. In contrast with previous years, we organized the descriptive keywords hierarchically, so that the keywords matched the session categories. This hierarchy allowed us to achieve a certain degree of internal organization for each session, and also allowed us to apportion the number of speakers for each sub-topic roughly in proportion to the number of abstracts submitted in each sub-field (see below).

We believe that the choice of session topics worked generally quite well. The most popular submission topics were Pattern Formation and Signal Transduction, but some other subjects such as Cell Division and the Cytoskeleton, Gene Regulation, and Neural Development were not far behind. We were able to deal with the higher numbers of submissions in these areas simply by offering two slide presentation sessions for these topics as opposed to one session for the less heavily enrolled subject areas. Two areas - Immune System and Apoptosis, and Techniques and Genomics - had a disproportionately small percentage of the total abstracts. This reflects to a large extent the fact that workshops with strong overlaps for these subjects were independently organized, a matter we discuss in

more detail below. With the exception of these last two topic areas (which were particularly favorable to submitters), it appears that abstracts competing for space in the various slide sessions had a roughly equal chance to be selected.

**Slide Sessions** - We selected abstracts for slide sessions from among the pool of abstracts requesting such consideration using the primary criterion of scientific interest. However, we felt strongly that two secondary criteria were also of importance. First, we tried to spread out the selected presentations among labs. We were averse to having more than one slide presentation chosen from any one laboratory, although in a few cases two selections from the same group were unavoidable. Second, we attempted to eliminate abstracts for which essentially the same subject from the same laboratory had been selected for a slide presentation in the previous year.

Employment of these secondary criteria was in our experience quite successful. This spread the benefits of speaking to as many laboratories as possible, and we did not encounter any situation in which a laboratory selected for one slide presentation expressed anger at not being selected for another presentation. We recommend that in future years, abstract submissions should have a field indicating the identity of the principal investigator so that abstracts could be sorted according to laboratory. This step would simplify the utilization of these secondary criteria.

Two other innovations concerning the slide sessions bear brief mention. First, for session chairs we chose, as much as possible, junior faculty, particularly those we knew to be entering the time of their tenure decisions. In some cases, the abstracts of these junior faculty had not been chosen for a slide presentation. This innovation appeared to be much appreciated by the session chair appointees. Second, at the time we selected abstracts for the slide sessions, we also chose runner-ups who could be rapidly appointed as replacements if a previously chosen speaker was unable to attend. This approach saved us considerable time because there were three cases in which replacements were required.

**Workshops** - There were 10 workshops organized. For the Techniques Workshop, we identified an ideal coordinator (Ken Burtis) and asked him in advance if he would be the organizer. The other 9 workshops were proposed by the individuals listed as organizer in the appendix. It should be noted that, for the first time to our knowledge, the Ecdysone Workshop was linked to the meeting and included in the Program. Issues related to the workshops were by far the most time-consuming and vexing problems we encountered.

(1) The workshops have something of a split personality, due to the fact that the workshops were independently organized. In particular, some workshops are unrelated to the material in any of the regular sessions (such as the Genetics of Non-Drosophilid Insects, or Drosophila Research at Primarily Undergraduate Institutions), while other workshops are essentially carbon copies of regular sessions (examples include the workshops on Techniques, DNA Microarrays, RNA processing, Hematopoiesis/Cellular Immunity, and Fate Changes and Asymmetric Cell Divisions). The latter group of workshops presents many difficulties. Should abstracts be submitted to the regular session or to the workshop or both? How are speakers apportioned between sessions and the corresponding workshops? (In many cases, this was settled by some time-consuming haggling between ourselves and the workshop organizers.) How should abstracts for workshops be treated in the meeting program, given that abstracts selected for slide sessions were removed from the part of the program listing abstracts for poster presentations?

The organizers of the 2000 Drosophila Conference strongly recommended that the Conference maintain a highly visible techniques workshop which will allow selection of critical development for Drosophila research. We agree that Techniques are in many ways now the most essential component of the meeting, and hence we scheduled the Techniques Workshop as a standalone, with no other

concurrent workshops. However, we encountered problems because we also arranged for a Techniques slide session and permitted an independent Microarrays Workshop to be organized as well. This trio caused the greatest coordination difficulties. Future organizers should consider whether a slide session is warranted in addition to a Workshop. Perhaps the Workshop could be limited only to the talks of most general interest, while the slide session could address more detailed issues. In any event, better early planning should minimize such problems.

(2) Following the recommendations of last year's committee, we attempted to organize the workshops early so to allow publication of the schedule of speakers (with accompanying abstracts) in the program book. This strategy was intended to increase the visibility of the workshops among participants. Unfortunately, only a few proposals were received as the deadline neared; one was for a workshop on Non-Drosophilid Insects, which was to be coupled to an independent companion meeting on *Nasonia*. We sent a reminder through Flybase requesting Workshop proposals. Eventually 12 proposals (including that for Ecdysone) were received but three were rejected: two were not fully formulated or novel and one arrived late and overlapped with an accepted proposal.

Workshop moderators had very different ideas of how "pre-packaged" their workshops should be. In some cases, the moderators took pains to choose their speakers and solicit abstracts from them at an early stage. In other cases, the moderators wanted to choose their speakers at the last minute, or from the "platform rejects", so in several cases we do not as yet know who will be speaking at such workshops. We emphasized to the organizers that Workshops are to be informal discussions, not "platform substitutes" but we are not certain how well this will be enforced.

(3) The combination of situations (1) and (2) above created an administrative nightmare. In some cases, the organizers of the workshops did not know that their speakers had submitted abstracts for the slide sessions. Often, we had no knowledge about whether speakers we were considering for slide sessions were delivering essentially the same talk at a workshop. Some workshops will appear in the meeting Program in a format complete with abstracts, others will be announced only in a very sketchy manner. The negotiations between ourselves and the workshop organizers were in some cases very protracted, truncating the time available to react to decisions. As a result, some abstracts ended up appearing in two places in the Program (under the workshop and the poster session), though this was not a problem for abstracts chosen for slide presentations since we eliminated all overlaps prior to selection.

These problems can be dealt with in several possible ways. (a) Workshops could be restricted to topics that do not obviously overlap with slide sessions. This would be the easiest solution administratively. (b) Workshops should be organized - even to the extent of selecting speakers - at a very early stage, prior to the submission of abstracts for platform sessions, so that the participants in the workshops can be easily identified and tracked. This would facilitate preparation of the Program. (c) Strict rules could be instituted so that workshop participants do not submit abstracts on the same topic to the general meeting. (d) Potentially, a separate area of the Abstract submission Website should be made for Workshop submissions. (e) Other than choosing the Workshops and listing the times and rooms, the meeting organizers should play no role in this matter. This would simplify the lives of the organizers, but would prevent efforts to integrate the Workshops into the meeting and could foster abuses (such as having the same talk delivered in a slide session and Workshop).

**Programmatic Changes** - Several changes were made to the general format of the program.

**A.** The organizing committee for the 2000 meeting complained that, because the abstract submission date (set by the GSA) was originally November 8, the *Drosophila* community was not prepared and

there was a poor response. The deadline for abstract submission for the 2000 meeting was then extended by one week, which substantially improved submission numbers. For the 2001 meeting, the submission deadline was considerably later (November 27). We encountered problems in that the FASEB Website crashed over the Thanksgiving weekend, and there was no way for us to access or fix the site because this was FASEB's property. GSA immediately contacted FASEB for help and also extended the abstract deadline to compensate. In any event, the later submission deadline caused no major problems. The committee's time for choosing slide presentations was shortened, but we were able to complete the selection process within a week. We thus believe later deadlines are advantageous in terms of allowing sufficient time for community response, although future organizers should be aware that they will spend Christmas week sorting abstracts.

**B.** In 2000, authors were asked to choose between slide only, slide or poster, poster only for the presentation of their abstracts. Because that system was reported to introduce some confusion, we went back to the simpler, older system in which authors could indicate slide or poster. Those abstracts that were self-nominated for slide presentation but that were not chosen were automatically put into poster sessions. We believe this system worked well, except for some difficulties introduced by the workshops that were described above. We anticipate that the large majority of the abstracts that were not selected for talks will appear as posters at the meeting, but this remains to be seen.

**C.** In contrast with previous years, we made efforts to obtain abstracts for the plenary talks and workshops and to include these in the meeting's Program. These efforts worked very well for the plenary talks, and we believe the inclusion of plenary abstracts helps advertise the plenary talks and makes the Program more complete. However, as described above, our attempts to include workshop abstracts engendered some problems.

**D.** At the urging of Laurie Tompkins, the program director in Genetics and Developmental Biology at NIH/GM, we initiated a lunch meeting that would bring together Drosophila investigators and several program directors at the NSF and at NIH institutes who are interested in funding fly grants. Dr. Tompkins assumed most of the responsibility for organizing this session. The session could not be made into a workshop because the NSF/NIH program directors wanted to meet with us during the day.

Although we have strong hopes that this lunch will be a high point of the meeting, it remains to be seen how useful or well-attended the session will prove in reality. One worry is logistical: we could find no simple way to make sure that participants in this "lunch" will actually find something to eat. The hotel does not allow external caterers to bring food into the meeting venue, and the hotel was unable to come up with an inexpensive lunch menu themselves. As a result, participants will have to leave the hotel and personally bring bag lunches back; we allotted insufficient time to allow people to do so. In the future, if participants find this lunch to be of utility, it may be advantageous to make this meeting with NSF/NIH program directors into a workshop. The issue may in any case be moot because involvement of the NSF/NIH people was predicated on a meeting venue of Washington DC.

**E.** In this meeting, complimentary hotel rooms were reserved -- as traditionally -- for GSA personnel, the two major organizers (who have traditionally been felt to deserve something for their efforts, and we agree!), and foreign scientists (mostly from Russia) who could not afford the rooms. We regret that, in contrast to previous years, we were unable to give complimentary rooms for distinguished figures from the Old Guard (like Mel Green or Dan Lindsley). We felt that needy foreign scientists were a higher priority, and that the Old Guard would be more able to afford rooms. Several of the needy cases had been selected for slide presentations (unbeknownst in terms of need), so the comp rooms were essential for the meeting program. We did not encounter any complaints as a result of this policy, and offers of

comp rooms were much appreciated by the foreign Drosophilists. Insofar as we know, registration fees were waived for all participants who asked on the basis of serious financial need. We recommend that this policy be continued.

### **Future Considerations and Organization of the Meeting -**

**A.** A major problem this year, and one that will continue to increase in severity over time, is the necessity for arranging computer-assisted A/V equipment (for movies and PowerPoint presentations). It is extremely expensive to rent such equipment; these costs are even higher because rental companies make rules that maximize our costs (like not allowing movement of projection equipment from one room to another). Another aspect of this problem is the issue of compatibility between various kinds of computers and projectors. We hope such difficulties will be solved in the speaker ready rooms, but this remains to be seen. We see only two possible solutions. The meeting either needs to raise funds to cover these expenses (see below), or the fly board should purchase A/V and computer equipment that could be used on site. The advantages of the latter solution are the savings in the long run, and the possibility to ask authors to forward CDs, Zip disks, or electronic files prior to the meeting to avoid last-minute compatibility hassles. The disadvantages are the high up-front capital costs, and the possibility that the equipment purchased will soon go out of date.

**B.** We understood that at last year's Fly Board meeting it was decided that outside corporate (or NIH/NSF?) sponsorship was worth soliciting, but that this was the responsibility of the Fly Board. We understand that there may have been concern about favoritism shown to one particular company. To our knowledge, no corporate sponsorship was solicited for this year's meeting, though we understand that one pharmaceutical company inquired about possible support and may be providing meeting participants with briefcases. [In addition, the organizers of the Ecdysone Workshop may have obtained sponsorship from NE Biolabs (where both are employed) for the Ecdysone Workshop's coffee break. This was out of our purview so we don't know the details.] It is recommended that the Board establish a procedure so that the next organizing committee can pursue company or government sponsorship. These moneys would go a long way to paying the cost of renting the projection equipment and perhaps perhaps even provide some coffee breaks. Outside support would also allow the possibility of providing some funds to help indigent applicants, to pay speakers' expenses, or to defray cost overruns.

**C.** We believe that there are some issues concerning the interactions between the organizers and the GSA that could be improved. First, we found out only after most of our work was completed that the meeting is billed for everything we asked the GSA to do. Many of our requests for help from GSA thus added to the meeting costs, unbeknownst to us and in some cases unnecessarily. Future organizers should be aware of this fact from the outset. Second, many inefficiencies of time were introduced by a constant flow of communication between ourselves, GSA, the Fly Board, and individual participants. Not all of this communication was strictly necessary, and could have been avoided by some guidelines. Third, the deadlines we were given by GSA were not always observed by them in reality. These unnecessarily early deadlines caused us some serious time crunches when a few days leeway was in fact possible and would have been greatly appreciated. Future organizers need to be aware that GSA arranges many meetings in addition to the fly meeting, so that some items are scheduled around their calendar. These points are not in any way meant to denigrate the high degree of professionalism from Marsha Ryan and others at GSA, who did an excellent job overall and whose job is made difficult by having to work with new, novice organizers each year. We do however wish to suggest that certain steps could be taken to streamline the communication:

(1) Complimentary rooms - Participants wishing complimentary rooms or a waiver of the registration costs should be directed to send these requests by a certain date (say two months before the meeting) to a specific e-mail address set aside for this purpose either by one of the organizers or by GSA (or alternatively with a common subject heading). Then all of these requests could be considered at the same time, rather than piecemeal as has been done to date.

(2) Communications with authors - Many times, we had to forward e-mail messages to GSA so that they could be resent to authors. This was simply because we did not have the e-mail addresses of the authors available to us. Such communications would be made more efficient if each abstract indicated the senior author/PI and the corresponding e-mail address. As discussed above, it would be advantageous if abstracts were also sorted by senior author/PI so that determinations could more easily be made about the number of abstracts accepted for slide presentations from each lab.

**D.** The situation relative to T-shirts for the meeting should be clarified. It did not become clear until a late stage of the process that the organizer in charge of the T-shirts (M.L. Goldberg) was expected by GSA to be responsible for all aspects of this project, including personally fronting all the money to buy the T-shirts and personally selling these shirts at the meeting. This makes little sense, particularly given that T-shirt sales could be a substantial source of income for the meeting. A small amount of help from the Fly Board (making the original purchases and obtaining people to sell the shirts) could create a profit center that would help the meeting in the future.

**E.** Given that hotel expenses are likely to be high in most of the venues selected in future years, we believe the meeting Website should have a central location to facilitate the finding of roommates willing to split costs. In past years, people have been able to find roommates through postings on Dros.Bionet, but you have to know where to look; some people also emailed the organizers for help in finding roommates. We did what we could, which was limited. Posting a site, or at least a link, as part of the official meeting page would help many people handle the high prices of hotel rooms. GSA or the organizers do not have to put people together themselves, just make it easy to access a location that participants can use themselves.

**F.** In the future, we recommend that the registration form note that undergraduates should sign up in the "graduate student" category (unless the organizers wish to make a separate category; we think this is fine but unnecessary). This would avoid the several calls to the organizers either asking how one's undergrads should sign up, or informing the organizers that it was wrong to exclude undergraduates.

**G.** Although organizers of the previous two flymeetings were generous with their time and suggestions, the learning process for us was somewhat painful. There are many things that one just does not know or anticipate in organizing such a meeting, so the "wheel" has to be reinvented annually. To remedy this, we (the organizers of the 2001 meeting) are compiling a "how-to" manual, which we will give to the next organizers within the next few months. It will be helpful if the FlyBoard could include updated information about decisions reached in response to this Report.

**H.** Additional details raised by the y2k organizers:

- (a) Mailing abstract books. We stayed with last year's practice.
- (b) The schedule of opening night events. We kept the shorter Sandler and Keynote talk times, as initiated last year in response to requests to allow enough time for a mixer.
- (c) We notified all plenary speakers and session Chairs that the conference does not have funds to defray any of their costs. We did not receive any complaints about this, but we

recommend that future organizers retain this practice to avoid potential problems. We offered the Keynote Speaker (Gerry Rubin) travel and a comp room, but he graciously and generously declined both. The NIH/NSF program directors who will be coming only for an hour will be issued comp. badges.

## I. Updated Plenary Speaker list

Susan Abmayr	1995	Ulrike Heberlein	1998
Kathryn Anderson	1999	Martin Heisenberb	1998
Deborah Andrew	1997	Dave Hogness	1999
Chip Aquadro	1994	Joan Hooper	1995
Spyros Artavanis	1994	Wayne Johnson	2000
Bruce Baker	1996	<b>Thom Kaufman</b>	<b>2001</b>
Utpal Banerjee	1997	Rebecca Kellum	1999
Amy Bejsovec	2000	Christian Klambt	1998
Phil Beachy	1998	Mitzi Kuroda	1997
Hugo Bellen	1997	Paul Lasko	1999
Celeste Berg	1994	Cathy Laurie	1997
Marianne Bienz	1996	Maria Leptin	1994
Seth Blair	1997	Bob Levis	1997
Nancy Bonini	2000	Haifan Lin	1995
Juan Botas	1999	Susan Lindquist	2000
<b>Andrea Brand</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>John Lis</b>	<b>2001</b>
Vivian Budnik	2000	Dennis McKearin	1996
Ross Cagan	1998	Mike McKeown	1996
John Carlson	1999	Jon Minden	1999
Sean Carroll	1995	Roel Nusse	1997
Tom Cline	2000	David O'Brochta	1997
Claire Cronmiller	1995	Terry Orr-Weaver	1996
<b>Ilan Davis</b>	<b>2001</b>	Mark Peifer	1997
Rob Denell	1999	Trudy MacKay	2000
Michael Dickinson	1995	Nipam Patel	2000
Chris Doe	1996	Norbert Perrimon	1999
<b>Ian Duncan</b>	<b>2001</b>	Leslie Pick	1994
Bruce Edgar	1997	<b>M. Ramaswami</b>	<b>2001</b>
<b>Anne Ephrussi</b>	<b>2001</b>	Pernille Rorth	1995
Martin Feder	1998	Gerry Rubin	1998
Janice Fischer	1998	<b>Gerry Rubin</b>	<b>2001</b>
Bill Gelbart	1994	Hannele Ruohola-Baker	1999
Pam Geyer	1996	Helen Salz	1994
David Glover	2000	Babis Savakis	1995
<b>Kent Golic</b>	<b>2001</b>	Paul Schedl	1998
Iswar Hariharan	1998	Gerold Schubiger	1996
<b>Dan Hartl</b>	<b>2001</b>	John Sedat	2000
<b>Scott Hawley</b>	<b>2001</b>	Amita Sehgal	1996
Tom Hayes	1995	Allen Shearn	1994
Ulrike Heberlein	1996	Marla Sokolowski	1998

Ruth Steward	1996	<b>Barbara Wakimoto</b>	<b>2001</b>
Bill Sullivan	1996	Steve Wasserman	1996
John Sved	1997	Kristi Wharton	1994
John Tamkun	2000	Eric Wieschaus	1996
Barbara Taylor	1996	Ting Wu	1997
Bill Theurkauf	1994	Tian Xu	1997
Tim Tully	1995	Susan Zusman	1998

## II. Areas of Primary Research Interest

	Slide Request	Poster	Total
Cell Division and Cytoskeleton	48	61	109
Chromosome Structure and Function	28	55	83
Gene Regulation	33	61	94
Signal Transduction	42	79	121
Pattern Formation	56	67	123
Reproduction	26	53	79
Organogenesis	22	34	56
Neural Development	26	66	92
Neural Physiology and Behavior	28	39	67
Evolution	29	33	62
Immune System and Apoptosis	19	16	35
Techniques and Genomics	20	23	43

## III. Keywords

### 01 Cell Division and cytoskeleton

a. mitosis, b. meiosis, c. checkpoint, d. kinase/phosphatase/cyclin, e. developmental modulation, f. centrosome, g. kinetochores and cohesion, h. spindles and motors, i. cytokinesis, j. cytoskeleton, k. other

02 Chromosome Structure and Function. a. chromatin and remodeling complexes, b. insulators/boundary elements, c. polycomb/trithorax complexes, d. position effect variegation, e. dosage compensation, f. telomere, g. centromere, h. other

03 Gene regulation. core promoters and general transcription factors, enhancers, activators/coactivators, repressors/corepressors, transcription elongation, splicing, and its regulation, RNA modification and editing, translational control, RNA localization, other

04 Signal transduction. kinase/phosphatase, cell-cell communication, G protein, receptor-ligand, tumorigenesis, protease, secondary messenger, downstream cascades and targets, other

05 Pattern formation. segmentation, homeotics, axes, compartments and boundaries, cell migration and motility, cell polarity, commitment, imaginal disk derivatives, non-Drosophila, other

06 Reproduction, oogenesis (germ line), oogenesis (soma), spermatogenesis, pre-gametogenic germ cell development, sex determination (germ line), sex determination (soma), sex-specific traits and molecules, fertilization, other

07 Organogenesis, endodermal derivatives, mesodermal derivatives (muscle), mesodermal derivatives (non-muscle), ectodermal derivatives (non-neural), extracellular matrix/cell adhesion, non-Drosophila, other

08 Neural Development, axon guidance, synaptogenesis, neuronal specification, programmed cell death, glia, hormonal control, CNS, Sensory, Postembryonic, other

09 Neural Physiology and Behavior, sensory, synapse, neurotransmitter/neuropeptides, ion channels, homeostasis , learning/memory, courtship and mating, rhythms , hormones, other

10 Evolution, a. genome evolution, b. population variation, c. evolution and development, d. quantitative traits, e. speciation, f. phylogenetics

11 Immune system and Apoptosis, cellular immunity, humoral immunity, caspases, death mutants/genes, iaps, transcriptional regulation, other

12 Techniques and genomics, microarrays, transformation, RNAi, microscopy, gene disruption and targeting, computational analyses, mutational screens, molecular interactions, other

#### **IV. Workshops.**

<b><i>Workshop Title</i></b>	<b><i>Moderator</i></b>
Ecdysone Workshop	Maina, Claude Tzertzinis, George
Drosophila Research at Primarily Undergraduate Institutions	Hales, Karen McLean, Janna Pokrywka, Nancy Reynolds, Elaine
Signaling Through Heterotrimeric G Proteins	Forte, Michael
Distribution, Structure and Function of Cytonemes and Filopodia in Drosophila Tissue	Kornberg, Thomas Chiba, Akira
Techniques	Burtis, Ken
Genetics of Non-Drosophilid Insects	Pultz, Mary Anne Werren, John
DNA Microarrays	Michelson, Alan
Fate Choices and Asymmetric Cell Divisions	Giangrande, Angela

Hematopoiesis/Cellular Immunity	Govind, Shubha Meister, Marie
RNA Processing	Salz, Helen

## **2. REPORT OF THE SANDLER LECTURER COMMITTEE (Lynn Cooley)**

### **Committee members:**

Lynn Cooley (chair), Haig Keshishian, Susan Parkhurst, Laurel Raftery, Bill Saxton (2000 chair)

### **Applications (thesis abstract, student's CV, Letter of support from Advisor):**

Applicant (advisor)

Aaron Bowman (Larry Goldstein), Russell Collins (Jessica Treisman), Michael Palladino (Rob Reenan)  
Sergei Prokopenko (Hugo Bellen), James Wilhelm (Ron Vale), Yihong Ye (Mark Fortini)

### **Initial round of selection:**

Each member of the committee ranked the applicants from 1 to 6 based on the quality and impact of the research and the independence of the applicant. Three of the six applicants were ranked high on everyone's list. Those three (Wilhelm, Palladino and Ye) were asked to send me five copies of their completed thesis, which I distributed to the committee. One of the theses arrived on CD ROMs with printouts of the figures. All but one committee member liked that format.

### **Final round of selection:**

Each member of the committee read the theses and ranked the three finalists. James Wilhelm was everyone's first choice. Because there were no major disagreements during both phases of the selection process, the committee was able to correspond by email with no conference calls necessary.

### **The Award:**

Opening talk of the Drosophila Research Conference March 21, 2001.

Publication of thesis as a monograph by Kluwer Academic Publishers ([Joann.Tracy@wkap.com](mailto:Joann.Tracy@wkap.com) was the contact)

Sandler Award Plaque

Lifetime membership in the GSA

All expenses to attend the meeting

### **Expenses:**

I arranged for 10 plaques to be made by Brinks Trophy Shop in Santa Cruz, CA (831-426-2505; [staff@brinkstrophies.com](mailto:staff@brinkstrophies.com)). Bill Sullivan laid the groundwork for this last year. Marsha Ryan at the GSA paid for the plaques (\$690.00 total) and she has all the information on how to contact them. For the next nine years, the selection committee simply needs to contact Brinks Trophy so that the name of the winner and the date of the award can be silk-screened on one of the plaques. This has already been paid for. The only additional cost will be shipping of the completed plaque to the committee chair.

### **Outstanding expenses:**

\$16.00 - Shipping of plaque to Lynn Cooley

\$122.25 - Shipping to committee members (Lynn Cooley)

## **3. REPORT OF THE GSA COORDINATOR (Marsha Ryan)**

### **42<sup>ND</sup> ANNUAL DROSOPHILA RESEARCH CONFERENCE**

Advance registrations for the 2001 are a record high at 1430, compared to lowest attendance in 8 years in Pittsburgh 2000 with only 1183 registrants. It is expected that another 50-100 people will register on-site in 2001. Hotel room rates for singles and doubles in 2001 (\$191 single, \$214 double) were significantly higher than in 2000 (\$115 single, \$127 double). This would indicate that room cost is less important to

attendance than having the meeting located in a major city, though the US Air worker strike before and during the Pittsburgh meeting did have some impact, but it is impossible to know just how much. Room pickup on peak night in Washington is 620 at the Marriott and 94 at the Omni, totaling 714. Basically, this equals pick-up peak night in Pittsburgh, which indicates that more people purchased single rooms at the lower rates in Pittsburgh and more people doubled or tripled-up in Washington to keep their room cost down.

The number of exhibits sold this year is two more than last year. Represented are 13 commercial companies and one not-for-profit organization in a total of 14 spaces.

Geographic distribution statistics for pre-registrants follow:

**BY COUNTRY:**

ARGENTINA	1	ISRAEL	8	SLOVAKIA	1
AUSTRALIA	10	ITALY	3	SPAIN	4
AUSTRIA	4	JAPAN	28	SWEDEN	8
BRAZIL	5	KOREA	3	SWITZERLAND	24
CANADA	61	MEXICO	7	TAIWAN	8
DENMARK	2	NETHERLANDS	3	UK	67
FRANCE	37	PORTUGAL	2	<b>TOTAL FOREIGN</b>	<b>335</b>
GERMANY	37	REP.OF CHINA	5	<b>from 25 countries</b>	
INDIA	1	RUSSIA	6		

**BY STATE:**

ALABAMA	12	MARYLAND	89	OREGON	13
ARIZONA	11	MASSACHUSETTS	115	PENNSYLVANIA	63
CALIFORNIA	159	MICHIGAN	20	PUERTO RICO	3
COLORADO	6	MINNESOTA	14	RHODE ISLAND	9
CONNECTICUT	33	MISSOURI	29	SOUTH CAROLINA	2
DIST COLUMBIA DC	1	MONTANA	2	TENNESSEE	4
FLORIDA	2	NEBRASKA	3	TEXAS	59
GEORGIA	18	NEVADA	2	UTAH	18
HAWAII	2	NEW HAMPSHIRE	4	VERMONT	2
IDAHO	1	NEW JERSEY	57	VIRGINIA	15
ILLINOIS	33	NEW MEXICO	6	WASHINGTON	27
INDIANA	25	NEW YORK	100	WISCONSIN	15
IOWA	17	NORTH CAROLINA	58	<b>TOTAL USA</b>	<b>1,095</b>
KANSAS	7	NORTH DAKOTA	1	<b>from 44 states</b>	
KENTUCKY	10	OHIO	24		
LOUISIANA	2	OKLAHOMA	2		

**2002 - 43<sup>RD</sup> ANNUAL CONFERENCE - MARCH 6-10 - TOWN & COUNTRY HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA**

The Board selected the Town & Country Hotel in San Diego, as the venue for the 2002 conference. Room rates guaranteed in the contract range from \$135-155 single/double per night. The Board should note that the Town & Country conference facilities have undergone a multi-million dollar renovation, so many of the less attractive features some may remember from 1996 have been updated. Significant improvements and upgrades of the grounds surrounding the conference facilities and hotel room buildings also have been made. Sleeping rooms have been updated with new paint, carpeting and cosmetic fixtures. Additionally, to add to the improvements, the San Diego Trolley has been up and running successfully for several years now, making outings to restaurants such as in Old Town San Diego an easy and inexpensive trip.

The Board, and program chairs, should note that because the meeting dates are approximately 2 weeks earlier, all major deadlines will need to be moved ahead. GSA meetings, computer and publications staff had barely enough time to complete the Program book to final stage and get it printed in time to mail it only 2 weeks in advance in 2001. Three weeks advance time to guarantee that it is freighted and delivered to the Town & Country in time will be required. Therefore, the whole timeline schedule that will be presented to the incoming program chairs will reflect a total of 3 weeks difference from the 2001 timeline. **This will require the deadline for abstracts to be moved from Monday, November 27, in 2000, to Monday, November 5 in 2001. This change and the reasons for it should be promoted to registrants during the 2001 meeting.**



## **2003 - 44<sup>TH</sup> ANNUAL CONFERENCE - MARCH 5-9 - SHERATON CHICAGO HOTEL & TOWERS**

In 2000, the Board agreed upon Chicago and the Sheraton for the 2003 site. Rates will be finalized one year in advance, but will fall in the same range as the 2001 rates in Washington, D.C.

## **2004 - 45<sup>TH</sup> ANNUAL CONFERENCE**

The Board requested proposals for 2004 from Washington, DC, Philadelphia, PA and Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Much information has been presented, but some details of each proposal are still outstanding, mainly exact contract terms and for Montreal, see asterisked note.

### **WASHINGTON, DC**

Omni Shoreham Hotel (site of 1998 Drosophila Conference)

Space: All space needed is available in hotel and can accommodate all posters at once. Posters set up in parking garage w/unstated charge for use. Note, however, that we did not pay for use of space in 1998 and could no doubt negotiate same deal for 2004.

Dates: March 31-April 4 (no holidays, regular Wed-Sunday pattern)

Room Rates: Approx. \$240 sgl/dbl

2001 Coffee Cost per Gal: \$50++ (10% tax + 18% gratuity)

2001 Soda each: \$3++ (10% tax + 18% gratuity)

### **Marriott Wardman Park Hotel**

Space: Same as we're using in 2001 - All in hotel can accommodate all posters at once. Posters go in exhibit space with a charge this year of \$2000 for use of space. Hopefully could negotiate the same deal for 2004.

Dates: March 31-April 4 (no holidays, regular Wed-Sun pattern)

Rates: \$240 sgl \$250 dbl

2001 Coffee Cost per Gal: \$50++ (10% tax + 18% gratuity)

2001 Soda each: \$3++ (10% tax + 18% gratuity)

### **PHILADELPHIA, PA**

Philadelphia Marriott Hotel (Located downtown, connected to convention center and Market Place)

Space: Space needed is available in hotel, but third room for slide breakouts is not well proportioned and may not be adequate too small. Poster area will be tight and some posters may have to be placed in pre-function area, or posters would need to be split in half with 1<sup>st</sup> half up Thurs-Fri Afternoon, and 2<sup>nd</sup> half up Fri night-Saturday.

Dates: March 10-14 (no holidays, regular Wed-Sun pattern)

Rates: \$170 sgl \$185 dbl

2001 Coffee Cost per Gal: \$42++ (7% tax + 20% gratuity)

2001 Soda each: \$2.75++ (7% tax + 20% gratuity)

### **MONTREAL, QUEBEC, CANADA**

Requires 2 hotels:

Delta Centre Hotel (Primary hotel - located downtown, 2 blocks from convention center)

\*Rates: \$115 sgl/dbl (IN USD)

Holiday Inn (Overflow hotel - located downtown, across the street from convention center)

Rates in USD: \$100\* sgl/dbl (IN USD)

Dates: March 27-30 (*different arrival/departure--Sat-Tues*)

2001 Coffee Cost per Gal: \$25++ (14% tax + 18% gratuity)

2001 Soda each: \$1.65++ (14% tax + 18% gratuity)

Space: Palais des Congres de Montreal - All meeting, poster, and exhibit space in convention center. Rooms are all adequate and poster area is spacious.

\*NOTE: There is a \$46,000-48,000 USD rental charge for use of space at the center. I told The Montreal Convention and Visitors Bureau that we do not/cannot pay rent charges. They are currently trying to work out a deal between hotels and center for rent to be paid by adding \$20 per night per room to the above rates. This additional "collection" then would be paid back to the Center by the hotels. This means *actual rates including Center rent* would be about \$120-\$135 per night, plus \$2/night lodging tax, GST @ 7% plus 7.5% provincial tax, or a total of about \$140-\$157 USD.

#### 4. REPORT OF THE TREASURER (Steve Mount)

##### A. ANNUAL DROSOPHILA CONFERENCE INCOME/EXPENSE

	2001 PROJECTIONS	ACTUAL 2000
<b>Revenue</b>		
Registration	\$250,145	\$167,005
Exhibit Fees (8 @ \$700)	13,300	8,350
Mailing Fees	4,443	1,850
Miscellaneous	<u>100</u>	<u>4,995</u> <sup>1</sup>
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>\$267,988</b>	<b>\$182,200</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Fixed Expenses:</b>		
Hotel and Travel-Staff and others	2,250	\$ 5,239
Printing (call and program)	30,000	25,205
Mailing, addressing, shipping, freight	9,500	8,902
Telephone - FlyBase room computer lines	2,700	2,542
Telephone and fax - other	600	429
Office Supplies (badges, signs, misc.)	900	577
Projection/audio-visuals/electrical	32,800	28,153 <sup>4</sup>
Sound	2,000	
Space rental (poster and exhibit hall space)	4,000	
Equipment, carpeting, masking, poster boards	37,500	36,206 <sup>5</sup>
Contracted Services (reg. desk, security, nurse)	4,000	3,507
Computer Services	10,900 <sup>2</sup>	9,571 <sup>2</sup>
Insurance Expense	750	740
Legal fees		320
Salaries/Wages/taxes/benefits	71,431 <sup>3</sup>	68,030
<b>Variable Expenses:</b>		
Catering - Reception and coffee breaks	61,300	45,705
Catering - Fly Board and Fly Base	3,700	3,221
Credit card/bank fees	5,800	4,453
Miscellaneous Expense	<u>350</u>	<u>300</u>
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$280,481</b>	<b>\$243,100</b>
<b>NET REVENUE(EXPENSE)</b>	<b>(\$ 12,493)</b>	<b>(\$60,900)</b>

#### Footnotes:

1. From Bellevue, WA carpet expense.
2. Web design, maintenance, online abstract submission and registration.
3. Based on actual 2000 costs. This reflects Publications Manager work on collection, follow-up, organization and layout of plenary and workshop abstracts, formerly not included in the Program
4. Year 2000 number includes sound.
5. Year 2000 number includes space rental.

## B. MEETING ATTENDANCE

<b>Pre-registration 2001:</b>	<b>1,430</b>	<b>\$250,145</b>
<b>Pre-registration 2000:</b>	<b>1,083</b>	<b>\$131,075</b>
<b>Total registration 2000:</b>	<b>1,183</b>	<b>\$167,005</b>
<b>Pre-registration 1999:</b>	<b>1,142</b>	<b>\$156,350</b>
<b>Total registration 1999:</b>	<b>1,366</b>	<b>\$191,425</b>

## Drosophila Main Fund

<b>Meeting Year</b>	<b>Net Income</b>	<b>Fund Balance</b>	<b>Excess Over Reserve</b>	<b># Meeting Attendees</b>
1993	\$17,105	\$ 25,146	\$ 146	1,165
1994	2,800	27,946	2,946	1,222
1995	8,417	36,363	11,363	1,103
1996	15,035	51,398	26,398	1,423
1997	31,663	83,061	58,061	1,382
1998	21,894	104,955	79,955	1,378
1999	(6,053)	98,530	73,530	1,366
2000	<b>(60,900)</b>	37,630	12,630	1,183
2001(proj)	(12,493)	25,137	137	>1,500

**Note: GSA has granted our request to raise the fund cap to \$200,000.**

## Sandler Lecture Fund

<b>Year</b>	<b>Net Income</b>	<b>Balance</b>	<b>Excess to Reserve</b>
1993	1417	26,720	18,720
1994	-1,207	25,513	17,513
1995	1,891	27,404	19,404
1996	1,009	28,413	20,413
1997	1,467	29,880	21,880
1998	1,386	31,266	23,266
1999	894	32,160	24,160
2000	1,405	33,565	25,565

## 5. Election Report

The Elections Committee consists of Gary Karpen (Chair), Ulrike Heberlein, Deborah Andrew, and Steve DiNardo. We met virtually and chose the nominees listed below. People were nominated by the committee as a whole, based on previous involvement in the fly community, our perception of their ability to perform the job. We also tried to choose people that have not served on the Board for awhile, or ever, in order to infuse new blood into the organization. Furthermore, based on our discussion last year about female participation, we made sure that there was significant female representation on the ballot; 15 out of 25 original nominees were female, and 7 out of 9 final nominees were female.

The original nominees were

California:

Larry Marsh, Judith Lengyel, Tom Kornberg, Ken Burtis  
Ralph Greenspan, Ulrike Heberlein, Mark Krasnow

Northwest

Susan Parkhurst, Sara Smolik, Barbara Wakimoto  
Chris Doe, Hannele Rouhola-Baker

Mid Atlantic

Denise Montell, Kim McKim, Mary Lilly  
Brian Oliver, Steve DiNardo, Liz Gavis  
Allen Shearn, Paul Adler

President Elect

Ruth Lehmann, Marianna Wolfner, Trudi Schupbach  
Minx Fuller, Pam Geyer

Based on this slate, the committee voted and chose the top 3 for the President Elect, the top 2 for each regional representative.

The following letter was emailed to all flypeople in the FlyBase rolls.

Dear Flyperson,

Enclosed you will find a ballot on which to cast your vote for a representative from your region and/or the president-elect for the national *Drosophila* Board. The Board administers the finances for the annual North American *Drosophila* Research Conference and the Sandler Lecture Award, chooses the meeting organizers, provides oversight for the community resource centers, and addresses issues affecting the entire fly community. There are nine regional representatives on the Board, eight from the United States and one from Canada. The Board also has a President and Treasurer, as well as individuals representing *Drosophila* community resource centers, including the BDGP, Flybase and the Bloomington Stock Center. The Board has a business meeting once a year, just before the start of the annual meeting; during the year business is regularly addressed with e-mail discussions and voting. Further information about the Board can be found at

[flybase.bio.indiana.edu/docs/news/announcements/other/Dros\\_Board\\_history.html](http://flybase.bio.indiana.edu/docs/news/announcements/other/Dros_Board_history.html)

Historically, the Board representatives have been appointed by previous members. This year the Board voted to democratize the process and instituted community elections, commencing with this ballot. We also decided to vote for a President-Elect, to ensure that the next President would be trained in advance of assuming the position.

Please participate in this election, it is your opportunity to choose the people that will determine the scope and organization of the national meetings, as well as help set priorities and garner support for community resources.

Please vote for one of the following people in each category.

The nominees and results for the general election were:

President Elect

Trudi Schupbach\*  
Ruth Lehmann  
Mariana Wolfner

Mid Atlantic Representative

Denise Montell\*  
Kim McKim

California Representative

Judith Lengyl \*  
Larry Marsh

Northwest Representative

Susan Parkhurst\*  
Sarah Smolik

The number of votes received was low (~190 total), and we need to do more this year to entice more people to vote. Perhaps it was low because it was the first year. The elections and the need for participation should be stressed at the business meeting, and people need to be told that this is their opportunity to participate in choosing leaders in the fly community. Second and third mailings spaced one week apart would also be helpful. Any other ideas the Board has are welcome.

This year we have to nominate and elect another President Elect, as well as regional representatives for the Great Lakes, the Southeast, and New England. We plan on doing this much earlier in the year in order to allow the President Elect to be exposed to the workings of the Board. Ballots will be mailed by the end of April 2001.

Last year it was proposed that redistricting occur such that the regional representatives, where possible, be affiliated with regional fly meetings. This matter needs to be addressed, as does an updating of the charter on the FlyBase web site.

We have also changed from having a large number of individuals with indefinite terms to very few, as reflected in the list on the next page.

## Drosophila Board Master List:

### Officers:

Steven Wasserman	President	2002	stevenw@ucsd.edu
Gary Karpen	Past-President	2001	karpen@salk.edu
Trudi Schupbach	President-Elect	2003	gschupbach@molbiol.princeton.edu
Steve Mount	Treasurer	2002	sm193@umail.umd.edu

### Regional Representatives:

Paul Lasko	Canada	2002	Paul_Lasko@maclean.mcgill.ca
John Belote	Great Lakes	2001	jbelote@mailbox.syr.edu
Susan Parkhurst	Northwest	2003	susanp@fred.fhcrc.org
Rick Fehon	Southeast	2001	rfehon@acpub.duke.edu
Judith Lengyel	California	2003	jlengyel@ucla.edu
Bob Boswell	Heartland	2002	boswell@beagle.colorado.edu
Claude Desplan	New England	2001	desplan@rockvax.rockefeller.edu
Denise Montell	Mid-Atlantic	2003	dmontell@jhmi.edu
Jeff Simon	Midwest	2002	simon@molbio.cbs.umn.edu

### Ex Officio:

Bill Gelbart	FlyBase	----	gelbart@morgan.harvard.edu
Gerry Rubin	BDGP	----	gerry@fruitfly.berkeley.edu
Thom Kaufman	Bloomington SC	----	kaufman@sunflower.bio.indiana.edu
Kathy Matthews	Bloomington SC	----	matthewk@indiana.edu
Jim Thompson	DIS	----	jthompson@ou.edu
Michael Ashburner	Europe	----	ma11@gen.cam.ac.uk
Hugo Bellen	SC adv. comm.	2003	hbellen@bcm.tmc.edu
John Lucchesi	at-large	2001	lucchesi@biology.emory.edu
Chuck Langley	at-large	----	chlangley@ucdavis.edu
Allan Spradling	at-large	2003	spradling@mail1.ciwemb.edu
Larry Goldstein	at-large	2002	lgoldstein@ucsd.edu
Lynn Cooley	Sandler Lect.	2001	lynn.cooley@yale.edu

### 2002 Meeting Organizers:

Scott Hawley	---	2003	rshawley@ucdavis.edu
Ken Burtis	---	2003	kcburtis@ucdavis.edu

### 2001 Meeting Organizers

Mariana Wolfner	---	2002	mfw5@cornell.edu
Mike Goldberg	---	2002	mlg11@cornell.edu

### Past Meeting Organizers:

Pam Geyer, chair	---	2001	pamela-geyer@uiowa.edu
Lori Wollrath	---	2001	lori-wallrath@uiowa.edu

GSA Representatives:

Elaine Strass	Exec. Dir.	----	<a href="mailto:estrass@genetics.faseb.org">estrass@genetics.faseb.org</a>
Marsha Ryan	Mtg. Coord.	----	<a href="mailto:mryan@genetics.faseb.org">mryan@genetics.faseb.org</a>

## 6. REPORT OF STOCK CENTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE (Hugo Bellen)

Report from the Bloomington Stock Center Advisory Board (March 10, 2001) As usual, we are quite happy with the performance of the Bloomington Stock Center. Most of the details of the performance of the Stock Center are found in its annual report. The collection is slowly expanding and the use is higher than ever.

The major issues that will be discussed in this years annual meeting are:

1. A fair cost recovery system to build an endowment for the lean years.
2. Deciding type and number of mutations that need to be kept for each gene: EP, GT, PGAL4 and EMS induced mutations. Should we try to keep more than one mutation per gene?
3. The closing of the Umea stock center and its impact on Bloomington.
4. Status of the Hungarian collections and their funding.
5. The status of P-element genome disruption project (Rubin, Spradling, Bellen).
6. The status of the deletion project (Cook).

## 7. BLOOMINGTON STOCK CENTER REPORT (Kevin Cook, Kathy Matthews, Thom Kaufman)

Report from the Bloomington Stock Center

Total stocks as of 3/8/01	7,906
Added during 2000	482
Lethal, sterile or visible alleles	318 (55 are P insertion lethal alleles)
GAL4/GAL80/UAS	37
GFP	14
FRT/FLP	38
Cre	4
lacZ	8
Deficiencies	35
Duplications	14
Balancers	4
Marker chromosomes	5
Other	5

Use during 2000 -- increase compared to 1999 is shown in parentheses

- 861 (7%) groups received stocks
- 7,791 (19%) shipments were made
- 85,650 (21%) subcultures were sent
- 36% of shipments and 38% of stocks went to groups outside the U.S.
- 96% of stocks went to researchers in academic institutions

Cost recovery

Fee structure for 2000

Category	Stocks/Shipment	Base fee + additional shipping
100+	1-20 stocks in up to 6 shipments	\$100 + \$8 per shipment over 6
200+	21-100 stocks in up to 12 shipments	\$200 + \$8 per shipment over 12
400+	101-250 stocks in up to 12 shipments	\$400 + \$8 per shipment over 12
500+	251-500 stocks in up to 12 shipments	\$500 + \$8 per shipment over 12
600+	>500 stocks in up to 12 shipments	\$600 + \$8 per shipment over 12

Number and percent of groups in each use category and amount invoiced\*

100+	364	42%	\$ 30,180
200+	282	33%	\$ 53,888
400+	127	15%	\$ 52,781
500+	62	7%	\$ 37,472
600+	26	3%	\$ 19,576
Total			\$193,897*

\* \$15,483 in fees were waived prior to invoicing; for 1999 use, 4% of the amount invoiced was never paid

A new fee structure is expected for 2001 but the specifics are still being discussed with advisors.

Funding for FY 00/01

NSF	\$326,872
NIH	\$100,000
IU	\$ 39,338
Fees	\$186,454 (estimated -- \$193,897 - 4%)
-----	
Total	\$652,664

We are currently in year 2 of a 5-year funding period. A request for supplemental funds to allow us to add 5,000 additional P-insertions in or near genes not currently represented by mutations in the collection was granted by NIH. The collection is now funded to expand to 15,000 lines over the next 3 years.

We were notified on February 6 that the Umea stock center would be closed to the public as of March 1. They will continue to maintain their stocks and make them available to other stock centers at least through the spring. Bloomington will take ~475 lines from the Umea collection. It is expected that most of the others will be added to the developing Japanese Stock Center collection.

Endowment

The value of our endowment as of 3/8/01 is \$442,114. If you would like to make a bequest to the center please contact us. Various items in the center are available for naming in your honor, depending on the size of the bequest. For \$5M we will name the center after you:).

Deficiency project

Kevin Cook and Thom Kaufman's grant to improve deletion coverage of the fly genome and to provide duplication coverage of the X chromosome runs from May 1999 to April 2003. Substantial effort was made the first year to generate deletions by irradiating P-element insertion-bearing chromosomes, but this met with limited success. During the past year, the project has refocused its efforts on creating deletions using transposase-induced rearrangements between P- elements. This approach has proven very efficient and, after investing the time to mark P-element insertions spanning gaps in deletion coverage with visible markers, the project has entered a phase of intensive screening. Currently, deletion coverage of the autosomes is the primary focus, but pilot work for X chromosome deletion and duplication screens has been done.

**Advisory Committee** - current members

Hugo Bellen (Chair), Michael Ashburner, Ulrike Heberlein, Norbert Perrimon, Amanda Simcox

**8. DIS REPORT (Jim Thompson)**

Volume 83 of *Drosophila Information Service* has been published and distributed, with technique and research articles, reports of new mutants, teaching notes, and conference reports. This is the 10<sup>th</sup> year of publication from the University of Oklahoma, and at 248 pages it is the largest issue since 1994. No price change has been implemented since volume 71 (1992), and we will continue distributing the books at \$12.00 plus shipping and handling for the foreseeable future, especially as a benefit to those in foreign countries with funding limitations. This issue was distributed several months later than normal, because at the traditional submission deadline in May we actually had only a handful of submissions. For many years, large elements like stock lists tended to fill a volume so that the cut-off for individual contributions was not a major consideration. But with electronic access to information of that kind, the pattern of individual technique and research note submission has become more significant. Most are received during the late summer or early fall, presumably as a function of freed time from academic schedules over the summer. For that reason, we have decided to shift the annual publication date to January each year with a recommended submission deadline of September, and DIS 84 will be dated "January 2002". In the interim, however, we plan to begin posting on the *Drosophila Information Service* web site the texts of selected categories (and eventually all categories) of articles as they are received, with initial emphasis on technique and teaching articles. A web site has been established and will be publicized more broadly when we have completed testing some elements and adding key files. As an on-going project, we will eventually have full text access to all back issues (1934-present) and a key word search capability. With continued low printing costs and no charges for personnel time, the journal can remain self-supporting for many years even if most researchers and students begin to depend on no-cost electronic access once the web site is fully active.

## **9. FLYBASE (Bill Gelbart)**

The FlyBase Project is continuing along the same paths outlined in previous reports to the Board. Our main preoccupation over the last year has been to evaluate and represent all of the genomic and gene model sequence information, and to integrate it with community-derived information. This is very much a work-in-progress. The regular reannotation of the *Drosophila melanogaster* genome is planned for a 6-month cycle time, with the necessary tools and datasets being in place for the first cycle to begin September 2001. This reannotation will be based on the finished sequence that is currently being produced by the BDGP (Susan Celniker's group) and their subcontractor at Baylor (Richard Gibbs' group). We are currently evaluating how to integrate all of the molecular, phenotypic and bibliographic information into individual Gene Reports. Suggestions from the Board and the community concerning the layout and content of Gene Reports (or any other aspect of FlyBase) would be most welcome. Finally, there is the recurring issue of how to get information from the community, including but not restricted to sequence level annotation information. This is as much a sociological issue as a technical one, and insights from the Board on this topic would be gratefully received.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Gelbart (PI - FlyBase)

## **10. International Congress of Genetics (Phil Batterham)**

Genomes - The Linkage to Life

Melbourne Australia

July 6-12, 2003

## **Background**

The International Congress of Genetics (ICG) has a rather proud history dating back to the year 1899 (see Haynes - Genetics **148**: 1419-1431). Held once every five years under the auspices of the International Genetics Federation, it serves to reflect on progress made in Genetics, to celebrate the best of contemporary research and to anticipate future developments in the discipline. The Congress has been held in many major centres around the world, but never in the southern hemisphere and, hence, never in Australia. In 1998 a bid to hold the 2003 Congress in Melbourne succeeded over a competing bid from Hamburg, Germany.

### **The Melbourne Congress - July 6-12, 2003**

ICG 2003 in Melbourne will be a huge event. Over 3000 delegates will gather at the Melbourne Exhibition and Convention Centre, half of these coming from countries other than Australia.

2003 highlights a critical landmark in Genetics - the fiftieth year since the publication of the Watson and Crick paper on the structure of the DNA molecule. The work of Watson and Crick and all that has stemmed from it will be discussed and celebrated. James D. Watson will attend the celebrations.

The Congress theme is *Genomes - the Linkage to Life*. With complete genome sequences now in hand, the discipline of genetics is free to powerfully address the broadest range of biological questions. The Congress will cover Genetics in all of its contemporary depth and breadth. There will be 10 plenary addresses and 54 symposia with a total of 280 invited speakers (over 220 of these from overseas), considering basic research themes as diverse as mutation, development and evolution and a broad raft of applied themes with relevance to agriculture and medicine using organisms ranging from viruses to humans. Ethical and legal issues will also be on the agenda. Given the importance of genetics research for wealth generation, issues relating to commercialisation, patents, IP and the availability of data in the public domain will be discussed in detail. A number of satellite meetings and workshops are being planned. This will provide added value for Congress delegates, allowing them to discuss specific areas of interest in greater detail than would be possible within the main program.

### **Congress Management**

Our Congress President is Dr. Jim Peacock, Chief of the CSIRO Division of Plant Industry and recent winner of the inaugural Australian Prime Ministers Science Prize. The Secretary General, Dr. Philip Batterham, in leading the Congress organization committees has the support of the best local and international scientific expertise. Colleen Wenn and her team at 'The Meeting Planners' are providing outstanding professional conference management skills to ensure that the Congress is a huge success.

The head of our National Program Committee is Professor David Smyth. David has a breadth of experience in genetics research on organisms from fungi to humans. His research on floral development, initiated in collaboration with Professor Elliott Meyerowitz, has gained much international recognition. The International Program Advisory Committee is Chaired by Professor Chuck Langley (U. C. Davis), winner of the 1999 Genetics Society of America Medal.

### **Communication**

The Congress web site ([www.geneticscongress2003.com](http://www.geneticscongress2003.com)) will soon be launched. This site will provide regularly updated, detailed information on all aspects of the Congress. Registration, accommodation bookings and the submission of abstracts will also be managed via this site.

## **Proposal**

Given the importance of the *Drosophila* research in the discipline of Genetics, we aim to ensure that *Drosophila* geneticists are appropriately represented among the Congress speakers and delegates. The promotional opportunity provided by the *Drosophila* Board at the 2001 Fly Meeting is therefore greatly appreciated. I would now ask the Board to consider the following two issues:-

### ***Promotion of the Congress at the 2002 Fly Meeting***

ICG2003 would serve as a major sponsor of the 2002 Fly Meeting. This would be done in partnership with a major sponsor for ICG2003. In particular a significant financial contribution would be made to the Fly Meeting Mixer. In return ICG2003 and their partner sponsor would be entitled to:-

1. a link to the Congress web site on the Fly Meeting web site
2. the inclusion of advertisements in the Fly Meeting Abstract volume
3. two display booths in the poster area
4. 'theme' the Mixer to promote the Congress. We envisage this to mean:-
  - a. decoration of the venue including signs
  - b. printed information and giveaways made available to Fly Meeting registrants
  - c. provision of Australian food and drinks
  - d. project digital images (without sound) on a wall during the Mixer
  - e. subject to availability - a brief cultural display (didgeridoo or native dance)

As I attend the Fly Meeting every year, I realize that this proposal would generate a major change in the Mixer. However, I believe that it would enhance the event, not detract from it.

### **Satellite Fly Meeting in Cairns (Australia) in July 2003**

Cairns is on the Great Barrier Reef. Aside from being situated in tropical paradise, Cairns offers excellent meeting venues easily reached from around the Pacific rim.

While such a meeting could be organized by locals, a cooperative venture drawing upon the experience of the *Drosophila* board would be preferable. We seek support with promotion of this meeting and in development of an attractive program. The professional conference organizer for the Congress can fully handle administration of the meeting.

### **Final Comments**

**I look forward to meeting with you in Washington D.C. to discuss the details of this proposal.**

Dr. Philip Batterham  
Secretary General  
International Congress of Genetics 2003