

2002 NATIONAL DROSOPHILA BOARD MEETING

April 10, 2002, San Diego, CA

Pacific Salon 4&5 Town and Country Resort and Convention Center

<u>INTRODUCTIONS, APPROVAL OF THE 2001 MINUTES</u>	2:00 - 2:10
<u>MEETING FORMAT AND ORGANIZATION:</u>	2:10 - 2:50
2002 PROGRAM COMMITTEE (Ken Burtis, Scott Hawley)	2:10 - 2:30
2003 PROGRAM COMMITTEE (Dennis McK. Helmut K. John A.)	2:30 - 2:35
MEETING FORMAT & WORKSHOP DISCUSSION	2:35 - 2:50
<u>MEETING SITE SELECTION:</u>	2:50 - 3:10
GSA MEETING COORDINATOR (Marsha Ryan)	2:50 - 3:00
DISCUSSION OF 2005 MEETING SITE	3:00 - 3:10
<u>FLY BOARD FINANCES:</u>	3:10 - 3:40
TREASURER (Steve Mount)	3:10 - 3:20
BOARD DISCUSSION OF FINANCES, SPONSORS	3:20- 3:40
<u>FLY BOARD COMPOSITION</u>	3:40 - 3:50
ELECTION COMM (Gary K.) AND DISCUSSION	3:40 - 3:50
BREAK/ SNACKS	3:50 - 4:00
SANDLER LECTURER COMMITTEE (Steve DiNardo)	4:00 - 4:10
<u>COMMUNITY RESOURCES:</u>	4:10 - 5:15
STOCK CENTER ADVISORY COM. (Hugo Bellen)	4:10 - 4:15
BLOOMINGTON STOCK CNTR (Kevin Cook, Kathy Matthews)	4:15 - 4:30
STOCK CENTERS: PAST, ONGOING, AND NEW (Michael A.)	4:30 - 4:40
DIS (Jim Thompson)	4:40 - 4:50
FLYBASE (Bill Gelbart)	4:50- 5:00
D. PSEUDOOBSCURA SEQUENCING (Hugo Bellen)	5:00-510
COMMUNITY RESOURCES COMMITTEE REPORT (Bill G.)	5:10 - 5:25

OTHER BUSINESS

5:25 - 6:00

DRAFT REPORTS

REPORT OF THE 2002 PROGRAM COMMITTEE (Ken Burtis, Scott Hawley, Chuck Langley)

Registration - Pre-registration for the meeting continues to be strong, as detailed in the report from Marsha Ryan. To date (as of 4/4/02), 1392 people (only 38 fewer than last year's record high) have registered for the meeting; the breakdown is in Marsha's report. An additional 100 participants are expected to register at the meeting itself. The strong attendance continues even with the increased registration fees and challenging air travel conditions this year.

Plenary Speakers - Fourteen plenary speakers were invited; this is three more than in previous years, due to the addition of a special plenary session sponsored by the NIGMS on "Drosophila in the 21st Century: Current and Future Role of Drosophila as a Model System for the Study of Human Disease and Normal Biological Processes." The NIH is covering the costs of audiovisual rental and refreshments for the break, so there is no added expense to the Drosophila community. No traditional meeting activity was eliminated by the addition of this extra plenary session, although we did reduce by one the number of sessions at which poster presenters were officially encouraged to stand next to their posters, in order to avoid temporal overlaps with scheduled workshops. This should not, however, detract from attendance at the poster sessions. 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, to include investigators at different stages in their careers, and to achieve gender and geographical balance to the extent possible (8 male and 6 female this year). Ed Lewis was invited to be the keynote speaker for the opening night, and will speak on "The Legacy of Calvin Bridges." An updated List of Plenary Speakers is appended to this report that includes the year 2002 invited speakers.

Abstract Submission- Abstracts were solicited under thirteen areas of primary research interest (one more area than employed during the 2001 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, 1003 requests were received for posters and platform talks (versus 966 in 2001 and 802 in 2000). There were 377 requests for slide presentations for 144 available slots, allowing accommodation of approximately 37% of the requests (1% less than last year). The number of speakers for each sub-topic was roughly in proportion to the number of abstracts submitted in each sub-field, insofar as possible without combining topical areas in a single platform session.

The choice of session topics worked well, although there is definitely a higher chance of being chosen for a platform presentation in some areas relative to others (see table below). The most popular submission topics were Signal Transduction and Neurogenetics and Neural Development, but other subjects such as Regulation of Gene Expression and Pattern Formation were not far behind. We were able to deal with the higher numbers of submissions in the first two areas by offering two slide presentation sessions for these topics as opposed to one session for the less heavily enrolled subject areas. There is an important issue that needs to be dealt with in coming years regarding the overlap between platform sessions and workshops; for example Immune System and Apoptosis and Techniques are each represented by small platform sessions as well as workshops that have become, in reality, additional platform sessions.

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 that other criteria were also of importance. As far as possible, we tried to avoid having more than one slide presentation chosen from any one laboratory, although in some cases of large, highly productive labs or labs working

in multiple disciplines, selections from the same group were appropriate. The task of dealing with this issue would be simpler if abstract submissions had a field indicating the identity of the principal investigator so that abstracts could be sorted according to laboratory.

Workshops - There were 13 workshops organized. The workshops have evolved to the point where they range from real workshops (e.g. *Drosophila* population genomics) with very loose organization, to alternative community-selected Platform Sessions (most of the "workshops", to an additional plenary session (the Techniques Workshop). Once again, as noted by the previous organizers, issues related to the workshops were the most time-consuming and vexing problems we encountered.

A choice needs to be made: are the workshops meant to be workshops (informal groups of people meeting to discuss relevant issues), or are they meant to be another form of platform session, with the topic suggested by the community? If the latter is the case, it would probably be more useful to get community input beforehand about desired areas for new platform sessions, and then handle them in the same manner as the other platform sessions. It might then be useful to arrange for small rooms to be set aside for truly informal workshops, with reservations for space prioritized in some organized manner. Platform sessions should have abstracts and scheduled speakers; workshops should not.

Policies - In general, the policies followed were similar to those for the 2001 meeting. Complimentary hotel rooms were reserved -- as traditionally -- for GSA personnel, the 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. 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. Audiovisual needs are being met as in past years, and there are no apparent problems to be dealt with in this regard, other than a tendency for some meeting participants to fail to read the information on the web site regarding what is available.

B. Some efforts were made to obtain corporate sponsorship of T-shirts this year, but in the end, they were unsuccessful. The organizers were not inclined this year to take the T-shirt production and sales upon themselves, so there will be no official meeting T-shirt this year.

C. Interactions with the GSA office and staff were excellent this year. Although the organizers are new each year, the GSA is becoming more and more experienced with respect to this meeting (thank you Marsha Ryan), and most issues were dealt with efficiently and expediently. The organizers have begun accumulating a compendium of advice (coordinated by Mariana Wolfner) to be passed along to future organizers, which includes both formal and informal wisdom about issues that need to be addressed. We will continue this tradition with respect to next year's organizers.

It was possible to save some money this year by doing things locally that would otherwise have to be done (at the normal expense) by the GSA office. For example, a web site was created for last minute changes and announcements that was developed by the program chair and created and hosted at Davis, rather than on the official GSA website. Links to this site were added by the GSA to the meeting web site. This approach could be used in many ways, presuming that the organizers are comfortable with web site creation.

As noted in last years report, it would be useful for the organizers to have contact information for meeting registrants (email and phone contact information). Unfortunately, not everyone is on the Flybase People database, and last minute emergencies (cancellations, etc.) could be handled more efficiently if the organizers had this information at their fingertips.

In summary, everything went fairly smoothly this year; attendance remains at record levels despite the events of last year, and the meeting is projected to earn a substantial profit. We look forward to an enjoyable meeting.

Acknowledgements: This report used the report of the 2001 organizing committee as a template, and includes where appropriate some text from that report.

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	Timothy Karr	2002
Bruce S. Baker	2002	Thom Kaufman	2001
Utpal Banerjee	1997	Rebecca Kellum	1999
Amy Bejsovec	2000	Christian Klambt	1998
Phil Beachy	1998	Thomas B. Kornberg	2002
Hugo Bellen	1997	Mitzi Kuroda	1997
Celeste Berg	1994	Paul Lasko	1999
Marianne Bienz	1996	Cathy Laurie	1997
Ethan Bier	2002	Ruth Lehmann	2002
Seth Blair	1997	Maria Leptin	1994
Nancy Bonini	2000	Bob Levis	1997
Juan Botas	1999	Haifan Lin	1995
Andrea Brand	2001	Susan Lindquist	2000
Vivian Budnik	2000	John Lis	2001
Ross Cagan	1998	Dennis McKearin	1996
John Carlson	1999	Mike McKeown	1996
John Carlson	2002	Jon Minden	1999
Sean Carroll	1995	Denise Montell	2002
Andrew G. Clark	2002	Roel Nusse	1997
Tom Cline	2000	David O'Brochta	1997
Claire Cronmiller	1995	Terry Orr-Weaver	1996
Ilan Davis	2001	Terry L. Orr-Weaver	2002
Rob Denell	1999	Mark Peifer	1997
Michael Dickinson	1995	Trudy MacKay	2000
Chris Doe	1996	Nipam Patel	2000
Ian Duncan	2001	Norbert Perrimon	1999
Bruce Edgar	1997	Leslie Pick	1994
Anne Ephrussi	2001	M. Ramaswami	2001
Mel B. Feany	2002	Pernille Rorth	1995
Martin Feder	1998	Gerry Rubin	1998
Janice Fischer	1998	Gerry Rubin	2001
Elizabeth R. Gavis	2002	Hannele Ruohola-Baker	1999
Bill Gelbart	1994	Helen Salz	1994
Pam Geyer	1996	Babis Savakis	1995
David Glover	2000	Paul Schedl	1998
Kent Golic	2001	Gerold Schubiger	1996
Iswar Hariharan	1998	Matthew P. Scott	2002
Dan Hartl	2001	John Sedat	2000
Scott Hawley	2001	Amita Sehgal	1996
Tom Hayes	1995	Allen Shearn	1994
Ulrike Heberlein	1996	Marla Sokolowski	1998

Ruth Steward	1996	Tim Tully	1995
Tin Tin Su	2002	Barbara Wakimoto	2001
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
William Theurkauf	2002	Susan Zusman	1998

II. Number of applicants and speakers in different topical areas

Topic	Number of applicants (platform and poster)	Number of Speakers
Signal Transduction	116	16
Neurogenetics and Neural Development	98	16
Regulation of Gene Expression	94	12
Pattern Formation	88	12
Gametogenesis and Sex Determination	80	12
Meiosis, Mitosis, and Cell Division	76	12
Neural Physiology and Behavior	75	12
Genome and Chromosome Structure	74	12
Evolution and Quantitative Genetics	72	8
Cytoskeleton and Cellular Biology	69	8
Techniques and Genomics	66	8
Organogenesis	51	8
Immune System and Apoptosis	41	8

III. Workshops.

Ecdysone

Moderator: Steve Robinow, University of Hawaii.

Mechanisms of Morphogenesis

Moderator: Susan Parkhurst, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle.

Immunity

Moderator: Tony Ip, University of Massachusetts Medical Center, Worcester.

Drosophila population genomics

Moderator: Trudi Mackay, North Carolina State University.

RNA Processing

Moderator: Bill Mattox, University of Texas, M.D. Anderson Cancer Center

Techniques

Moderator: Norbert Perrimon, Harvard Medical School

Signaling in the eye

Moderator: Nansi Colley, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Kevin Moses, Emory University School of Medicine.

Stem cells and asymmetric division during development

Moderators: Suma Datta, Texas A&M; Haifan Lin, Duke University.

Research at Primarily Undergraduate Institutions: Institutional Research Philosophy and Expectations/Institutional Resources and Support

Moderator: Beverly Clendening, Hofstra University, Hempstead, NY

Cell cycle checkpoints

Moderator: Tin Tin Su, MCDB, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO

Wolbachia

Moderator: Tim Karr, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.

Myofibrils

Moderator: Sanford I. Bernstein, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA.

2. REPORT OF THE SANDLER LECTURER COMMITTEE (Steve DiNardo)

Committee members:

Steve DiNardo, UPenn (Chair)
Lynn Cooley, Yale Med (2001 Chair)
Chip Ferguson, U Chicago
Helen Salz, Case Western

Mechanism of Committee Selection: The current year's chair selects next year's chair (during summer), and also stays on for one year for "continuity". The chair selects the other members; a list of recent members is pasted at the end of this document. You need to have the committee chosen by early Fall. Membership numbers have varied; we had no problem with a committee size of four. One should pay attention to gender, geographic region and perhaps specialty / area of expertise.

Please contact Marsha as early as possible with the name and address of the chairperson so the information is included in the Fly Meeting Announcements. The deadline for nomination should be given careful consideration, given the fluctuation in Fly Meeting dates. This year's meeting (2002) was to be held relatively late, hence the January deadline.

Key Contact at GSA: Marsha Ryan mryan@genetics.faseb.org

Selling points for committee work: not much work; really fun to read what is going on in fly field; responsibility to the meeting, which is FOR the students and postdocs, really. I let faculty "off the hook" for good reasons (grant due Feb / March 1 (this happened quite frequently), but made them give me two names as suggested committee members.

Operation of Committee: Because there were no major disagreements during both phases of the selection process (see below), the committee was able to correspond by email with no conference calls necessary.

Initial Nomination / Application: (thesis abstract, student's CV, Letter of support from Advisor):

As the Fall progressed I became concerned with the slow pace of nominations. I asked Trudy if Flybase (Thom) could send out a reminder. However, there were 13 nominees eventually, and most came in during the last week (prior to Thom's posting through a FlyBase email).

2002 Nominees (Advisor)

Bennet (Luke Alphey)
Bettencourt (Martin Feder)
Bradley (Debbie Andrews)
Furuyama (Peter Harte)
Gibson (Gerold Schubiger)
Kiesman (Bruce Baker)
Kusano (Barry Ganetzky)
Lebestky (Utpal Banerjee)
López-Schier (Daniel St. Johnston)
Sonoda (Robin Wharton)
Torres-Vázquez (Kavita Arora)

Vied (Jamila Horabinhnston)
Wilkie (Daniel St. Johnston)

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 similarly high on everyone's list.

Those three (*Gibson, Lebestky* and *Kusano*) were asked to send copies of their completed thesis **on CD ROMs** (figures and text), which I mailed to the committee.

All but one committee member liked that format; this committee member (Chip Ferguson) asked for hard copy - I had the candidates themselves each send out one printed version to Chip. No one else seemed bothered by viewing files on computer screen (or printing parts themselves that they needed).

Final round of selection:

Each member of the committee read the theses and ranked the three finalists. Although it was quite hard for one member to choose between two nominees, in the end Matt Gibson was everyone's first choice.

The Award:

1. *Opening talk of the Drosophila Research Conference April, 2002.* Chairperson introduces speaker; summarizes why the award exists, perhaps briefly mentions some things about the selection process, etc.

It is likely that most of us chosen to be on the selection committee these days (and forward) are going to be "removed" from the Sandler lineage. Thus, I advise subsequent chairs to use a suggestion made to me by Lynn Cooley: take a look at Dan Lindsley's "Perspectives" about Larry Sandler (*Genetics* 151, 1233-1237).

2. *Publication of thesis as a monograph by Kluwer Academic Publishers*
(Joann.Tracy@wkap.com was the contact).

This did not happen this year: I emailed the above person to no avail (mail undeliverable); asked Marsha Ryan what this whole thing was about and she did not knowää

3. *Sandler Award Plaque* (see entry on "Plaque", below)

4. *Lifetime membership in the GSA* (Arranged wholly by Marsha)

5. *All expenses to attend the meeting* (Arranged wholly by Marsha)

Plaque:

This went exactly as planned, all by email. I emailed the info, including the full name and the award date, and they contacted me back by return email to verify.

The history: Lynn Cooley (2001) arranged for 10 plaques to be made by Brinks Trophy Shop in Santa Cruz, CA (831-426-2505; staff@brinkstrophies.com). Bill Sullivan laid the groundwork for this in 2000. Marsha Ryan (GSA) paid for the plaques and the silk-screening of the name / date of the award winner (\$690.00 total), and she has all the information on how to contact them.

The selection committee chairperson simply needs to contact Brinks Trophery so that the name of the winner and the date of the award can be silk-screened on one of the plaques. The only additional cost will be shipping of the completed plaque to the committee chair; sent by UPS ground.

Outstanding expenses:

\$14.00 - Shipping of plaque to Steve DiNardo

\$xx.xx - Shipping CDs to committee members (Steve DiNardo)

Previous Committee Members:

I found it useful to know who had served recently. I suggest we keep a running record of this.

2000 Committee:

Amy Bejsovec , Tom Cline, Joe Duffy, Chris Field, Janice Fischer , Scott Hawley

Bill Saxton (Chair)

Bill Sullivan (1999 Chair)

2001 Committee:

Laurel Raftery

Haig Keshishian

Susan Parkhurst

Bill Saxton (2000 Chair)

Lynn Cooley (Chair)

2002 Committee:

Steve DiNardo, UPenn (Chair)

Lynn Cooley, Yale Med (2001 Chair)

Chip Ferguson, U Chicago

Helen Salz, Case Western

3. REPORT OF THE GSA MEETING COORDINATOR (Marsha Ryan)

43rd ANNUAL DROSOPHILA RESEARCH CONFERENCE

Advance registrations for the 2002 are excellent totaling 1392, though this figure is 38 fewer than in 2001. It is expected that another 50-100 people will register on-site in 2002. Hotel room rates for singles and doubles in 200 (\$130-150 single or double) are significantly lower than in 2001 (\$191 single, \$214 double). Room pick-up is record at 751 rooms peak night. Note that room pick-up is of significant importance in leveraging the conference during negotiations with future conference facilities. Last year's peak night advance pick-up was 714 rooms.

The number of exhibits sold this year is 4 more than last year, totaling 16. Represented are 15 commercial companies and one not-for-profit organization.

2001: Geographic distribution statistics for pre-registrants follow:

BY COUNTRY:

ARGENTINA	1	BRAZIL		FRANCE	37
AUSTRALIA	10		5	GERMANY	37
AUSTRIA	4	CANADA	61	INDIA	1
		DENMARK	2	ISRAEL	8

ITALY	3	REP.OF CHINA	5	TAIWAN	8
JAPAN	28	RUSSIA	6	UK	67
KOREA	3	SLOVAKIA	1	TOTAL FOREIGN	335
MEXICO	7	SPAIN	4	from 25 countries	
NETHERLANDS	3	SWEDEN	8		
PORTUGAL	2	SWITZERLAND	24		

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	TOTAL USA	1,095
KANSAS	7	NORTH DAKOTA	1	from 44 states	
KENTUCKY	10	OHIO	24		
LOUISIANA	2	OKLAHOMA	2		

2003 - 44th ANNUAL CONFERENCE - MARCH 5-9 - SHERATON CHICAGO HOTEL AND TOWERS

Room rates at the Sheraton have been set at \$180 single/double range per night. By the contract terms, based upon the Sheraton's group rate of \$159 in 1999, our rate for 2003 was to be limited to no more than a 5% per year increase. Thus, the highest the rate could have been was \$193 single or double. At the request of the Sheraton, in exchange for releasing a part of our exhibit/poster space the day before the Dros conference begins so the hotel could accommodate another group 1) the hotel set the sleeping room rate lower than they could have charge; 2) the hotel and the other group agreed to carpet the exhibit/poster area for the other group's function and leave it in place for Dros, thus reducing the amount of time our decorator needs to set up our exhibit/poster space (and thus reducing the expense of carpeting).

Note that because the meeting dates for 2003 are approximately 5 weeks earlier than this year, all major deadlines will need to be moved ahead accordingly. This means the deadline for abstract submission will be November 3. If the deadline for 2003 were the exact length of time before the first day of the conference as for the 2002 conference, the deadline would be October 31. Deadline dates already given to the 2003 Program Chairs are FIRM within 1-2 days and cannot be moved without causing considerable ripples in the overall preparation of publications and web sites for the conference. Also taken into account, though of much less significance is the timeline used by GSA staff members in preparing for the annual meeting of the American Society of Human Genetics. Conflicts and particularly heavy workloads for staff working on both meetings come in mid-late July this summer and early-mid October (ASHG meeting is Oct. 15-19). Major differences for the Program Chairs are the fact that they will need to get to work almost immediately, and that the heaviest load of their work (selecting platform abstracts, finalizing plenary speakers and workshops) must be completed before the December/January holidays (instead of over and during the holidays).

2004 - 45th ANNUAL CONFERENCE

At the 2001 Fly Board meeting, the Board selected the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel in Washington, DC, site of the 2001 conference, as the facility for the 2004 conference.

2005 - 46th ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The Town and Country Resort & Convention Center has been asked for a proposal for 2005 and has been told that much of the decision to be made by the Fly Board in selecting the site for 2005 will be based upon the outcome of this year's conference and how the staff performs, the space meets the conference needs and the enthusiasm, or lack of enthusiasm, of the registrants indicate for the T&C.

4. REPORT OF THE TREASURER (Steve Mount)

April 6, 2002

A. ANNUAL DROSOPHILA CONFERENCE INCOME/EXPENSE

(Data are from the GSA [Marsha Ryan], March 29, 2002)

	<u>Actual 2001</u>	<u>2002 (Projections)</u>
Revenue		
Registration	\$297,915	\$282,650 ¹
Exhibit Fees	12,600	15,300
Mailing Fees & Program Book Sales	1,476	5,260 ²
Advertising	-0-	500
Donations	2,500	5,000 ³
Miscellaneous (Cancellations, etc.)	<u>5,076⁴</u>	<u>5,100</u>
TOTAL REVENUE	\$319,567	\$313,810
Expenditures		
Fixed Expenses:		
Hotel and Travel-Staff	997	\$ 3,500
Printing (Call, Program Book)	28,464	30,000
Mailing, Addressing, Shipping, Freight	7,729	10,500
Duplicating/Copying	713	800
Telephone - FlyBase room computer lines	5,325	5,500
Telephone & Fax - Other	803	850
Office Supplies (badges, signs, misc.)	1,778	4,000
Projection & Sound	31,488	30,000
Space rental (poster/exhibit hall space)	2,000	-0-
Masking, poster boards, tables, chairs	29,743	22,000
Exhibits	2,733	3,100
Contracted Services (Reg desk, security)	3,623	4,000
Computer Services	1,380	1,450
Insurance Expense	941	-0-
Miscellaneous	<u>11</u>	<u>100</u>
Subtotal Fixed Expenses:	\$117,728	\$115,800
Variable Expenses:		
Salaries/Wages/taxes/benefits	\$57,158	\$58,000
Catering - Coffee/Soda Breaks	31,313	26,000 ⁵
Catering - Reception	30,284	30,000
Catering - Fly Base	4,126	4,100
Miscellaneous/Credit Card Expense	<u>7,303</u>	<u>8,500</u>
Sub-total Variable Expenses:	\$130,184	\$126,600
Total Expenditures	\$247,912	\$242,400
NET REVENUE (EXPENSE)	\$71,656	\$71,410

¹ As of 3/27/02 registrations totaled 1,389. To make budget of \$282,650, approximately 150 people need to register on-site.

² In 2002, advance mailing fee raised to \$15 from \$5 in 2001. Only 284 registrants requested advance mailing in 2002 compared to 659 in 2001. Additionally, because most of those who requested advance mailing from overseas in 2001 did not receive their books in time for the meeting, overseas registrants wanting advance mailing were required to pay cost of Federal Express. No overseas requests received in 2002.

³ This figure is the projected amount for which NIGMS will contribute based upon costs of audiovisual equipment and the coffee break for their sponsored plenary session.

⁴ This figure includes a reimbursement from the Gelbart Lab for the catering expenses incurred by the FlyBase Room in the amount of \$4,126 (shown in expenses under Catering - FlyBase).

⁵ Coffee/Soda Breaks are based on 1400 registrants; and coffee is significantly less costly than in Washington, DC.

B. MEETING ATTENDANCE

Pre-registration 2002 (San Diego):	1,219	\$211,000
Projected total registration 2002:	1,454	\$282,650
Pre-registration 2001 (Washington):	1,372	\$240,240
Total registration 2001:	1,627	\$297,915
Pre-registration 2000 (Pittsburgh):	1,083	\$131,075
Total registration 2000:	1,183	\$167,005
Pre-registration 1999 (Seattle):	1,142	\$156,350
Total registration 1999:	1,366	\$191,425

C. ACCOUNT BALANCES

Drosophila Main Fund

Meeting Year	Net Income	Fund Balance	# Meeting Attendees
1993	\$17,105	\$ 25,146	1,165
1994	2,800	27,946	1,222
1995	8,417	36,363	1,103
1996	15,035	51,398	1,423
1997	31,663	83,061	1,382
1998	21,894	104,955	1,378
1999	(6,053)	98,530	1,366
2000	(56,060)	42,470	1,183
2001	71,656	114,126	1,627
2002 (proj)	71,410	185,536	1,454

Note: Fund balance cap established by GSA Board is \$250,000.

Sandler Lecture Fund

Year	Net Income	Balance	Excess to Reserve
1993	1417	25,964	17,964
1994	(451)	25,513	17,513
1995	1,595	27,108	19,108
1996	1,142	28,250	20,250
1997	1,119	29,369	21,369
1998	1,385	30,754	22,754
1999	877	31,631	24,160
2000	257	31,888	25,565
2001	(234)	31,654	23,654

D. SUMMARY AND REMARKS

In contrast to the concerns expressed at last year's board meeting, and fears raised by the potential effect of the events of Sept. 11 on conference participation, the fund increased by \$71,656 last year and a similar increase is projected for this year. This is due to the large number of late registrations at the 2001 meeting, the relatively inexpensive venue for the 2002 meeting, and consistently lower actual 2001 costs relative to projections in many categories (e.g. \$28,464 for printing vs. an estimate of \$30,000). In fact, if the projected net income from this year's Conference is realized, the fund will approach a balance of \$190,000, relative to a fund balance cap of \$250,000. The board may wish to consider making adjustments by reducing registration fees for next year's meeting. However, Marsha Ryan reminds us that many costs in Chicago will be greater than in San Diego. The single/double rate will near \$200 per night plus tax, which will make the rate about what attendees paid in Washington in 2001 (or slightly lower). It is likely that these rates will reduce attendance. Therefore, she does not recommend lowering the registration fee for the 2003 meeting. She will be preparing the 2003 budget in May after fixed banquet menu prices are available. I note that the fund balance fell rapidly from over \$100,000 in 1998 to \$42,470 in 2000 and was considered to be in serious danger of going negative at this time last year, so a reasonable cushion is certainly appropriate.

5. Election Report

Election Report

The Elections Committee consists of Gary Karpen (Chair), Debbie Andrews, Ulrike Heberlein, Steve DiNardo, and Eric Wieschaus. 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.

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

Starting last year, the Board instituted community elections for regional representatives and for the President-Elect.

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.

The election ballots were tallied by Thom Kaufman, and the winners were:

Barbara Wakimoto for president elect,
Amy Bejsovec, for the Southeast region,
Sean Carroll, for the Great Lakes region
Laurel Raftery for New England.

This year we have to nominate and elect another President Elect, as well as regional representatives for the Canada, Heartland, and Midwest. 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.

Drosophila Board Master List:

Officers:

end of term*

Steven Wasserman	Past-President	2002	stevenw@ucsd.edu
Trudi Schupbach	President	2003	gschupbach@molbio.princeton.edu
Barbara Wakimoto	President elect	2004	wakimoto@u.washington.edu
Steve Mount	Treasurer	2002	sm193@umail.umd.edu
Gary Karpen	Elections	2003	karpen@salk.edu

Regional Representatives:

Paul Lasko	Canada	2002	Paul_Lasko@maclean.mcgill.ca
Sean Carroll	Great Lakes	2004	sbcarr@facstaff.wisc.edu
Susan Parkhurst	Northwest	2003	susanp@fhcrc.org
Amy Bejsovec	Southeast	2004	bejsovec@duke.edu
Judith Lengyel	California	2003	jlengyel@ucla.edu
Bob Boswell	Heartland	2002	boswell@beagle.colorado.edu
Laurel Raftery	New England	2004	laurel.raftery@cbrc2.mgh.harvard.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
Kevin Cook	Bloomington SC	----	kcook@bio.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
Chuck Langley	at-large	----	chlangley@ucdavis.edu
Allan Spradling	P-element collect.	----	spradling@mail1.ciwemb.edu
Larry Goldstein	at-large	2002	lgoldstein@ucsd.edu
Stephen DiNardo	Sandler Lect.	2002	sdinardo@mail.med.upenn.edu

(Gary Karpen to become member at large 2004)
(Steve Wasserman to become member at large 2005)
(Trudi Schupbach to become member at large 2006)

2002 Meeting Organizers:

Scott Hawley	---	2003	rsh@stowers-institute.org
Ken Burtis	---	2003	kcburtis@ucdavis.edu

2003 Meeting Organizers

Denis McKearin		2004	dennis.mckearin@utsouthwestern.edu
Helmut Kramer	---	2004	helmut.kramer@utsouthwestern.edu
John Abrams	---	2004	john.abrams@utsouthwestern.edu

Past Meeting Organizers:

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

GSA Representatives:

Elaine Strass	Exec. Dir.	----	estrass@genetics.faseb.org
Marsha Ryan	Sr. Mtg. Coord.	----	mryan@genetics.faseb.org

* year indicates the final year through which the members will serve, unless reelected.

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

Report from the Bloomington Stock Center Advisory Board (March 10, 2001) As usual, we are very 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 expanding and the use is higher than ever.

The major issue that will be discussed in this year's annual meeting are:

1. The status of P-element genome disruption project, new efforts, community support (Bellen)

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

Report from the Bloomington Stock Center

1. Holdings

Total stocks as of 4/4/02	9,643
Added during 2001	1,091
Lethal, sterile or visible alleles	362 (184 are sequence-mapped P-insertion alleles)
Other sequenced-mapped P's	368 (many will prove to be alleles)
Deficiencies	218
Duplications	17 (plus 35 duplications in deficiency-primary stocks)
Balancers	4
Other aberrations	2
GAL4/UAS	68 (includes 1 FRT/FLP and 1 GFP also included below)
FRT/FLP	9 (includes 2 GFP's also included below)
GFP	4
lacZ	2
SNP mapping stocks	25
Other mapping	3
Marker chromosomes	8
P mutagenesis	1

2. Use

	US Acad	US Gov	US Com	US Teach	Non-US	Total
Registered	767 57%	20 1.5%	20 1.5%	40 3%	495 37%	1,342
Stocks	544 71%	14 70%	13 65%	13 33%	361 73%	945 71%

TABLE 1. Numbers of registered user groups in each institutional category (U.S. Academic, U.S. Government, U.S. Commercial, U.S. Teaching, and Foreign (Non-US)) and percent of total, and the percent of registered groups in each category that received stocks in 2001.

	US Acad	US Gov	US Com	US Teach	Non-US	Total
Registered	2,781	59	69	54	2,071	5,034

TABLE 2. The total number of registered user-group members in each institutional category for 2001. Only group members that have requested stocks in the last 3 years or were listed as current group members in an update from the laboratory are retained in our records.

	US Acad (IU)	US Gov	US Com	US Teach (IU)	Foreign Acad	Foreign Com	Foreign Teach	Total
Ships	6,127 (61) 72% (0.7%)	231 2.7%	118 1.4%	29 (10) 0.3% (0.1%)	3,450 41%	14 0.2%	4 0.04%	8,494
Subs	53,390 (335) 62% (0.4%)	2,114 2.4%	698 0.8%	151 (76) 0.2% (0.1%)	29,046 34%	385 0.4%	29 0.03%	85,975

TABLE 3. Degree of institutional use of the center during 2001. The number of shipments (Ships) and number of subcultures (Subs) received by each institutional category (U.S. Academic, U.S. Government, U.S. Commercial, U.S. Teaching, Foreign Academic, Foreign Commercial and Foreign Teaching) are shown, followed by the percent of the total each category represents. Use by Indiana University (internal use) is shown in parentheses under U.S. Academic and U.S. Teaching.

3. Fees

No. of Stocks	Cost per Stock	Account Fee	Range of Annual Fees*
1 - 5	\$10	\$25	\$35 - \$75
6 - 20	\$5	\$25	\$80 - \$150
21 - 50	\$3	\$25	\$153 - \$240
51 - 100	\$2	\$25	\$242 - \$342
101 - 500	\$1	\$25	\$343 - \$843
501 - 1000	\$0.75	\$25	\$843.50 - \$1,218
>1000	\$0.50	\$25	\$1,218.50 and up

TABLE 4. New Fee Structure for 2001. * Note that these ranges include the account fee and the stock fee, but do not include the extra-shipping fee. The group with the most shipments in 2000 paid \$400 in extra-shipping fees.

	1-5	6-20	21-50	51-100	101-500	501-1000	>1000	Total
Groups	182 (19%)	217 (23%)	181 (19%)	137 (14%)	203 (21%)	18 (2%)	7 (0.7%)	945
Stocks	497 (1%)	2,499 (3%)	5,966 (7%)	9,666 (11%)	43,628 (52%)	11,545 (14%)	10,212 (12%)	84,013*
Assessed Fees	\$9,520 (4%)	\$23,345 (9%)	\$34,596 (14%)	\$40,760 (17%)	\$105,794 (43%)	\$20,306 (8%)	\$11,972 (5%)	\$246,293
Invoiced Fees	\$8,355 (4%)	\$20,948 (9%)	\$32,824 (14%)	\$37,856 (16%)	\$101,020 (43%)	\$20,306 (9%)	\$11,972 (5%)	\$233,281

TABLE 5. Assessed and Invoiced Fees in Selected Use Ranges for 2001. The number of groups in each use range (and the percent of total active groups), the total number of subcultures received by those groups (and the percent of total chargeable subcultures), the assessed fees (and percent of total) for all groups in that range, and the invoiced fees (and percent total) are shown. Invoiced fees are assessed fees minus waived fees.

*The remaining 1,962 subcultures shipped in 2001 were unchargeable, either because they were replacements for stocks lost or killed in transit (1,793 stocks) or stocks sent in error (169 stocks).

4. Funding

Funding for FY 01/02

NSF	\$339,383
NIH	\$235,219
IU	\$ 40,518
Fees	\$223,950 (estimated as \$233,281 - 4%)

Total \$839,070

We are currently in year 3 of a 5-year funding period. The collection is funded to expand to 15,000 lines over the next 2 years.

5. Endowment

The value of our endowment as of 2/28/02 is \$496,555.

6. Advisory Committee

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

8. DIS REPORT (Jim Thompson)

Volume 84 of *Drosophila* Information Service is the first with the new December deadline for submission of materials. Issues will now report contributions on a calendar year basis. This was very successful, and the volume will be among the largest in terms of numbers of pages of research, technique, teaching, and mutant reports. Over 70 articles are included, and the price will remain at \$12.00 plus shipping and handling. The only negative is that the camera-ready copy was provided to the printer in mid-January, less than two weeks after the manuscript receipt deadline, and the printer promised final delivery the first week in February. It is now almost mid-April and the books have not yet been received. Since more than 2/3 of the manuscripts were received after the beginning of December, this is still a rapid publication turn-around, but I am obviously not satisfied with it. A new printing company has been located for next year. The cost will be a little higher, but still within our operating expense limits if the size of the issue remains about the same. I therefore do not plan an increase in cost of DIS 85. As a hedge against future delays of this type, plans for implementing the DIS web page are well on track for the summer. Data files are now being prepared, and the essential structure of the web page has been designed. We will begin by providing tables of contents and key word cross-references to articles. Previous articles will be archived for electronic access, beginning with the most recent three to five year's worth of technique, teaching, and research reports. Ultimately, we plan to have all articles on line. I also encourage members of the Board to send me information (*e.g.*, lists of speakers and titles) for regional *Drosophila* meetings. These are reported in a special section of each issue and can be a useful source of outreach for those seeking graduate school mentors or postdoctoral researchers. All information can be sent to: James N. Thompson, jr., Department of Zoology, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019; jthompson@ou.edu.

9. FLYBASE (Bill Gelbart)

Reannotation of the Release_3 *D. melanogaster* Genome:

The main focus of FlyBase over the last year has been to prepare for the global reannotation of the *Drosophila melanogaster* genome. In order to make this reannotation effort produce the best possible product for the *Drosophila* community, it was necessary to delay the projected start of the reannotation until several underlying datasets and tools were in place, including,

- the essentially finished, release_3, sequences of the individual euchromatic chromosome arms (BGDP),
- large additional 5' EST collections (BDGP and Brian Oliver),
- full length cDNA sequence of DGC 1.0 and at least in part, DGC 2.0 (BDGP),
- development of a computational pipeline (called BOP) to bring all of the prediction data together (FlyBase-Berkeley), and
- production in a collaboration between FlyBase-Berkeley and the EBI/Sanger Centre of an interface (called Apollo) for FlyBase curators to evaluate the evidence and produce a definitive set of gene models (that is, transcript and CDS predictions).

Reannotation began in earnest at the beginning of November, 2001. The strategy was to divide successive chromosome arms into ~350kb blocks (the submission size to the DNA databanks) and assign each block to a different curator at two of the FlyBase sites --Harvard and Berkeley. A first pass of reannotation was carried on two arms -- 2L and 3R -- both as a learning exercise for the curators to encounter problematic predictions and set up a uniform set of guidelines of the conclusions to draw from various combinations of evidence. This quality/consistency assessment has been extremely important since 10 curators are engaged in the reannotation effort. Finally, in February, the last of the data sets (the DGC 1.0 cDNA sequences) were added to the annotation pipeline and the first arm, 2R, was fully annotated. We are now in the process of submitting the annotation of the assembled release_3 sequence of chromosome arm 2R to GenBank, and it should be in public view through FlyBase, NCBI, EBI & DDBJ at the time of the fly meeting or shortly thereafter.

The first pass of chromosome arm 3R reannotation is being re-evaluated now with the additional cDNA sequence data, and it should be in public view by the end of April. Chromosome arm 2L will be fully reannotated and in public view by the end of May.

There have been some delays in the completion of the finished sequence of the other 2 major chromosome arms, but 3L and X should be ready for reannotation by the time that chromosome arm 2L is completed. Chromosome 4 will be done thereafter. Hopefully, this will allow the public release of the fully reannotated release_3 genome by the end of July, 2002.

A special acknowledgement should be made to efforts of the entire FlyBase staff to support this global reannotation effort. It has required a huge, highly coordinated effort to develop the informatics, to put the necessary datasets in place and to integrate the information into the FlyBase database and the public views of the data.

Acknowledgement of NHGRI for its generous support of FlyBase is equally important. Were it not for NHGRI, there is no way that FlyBase could have come anywhere close to its current scope, and the fly community should recognize this major contribution by NHGRI. FlyBase would also like to thank the Howard Hughes Medical Institute for support of two programmers at Berkeley.

FlyBase Web Server:

As part of the reannotation effort, FlyBase committed to providing an integrated view of the genome project and community data in our databases. We have made use of an internal group of biologists from the project to work with our technical staff to develop an integrated and, hopefully, user-friendly entry point for *Drosophila* gene data. This is a work in progress, and this group will continue to work on design and query-interface issues to make the data as accessible as possible to the scientific community.

Future Reannotation:

Beyond release_3, our current plan is to continue reannotation indefinitely. While the plans for the next phase of reannotation are not concrete yet (it is a topic of discussion for our spring FlyBase meeting), the general idea is to reannotate subsets of the genome according to the availability of new data and because the subsets have some unifying scientific principle. For example, a genomic region containing a cluster of related sequences will be reannotated if there is new information on what these sequences correspond to. Alternatively, the genes encoding a protein family may be reannotated if there is new information on the gene models they contain. In both cases, we expect that a curator will be assigned responsibility for a particular scientific domain and will work with experts in the community to refine the definitive set of gene models. Based on other genomes such as *C. elegans*, we expect changes to the underlying genome sequence to trickle in for the next 2-4 years, and occasionally, these will also necessitate reannotation of a genomic region. Perhaps most importantly, the comparative sequence data that are now available from the mosquito *Anopheles gambiae* and will be available in several months from *Drosophila pseudoobscura* (which is being sequenced by Richard Gibbs and the Baylor Human Genome Sequence Center) will be rich sources of information for regions of conservation for gene models and for potential regulatory elements. We will be evaluating how to best incorporate these data sets into our future reannotation strategy.

In addition to our responsibility to maintain an up-to-date view of the gene products encoded by the *D. melanogaster* genome, it is also clear that a great deal of information will be coming out about cis-regulatory sequences and other domains in the *D. melanogaster* genome. In general, it will continue to be our goal to attach all available biological information to the genomic sequence of *D. melanogaster*. This is a challenge that should keep us in business for some time to come.

The Future of FlyBase:

FlyBase is now in its 10th year of NHGRI funding, and has begun the fourth year of the current 5 year grant period. The FlyBase Consortium has already begun the planning process for the renewal application, which will be submitted in February-March, 2003 for funding beginning December 1, 2003. We are taking this opportunity to do a complete reassessment of the goals and strategies that have evolved over the first 10 years of the project. Some decisions have already been made at a January 2002 meeting of the PIs (Gerry Rubin, Michael Ashburner, Thom Kaufman, Kathy Matthews and myself).

All current sites will continue to participate in FlyBase during the next grant period, at least at its inception. There will however be some changes in responsibility and organization.

One important behind-the-scenes change will be that the data currently housed in two separate data structures (often referred to as GadFly and the FlyBase-literature databases) will be merged into one integrated structure. This true integration will enable even more powerful querying of the database and will provide a structure that can be downloaded by the ever-increasing number of users who wish global access to the FlyBase data sets. The public FlyBase query interface will be redesigned to take advantage of this new integrated structure. It is our goal to have the integrated database in place by the beginning of the new 5 year funding period.

Obvious areas that FlyBase needs to evaluate are its roles in the collection and centralization of other data sets of interest to the scientific community. Among these are developing transcript array and proteomic data sets. It is not our intention to duplicate the efforts of central repositories such as GEO, but rather to reflect the value-added information on these datasets that the *Drosophila* community provides through the hard copy and electronic literature. Similarly, FlyBase needs to play a role in presenting information on gene pathways and networks, but this area is in sufficient flux that we have not yet settled on a strategy for doing so. Population genetic data is another area that FlyBase has not focused on, and with envisioned projects such as Chuck Langley's initiative to fully sequence large genomic blocks of many *D. melanogaster* haplotypes, incorporation of population-based data may become a high priority.

Some significant changes of responsibility are being planned for the beginning of the next 5 year cycle. Most notably, since the genomic information on *D. melanogaster* will begin to stabilize, Berkeley views its role within FlyBase as winding down. Several of the responsibilities of the FlyBase-Berkeley group will shift to FlyBase-Harvard. The integrated database that will be co-designed by the Harvard and Berkeley technical staffs will be housed at Harvard, and almost all of the on-going molecular curation responsibility will be at Harvard. The Berkeley group will maintain a FlyBase software development group and a small curation/annotation group for the first two years or so of the next 5 year grant cycle.

Integration and Coordination with other Model Organism Databases:

The major model organism databases have had a very effective dialog over the last few years. One spin-off of this dialog has been the GO Consortium (Gene Ontology), a functional annotation collaboration that originated with FlyBase (through Michael Ashburner) and its mouse, yeast and Arabidopsis companion databases, and which has been adopted as a standard by a great many informatics groups. A new project that is being funded by NHGRI and NIGMS, called GMOD (Generic Model Organism Database) has the goal of creating a suite of software tools that can be used essentially off the shelf as the underpinnings of the burgeoning number of new model organism databases. One by-product of the GMOD project will be higher levels of coordination and collaboration among the major model organism databases, perhaps including joint public interfaces for compatible subsets of our data collections. Discussions of GMOD will undoubtedly be an important component of our next 5 year renewal.

Community Input:

FlyBase will meet with its advisory board in October to discuss the grant renewal and database integration plans in detail. The advisory board consists of *Drosophilists* and bioinformatics specialists, and has been extremely helpful in mapping out FlyBase's paths. However, advice from a broader swatch of the scientific community is crucial as well.

Input from the Fly Board (and the fly community in general) on ours plans, priorities, organization, etc., is especially important during the preparation of the competitive renewal application. Please encourage your regional communities to pass on their suggestions and criticisms so that we can factor them in during our planning process.

Bill Gelbart (PI - FlyBase)

10. Community Resources Committee Report - Bill Gelbart

Because of time constraints, there has been no consultation with members of the committee; Bill is solely responsible for any opinions and erroneous facts.

The Community Resources Committee went into hibernation after the production of the *Drosophila* whitepaper, but now that it's spring (albeit a year later), it's the appropriate time to reactivate the committee.

Several of the initiatives that are discussed in the whitepaper are underway. The status of the major points of the whitepaper are:

- 1) Funding for the sequencing of the *D. melanogaster* cDNA Unigene set (the DGC or *Drosophila* Gene Collection, which has been assembled and is being sequenced by the BDGP), has been provided by NHGRI and the Howard Hughes Medical Institute.
- 2) Funding for expansion of the Bloomington stock center is in the process of being provided. There should soon be carrying capacity for 10,000-15,000 strains.
- 3) Database supplements for the reannotation of the *Drosophila* genome were provided by NHGRI. The competitive renewal of the FlyBase grant will be submitted in February-March, 2003, and this will likely request funds at the level described in the whitepaper.
- 4) The Baylor Human Genome Sequencing Center was recently awarded an NHGRI grant to produce a ~7-8X whole genome shotgun assembly of the *Drosophila pseudoobscura* genome. Some EST and full length cDNA sequencing is also envisioned by Richard Gibbs (PI) as part of this project.
- 5) An application for a molecular stock center and community microarray facility is currently being revised for resubmission to NIH.

With these projects underway, it is time for the fly community to evaluate further needs. One reason that this is timely is that NHGRI has set up a new mechanism for community input into the prioritization of BAC library production and whole genome sequencing targets by the major NIH-funded sequencing centers (Whitehead, Wash U and Baylor). If we think that it is imperative that further *Drosophila* species be sequenced, we have to develop a specific proposal as a white paper that has clear community support. The NHGRI committee (called GRASPP) reviews these white papers with the goal of triaging potential sequencing targets, so that in the future, available capacity of the sequencing centers is directed toward the highest priority group of genomes. I suggest that the Community Resources Committee be assigned the task of identifying a *Drosophila* genome sequencing program by early fall of 2002.

Other projects are under consideration by various members of the fly community, and their success in part will be determined by the level of support within the fly community. One example is Chuck Langley's project to sequence the genomes of about 50 *Drosophila melanogaster* haplotypes through hybridization-based resequencing technology. Another is an offer from Amanda Simcox to produce embryonic cell lines from a variety of strains. I believe that it would be helpful for the Community Resources Committee to play a role in helping to develop these proposals and to serve as a vehicle for community input.

If the FlyBoard endorses these ideas, then the make-up of the committee and its chair should be reviewed as part of the discussion.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Gelbart

OTHER BUSINESS:

International Congress of Genetics (Phil Batterham)

Genomes - The Linkage to Life

Melbourne Australia

July 6-12, 2003

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.

Communication

The Congress web site (www.geneticscongress2003.com) has been 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.

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.

Dr. Philip Batterham

Secretary General

International Congress of Genetics 2003

Summary of Board Meeting 2002, San Diego

Minutes

2001 Minutes were approved.

Thom Kaufman and Bill Gelbart will post Minutes of the meetings on Web and revamp the link from Flybase to the Board documents so that these documents become a little more accessible to the uninitiated browser. Gary Karpen and Steve Wasserman will try to locate old Board Meeting Agendas and Reports, and send them to Thom Kaufman.

Program committee report:

The Board made the following recommendations, in response to the report by Ken Burtis:

Workshops: Since the past and present meeting organizers have found the workshops to be the most troublesome part of the meeting to coordinate, the Board discussed guidelines to make this part of the job easier. Workshop chairs should be told to encourage more discussion. Workshops should not be exactly like platform sessions. Overlap between workshops and platforms should be avoided. Overall, the honor system for giving only one talk at the meeting seems to work quite well. Only the title of the workshop and name of chair(s), time and room will be printed in the program book from now on; the workshop abstracts and speakers will no longer be included. Organizers should therefore not have to worry about the exact workshop programs and speakers. But in turn for being given free reign, workshop chairs have to allow time for discussion and think of ways to encourage discussion.

Poster Sessions: More time should be allotted for poster sessions; possibly a greater number of workshops could be held in parallel to avoid the conflicts of workshop and the poster sessions. This change will require that we rent more rooms, and therefore will cost more (projection costs would increase as well). Marsha Ryan will investigate whether this will be possible in Chicago. Big advantage would be that it would free up time. Since there is some extra money, it should be possible to try this. In addition, the poster sessions are growing. This may pose space problems in the future. Right now, space for all posters is available, as long as the slightly smaller poster boards (4x6) are used. This size seems acceptable, and will be used in the future in order to accommodate all posters, unless there are complaints after the San Diego meeting. But if poster numbers increase a lot more, it is possible that two different sessions will be necessary in the future.

T-shirts. These have to be an option left to organizers. Some organizers may choose to have T-shirts, while others may not. No one should feel obligated to make T-shirts available. Ken Burtis suggests that people who want T-shirts can email the organizers to obtain the art design of the program book as an electronic file, and they can make their own T-shirts.

Future sites: We are moving toward a three-site rotation (Chicago, Washington DC, San Diego) but we can remain flexible and decide whether sites live up to expectation (this may also give some bargaining power).

Finances

The meeting has now a substantial surplus. This allows for some flexibility.

Ideas on how to spend the surplus were discussed and the strongest support was for providing a free breakfast to attendees. This can be organized after the registration deadline, i.e. when it becomes clearer what the financial outlook of the particular meeting will be. If there is a substantial surplus, there could be two free breakfasts. Also snacks could be offered at the poster session, in addition to the free drinks that are traditionally available. The meeting organizers together with Marsha Ryan and the Board president can decide on these expenditures on a flexible basis.

New expenditure: The Board decided that finalists of the Sandler award competition should also be invited to the meeting. Their travel and registration will be paid for by the general fund, and their names will be announced at the meeting.

Reserve amount: Keeping a reserve amount against future losses was generally approved by the Board. The exact amount has not been determined. Several board members felt that \$150,000 would be a comfortable amount, which could offset two years of losses on the order of the Pittsburgh meeting. Marsha Ryan and Steve Mount thought \$150,000 is too much to set aside. We will ask the Board members to consider this issue further and decide soon on an amount to keep in the reserve.

Elections

The election committee nominates delegates living in the different regions to ensure diversity on the Board. It was agreed that everyone in the fly community can vote for the proposed delegates, including any of the regional representatives who are on the ballot that year.

To ensure long-term memory on the Board, former presidents will usually become members at large for three years after their terms expire. In this particular year, that means that Gary Karpen, who served as president in 1999/2000, and past president in 2000/2001 will become a member at large serving through 2004, Steve Wasserman will become a member at large serving through 2005. The job of organizing elections will also be rotated off, such that this year Steve Wasserman will be in charge of elections, and will he will transfer this duty next year to Trudi Schupbach.

Sandler report

Thesis of the finalists are now usually submitted on CDs, saving the candidates money in printing copies of their figures and making shipping easier. In addition to the winner, the finalists will be invited to the meeting (see above, under Finances). This will be paid for by the general meeting fund. The Sandler chair, Steve Di Nardo, will select a new Sandler committee chair, and serve on next year's committee.

Community Resources

Hugo Bellen reported on efforts to generate new P-element insertions. Many new P-elements have already been sent to Bloomington, and by the spring of next year, in the order of 4,000 new P-elements should be at Bloomington. Different P-element vectors will be used to ensure diversity in insertion sites.

Question about Piggyback insertions: Michael Ashburner reported that Cambridge is about to sign an MTA with Exelixis to be able to distribute Piggyback insertion strains. The exact legal issues are not clear, but it may be worthwhile for the US P-element team to check with Michael. Hugo Bellen also reported that Piggyback, while being great at having a different insertion propensity, and therefore good for targeting new genes, has drawbacks as a mutagen. However, Allan Spradling is improving their use.

Stock Centers:

The Bloomington Stock Center continues to do extremely well.

Kyoto Drosophila Genetics Resource Center: This stock center will begin distributing stocks during 2002. They intend to serve as the primary distributor of common stocks to Asia and this should alleviate some of the work/costs of Bloomington in sending stocks to Asia. They also intend to distribute many unique stocks. While they may face difficulties during their initial years of operation, their success is important in adding to the total worldwide stock maintenance capacity.

Kathy Matthews explained that the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity has drafted a protocol (the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety) concerning the international transfer of genetically-modified organisms. The protocol exempts research model organisms from detailed risk assessments, but there is some concern that adoption of the protocol by member nations would negatively impact the free exchange of fly strains between researchers via the mail. Should the U.S. sign the protocol and the U.S. Postal Service propose or implement

new regulations, the Drosophila Board should comment on proposed guidelines and/or petition for relief from burdensome requirements. Current postal guidelines are not explicit in their requirements for the international transport of most fly strains (transgenic or non-transgenic), but it has not proven to be a problem. Should practices change, the Board may need to petition the Postal Service to draft guidelines specifically mentioning Drosophila, such as those regulating the transport of other insects (e.g. silkworms, honeybees).

Flybase

Bill Gelbart reported on new genome annotation. Also, Flybase is introducing much valuable new data on gene expression. (The demos at the meeting were indeed very impressive).

Nomenclature

Bill Gelbart and Gerry Rubin stated that the nomenclature rules for Drosophila are in many ways cumbersome in this era of electronic curation and searching with electronic tools. Many programs, for instance, do not distinguish between upper case and lower case, and thus B and b cannot easily be distinguished as different genes.

The Board decided that a Nomenclature Committee should be formed. Scott Hawley was designated as its chair, and he will convene a committee. He selected Kevin Cook as one member. It was suggested that at least one additional member be a Flybase person to ensure that the new rules are "computer compatible". The committee will look at all the nomenclature rules as they are posted on FlyBase, and will make recommendations for consideration by the Board.

New Genome Sequencing Projects

The Anopheles sequence should be on line soon.

Sequencing of Genomes of other fly species would be very valuable.

Bill Gelbart stated that there are deadlines this year (June and November) where big sequencing projects can be submitted to the NIH. This may be the last opportunity for funding large sequencing projects for some time, given insecurities about funding from year to year and shifts in NIH priorities. With this in mind, it was agreed that it is in the best interest of the Drosophila community to consider what the highest priorities should be for the next large scale sequencing projects. Gelbart suggested that whitepapers outlining these priorities would be useful. Chuck Langley agreed to assemble a group that would assess the value and strategies for sequencing different strains of *D. melanogaster* for studies of intraspecific variation. Gerry Rubin agreed to assemble a group that would consider which species of Drosophila might be most useful to sequence. These groups will report back to the Board as soon as possible. Bill Gelbart will advise of exact requirements for submission of the NIH proposals.

There is also a grant already submitted by Gary Karpen and collaborators that proposes a Heterochromatin Genome Project for *D. melanogaster*. It seems that this is an excellent grant, with good chances for being funded. The Board will find out whether anything can be done to lobby for this and other sequencing projects with the granting agencies.

In general, it was decided that the Board could do more to educate the NIH of the importance of supporting Drosophila research and community resource projects. This effort is especially critical this year because of the recent turnover of key NIH personnel and a proposed reorganization at the NIH being considered. Laurie Tompkins has been recommended by many people as an excellent resource to advise us of name/contacts of people at the NIH that we should talk with. Trudi Schupbach and Barbara Wakimoto will contact Laurie Tompkins immediately. It was also recommended that the Board should encourage prestigious, well-spoken Drosophila researchers (including Board members) to go to Washington to meet with officials of the NIH or

other granting agencies (or to meet with officials when Board members are in Washington anyway). In addition, if any Board Members become aware of opportunities along these lines, they should advise the Board.