

2005 NATIONAL DROSOPHILA BOARD MEETING
AGENDA
March 30, 2005, San Diego, CA
Pacific Salons 4/5, Town and Country Resort & Convention Center, 2 – 6 p.m.

		Report
INTRODUCTION & APPROVAL OF THE 2004 MINUTES	2:00 – 2:10	1
MEETING ORGANIZATION	2:10 – 2:40	
2005 PROGRAM COMMITTEE (Frank Laski, Rahul Warrior, Kavita Arora)	10'	2
2006 PROGRAM COMMITTEE (Hugo Bellen, Ron Davis, Graeme Mardon, George Halder)		3
REPORT OF THE GSA MEETING COORDINATOR (Marsha Ryan)	10'	4
AWARDS		
SANDLER LECTURESHIP COMMITTEE (Gerold Schübiger)	5'	5
GSA POSTER AWARD (Frank Laski, Rahul Warrior, Kavita Arora)		6
IMAGE AWARD (David Bilder)		7
TREASURER'S REPORT (Rick Fehon)	2:40 – 2:50	8
DROSOPHILA BOARD COMPOSITION		
ELECTION REPORT (Barbara Wakimoto)		9
COMMUNITY RESOURCE REPORTS & PROJECTS	2:50 – 3:45	
BLOOMINGTON STOCK CENTER (Kathy Matthews, Kevin Cook)	5'	10
REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE (Hugo Bellen)		11
DROSOPHILA GENOMIC RESOURCE CENTER (Justen Andrews)	5'	12
P-ELEMENT COLLECTION (Allan Spradling)	10'	13
SPECIES SEQUENCING PROJECT (Teri Markow, Thom Kaufman)	10'	14
FLYBASE (Bill Gelbart)	10'	15
DIS (Jim Thompson)		16
KYOTO STOCK CENTER (Yoshi Yamamoto)	5'	17
TUCSON STOCK CENTER (Teri Markow)	5'	18
SPECIAL GUEST Laurie Tompkins (NIH)	3:45-4:00	
BREAK & SNACKS	4:00 – 4:15	
WHITE PAPERS	4:15 – 5:45	
DROSOPHILA BOARD WHITE PAPER (Lynn Cooley)	45'	19
D-ENCODE WHITE PAPER (Brian Oliver)	45'	20
ADJOURN	6:00	

Present: Justen Andrews, Kavita Arora, Hugo Bellen, Sarah Bray, Ken Burtis, Susan Celniker, Kevin Cook, Lynn Cooley, Ron Davis, Rick Fehon, Bill Gelbart, George Halder, Scott Hawley, Yasushi Hiromi, Gary Karpen, Thom Kaufman, Rebecca Kellum, Mark Krasnow, Henry Krause, Mitzi Kuroda, Chuck Langley, Frank Laski, Ruth Lehmann, Trudy MacKay, Graeme Mardon, Teri Markow, Kathy Matthews, Dennis McKearin, Brian Oliver, Robert Saint, Gerold Schubiger, Amanda Simcox, Allan Spradling, Trudi Schüpbach, Rahul Warrior, Kevin White, Toshi Yamamoto.

1. 2004 MINUTES

2004 Drosophila Board Meeting Minutes

March 24, 2004, Washington D.C. Marriott Wardman Hotel

Submitted by Ruth Lehmann

Posted on FlyBase

Approved.

Present: Kavita Aurora, Michael Ashburner, Hugo Bellen, David Bilder, Amy Bejsovec, Ken Burtis, Ross Cagan, Kevin Cook, Lynn Cooley, Claude Desplan, Rick Fehon, Bill Gelbart, Scott Hawley, Yash Hiromi, David Ish-Horovitz, Henry Krause, Frank Laski, Chuck Langley, Ruth Lehmann, Dennis McKearin, Brian Oliver, Susan Parkhurst, Laurel Raftery, Marsha Ryan, Rob Saint, Trudi Schüpbach, Allan Spradling, Jim Thompson, Barbara Wakimoto and Toshi Yamamoto

2. REPORT OF THE 2005 PROGRAM COMMITTEE (Frank Laski, Rahul Warrior, Kavita Arora)

Summary: Kavita Arora, Rahul Warrior and Frank Laski report that organizing this years meeting went smoothly and was less work and more fun than anticipated. This was mainly due to the tremendous help provided by Marsha Ryan and her colleagues at the GSA, who provided outstanding support and advice. The format of the 2005 meeting is very similar to that of the 2004 meeting, although a few significant changes were made. These changes include the listing of first names in the abstracts, the addition of a “Drosophila models of Human Diseases” platform session, and to reduce costs, the decision not to hire an AV technician to load talks onto computers. In addition, the organizers scheduled a 20 minute session on the first night of the meeting to acknowledge the passing of Jose Campos-Ortega, Edward Lewis and Judith Lengyel.

Suggestions for next year include: 1) evaluating the changes made this year to decide if they should be kept; 2) the Drosophila models of Human Diseases platform session brought the number of primary research interests to 14, we believe 13 works better if the schedule used this year is maintained. Our suggestion is to combine the Organogenesis session with the Gametogenesis and Sex Determination session into a single larger session called Gametogenesis and Organogenesis; 3) the Drosophila board should develop suggestions or guidelines on how to properly acknowledge the passing of Drosophila researchers in the future.

Organizers: Judith Lengyel originally volunteered and was selected to organize the 2005 Drosophila Research Conference. During the fall of 2003 Judith fell ill and had to resign the position of organizer. It was at that time that Kavita Arora, Rahul Warrior and Frank Laski substituted for her. The organizers asked her to remain on the committee, but Judith thought it would be better if her name were removed from the list. However she said she would be happy to give advice and suggestions, which she continued to do as her illness worsened. Sadly, Judith passed away September 25, 2005. The committee members will always remember her as a warm, enthusiastic and brilliant woman, scientist, mentor and friend.

Registration: Pre-registration for the meeting is strong, but weakened from last year, as detailed in the report from Marsha Ryan. 1435 people have registered for the meeting, which is down from the 1540 that registered for the 2004 meeting. An additional ~100 participants are expected to register at the meeting itself. The organizers do not know the reason for the reduction in registrants. One possible reason is the tightening in federal funding. A second factor could be that this is the 4th time the meeting is held at the Town and Country in San Diego, and some people may be tiring of it. Although there was a reduction in the number of registrants, there was an increase in the number of abstracts submitted (see below).

Plenary Speakers: Twelve plenary speakers were invited for the two plenary sessions on Thursday and

Sunday morning. 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 achieve gender and geographical balance to the greatest extent possible: 2 junior, 2 mid-level and 8 senior investigators; 7 male and 5 female; 9 from the US, 2 from the UK, 1 from Switzerland. Christiane Nüsslein-Volhard was invited to be the keynote speaker for the opening night, and will speak on “ From flies to fish: A personal history of developmental genetics ”. An updated List of Plenary Speakers is appended to this report, which includes the year 2005 invited speakers.

Memorial Talks: This was a tough year for the fly community, with the passing away of Jose Campos-Ortega, Edward Lewis and Judith Lengyel. The organizers consulted with many people on how to properly acknowledge the contributions of Jose, Ed and Judith and decided on talks during the first evening of the meeting. James Crow will give a talk remembering Edward Lewis and Volker Hartenstein will memorialize Jose Campos-Ortega and Judith Lengyel.

While the meeting organizers believe this years memorial talks are appropriate, they do not necessarily think that they should become a precedent. We suggest the Drosophila board develop suggestions or guidelines to future meeting organizers on how to properly acknowledge the passing of Drosophila researchers (which hopefully won't happen again until the distant future).

Abstract Submission: Abstracts were solicited under fourteen areas of primary research interest (one more than last year). The list of 2005 topics is appended to the end of this report, including the number of abstracts submitted in each area. In total, 1043 requests were received for posters and platform talks (959 + 84 late). This compares with 982 in 2004, 1016 in 2003, 1003 in 2002 and 966 in 2001. There were 443 requests for platform presentations (361 applied last year) for 156 available slots, allowing accommodation of 35% of the requests (7% less than last year).

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 II below). This is because of the constraints placed on the number of talks per session, which vary from 14 to 7. The number of speakers for each sub-topic was roughly in proportion to the number of abstracts requesting platform talks in each sub-field. The most popular submission topics were Signal Transduction and Pattern Formation. The organizers were relieved to find that the newly formed session on Drosophila Models of Human Diseases was popular, with 62 abstract submissions; seven topics had more abstracts, six fewer.

While planning the schedule, the meeting organizers realized that adding a 14th session topic created difficulties in assigning topics to time slots. Having 13 topics instead of 14 would make this task easier. The organizers noted that although the session on Gametogenesis and Sex Determination was popular, with 60 abstracts submitted and 23 talks requested, only one of the requested talks was in the field of Sex Determination. It seems that many people in the Sex Determination field now submit their abstracts to other sessions, such as Neural Physiology or Gene Expression. This year Gametogenesis and Sex Determination has 8 talks and Organogenesis has 7 talks. Our suggestion is to combine these two into a single session called Gametogenesis and Organogenesis (which will likely have 14 talks), which will reduce the total number of topics to 13. Sex Determination could be listed as a sub-field within the other topics.

This year the abstracts list full first names as opposed to just initials. This was a suggestion from the 2004 Meeting Organizers. This years organizers believe it should make it easier to initiate conversations at the meeting.

Posters: We maintained, as much as feasible, the policy of the 2004 organizers in having a great deal of time devoted to poster sessions (15 hours). As in 2004, we devoted a large percentage of the time early in the meeting to blocks of poster time with author attendance.

Slide Sessions: Initial selection of abstracts for platform talks was carried out by the platform session chairs from among the pool of submissions requesting consideration. The primary criteria were novelty and scientific interest. As program chairs we then reviewed the selections and made minor alterations to the list of selected speakers

Workshops: A total of 11 workshops were organized: 10 during the conference and the “Ecdysone” workshop on Wednesday, before the conference officially begins. This is a slight reduction to the number of workshops offered for the 2003 conference (14).

The organizing committee adopted a “hands-off” policy on workshops: all workshops suggested by the community were approved. The atmosphere of each workshop will reflect the attitudes adopted by the individual workshop organizers. Workshops were originally scheduled for Friday from 2-4 PM, Saturday from 7-9 PM and Saturday from 9:30-11:30 PM. Neil Silverman requested a 3 hour time slot for the Immunity, Pathogenesis and Hematopoiesis Workshop, and a Saturday 7-10 PM time slot was scheduled. Abstracts for each workshop were mandatory; these are listed in the Program and Abstracts book. Lists of speakers and titles were not mandatory but were encouraged. To induce workshop organizers to submit their abstracts and speaker lists early, they were informed that Workshop slots would be handed out on a first come, first served basis. The first organizer to submit an abstract and at least 6 confirmed speaker would get first choice in picking a time slot; second to submit would get second choice; etc. Many workshop organizers wanted to avoid the Saturday 9:30-11:30 time slot and submitted early. Five of the workshops have speakers listed, of these three also list titles.

In the two to three weeks preceding the meeting the meeting organizers received updates from many of the workshop organizers. This information arrived too late to put in the Program and Abstracts book or on the Web site. It was therefore decided, with the help of the GSA, to send out a mass e-mail to all registered attendees on the Monday before the meeting. The e-mail will have a link to a web site where an up-to-date workshop schedule can be downloaded. This up-to-date Workshop schedule will also be posted near the registration desk at the meeting.

This year there was no proposal for a 'techniques' workshop and the organizers did not solicit one. However, Norbert Perrimon and Bernard Mathey-Prevot are organizing a workshop on “RNAi Technologies and High Throughput Screens” which will cover a number of RNAi related techniques.

The Ecdysone workshop meets before the conference begins, there were discussions as to what level of support to provide them. The organizing committee thought they should receive the same kind of support that other workshops got (room, projector and screen) and that they shouldn't be charged for these costs. The Drosophila board supported this decision.

Of the 11 workshops, only 10 are listed in the Program and Abstract book. A submission for a workshop on “Endocrine Regulation of Growth and Metabolism” came too late to be listed in the Abstract Book, but the organizing committee accepted the workshop and listed it on the Web site. It will also be listed on the downloadable Workshop schedule.

Policies regarding registration, travel and accommodation expenses: The board made available to the meeting organizers \$3,000, which was to be used to reimburse the historical and invited speakers. The meeting organizers decided to use these funds to partially reimburse the historical speaker and the three plenary speakers from Europe. In addition the meeting organizers gave complimentary registration to all 12 Plenary speakers, the historical speaker and the two memorial speakers. The meeting organizers thought this was standard practice, it was only after the deed was done that they found out that historically the Plenary speakers pay their own registration fees. The organizers thank the board for covering for their mistake and

approving the comp of the speakers registration fees. After discussion, the Board voted to provide complementary registration for plenary speakers in the future. The board also approved the reimbursement of travel and hotel costs for Dr. James Crow. Complimentary hotel rooms were reserved -- as traditionally -- for GSA personnel, the meeting organizers, and foreign scientists who indicated critical fund shortages. Registration fees were waived for participants who made such a request on the basis of serious financial need. While there are many deserving domestic scientists, the critical nature of fund shortages presented by foreign colleagues and the limited supply of complimentary rooms made it difficult to justify extending this courtesy to scientists from historically affluent countries.

Interactions with the GSA office: Marsha Ryan and the GSA office were great. Anytime the meeting organizers e-mailed them with a question we would get a full and easy to understand reply the same day, usually within an hour, even on weekends. Marsha and the staff did all of the hard stuff, leaving the organizers time to do the fun parts. The 2005 organizers met with the 2004 organizers in Washington DC to discuss planning of the conference; similarly, we will meet with the 2006 organizers in San Diego to provide advice and information. We also periodically contacted the 2004 organizers for advice during the planning process, and will be available in a similar capacity to the 2006 organizers.

AV/Computer-based presentations: As computer-based presentations are now the dominant media for talks, a professional AV contractor was hired to handle the IT demands of the meeting in 2004. However, the high cost of AV services led to a change in how the AV will be done this year. In 2004 there was an AV room where a professional technician would load talks onto a computer. This position was cut this year as a cost cutting measure. Instead, each person presenting a talk was told to bring their own computer. Each session at the meeting will have a 6 x 1 SVGA switcher connection to the projector. This should allow us to attach up to six computers at once to the projector, making it relatively easy to switch from one talk to another. All of the session moderators have been told of this setup, and they will be responsible to make sure it works (with the help of an AV technician). Whether this cost savings plan causes problems or not should be evaluated during the meeting.

Acknowledgements: This report used the report of the 2004 organizing committee as a template, and includes text from that report.

I. Updated Plenary Speaker list

Susan Abmayr	1995
Kathryn Anderson	1999
Deborah Andrew	1997
Doris Bachtrog	2005
Bruce Baker	1996
Bruce S. Baker	2002
Utpal Banerjee	1997
Utpal Banerjee	2005
Konrad Basler	2003
Amy Bejsovec	2000
Phil Beachy	1998
Hugo Bellen	1997
Marianne Bienz	1996
Ethan Bier	2002
Seth Blair	1997
Grace Boekhoff-Falk	2003
Nancy Bonini	2000
Juan Botas	1999

Andrea Brand	2001
Sarah Bray	2005
Vivian Budnik	2000
Ross Cagan	1998
John Carlson	1999
John Carlson	2002
Sean Carroll	1995
Richard Carthew	2005
Andrew G. Clark	2002
Tom Cline	2000
Francis Collins	2004
Claire Cronmiller	1995
Ilan Davis	2001
Rob Denell	1999
Michael Dickinson	1995
Chris Doe	1996
Ian Duncan	2001
Bruce Edgar	1997
Sarah Elgin	2005
Anne Ephrussi	2001
Mel B. Feany	2002
Martin Feder	1998
Janice Fischer	1998
Matthew Freeman	2004
Minx Fuller	2003
Elizabeth R. Gavis	2002
Pam Geyer	1996
Richard Gibbs	2003
David Glover	2000
Kent Golic	2001
Ralph Greenspan	2005
Ernst Hafen	2005
Iswar Hariharan	2003
Dan Hartl	2001
Scott Hawley	2001
Tom Hayes	1995
Ulrike Heberlein	1996
Ulrike Heberlein	1998
Martin Heisenberg	1998
David Hogness	1999
Joan Hooper	1995
Yuh Nung Jan	2005
Wayne Johnson	2000
Laura Johnston	2005
Timothy Karr	2003
Thom Kaufman	2001
Rebecca Kellum	1999
Christian Klambt	1998
Thomas B. Kornberg	2002
Mark Krasnow	2004

Henry Krause	2004
Ed Kravitz	2004
Mitzi Kuroda	2003
Paul Lasko	1999
Cathy Laurie	1997
Ruth Lehmann	2002
Mike Levine	2003
Bob Levis	1997
Haifan Lin	1995
Susan Lindquist	2000
John Lis	2001
Liqun Luo	2003
J. Lawrence Marsh	2004
Erika Matunis	2004
Dennis McKearin	1996
Mike McKeown	1996
Jon Minden	1999
Denise Montell	2002
Roel Nusse	1997
David O'Brochta	1997
Michael O'Connor	2005
Terry L. Orr-Weaver	2002
Linda Partridge	2004
Mark Peifer	1997
Trudy MacKay	2000
Nipam Patel	2000
Norbert Perrimon	1999
M. Ramaswami	2001
Robert Rawson	2003
Pernille Rorth	1995
Gerry Rubin	1998
Gerry Rubin	2001
Hannele Ruohola-Baker	1999
Babis Savakis	1995
Paul Schedl	1998
Gerold Schübiger	1996
Trudi Schüpbach	2004
Matthew P. Scott	2002
John Sedat	2000
Amita Sehgal	2003
Marla Sokolowski	1998
Ruth Steward	1996
Daniel St. Johnston	2005
Tin Tin Su	2002
Bill Sullivan	1996
John Sved	1997
John Tamkun	2000
Barbara Taylor	1996
William Theurkauf	2002

Jessica Treisman	2005
Tim Tully	1995
Talila Volk	2004
Barbara Wakimoto	2001
Steve Wasserman	1996
Kevin P. White	2004
Kristin White	2004
Eric Wieschaus	1996
Ting Wu	1997
Tian Xu	1997
Philip Zamore	2003
Susan Zusman	1998

II. Number of applicants and speakers in different topical areas

Session Title	# abstracts (excl. late)	# requesting talk	# selected for talk
1 Meiosis, Mitosis, and Cell Division	50	29	8
2 Cytoskeleton and Cellular Biology	78	32	14
3 Genome and Chromosome Structure	48	21	8
4 Regulation of Gene Expression	89	42	14
5 Signal Transduction	107	48	16
6 Pattern Formation	92	55	22
7 Gametogenesis and Sex Determination	60	23	8
8 Organogenesis	48	20	7
9 Neurogenetics and Neural Development	84	36	14
10 Neural Physiology and Behavior	70	28	8
11 Evolution and Quantitative Genetics	80	36	14
12 Immune System and Cell Death	51	25	7
13 Techniques and Genomics	41	23	8
14 Drosophila Models of Human Diseases	61	25	8

3. 2006 PROGRAM COMMITTEE (Hugo Bellen, Ron Davis, Graeme Mardon, George Halder)

Flymeeting 2006 will be held in Houston, TX on March 29-April 2 in the Hilton (very nice, new, relatively cheap Hotel). The organizers will be: Bellen, Davis, Mardon (all at BCM) and Halder (MDA) and numerous PIs in the Houston area. The meeting will probably be the same format as this year, although some minor changes will be implemented.

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

46th ANNUAL DROSOPHILA RESEARCH CONFERENCE

Registration:

Total registrations for 2005 as of the advance cutoff date of 3/14/05 is 1435. This number is lower than that of 2004 when there were 1540 registered at the cut-off date. Registration income at this point is about \$39,000 below the total projected registration income of \$308,100. The number of individuals registering as GSA members, paying the lower member rate, also appears lower than 2004 (797 vs. 928 in 2004). It is

possible that on-site registrations may bring in enough additional income to make up the shortfall in the actual registration income.

Hotel Rates and Pick-up:

Hotel room rates for singles and doubles in 2005 were \$148/158/\$168, significantly lower than last year's \$217 single or double in Washington, DC at the Marriott. Pick-up this year is well ahead of 2004 in that the peak night's room pickup is 757 compared to only 703 in Washington. This group continues to respond directly to hotel room rates in fulfilling the contracted group room block.

Exhibitors:

Twenty-one exhibit spaces were sold this year—1 less than 2004, though there are 18 commercial companies represented, 1 more than 2004.

Donors:

There were no donations this year.

Advertisers: Two exhibitors each purchased a full page ad in the Program book for a total advertising income of \$1500.

2006 - 47TH ANNUAL DROSOPHILA CONFERENCE – March 29-April 2 – Hilton Americas-Houston

This property is not only beautiful, but offers convenience and affordability for the Drosophila Conference. Room rates are set at \$149-\$179 single or double, depending upon the room location. Meeting, poster and ancillary space are first rate and more than adequate. A preliminary budget will be presented for the Board's approval by the end of June 2004, after all the final bills to 2004 vendors have been received and paid and prices have been confirmed by 2006 vendors. Downtown Houston is continuing to grow with many and varied places to eat within reasonable walking distance.

2007 – 48th ANNUAL DROSOPHILA CONFERENCE – March 7-11 – Philadelphia Marriott

A comparison among the east coast cities of Washington, DC, Boston, MA and Philadelphia, PA, convinced the FlyBoard to host the 2007 conference in Philadelphia at the downtown Marriott, located in the city's center. Room rates, meeting space, vendor costs all were significantly more economical in Philadelphia. By contract, room rates will not exceed \$185 single and \$195 double. Meeting and poster space is more than adequate and match or exceed the quality of the Marriott Wardman Park's space. Immediately adjacent to the Marriott are the famous Reading Market Terminal, historic city landmarks, including Independence Hall, as well as countless restaurants—all in easy walking distance.

2008 – 49th ANNUAL DROSOPHILA CONFERENCE The 2008 conference will be the western rotation, again, at the Town and Country. Meeting dates are April 2 through April 6. Rates have already been negotiated and will range from \$162-\$182 single/double per night. Meeting space has been set aside based upon the same program and schedule we are using this year.

2009 – 50th ANNUAL DROSOPHILA CONFERENCE The Fly Board has not received nor requested any proposals for 2009 at this time. However, I can report that the Sheraton Chicago is currently undergoing significant updating and improvements, and I have been told that the leaking ceiling and poor lighting in their basement exhibit hall are to be a part of these improvements. At this time there is no rush to book space, and the Fly Board may want to see how the Houston experience works out before requesting 2009 site proposals.

Registrations - 2005

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Members	526	44101	\$99,940.00
NonMembers	265	44102	\$82,150.00
Student Members	234	44103	\$18,720.00
Student Nonmembers	290	44104	\$42,050.00
Complimentary	33	44109	0
Advance-Early	1,348		\$242,860.00

Members	32	44105	\$7,680.00
NonMembers	23	44106	\$8,510.00
Student Members	4	44107	\$640.00
Student Nonmembers	25	44108	\$4,750.00
Complimentary	0	44109	\$0.00

Advance-Late	84		\$21,580.00

Mailings-USA		281	\$4,215.00
Overseas		28	\$0.00
Advance Mailings		309	\$4,215.00

Grand Total	1,432		\$268,655.00

Country Breakdown Report

Country	Count
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES	= 1
ARGENTINA	= 2
AUSTRALIA	= 6
BARBADOS	= 1
BRAZIL	= 2
CANADA	= 42
SWITZERLAND	= 18
GERMANY	= 37
DENMARK	= 1
SPAIN	= 23
FINLAND	= 4
FRANCE	= 28
UNITED KINGDOM	= 63
GREECE	= 1
HONG KONG	= 3
ISRAEL	= 11
INDIA	= 3
ITALY	= 5
JAPAN	= 40
KOREA	= 5
MEXICO	= 4
NETHERLANDS	= 4
NORWAY	= 1
PORTUGAL	= 1
RUSSIAN FEDERATION	= 8
SWEDEN	= 8
SINGAPORE	= 3
SLOVAKIA	= 1
TAIWAN	= 18
US	= 1091
Total Number	= 1,435

30 different countries: 76% from USA and 24% from Canada and overseas

5. REPORT OF THE SANDLER AWARD COMMITTEE (Gerold Schübiger)

Committee:

Gerold Schubiger, University of Washington (Chair 2005)

Ross Cagan, Washington University (Chair 2004)

Seth Blair, University of Wisconsin

Gertrud Schüpbach, Princeton University

Selection Procedure:

- On December 31st, 2004 I received 14 nominations that included *Curriculum Vitae*, a thesis abstract, and a letter of nomination from the advisor. Nominations were received as PDF files and sent to the committee members.
- On January 14th, 2005 I received the lists of the 5 top candidates from each committee member. 7 names appeared and based on the rankings we selected the top 5 candidates and requested their theses.
- Thesis advisors gave me passwords and a username to access the thesis as PDF files through a website and thus distribute them to all committee members.
- On February 8th, the committee members provided me with a ranking of the 5 theses. At this point already, Elissa Hallem (Yale University) was unanimously ranked as number 1.
- On February 9th, I arranged a conference call, confirming Elissa Hallem as the clear winner and discussing the final ranking of the remaining 4 candidates. We reached consensus and agreed that Michelle Markstein (University of California, Berkeley) is the 1st runner-up, and Elizabeth Marin (Stanford University) is the 2nd runner-up.

Discussion at the Board meeting: PIs need to be encouraged to submit students to the competition. Incentives such as cash prizes and/or short talks for runners-up were discussed. It was also considered whether only the winner should be invited to attend the meeting.

Previous Committee Members: This is the list of past committee members to help future chairs select new people for the task.

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

2003 Committee:

Amanda Simcox, Ohio State (Chair)
Steve DiNardo, UPenn (2002 Chair)
Celeste Berg, University of Washington
Jin Jiang, UT Southwestern

2004 Committee:

Ross Cagan, Washington University (Chair)
Amanda Simcox, Ohio State (2003 Chair)
Susan Abmayr, Stowers Institute
Tom Clandinin, Stanford

2005 Committee:

Gerold Schubiger, University of Washington (Chair)
Ross Cagan, Washington University (Chair 2004)
Seth Blair, University of Wisconsin
Gertrud Schüpbach, Princeton University

2006 Committee:

Scott Hawley (Chair)

6. GSA POSTER AWARD (Frank Laski)

The GSA is sponsoring an award for the best poster. First (\$500), second (\$300) and third (\$200) place prizes will be given to the students or postdocs judged to have the best posters. Both scientific merit and clarity of presentation will be taken into account. Each Platform session moderator has agreed to nominate one or two posters from their research topic. Michael Levine and William McGinnis have volunteered to judge the nominated posters and pick winners. The winners will be announced by Trudi Schüpbach at the beginning of the Sunday Plenary Session. If possible we will move the winning posters to the hallway outside of the Grand Ballroom for the Sunday Session, providing maximum exposure to the winning students and their posters.

7. IMAGE AWARD (David Bilder)

The 2004 competition was run along the same guidelines as the 2003 competition. This year 27 submissions were received, up from 22 in the initial year of the competition in 2003. This year's entrants included images from India as well as Europe and the U.S. Subject matter ranged from embryonic development to neurobiology to evo-devo.

Ten finalists were selected in initial voting, with eight images being judged outstanding by more than one committee member. A second round of voting led to a clear winner,

Takashi Hayashi, for his image demonstrating parallels in packing geometries between Drosophila retinal cells and soap bubbles, suggesting that simple surface mechanics can lead to the stereotyped arrangement of wild-type retinal cells.

The number of quality images led the committee to select three runners-up:

- *Nic Gompel and Ben Prud'homme for their image illustrating the evolution of wing pigment patterns in Drosophila species*
- *Johannes Jaeger for his image charting the dynamic shifts of Kruppel protein and transcript expression boundaries during patterning in the blastoderm*
- *Dave Kosman for his technique allowing simultaneous visualization of up to five transcripts in Drosophila tissues*

The committee was again pleased with the outcome of the competition and in particular the depth of the finalist images. The committee discussed the following issues that arose during this year's competition:

- **Eligibility:** This year's winner could not be present at the fly meeting, nor is he a GSA member. We also received inquiries from companies working on Drosophila. Despite the appeal of having a winner present to accept the Award in person (as Wes Grueber did last year) the committee feels that the competition should be open to all Drosophila researchers worldwide regardless of professional affiliation or ability to attend the conference.
- **Publicity:** Several of this year's finalist images were submitted after active solicitation by committee members (note that some solicited images were not selected as finalists). This solicitation is one of the primary duties of a committee member, yet it would be preferable if all outstanding images were submitted without solicitation. Increased publicity and awareness of the Award would contribute to this goal. While each Award will increase the profile of the competition at the U.S. Fly meeting, efforts should be made to contact European and Asian Drosophila conferences as well.
- **Committee composition:** Having completed two cycles of the Award, the committee is starting to think about rotating membership. We will add one new member this year, as Trudi Schupbach steps down and selects a replacement. David Bilder has agreed to stay on as chair for the 2005 Award; for 2006 he plans to select another committee member to replace him in this capacity.
- **GSA support:** Elaine Strass has affirmed that the GSA will support both the costs of providing the Award (a framed picture with plaque, \$150) and as of next year will assume responsibility for producing it, which will relieve the committee of this task. David and Elaine are looking into the possibility that the GSA will host a website with archived images of the finalists from each competition as well as other content.

Committee members:

David Bilder
Peter Lawrence
Liqun Luo
Laurel Raftery
Trudi Schüpbach

8. TREASURER'S REPORT (Rick Fehon) – March 23, 2005

A. ANNUAL DROSOPHILA CONFERENCE INCOME/EXPENSE

(Data are from the GSA [Marsha Ryan], 3/15/05)

	2005 (Projected¹)	2004 (Actual)	2004 (Projected²)
Income			
Registration/Mailing fees: 1600 registrants @ same fee sch as 2004	\$308,100	313,645	299,270
Exhibit Fees	25,000	28,500	24,400
Program Book Sales	200	140	4,330
Advertising	1,500	1,500	1,500
Donations	-0-	1,000	1,000
Miscellaneous (Reg Cancellations, Flybase)	800	2,515	2,000
TOTAL REVENUE	\$335,600	347,300	332,500
Expenditures			
Fixed Expenses:			
Hotel and Travel-Staff	\$3,000	1,132	1,590
Speaker Travel (airfare for ltd # plenary spkrs + historical spkr air/hotel)	4,500	4,156	3,150
Printing (Call postcard, Program/Abstracts Volume)	28,869	26,453	34,000
Computer Services (Web site)	2,500	6,535	2,000
Mailing, Addressing, Shipping, Freight (mtg supplies, poster boards, etc.)	10,900	4,455	12,000
Duplicating/Copying	150	111	150
Telephone - FlyBase room internet & telephone lines	5,800	1,200	5,800
Telephone & Fax – Other/On-site	500	3,527	1,000
Office Supplies (badges, signs, misc.)	1,000	727	4,000
Sound & Sound techs (hotel charges)	7,500	1,682	6,000
Projection and AV Company	35,000	71,390	67,500
Poster boards, tables, chairs, masking, reg furn, carpeting	16,000	20,046	29,000
Exhibits	7,900	5,320	4,500
Contracted Services (Registration, security)	4,000	3,450	6,600
Miscellaneous	100	103	100
Subtotal Fixed Expenses:	\$127,719	\$150,287	179,890
Variable Expenses:			
Salaries/Wages/taxes/benefits	\$75,125	62,070	65,000
Catering:			
Coffee/Soda Breaks/Misc	32,000		
Catering – Reception (1400)	40,000		
Continental Breakfast (1400)	16,000 ³		
Catering – Fly Base	1,200		
Catering subtotal	89,200	100,527	97,380
Credit Card Expense	9,500	9,120	9,500
Sub-total Variable Expenses:	\$173,825	171,717	172,380
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$301,544	322,004	352,270
NET PROJECTED REVENUE (EXPENSE)	\$34,056	\$25,296	(19,770)

¹ Assumes 1600 total registrants. Currently (3/15/2005) there are 1451 paid registrants. Overall registration looks a bit lower than last year (total attendance = 1653 in 2004).

² From last year's budget (3/04). Items where the actual and projected expenses are significantly different are indicated in italics.

³ This breakfast was omitted by the board last year due to the high expense (>\$20K), and then added back at the last minute when a better price was obtained by M. Ryan (~\$11K). The board may wish to consider again whether this breakfast is worth the expense.

B. MEETING ATTENDANCE

Pre-registration 2005 (San Diego):	1,451	\$264,440
Total registration 2005:	(1,600)	\$308,010
Pre-registration 2004 (Wash DC)	1470	\$266,110
Total registration 2004:	1,653	\$313,645
Pre-registration 2003 (Chicago):	1,488	\$256,130
Total registration 2003:	1,603	\$283,270
Pre-registration 2002 (San Diego):	1,219	\$211,000
Total registration 2002:	1,552	\$290,170
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	60,661	174,787	1,552
2003	(22,993)	151,793	1,603
2004	25,296	177,089	1,653
2005 (projected)	34,046	212,135	1,600

NB: The GSA Board (Sept. 2003 meeting) established a required ~\$150,000 *minimum* reserve fund (one-half of meeting expenses). No cap figure stated. This information was not passed on to the treasurer until 7/22/04.

Sandler Lecture Fund			
Year	Net Income	Balance	Excess to Reserve (\$8,000)
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	23,631

2000	257	31,888	23,888
2001	(234)	31,654	23,654
2002	(846)	30,808	22,808
2003	(2431)	28,377	20,377
2004	432	28,809	20,809

D. SUMMARY AND REMARKS

Last year's budget worked out considerably better than we had expected (~\$45K better) due to higher than expected registration numbers and lower than expected expenses in numerous categories. This highlights the uncertainty in predicting our financial outlook from one year to the next. It is unclear that anything can be done to improve our ability to predict expenses/income, so it is important that the board continue to maintain a healthy balance in the GSA meeting fund. Added to this, I learned this past summer that during its 2003 board meeting, the GSA passed a resolution stating that the Drosophila fund should not drop below one-half of the annual meeting costs (or ~\$150K at present). It is not clear what actions would be taken by GSA if we did drop below this minimum, but taken together these factors suggest that we should allow the Drosophila fund to grow modestly over the next few years. Given that we did manage a small 'profit' in 2004, and that we have significantly cut meeting expenses this year by reducing AV support, at the moment it appears that we should be able to keep registration fees constant. However, the board may want to reconsider this matter if registration falls short of expectations this year, or if next year's expenses are significantly higher than the past 2 years (M. Ryan will provide preliminary figures for 2006 in June 2005).

Two issues regarding meeting expenses arose quite late this year. **First**, the board decided last year to omit the continental breakfast due to its expense (originally over \$20K) and then added it back at the last minute when Marsha was able to negotiate a much better deal (\$11K). For this reason it was also added to this year's budget, at a cost of \$16K (over \$11 per person for one continental breakfast). The board should decide whether this is worth the expense. **Second**, the policies regarding complementary registrations for speakers have never been spelled out explicitly. In the past, only 'select' plenary speakers (those who would not otherwise have reason to attend the meeting) have been granted complementary registration, while this year registration fees for all plenary speakers were waived. Certainly it is not unusual for meetings to cover the registration costs of all invited speakers, but apparently this has not been the practice for the fly meetings. It would be useful for the board to decide this issue so that future organizers have concrete guidance. In addition, with Marsha's help I have put together a set of general guidelines, appended below.

Finally, the President's fund has continued to be a very useful mechanism for promoting Drosophila causes at a very modest expense (\$2,380 in 2003 and \$2,269 in 2004). I suggest that the board formally endorse this fund with an annual spending limit of \$5,000, to be spent under the discretion of the Board President and under GSA accounting rules. This would not be a separate fund, but rather just a limit on spending from the general fund.

Draft: Guidelines for Drosophila meeting organizers

Workshops

Generally we expect to be able to accommodate 10-12 workshops together with necessary projection and audio equipment. We do not normally provide funds for refreshments (funds for this can be solicited from sponsors).

Complementary hotel accommodations

Overseas participants: up to 5-6 rooms, 5 nights each. Organizers should rank order the applicants (first authors on abstracts submitted on time), and then rooms will be awarded depending on number of complementary rooms available (depends on overall 'pickup').

GSA and decorator staff

Meeting organizers

Fly Board president

Complementary registration

Overseas applicants who request it (except Western Europe) – again first authors on abstracts submitted on time
'Select' plenary speakers (usually reserved for speakers who would otherwise have no reason to attend the meeting)
Historical speaker
Meeting organizers

Budget for historical speaker, Sandler runners-up, and plenary speakers

\$4500 total (2005) – this can be used toward travel (economy fare), hotel, or meals for plenary speakers and historical speaker. Travel expenses for Sandler Award runners-up also come from this fund.

9. ELECTION REPORT (Barbara Wakimoto)

The Elections Committee consisted of Barbara Wakimoto (Chair), Mariana Wolfner, Celeste Berg, Jeff Simon, and two new members Ross Cagan and Laurel Raftery. We met virtually and made a list of possible nominees. Candidates were selected based on previous involvement in the fly community or our perception of their ability to perform the job. We also asked the outgoing regional representatives and other Board members for their input. The chair contacted the individuals selected by the committee to construct the final ballot.

This was the initiating year for the position of President-Elect, a new officer approved by the Drosophila Board in Spring 04. At that time, the Board suggested we run a separate election to select this first President-Elect. However, the Election Committee decided it would be more efficient to construct a single ballot with four candidates for President-Elect and the provision that the front-runner will be our first President-Elect and the individual receiving the second highest number of votes will be next President-Elect. All of the nominees agreed to this proposal. The ballot also had two candidates each for three regional representative positions.

The following letter was e-mailed to Drosophilists through FlyBase.

Dear FlyPerson,

Enclosed you will find a ballot on which to cast your vote for new members of the National Drosophila Board. The Board plays an important role for the Drosophila research community, so please take a few seconds to learn about the Board and cast your vote.

The Board's duties include: overseeing community resource centers and addressing other research and resource issues that affect the entire Drosophila research community. The Board also administers the finances for the annual North America Drosophila Research Conference and its associated awards, and it chooses the organizers and the site of the annual meeting. The Board consists of 9 regional representatives, 8 from the U.S. and 1 from Canada, who serve 3-year terms. It also has 3 elected officers include a President, a President-Elect and a Treasurer. As explained below, the President-Elect is a new position which will begin this fall. In addition, the Board has ex officio members who represent Drosophila community resource centers or international Drosophila communities. For more information about the Board and the summaries of the annual Board meetings see: <http://flybase.net/.data/docs/DrosBoard>

Last spring, the Board voted to have a President-Elect who would serve with the current President prior to beginning his/her term as President. Since this is a transitional year, the ballot below asks you to vote for 2 candidates for President-Elect; The individual receiving the highest number of votes will serve as President-Elect from Sept 2004 -March 2005, then as President of the Board from March 2005 – March 2006. The

individual receiving the second highest number of votes will serve as President –Elect from March 2005-March 2006, then as President beginning March 2006. As in the past, we will elect three regional representatives, who will serve 3-year terms.

Please participate in this election. It is your opportunity to choose the individuals who will help set priorities and garner support for community resources. In order to record your vote, delete this upper portion of the ballot and simply reply to this email indicating your selection. You may vote for candidates in ALL categories even though you do not reside in the region represented by the candidates. Balloting will end SEPTEMBER 15, 2004.

The Election Committee for the Drosophila Board

.....

REMEMBER

Return **ONLY** the ballot portion of the message.
Reply to the sender of this message, **NOT** to the people below.

-----cut here -----

President Elect: VOTE FOR TWO INDIVIDUALS

Steve Crews (University of North Carolina)
Ken Irvine (Rutgers University)
Mark Krasnow (Stanford University)
Trudy MacKay (North Carolina State University)

New England: VOTE FOR ONE INDIVIDUAL

Mitzi Kuroda (Harvard University)
Bill Theurkauf (University of Massachusetts)

Southeast: VOTE FOR ONE INDIVIDUAL

Tien Hsu, Medical University of South Carolina
Rebecca Kellum, University of Kentucky

Great Lakes: VOTE FOR ONE INDIVIDUAL

Javier Lopez, Carnegie-Mellon University
Amanda Simcox, Ohio State University

RESULTS

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

Mark Krasnow for president-elect to April 2005, President from April 2005-April 2006
Trudy MacKay for president-elect April 2005-April 2006
Mitzi Kuroda for New England regional rep
Rebecca Kellem for Southeast regional rep
Amanda Simcox for Great Lakes regional rep

• **Drosophila Board Master List**

Spring 2004 - 2005

Year indicates the last spring through which Board Members will serve as Officers or Regional Reps.

Officers:		Spring	
Lynn Cooley	President	2005	lynn.cooley@yale.edu
Mark Krasnow	President-elect	2005	krasnow@cmgm.stanford.edu
Trudy MacKay	President-elect	2005-2006	trudy_mackay@ncsu.edu
Ruth Lehmann	Past-President	2005	lehmann@saturn.med.nyu.edu
Barbara Wakimoto	Past-past President & Elections Chair	2005	wakimoto@u.washington.edu
Rick Fehon	Treasurer	2006	rfehon@duke.edu
Regional Representatives:			
Henry Krause	Canada	2006	h.krause@utoronto.ca
Sean Carroll	Great Lakes outgoing	2005	sbcarrol@facstaff.wisc.edu
Amanda Simcox	Great Lakes	2008	simcox.1@osu.edu
Barb Taylor	Northwest	2007	taylorb@bcc.orst.edu
Amy Bejsovec	Southeast outgoing	2005	bejsovec@duke.edu
Rebecca Kellum	Southeast	2008	rkellum@pop.uky.edu
Ken Burtis	California	2007	kcburtis@ucdavis.edu
Dennis McKearin	Heartland	2006	dennis.mckearin@utsouthwestern.edu
Laurel Raftery	New England outgoing	2005	laurel.raftery@cbrc2.mgh.harvard.edu
Mitzi Kuroda	New England	2008	mkuroda@genetics.med.harvard.edu
Claude Desplan	Mid-Atlantic	2007	claudes@nyu.edu
Lori Wallrath	Midwest	2006	lori-wallrath@uiowa.edu
International Representatives:			
Robert Saint	Australia/Oceania	2007	robert.saint@anu.edu.au
Yasushi Hiromi	Asia	2007	yhiromi@lab.nig.ac.jp
David Ish-Horowicz	Europe	2007	david.horowicz@cancer.org.uk
Ex Officio:			
Bill Gelbart	FlyBase		gelbart@morgan.harvard.edu
Gerry Rubin	BDGP & FlyBase		gerry@fruitfly.berkeley.edu
Thom Kaufman	B'ton S.C. & FlyBase		kaufman@sunflower.bio.indiana.edu
Kathy Matthews	B'ton S.C. & FlyBase		matthewk@indiana.edu
Kevin Cook	B'ton S.C. & Nomenclature Comm.		kcook@bio.indiana.edu
Teri Markow	Tucson Species S.C.		tmarkow@arl.arizona.edu
Jim Thompson	DIS		jthompson@ou.edu
Michael Ashburner	Europe & FlyBase		ma11@gen.cam.ac.uk
Hugo Bellen	B'ton S.C. Adv. Comm. & P element project		hbellen@bcm.tmc.edu
Allan Spradling	P-element project		spradling@ciwemb.edu
Gerold Schubiger	Sandler Comm.		gerold@u.washington.edu
Scott Hawley	Nomenclature Comm		rsh@stowers-institute.org
David Bilder	Image competition		bilder@socrates.berkeley.edu
Larry Goldstein	At-large		lgoldstein@ucsd.edu
Chuck Langley	At large		chlangley@ucdavis.edu
Past-Presidents serve as Members at large with terms ending:			
Trudi Schüpbach		2005	gschubach@molbiol.princeton.edu
Barbara Wakimoto		2006	wakimoto@u.washington.edu
Ruth Lehmann		2007	lehmann@saturn.med.nyu.edu
2005 Meeting Organizers:			
Kavita Arora			karora@uci.edu
Frank Laski			laski@mbi.ucla.edu
Rahul Warrior			rwarrior@uci.edu

Drosophila Board Master List

Spring 2005 - 2006

flyboard@morgan.harvard.edu

Year indicates the last spring through which Board Members will serve as Officers or Regional Reps.

Officers:		Spring	
Mark Krasnow	President	2005	krasnow@cmgm.stanford.edu
Trudy MacKay	President-elect	2005-2006	trudy_mackay@ncsu.edu
Lynn Cooley	Past-President	2005	lynn.cooley@yale.edu
Ruth Lehmann	Past-President & Elections Chair	2005	lehmann@saturn.med.nyu.edu
Rick Fehon	Treasurer	2006	rfehon@duke.edu
Regional Representatives:			
Henry Krause	Canada	2006	h.krause@utoronto.ca
Amanda Simcox	Great Lakes	2008	simcox.1@osu.edu
Barb Taylor	Northwest	2007	taylorb@bcc.orst.edu
Rebecca Kellum	Southeast	2008	rkellum@pop.uky.edu
Ken Burtis	California	2007	kcburtis@ucdavis.edu
Dennis McKearin	Heartland	2006	dennis.mckearin@utsouthwestern.edu
Mitzi Kuroda	New England	2008	mkuroda@genetics.med.harvard.edu
Claude Desplan	Mid-Atlantic	2007	claudedesplan@nyu.edu
Lori Wallrath	Midwest	2006	lori-wallrath@uiowa.edu
International Representatives:			
Robert Saint	Australia/Oceania	2007	robert.saint@anu.edu.au
Yasushi Hiromi	Asia	2007	yhiromi@lab.nig.ac.jp
David Ish-Horowicz	Europe	2007	david.horowicz@cancer.org.uk
Ex Officio:			
Bill Gelbart	FlyBase		gelbart@morgan.harvard.edu
Gerry Rubin	BDGP & FlyBase		gerry@fruitfly.berkeley.edu
Thom Kaufman	B'ton S.C. & FlyBase		kaufman@sunflower.bio.indiana.edu
Kathy Matthews	B'ton S.C. & FlyBase		matthewk@indiana.edu
Kevin Cook	B'ton S.C. & Nomenclature Comm.		kcook@bio.indiana.edu
Justen Andrews	DGRC		justen.andrews@bio.indiana.edu
Teri Markow	Tucson Species S.C.		tmarkow@arl.arizona.edu
Jim Thompson	DIS		jthompson@ou.edu
Michael Ashburner	Europe & FlyBase		ma11@gen.cam.ac.uk
Hugo Bellen	B'ton S.C. Adv. Comm. & P element project		hbellen@bcm.tmc.edu
Allan Spradling	P-element project		spradling@ciwemb.edu
?	Sandler Comm.		gerold@u.washington.edu
Scott Hawley	Nomenclature Comm		rsh@stowers-institute.org
David Bilder	Image competition		bilder@socrates.berkeley.edu
Chuck Langley	At large		chlangley@ucdavis.edu
Past-Presidents serve as Members at large with terms ending:			
Barbara Wakimoto		2006	wakimoto@u.washington.edu
Ruth Lehmann		2007	lehmann@saturn.med.nyu.edu
Lynn Cooley		2008	lynn.cooley@yale.edu
2006 Meeting Organizers:			
Hugo Bellen			hbellen@bcm.tmc.edu
Ron Davis			rdavis@bcm.tmc.edu
Graeme Mardon			gmardon@bcm.tmc.edu
George Halder			ghalder@mdanderson.org

10. BLOOMINGTON STOCK CENTER (Kathy Matthews, Kevin Cook)

Discussion about mailing fly stocks: As of May 1, 2005 it will be legal to mail *Drosophila* stocks overseas. Importing fly stocks will still require an import permit.

A. Holdings

Total stocks on 12/31/04 19,285

a) ADDED DURING 2004

5,313 stocks were added to the collection in 2004. This was double the rate of addition in 2003 because of the acquisition of the Exelixis collection, which consisted of 506 Exelixis deficiencies (47 of these lines have subsequently been found to be not-as-represented or redundant and were discarded in 2005), 1,927 gene-disruption insertions, and 266 other transposable element (TE) insertions, primarily of Exelixis-created constructs. The remaining 2,614 lines consisted of 1,766 non-Exelixis gene-disruption insertions (1,504 *P*{ insertions from the Gene Disruption Project *per se*, and 262 *PBac*{ insertions from Udo Haecker), 448 Deletion Generator insertions from the Gelbart lab (these also provide gene disruptions in many cases, but are not suitable as primary representative alleles, see below), 83 DrosDel deficiencies, 48 other deficiencies, and 269 miscellaneous stocks from 47 different donors. The new stocks can be categorized by their primary characteristics as follows:

Gene Disruption insertions total	3,693
2,961 create alleles	
732 are not known to create alleles	
Deletion Generator insertions	448
227 create alleles	
Other Alleles	239
Deficiencies	638
Duplications	7
Transpositions	1
Balancers	5
GAL4/UAS	226
(3 are also in the GFP category, 11 are also in the allele category)	
FRT/FLP	16
Other tools for clonal analysis	4
GFP and other florescent markers	16
lacZ markers	17
TE insertion mutagenesis tools	13
Rescue constructs	3
Wild-type lines	1

b) SUMMARY OF CONTENTS OF THE COLLECTION AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2004

Component Categorizations

Defined genetic components in all stocks	77,278
Unique components	27,735
Genes represented by one or more mutant alleles	7,320 ¹
Genes represented by at least one TE insertion allele ²	5,496
Mutant alleles	49,200
Unique mutant alleles	11,722
Unique alleles caused by TE insertions ²	7,637
Alleles containing more than one insertion	7
Insertions of TE constructs	14,847
Unique TE constructs	692
Unique insertions of TE constructs	13,413
Insertions known to cause an allele ³	7,541
Insertions that cause more than 1 allele ⁴	65
Insertions not known to cause alleles	5,872
Aberrations	4,446
Unique aberrations	2,600

¹FlyBase currently has records for 25,270 *D. melanogaster* genes; 13,798 of these have been identified in the reference genome sequence. 36% of sequenced genes (4,982) are included in the 7,320 genes noted.

²For our purposes, a TE allele always refers to the insertion of an engineered transposable element construct; insertions of naturally occurring, unmarked, transposons are excluded from this category.

³An allele may be defined functionally (an insertion disrupts the function of a gene) or structurally (an insertion is within the annotated transcription unit of a gene).

⁴This is a result of overlapping genes.

Stock Categorizations

Here the category indicates the primary reason the stock is in the collection. Some stocks, in addition to those indicated, contribute to multiple categories in the list below.

Alleles	10,699 (includes TE insertion alleles)
Other TE insertions	4,059
Deletion Generator insertions	448 (includes 277 TE insertion alleles)
Deficiencies	1,753
Duplications	320
Balancers	267
Other aberrations	1,140
GAL4/UAS	845
FRT/FLP	174
lacZ	156
GFP	118
Mapping stocks	168
Marker chromosomes	334
Clonal analysis	68
Wild type	72
Other	51

B. Use

	US Acad	US Gov	US Com	US Teach	Foreign All	Total
Registered 2004	841 57%	25 1.7%	20 1.4%	20 1.4%	565 38%	1,471
Received Stocks	653 59%	19 1.7%	9 0.8%	9 0.8%	417 38%	1,107 75%

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) and percent of total, and the percent of registered groups in each category that received stocks in 2004.

	US Acad	US Gov	US Com	US Teach	Non-US	Total
Registered	2,378 58%	57 1.3%	43 1%	26 0.6%	1,618 39%	4,122

TABLE 2. The total number of registered user-group members in each institutional category for 2004.

	US Acad	US Gov	US Com	US Teach	Foreign Acad	Foreign Com	Foreign Teach	Total
Ships	7,246 62%	250 2.1%	109 0.9%	25 0.2%	3,995 34%	42 0.4%	2 0.02%	11,669
Subs	96,433 63%	3,492 2.3%	735 0.5%	82 0.05%	51,629 34%	1,126 0.7%	3 0.00%	153,500

TABLE 3. Degree of institutional use of the center during 2004. 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.

C. Fees for 2004

No. of stocks	1-5	6-20	21-50	51-100	>100	Total
Per stock cost	\$10	\$5	\$3	\$2	\$1	
Groups	224 (18%)	275 (22%)	251 (20%)	184 (15%)	307 (25%)	1,242
Stocks	637 (0.4%)	3,306 (2%)	8,416 (6%)	13,101 (9%)	124,118 (83%)	149,578*
Assessed Fees	\$13,594 (3%)	\$35,336 (8%)	\$57,847 (14%)	\$63,915 (15%)	\$246,744 (59%)	\$417,436
Invoiced Fees	\$13,012 (3%)	\$34,491 (9%)	\$56,079 (14%)	\$62,766 (15%)	\$238,753 (59%)	\$405,101

TABLE 4. Assessed and Invoiced Fees in Each Use Range for 2004. 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 or reduced fees, plus underpayment of 2003 balance (usually a result of bank charges for electronic funds transfer being deducted from the payment).

*The remaining 3,922 subcultures shipped in 2004 were unchargeable, because they were replacements for stocks lost or killed in transit.

D. Funding

We began our first year of a new five-year funding period in August of 2004. Direct-costs support for the collection from NSF and NIH for the current fiscal year is \$416,890. This is a 1.2% increase in grant funding compared to the last fiscal year. The funded amount is 22% less than we requested in our grant proposal and the collection is 16% larger than we expected (primarily as a result of the Exelixis donation) when we wrote the grant. Fees were therefore restructured for 2004, with the expectation of additional increases averaging 5% a year over the course of the grant, to assure that the additional needed funds will be raised through cost recovery. For 2004, the minimum per-stock charge was increased from 50 cents to \$1, the 'excess shipment' charge of \$8 per shipment over 12 per year was dropped, a \$3-per-shipment handling charge was added for every shipment, and the cost of postage was added as a separate charge. For 2005, the per-stock charges in the upper categories were increased to \$3.50, \$2.50 and \$1.25.

E. Endowment

We have not added new funds to our endowment account, but the yield is reinvested. The book value of our endowment as of 2/28/05 was ~\$810,000. Market value is less, perhaps 75% of the book value.

F. Advisory Committee

Hugo Bellen (Chair)
Michael Ashburner
Susan Parkhurst
Norbert Perrimon
Amanda Simcox

11. REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE (Hugo Bellen)

The advisory committee (Ashburner, Perrimon, Parkhurst, Simcox, and Bellen together with Cook, Matthews, and Kaufman) meets once a year during the fly meeting. We met last year and discussed the increase in recovery fees, the further need for expansion of the stock center, the lack of adequate support from NSF and NIH to cover the expansion, the culling, and the maximal capacity of the center.

As usual, much of the discussion and conclusions have been implemented by Kevin Cook and Kathy Matthews.

Key issues:

- Usage of the center: With about 20,000 stocks and about 150,000 subcultures sent out per year, usage remains high, and the cost per stock low (about \$5.00 per stock).
- Funding: Lack of additional funding and support combined with an ~5,000 stock expansion lead us to increase the fees that are being charged to users. They are now at \$1.00 per stock. This will generate an ~\$350,000 in revenue, much of which will have to be spent. Some small labs object to this policy. Maybe we should briefly discuss this issue.
- Culling: Has not really been a major issue as it is based on usage. Most stocks that are kept are regularly ordered. The df kits are the most popular.
- Expansion: The stockcenter can expand somewhat (5,000-maybe more), but there may be a need for planning more capacity in the future. How and who will oversee this?
- Quality of Stockcenter and personnel: Remains outstanding!

12. DROSOPHILA GENOMICS RESOURCE CENTER (Justen Andrews, Thom Kaufman, and Peter Cherbas)

A. INTRODUCTION

The Drosophila Genomics Resource Center (DGRC) exists to ensure that the research community has access to high quality Drosophila genomics resources. The creation of the DGRC and its aims were driven by discussions among the research community in 2000-2001. Specifically, community resource workshops at the 41st and 42nd ADRC and the Drosophila White paper of 2000. Following these discussions we convened an Advisory Board and sought NIH funding for the following aims: (i) To fabricate and distribute transcriptome microarrays. (ii) To acquire archive and distribute molecular reagents such as vectors, clones and cell lines. (iii) To provide guidance and support in the use of these reagents as well as emerging genomics technologies. The DGRC was funded jointly by NCR and NIGMS in July 2003 for a period of 4 years. The grant funds a portion of the costs -- principally set-up and personnel --- with the remainder being recovered from users.

Our efforts in the first year were focused on setting up the DGRC. This included hiring, acquiring resources, developing microarrays, developing a web-site, and putting in place the computational and administrative infrastructure for processing orders and responding to users' requests. We launched the web-site and began distribution in February 2004. Since then our focus has shifted from set-up to full scale distribution of genomics resources. This has entailed considerable growth. Briefly, we now have 2,199 registered users from 976 laboratories; have distributed a total of 8,272 individual reagents (microarrays, vectors, clones, and cell lines) in 2,221 individual orders; and have responded to over 1,708 enquiries from users. This is summarized in more detail below.

B. MICROARRAYS

We are producing and distributing spotted amplicon transcriptome microarrays. We are providing hybridization ready microarrays, associated data, and suggested protocols. The comprehensive arrays are printed with approximately 15,000 DNA fragments PCR amplified from genomic DNA template using gene specific primers. The primers were originally designed against version 1 of the genome annotation and correspond to approximately 75% of currently annotated genes. The annotated gene lists, deconvolution files (mapping spot locations to DNA samples), and suggested protocols are available to download from the web-site. We are also distributing a stripped down version of the arrays, called test arrays, that are intended for pilot experiments to optimize experimental conditions. These are identical to the comprehensive arrays except that they contain only 196 spots.

We began distributing microarrays in May 2004 and have distributed 605 comprehensive arrays and 70 test arrays to date. We currently charge \$100 per comprehensive array and \$25 per test array. Clearly the current demand for our microarrays is much lower than the figure (10,000 arrays/year) we estimated for “mature demand.” It is too early to tell whether that figure was in error or, alternatively, demand will continue to grow as we begin serious efforts to acquaint the community with the DGRC arrays.

C. VECTORS, CLONES AND CELL LINES

We are acquiring, archiving and distributing molecular reagents including transformation vectors, collections of clones, and cell lines. We have far exceeded our original plans for the distribution of vectors, clones, and cell lines. This has largely been driven by the overwhelming response from the community -- donors, recipients, and the DGRC Advisory Board. Our current inventory is summarized below.

Common vectors: Includes 225 transformation vectors with a range of uses (general transformation, epitope tag, FLP/FRT, gateway, reporters, RNAi, shuttle, UAS/GAL4, cell culture). These are distributed individually and QC tested (restriction digests) prior to distribution.

BDGP EST collection: Includes ca. 270,000 cDNA clones distributed individually.

BDGP Drosophila Gene Collection R1 and R2: Includes ca. 11,000 cDNA clones distributed individually.

BDGP Gold Collection: Includes ca. 6,000 full length cDNA clones. These are distributed individually and as a set.

CuraGen Yeast-2-hybrid Collection: Includes ca. 40,000 clones distributed as individual yeast cultures. This collection may be distributed as a collection if there is sufficient interest.

Cell Lines: Includes 101 cell lines currently being distributed and another 50 being prepared for distribution. Cell lines are derived from a variety of sources including mutant flies, defined larval tissues, (imaginal discs and CNS and non-melanogaster species).

We began distributing vectors, clones and cell lines in February 2004. To date we have distributed over 2,000 vector/clone orders including 7,201 individual vectors or clones, and over 190 cell line orders including 396 individual cell lines. We are currently charging \$15 per vector or clone and \$100 per cell line.

D. USER SUPPORT

Our aims include facilitating researchers' use of DGRC reagents by creating a DGRC web site with mechanisms for on-line ordering and information on reagents, providing a telephone and email help desk, and posting recommended protocols. There are currently 2,199 individual registered users in 976 laboratories and we therefore need to devote considerable effort to user support. We have developed an extensive web-site that is our principal tool for communicating with users and providing support. The web-

site has the following features: (i) a general introduction to the DGRC and the resources available, (ii) a searchable database of resources, (iii) user account registration, (iv) on-line ordering, (v) resource specific guides, FAQs, ancillary data (e.g. gene lists, micrographs of cell lines, maps and gel images of vectors), and protocols, (vi) back end database functions for tracking reagents, inventory, orders and payments, and (vii) a news page. The average number of visits to the web-site per month has increased from 4,168 in the first quarter (March-May, 2004) to 7,163 in the last quarter (December 2004-February 2005). In cases where the distribution of reagents requires a Material Transfer Agreement, the DGRC facilitates the process but is not a party to the agreement. In most cases we have negotiated the wording of a template MTA which is available on the web-site, and we do not ship reagents until we are notified by the donor that the MTA has been completed. The average number of pages viewed per visit has declined only slightly from 8.8 in the first quarter to 7.6 in the last quarter. We also offer online and telephone user support. The user support is being managed using user support issue tracking software -- telephone and email correspondence are logged and recorded, issues are prioritized, assigned to the appropriate expert, and managed to ensure a timely response. In the last 12 months we have responded to approximately 1,708 enquiries from users.

E. DEVELOPMENTS AND EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES

It is our aim that the DGRC will take an active role in evaluating, optimizing and adopting appropriate new genomics technologies. To this end we are pursuing the following.

Spotted oligonucleotide transcriptome microarrays: Within the framework of the International Drosophila Array Consortium (INDAC) we have been collaborating in the development of long oligonucleotide microarrays. A set of oligonucleotides (70 to 73-mers) representing each gene has been designed and the synthesis contracted with Illumina. We anticipate beginning to fabricate oligo transcriptome microarrays in the next few months.

Genome tiling path microarray distribution: Kevin White (Yale University) has received NHGRI funding to fabricate genome tiling path microarrays. Within this award the DGRC is sub-contracted to distribute the tiling path arrays. We expect distribution to begin in the next year.

O'Farrell RNAi Library: Pat O'Farrell has donated a library of ca. 7,000 amplicon templates for dsRNA production. This will be distributed as a collection.

Drosophila Species Sequencing Consortium Fosmid Clones: We are archiving these and do not plan to distribute them.

Microarray data analysis and archiving: We are continuing to evaluate open source microarray data analysis algorithms developed with the statistical package R as well as open source microarray databases. Our recommended protocols will be provided to users.

Cell line characterization: We have been characterizing cell lines by immunostaining and microarray transcription profiling. These data will be published and made available to the community.

G. ADVISORY BOARD

Ken Burtis
Section Mol. Cellular Biology
University of California, Davis

Reed George
BDGP and Lawrence Berkeley Lab
University of California, Berkeley

Alex E. Lash
Computational Biology Center
Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, NYC

Brian Oliver
Laboratory of Cellular Developmental Biology NIDDK, NIH

Susan M. Parkhurst
Division of Basic Sciences
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center, Seattle

J. Tim Westwood
Department of Zoology
University of Toronto -- Mississauga

Kevin P. White
Department of Genetics
Yale Univ. School of Medicine, New Haven

13. BDGP GENE DISRUPTION PROJECT (Allan Spradling)

The BDGP gene disruption project seeks to generate and/or assemble strains containing single P element insertions that allow the genetic manipulation of all *Drosophila* genes into a publically available collection. The number of such lines has increased substantially from the 7,140 lines disrupting 5,362 genes reported one year ago in Bellen et al. (2004). Subsequently we analyzed approximately the following number of lines with insertions that could be mapped to unique genomic sites: 5,700 EY lines, 3,600 protein fusion lines, 623 lines from Develogen Corp., 849 lines from the European genome project (EBI), 285 PZ lines from Carnegie. These numbers were bolstered by manual Blast analysis of several hundred lines that failed to automatically align to a unique site by which could be aligned manually by an expert. From these sources we increased the total number of genes to approximately 5,986. In addition, we re-analyzed 24,862 P or PiggyBac containing lines from Exelixis Corp., using both the genome assignments reported publically as well as genome assignments based on the same DNA traces analyzed using BDGP criteria at LBNL. This work showed that the actual number of genes hit by the Exelixis collection is about 5,160, rather than 6,900 (50%) as reported in their paper. Based on the original alignments, we identified 2,162 Exelixis lines associated with novel genes, but this was reduced to 2,006 based on the re-analysis. We forwarded this data to the Bloomington Stock Center, made it publicly available on the Baylor Website and assisted with the transfer of the 2,162 strains to Bloomington. We also obtained sequence data and analyzed the lines currently in the Japan Stock Center, the Drosdel deletion project and at the private company GenExcel for their degree of overlap with the public Bloomington collection, and facilitated the transfer of Drosdel lines representing novel genes to Bloomington. Consequently, we now have a database that combines the molecular location of the P element insertion lines in all the large collections that exist worldwide. Taking into account all the lines we selected and helped move to the public domain at Bloomington, the public collection now stands at about 7,587 genes. This represents an increase of from 40% to 55% of all annotated genes during this year. If private lines generated by GenExcel are included, the total becomes 8,589 genes (62%).

A remaining problem is the lack of a central clearinghouse where information on all the available P element insertion lines can be obtained. There is no Website where the positions of available P element

insertions can be displayed graphically along the annotated genome. The gene disruption project has posted a Website listing the insertion coordinates of its lines, but many other existing, publically available lines are difficult or impossible for *Drosophila* researchers to find and obtain. Unfortunately, few bioinformatic resources were included within the funded project, so personnel are not available to address this situation.

A second problem is the projected need for additional stock center space to house new lines. The addition of the Harvard Stock Center housing Exelixis lines is extremely helpful. However, we project a need for 2,000-4,000 new insertion lines in the coming year alone and there is no site ready to house and distribute these lines within the United States.

Publications:

Bellen, H.J, R.W. Levis, G. Liao, Y. He, J. W. Carlson, G. Tsang, M. Evans-Holm, P.R. Hiesinger, K.L.

Schulze, G.M Rubin, R.A. Hoskins and Allan C. Spradling (2004). The BDGP gene disruption project: single transposon insertions associated with 40% of *Drosophila* genes. *Genetics* 167, 761-781.

14. SPECIES SEQUENCING PROJECT (Thom Kaufman)

A DOZEN FLY GENOMES: This is a special time for *Drosophila* genetics. Thanks to four separate National Human Genome Research Institute (NHGRI) funded initiatives, the sequence of 12 different species of *Drosophila* is well underway and assemblies should be available for all of these within the next few months. Projects that have already produced traces and/or assembled sequences are:

- *D. melanogaster*:
 - Euchromatic Arms (Sequenced to finished quality by the Berkeley *Drosophila* Genome Project: <http://www.fruitfly.org/>)
 - Heterochromatin (Draft assembly produced by the *Drosophila* Heterochromatin Genome Project: <http://www.dhgp.org/>)
- *D. pseudoobscura*: WGS assembly produced by the Baylor Human Genome Sequencing Center: <http://www.hgsc.bcm.tmc.edu/>
- *D. simulans* and *D. yakuba* (WGS assembly produced by the Washington University Genome Sequencing Center: <http://genome.wustl.edu/>)
- *D. erecta*, *D. ananassae*, *D. virilis*, *D. mojavensis*: WGS assemblies produced by Agencourt Bioscience Corp.: (<http://www.agencourt.com/company/experience/nhgri/>)
- *D. willistoni*: Traces deposited by the J. Craig Venter Institute; WGS assembly will appear shortly (see <http://www.venterininstitute.org/>)

Projects that are in their early stages are:

- *D. grimshawi*: Traces are just beginning to appear. WGS assembly to be carried out by Agencourt Biosciences Corp.: (<http://www.agencourt.com/company/experience/nhgri/>)
- *D. sechellia* and *D. persimilis*: WGS assembly to be carried out by the Broad Institute (see <http://www.broad.mit.edu/info.html>)

Rationales for the newer projects (all but *melanogaster* and *pseudoobscura*), may be found in community whitepapers entitled "Simulans Yakuba Genomes White Paper" and "Genomes White Paper" at <http://flybase.net/data/docs/CommunityWhitePapers/>). They include: (1) using comparative sequence analysis to improve the annotations of *D. melanogaster*, (2) understanding genome evolution, (3) describing variation at a genome scale, and (4) investigating differences between recently diverged species that produce interfertile hybrids.

The sequencing centers, FlyBase and members of the community are actively engaged in collaborative efforts to assemble, align and annotate these genomes. Access to downloadable files and to initial BLAST and browsing views of these genomes are available at several sites, including FlyBase (<http://flybase.bio.indiana.edu/>), the AAA page (<http://rana.lbl.gov/drosophila/multipleflies.html>), the UCSC genome browser (<http://genome.ucsc.edu/cgi-bin/hgGateway>), and the UC Davis sim-yak project (http://www.dpgp.org/sim_yak/index.html). Over time, all of the genome assemblies and annotations will be deposited in GenBank and will be fully integrated into FlyBase and other resources. Further announcements about these efforts will be posted on FlyBase, GENetics and elsewhere.

Contributors:

William M. Gelbart, FlyBase, Dept. of Molecular & Cellular Biology, Harvard University, 16 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA.

Doug Smith, Agencourt Biosciences Corporation, 500 Cummings Center, Suite 2450, Beverly, MA 01915, USA.

Thomas Kaufman, FlyBase, Dept. of Biology, Indiana University, 1001 E. Third St., Bloomington, IN 47405, USA.

Species	Inbred Line	DNA Made	Sequencing Center	Traces Available	Coverage	Assembly Performed	Annotation Performed	EST's cDNA's
<i>D. melanogaster</i>	yes	yes	Celera	yes	13X	yes	yes	yes
<i>D. sechellia</i>	yes	yes	Broad	no	3X	no	no	no
<i>D. simulans</i>	yes	yes	Wash.U.	yes	8X	yes	no	yes
<i>D. yakuba</i>	yes	yes	Wash.U.	yes	8X	yes	no	no
<i>D. erecta</i>	yes	yes	Agencourt	yes	8X	no	no	yes
<i>D. ananassae</i>	yes	yes	Agencourt	yes	8X	yes	no	yes
<i>D. pseudoobscura</i>	yes	yes	Baylor	yes	12X	yes	yes	yes
<i>D. persimilis</i>	yes	yes	Broad	no	3X	no	no	no
<i>D. willistoni</i>	yes	yes	TIGR	yes	8X	yes	no	no
<i>D. mojavensis</i>	yes	yes	Agencourt	yes	8X	yes	no	yes
<i>D. virilis</i>	yes	yes	Agencourt	yes	8X	yes	no	yes
<i>D. grimshawi</i>	no	yes	Agencourt	yes	8X	no	no	no

15. FLYBASE (Bill Gelbart)

FlyBase Report to North American Drosophila Board, March 20, 2005

FlyBase continues its role as the community repository of core genetic and genomic information on the family Drosophilidae. The challenge of maintaining this role is of course coping with the ever-increasing corpus of information, especially as a result of the major genome sequencing projects on-going on a dozen species.

As of now, FlyBase has incorporated genomic sequence and annotation information on two species: *D. melanogaster* and *D. pseudoobscura*. We provide BLAST access to preliminary assemblies of other species, and when available in GenBank, to sequence maps and annotation sets (<http://species.flybase.net/>). FlyBase is working with the genome centers to coordinate initial assemblies, alignments and annotations, with the goal of providing the community with as robust a set of sequences, syntenic maps and gene annotations as possible. Many groups in the community are participating in these efforts. It is hoped that out of these efforts, a longer term plan for updating these data sets will emerge. These plans should be clear well in advance of the next board meeting. Regardless of how other aspects of the plan develop, our highest priority will continue to be the *Drosophila melanogaster* genome and its encoded information.

Major efforts underway now are the completion of the transfer of information from a set of legacy databases into the integrated database called "Chado." Chado is at the heart of a great deal of coordinated development by the GMOD (Generic Model Organism Database) project, and will hopefully be a common repository for many model organism databases (MODs) in the future. Building the integrated Chado database, which has involved a complete re-evaluation and re-organization of our data structures, will permit us to similarly re-evaluate and redesign our web interface, permitting users to interrogate FlyBase in ways that have up to now been difficult or impossible. During this period of intensive Chado development we have continued our integration of updates of data curated from the literature, albeit on an approximately quarterly schedule. Similarly, FlyBase continues its development of Apollo as a genome annotation editor and dynamic visualization tool for GMOD. Recent updates to Apollo include its ability to read and produce Chado-XML. In general, FlyBase is committed to develop its software in a GMOD compliant, open source fashion. It will be very helpful if Board members are willing to provide feedback on community needs, and on new interfaces and tools as they are being prototyped.

In terms of grant support, FlyBase has just begun its second year of the current 5-year NHGRI funding cycle. Budget constraints at NHGRI required some belt tightening and deferred maintenance during last year and this year, just when we needed an extra infusion of funding to support the transition of services from Berkeley to the other sites as part of the planned phase-out of Berkeley from the project at the end of 2005. While this has created some difficulties, we expect to be back to steady-state levels of support beginning in 2006.

While we are on the topic of Berkeley's phase-out from FlyBase, those of us who are remaining on the project want to acknowledge and thank our colleagues at Berkeley for their many contributions to FlyBase and to Drosophila genomics in general. Their many contributions will be missed, and we wish them all the best in their future endeavours. We trust the Board will concur with these sentiments.

One item that we wish to raise with the Board is the issue of community announcements. This has been a year marked by the passing of several members of our community, and we have realized that FlyBase and the community do not have a mechanism to let our colleagues know of these and other significant events. We are thinking about two possibilities: (1) a quarterly FlyBase newsletter that could include announcements of community interest, both scientific (e.g., conference announcements, grant opportunities) and personal (e.g., job moves, retirements and death notices); (2) have a personal announcements page in the community announcements section of FlyBase. However, it would be far preferable for us if a member of the Board served as moderator/editor of this section on behalf of the community. We ask the Board to identify this person.

Submitted on behalf of the FlyBase Consortium by

Bill Gelbart
Michael Ashburner
Rachel Drysdale
Thom Kaufman
Kathy Matthews
Gerry Rubin

There was discussion of Flybase publishing a newsletter for the community.

16. DIS REPORT (Jim Thompson)

Volume 87 (2004) of *Drosophila* Information Service was published on schedule in January 2005. It contained the stock list of the Moscow Regional *Drosophila melanogaster* Stock Center, 23 Research Notes, 7 Technique Notes, 3 Mutation Notes, 2 Teaching Notes, and a Special Report on hardware development for long-term cultivation of *Drosophila* for the European Space Agency International Space Station facilities. Having articles published as a function of the calendar year continues to work well. Since the majority of contributions are received between late November and the end of December, this is a relatively rapid publication rate. The cost of this year's 134-page volume will be unchanged at \$12.00 plus shipping and handling. Beginning with the 2003 volume, we now use a commercial company that can print directly from electronic files using the images submitted by researchers (or good scanned versions), rather than the much more expensive process of creating professional half-tones produced for the printer. Thus, print-runs of the hard copy can be tailored more effectively to the anticipated demand. The only problem this year was a surprise three-fold increase in the cost of binding, so that the binding is now about half the cost of an issue. Use of an electronic file for printing also means that it will be easier to upload future volumes onto our web site (www.ou.edu/journals/dis). We are in the process of totally redesigning the DIS web page and will continue expanding the archive of back issues, with initial emphasis on technique articles. I also continue to solicit information about regional *Drosophila* meetings (e.g., lists of speakers and titles). These are reported in a special section of each issue and can be a useful source of outreach for those seeking graduate study mentors, postdoctoral researchers, or contacts when developing a new project. Teaching Notes are also of special interest to many readers of DIS. All information can be sent to: James N. Thompson, jr., Department of Zoology, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019; jthompson@ou.edu.

17. KYOTO STOCK CENTER (Toshi Yamamoto)

The *Drosophila* Genetic Resource Center (DGRC) in Kyoto was established in 1999 and has a capacity of around 35,000 stocks in double. In addition to the basic running cost, we are currently supported largely by the National Bio-Resource Project (NBRP: <http://www.nbrp.jp/index.jsp>) from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. NBRP-*Drosophila* supports the core center (DGRC, Kyoto Institute of Technology) and three sub-centers (National Institute of Genetics, Ehime University and Kyorin University). This is a five year project, and lasts two more years including this year. In order to get this project continue for another five years or longer from 2006 we have to demonstrate the government the international necessity of Kyoto Stock Center for the research of *Drosophila* and actual achievements in the stock supplies and results. We need further understanding, supports and cooperation from all *Drosophilists* to make the center really functional and stable.

1. Number of stocks at Kyoto stock center (stocks including sub-centers)

Total stocks on October 31, 2004	16,252 (22,762)
----------------------------------	-----------------

Among the lethals, steriles, inversions, deficiencies, visible alleles, many are duplicates with Bloomington's, which we think important to maintain separately in case a tragic loss occurred at either stock center.

Unique stocks are Gal-4 lines called NP lines, UAS/Promoter lines (GS and LA lines), Protein traps, old Umea stocks and chromosomal rearrangements mainly on the X and T(A;Y)'s. When insertion stocks becomes seriously big load for us to keep, these chromosomal rearrangements may be the first ones to be considered. Stocks can be searched and ordered through our WEB site (<http://kyotofly.kit.jp/stocks/>).

Sub-centers maintain and supply the following stocks;

1. NIG: Gal-4 NP lines (a half are duplicates with DGRC's) and planning to supply RNAi lines. (<http://kyotofly.kit.jp/stocks/> or <http://shigen.nig.ac.jp/fly/nigfly/>)

2. Ehime: 55 species collected in Japan wild populations.

(<http://kyotofly.kit.jp/jspecies/>)

3. Kyorin: Mutant lines of *ananassae*, *hydei*, *auraria*, and wild type strains of *ananassae* subgroup.

(<http://kyotofly.kit.jp/species-mutant/>)

2. Use

We sent out 10,345 stocks (6,740 within Japan, 3,605 to overseas) between April 1, 2004 and October 31, 2004. In 2003, we shipped 14,316 stocks. We should be known more to *Drosophila* labs in overseas.

3. Fees

Free. We had been advised to charge fees last three years, but we have sent them out for free. Soon we will arrange a system to charge fees equivalent to the Bloomington.

4. Database

Our WEB site is available. We sent out most of the stock list in June 2004 to Prof. Ashburner who was going to help to put our stocks on the Flybase.

5. Additions

At the last meeting in Chicago, we decided to start accepting unique P insertion lines from Hugo Bellen and send Hugo and Allan Spradling the molecular data of insertion sites of our NP lines and GS lines. Nothing had we accepted yet since. We are considering to accept other stocks which are recognized useful because we still have some capacity.

18. TUCSON STOCK CENTER (Teri Markow)

The Tucson Stock Center maintains approximately 1400 stocks of 250 species. For some species, the Center maintains genetically marked as well as wild type strains from more than one locality. We have experienced a steady increase in the number of users and a dramatic rise in the number of stocks being ordered (Table 1). In addition to the orders of stocks from the regular collection, we occasionally have offered recently collected isofemale lines of several species and these have been popular as well. Of the species being ordered, the twenty most frequently requested each year are given in Table 2. These values plus the inquiries we receive about stocks indicate that demand is being fueled by the genome sequencing projects. We are seeing more and more NIH supported investigators requesting stocks. Approximately 30% of our shipments go overseas.

In October 2004, our fourth annual *Drosophila* Species Identification Workshop rapidly filled to its capacity of twelve participants, with an even longer waiting list than in previous years.

Our NSF grant that supports the center is being renewed for an additional five years, but with a flat budget. We had requested an increase in the number of stock keepers in order to keep pace with the demand for flies, so the flat budget places us in a difficult position. The use is increasing, and in all likelihood, as the sequencing and BAC projects are completed, will grow even more. At the same time, we are, in effect, losing person-hours, as university fringe benefit rates have increased. The personnel needs cannot be met by cost recovery.

Year	Number of Users	Shipments	Stocks Shipped
2001 ⁽¹⁾	76	106 (1.4)	526 (6.9)
2002	101	140 (1.4)	567 (5.6)
2003	119	161 (1.4)	646 (5.4)
2004	134	195 (1.5)	1568 (11.7)

Table 1. Customer use 2001-2004. Number of individual users that received stocks in a given year, total shipments (and mean shipment per user), total stocks shipped (and mean stocks per user)

2001 ⁽¹⁾		2002		2003		2004		Total	
species	stocks	species	stocks	species	stocks	species	stocks	species	stocks
mauritiana	29	sechellia	37	pseudoobscura	78	simulans	131	simulans	228
pseudoobscura	29	simulans	35	simulans	40	melanogaster	71	pseudoobscura	195
virilis	29	mauritiana	31	mauritiana	38	pseudoobscura	62	mauritiana	120
montana	25	pseudoobscura	26	melanogaster	25	mimica	50	melanogaster	114
sechellia	24	virilis	21	persimilis	20	mojavensis	41	sechellia	110
simulans	22	lebanoensis	11	sechellia	19	immigrans	36	virilis	90
funebri	12	melanogaster	11	yakuba	18	sechellia	30	mojavensis	63
novamexicana	12	willistoni	11	willistoni	15	funebri	28	mimica	57
serrata	11	ananassae	10	aldrichi	14	virilis	28	immigrans	54
ananassae	9	orena	10	miranda	13	grimshawi	24	ananassae	48
willistoni	9	americana	9	virilis	12	acutilabella	23	funebri	46
hydei	8	hydei	9	orena	11	latifaciaeformis	22	yakuba	46
immigrans	8	sulfurigaster	8	hydei	10	mauritiana	22	willistoni	45
mojavensis	8	yakuba	8	ananassae	9	nannoptera	22	montana	44
takahashii	8	ezoana	7	busckii	9	ananassae	20	persimilis	43
teissieri	8	mojavensis	7	affinis	8	robusta	19	hydei	41
auraria	7	teissieri	7	teissieri	8	guttifera	16	teissieri	34
melanogaster	7	busckii	6	elegans	7	paulistorum	16	grimshawi	33
yakuba	7	mercatorum	6	eugracilis	7	aldrichi	15	americana	32
arizonae	6	novamexicana	6	mojavensis	7	arizonae	14	aldrichi	30
Total stocks/year	526	Total stocks/year	567	Total stocks/year	646	Total stocks/year	1568	Total stocks	3307

Table 2. Top twenty species most ordered in the Tucson Stock Center. Species organized by year and total.