2000 NATIONAL DROSOPHILA BOARD MEETING

March 22, 2000

Doubletree Hotel, Pittsburgh, PA

AGENDA

INTRODUCTION, APPROVAL OF THE 1999 MINUTES	**2:00 - 2:10 PM**
MEETINGS AND FINANCES:	**2:10 - 3:30**
2000 PROGRAM COMMITTEE (Pam Geyer, Lori Wallrath)	2:10 - 2:30
SANDLER LECTURER COMMITTEE (Bill Saxton)	2:30 - 2:35
2001 PROGRAM COMMITTEE (Dave Deitcher)	2:35 - 2:40
GSA COORDINATOR (Marsha Ryan)	2:40 - 3:00
TREASURER (Steve Mount)	3:00 - 3:20
BOARD DISCUSSION OF MEETINGS AND FINANCES	3:20 - 3:35
BOARD MEMBERSHIP AND ELECTIONS	**3:35 - 3:45**
COMMUNITY RESOURCES:	**3:45 - 5:20**
STOCK CENTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE (Hugo Bellen)	3:45 - 3:55
BLOOMINGTON STOCK CENTER (Kevin Cook)	3:55 - 4:10
DIS (Jim Thompson)	4:10 - 4:15
BERKELEY GENOME PROJECT (Gerry Rubin)	4:15 - 4:30
FLYBASE (Bill Gelbart)	4:30 - 4:45
NIH SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY RESOURCES (Bill Gelbart, Laurie Tompkins,)	4:45 - 5:00
BOARD DISCUSSION OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES	5:00 - 5:20
OTHER BUSINESS:	**5:20 - 6:00**
a) Status of women in the fly community (Terry Orr-Weaver)	5:20 - 5:40
b) Status of P element license (Larry Goldstein)	5:40 - 5:45
c) Press release on the completion of the genome	5:45 - 6:00

DRAFT MINUTES / REPORTS

1. SUMMARY OF 2000 MINUTES

2. APPROVAL OF THE 1999 MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes of the 1999 Board Meeting, as posted on Flybase by past president Larry Goldstein, was proposed and approved.

3. REPORT OF THE 2000 PROGRAM COMMITTEE (Pam Geyer, Lori Wallrath)

Plenary Speakers - Eleven plenary speakers were invited for plenary talks, leaving one slot for a business meeting. An updated List of Speakers is appended to this report that includes the year 2000 invited speakers.

Abstract Submission- Abstracts were solicited under fourteen areas of primary research interest. This represents an expanded list from the 1999 meeting, including the more specific topics of RNA Processing, Localization, and Translation; Cytoskeleton Assembly and Dynamics; and Signal Transduction and Apoptosis. The list of 2000 topics is appended to the end of this report, including number of abstracts submitted in each area. In total, 802 requests were made. There were 397 requests for slide presentations for 144 available slots, allowing accommodation of approximately 35% of the requests.

The most popular submission topics were Pattern Formation and Signal Transduction. This suggests that the future organizers may want to refine these topic areas to make them more specific, thereby facilitating the organization of slide and poster sessions into more related areas.

Some topic areas, notably Transposable Elements; RNA Processing, Localization and Translation and Techniques, received such a small number of abstract submissions that a separate slide session was not justified. Abstracts submitted to the topic Transposable Elements were merged with those in Chromosome Structure and Function, while abstracts submitted to RNA Processing, Localization and Translation were redistributed among several sessions. To accommodate abstracts submitted under Techniques, a workshop was organized and these abstracts were considered for presentation at this workshop. It is recommended that the Conference maintain a highly visible technique workshop which will allow selection of critical development for Drosophila research.

Workshops - There were 9 workshops organized. The title and moderators of each workshop are appended to the end of this report. Organization of the workshops was done early to allow publication of the schedule of speakers in the Abstract book. This strategy should increase visibility of the workshops among participants. Additionally, workshop presentations were cross-referenced with poster or slide abstracts, if the corresponding presentation covered the workshop topic.

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

1. To streamline abstracts submission, a new list of key words was developed to facilitate sorting of poster and slide presentations into related themes. It is recommended that the new organizers continue to refine this list. Within each of the 14 primary research interest topics, a space was reserved for authors to submit new key words, however this was not used in an effective way. It is recommended that the new description in the Call for Abstracts encourage authors to identify new words, if the subtopics do not specifically identify their research area.

2. Abstract submissions were accompanied by a request for the author to classify their presentation preference. This system was in lieu of the existing default procedure that assigned all abstracts a poster space, if the abstract was not selected for a slide presentation. The goal of the new system was to avoid having empty poster spaces. Authors were asked to choose between slide only, slide or poster, poster only. Unfortunately, there appeared to be some confusion concerning whether a person requesting a slide only presentation actually understood that their presentation would not be given poster space. It is recommended that additional language be included in the Call for Abstracts to clarify this system.

3. Abstract books were mailed to those requesting a copy prior to the meeting. This practice adds pressure to the submission deadline, as the abstract book needs to be sent to the publisher at an earlier date. The GSA office reports that approximately 30% of participants requested the abstract book be mailed.

4. The schedule of opening night events was changed slightly. A request from Thom Kaufman for time to make an award presentation was accommodated. Additionally, in response to criticisms that the opening night activities were very too long, the Historical Speaker was allotted a 45 minute presentation and the Sandler Presentation was limited to 35 minutes. It is recommended that future organizers adhere to these shorter time limitations, to allay criticisms that there is not enough time available for the mixer.

Future Considerations and Organization of the Meeting - The abstract submission date was November 8. The Genetics Society chose this date based upon their commitments and scheduling of other research meetings, whose participant number far exceeds that of the Drosophila Conference. This early date was problematic, as the Drosophila community was not prepared. This resulted in the low response and required that the deadline for abstract submission be extended by one week. This accommodation substantially improved submission numbers.

For next year, GSA requests a similar submission deadline, stating that they cannot accommodate a date later than November 15. It is recommended that the early submission date be accompanied by a reminder email distributed to the fly community, to prevent difficulties similar to those that arose this year. This warning email could be distributed one week prior to the submission deadline.

A second consideration for future meetings is the issue of company sponsorship. One pharmaceutical company inquired about possible funding of an event during the Drosophila meeting. This possibility was not pursued, as the mechanism by the company sponsorship could be advertised was not clear. Additionally, there was some concern over favoritism shown to one particular company. It is recommended that the Board establish a procedure so that the next organizing committee can pursue company sponsorship. These moneys could defray costs associated with renting some of the projection equipment and perhaps even provide some coffee breaks. This idea was strongly supported by the Board, and it was recommended that next year's organizers pursue company sponsorship rigorously.

Finally, it should be noted that several plenary speakers, workshop organizers and session moderators were under the impression that the Drosophila community would pay for their travel, housing and registration costs. It is recommended that in any correspondence with these individuals include a statement that the Drosophila Conference does not have money to defray these costs.

I. Updated Plenary Speaker List

Susan Abmayr	1995	Spyros Artavanis	1994	Phil Beachy	1998
Kathryn Anderson	1999	Bruce Baker	1996	Hugo Bellen	1997
Deborah Andrew	1997	Utpal Banerjee	1997	Celeste Berg	1994
Chip Aquadro	1994	**Amy Bejsovec 2000**		Marianne Bienz 1996	

Seth Blair	1997	Pam Geyer	1996	Norbert Perrimon	1999
Nancy Bonini	**2000**	**David Glover**	**2000**	Leslie Pick	1994
Juan Botas	1999	Iswar Hariharan	1998	Pernille Rorth	1995
Vivian Budnik	**2000**	Tom Hayes	1995	Gerry Rubin	1998
Ross Cagan	1998	Ulrike Heberlein	1996	H. Ruohola-Baker	1999
John Carlson	1999	Ulrike Heberlein	1998	Helen Salz	1994
Sean Carroll	1995	Martin Heisenberb	1998	Babis Savakis	1995
Tom Cline	**2000**	Dave Hogness	1999	Paul Schedl	1998
Claire Cronmiller	1995	Joan Hooper	1995	Gerold Schubiger	1996
Rob Denell	1999	**Wayne Johnson**	**2000**	**John Sedat**	**2000**
Michael Dickinson	1995	Rebecca Kellum	1999	Amita Sehgal	1996
Chris Doe	1996	Christian Klambt	1998	Allen Shearn	1994
Bruce Edgar	1997	Mitzi Kuroda	1997	Marla Sokolowski	1998
Martin Feder	1998	Paul Lasko	1999	Ruth Steward	1996
Janice Fischer	1998	Cathy Laurie	1997	Bill Sullivan	1996
Bill Gelbart	1994	Maria Leptin	1994	John Sved	1997
		Bob Levis	1997	**John Tamkun**	**2000**
		Haifan Lin	1995	Barbara Taylor	1996
		Susan Lindquist	**2000**	Bill Theurkauf	1994
		Dennis McKearin	1996	Tim Tully	1995
		Mike McKeown	1996	Steve Wasserman	1996
		Jon Minden	1999	Kristi Wharton	1994
		Roel Nusse	1997	Eric Wieschaus	1996
		David O'Brochta	1997	Ting Wu	1997
		Terry Orr-Weaver	1996	Tian Xu	1997
		Mark Peifer	1997	Susan Zusman	1998
		Trudy MacKay	**2000**		
		Nipam Patel	**2000**		

II. Areas of Primary Research Interest

	Slide Request	Poster	Total
Cell Cycle	24	20	44
Chromosome Structure and Function	33	41	74
Cytoskeleton Assembly and Dynamics	17	21	38
Gametogenesis	37	36	73
Neural Development	35	39	74
Neural Physiology and Behavior	32	32	64
Organogenesis and Muscle Development	19	28	47
Pattern Formation	62	66	128
Populations and Evolution	28	17	45
RNA Processing Localization and Translation	16	16	32
Signal Transduction and Apoptosis	56	50	106
Techniques	11	2	13
Transcriptional Regulation	18	27	45
Transposable Elements and DNA Repair	9	10	19

III. Keywords

IV. Workshops.

Workshop Title	***Moderator***
Ecdysone Workshop	Broadus, Julie
The Sequence of the Drosophila Genome	Celniker, Sue
Telomere Structure and Function	Mason, Jim

Resources in the Post-Genomic World: A Community Forum	Tompkins, Laurie
Stem and Cells and Asymmetric Division	Lin, Haifan
Technical Advances	Carthew, Richard
RNA	Lopez, A. Javier
Drosophila Immunity	Hoffmann, Jules
Drosophila Research in Drug Discovery	Carroll, Pamela

4. REPORT OF THE SANDLER LECTURER COMMITTEE (Bill Saxton)

I. 2000 Sandler Award Committee

Amy Bejsovec
Tom Cline
Joe Duffy
Chris Field
Janice Fischer
Scott Hawley
Bill Saxton (Chair)
Bill Sullivan (1999 Chair)

II. Applications.

A. Applications consisted of
1. Thesis abstract.
2. Student's CV
3. Letter of support from Advisor

B. 12 Applicants: (and Ph.D. Advisors)
Purnima Bhanot (Jeremy Nathans)
Bin Chen (Sidney Strickland)
Robert Cavallo (Mark Peifer)
Daniel Cox (Haifan Lin)
Anupama Dahanukar (Robin Wharton)
Karen Fitch (Barbara Wakimoto)
Amin Ghabrial (Trudy Schupbach)
Sarah Gibbs (James Truman)
Douglas Guarnieri (Michael Simon)
Eric Lai (James Posakony)
Tracy Tang (Terry Orr-Weaver)
Mark Wu (Hugo Bellen)

III. Selection Process:

A. Criteria for judging the applicants.
1. Quality of research.
2. Depth of experimental analyses
3. Creativity, continuity, and depth of thought.

4. Independence of applicant
5. Significance of contribution

B. Initial round of selection.
1. Each committee member ranked the applications (#1=top, 12=bottom).
2. The 6 with the best scores (lowest summed ranking numbers) were carried forward.

Comment: The applications were all excellent and this step in the process was quite difficult.

C. Second round of selection.
1. Each committee member submitted comments on the 6 semifinalists to the chair via email.
2. Comments were collated and then sent back out to the committee.
3. Each committee member picked their top 3 applicants.
4. Positions 3 and 4 were ambiguous, so we declared 4 finalists.
Bin Chen (Sidney Strickland)
Daniel Cox (Haifan Lin)
Douglas Guarnieri (Michael Simon)
Eric Lai (James Posakony)

D. Final round of selection.
1. Finalists were asked to send 8 copies of their theses to the Chair.
2. A set of 4 theses was sent to each committee member by the chair.
3. After reading the theses, comments were exchanged as before.
4. Each committee member voted for their top choice.
5. Bin Chen received 5 of the 8 votes.

IV. The Sandler Award 2000
A. Opening talk of the Drosophila Research Conference Wed. March 22.
B. Publication of thesis (after editing) as a monograph by Kluwer Academic Publishers.
C. Sandler Award Plaque.
D. $1,000 approved by Drosophila Board, for lifetime membership in the GSA and a subscription to Genetics.

V. Finances
A. Outstanding expenses from 1999 award
1. $1,000 award to 99 awardee Terence Murphy.
2. Cost of Sandler Award Plaque ($40) to Bill Sullivan.

B. Expenses from 2000 award
1. $126 shipping costs (Bill Saxton).
2. Cost of Sandler Award Plaque ($40) to Bill Sullivan.
3. $1,000 award to 2000 awardee Bin Chen (if approved by Drosophila Board).

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

6. REPORT OF THE GSA COORDINATOR (Marsha Ryan)

41st Annual Drosophila Research Conference

Advance registrations for the 2000 meeting indicate that overall registration numbers will be down slightly from 1999. Total registration in 1999, after deducting cancellations, totaled 1,366. Hotel room rates for singles in 2000 were lower than in 1999, ranging from $115-$127 single or double. Room pickup on peak night at the two conference hotels plus two additional overflow hotels, totals 702, significantly higher than the 674 peak night in Bellevue. This is the highest pick-up on record. Major contributions to increased room pick-up may be due to the diligence of the Pittsburgh Convention & Visitors Bureau Housing office that continued to take reservations and track room reservations until the meeting ends instead of the room block cutoff date of February 14. The other contributing factors include clarity of room type descriptions (spelling out that a quad room is only 2 double beds, not 4 separate beds/rollaways) and the lower room rates being more affordable for single and double occupancy.

The number of exhibits sold this year is the same as last year. Represented are eight commercial companies and one not-for-profit organization in a total of twelve spaces.

Geographic distribution statistics for pre-registrants follow:

BY COUNTRY:

Australia	4
Austria	7
Brazil	1
Canada	35
Denmark	1
England	41
France	31
Germany	34
Israel	7
Italy	3
Japan	27
Korea	7
Mexico	6
Netherlands	1
Portugal	3
Russia	2
Singapore	1
South Korea	1
Spain	2
Sweden	4
Switzerland	8
Taiwan	4

TOTAL NON-USA:
230 Registrants in 22 Countries.

BY STATE:

Alabama	11
Arizona	4
California	122
Colorado	5
Conneticut	15
District of Columbia	1
Florida	3
Georgia	21
Hawaii	1
Iowa	19
Idaho	1
Illinois	31
Indiana	6
Kansas	8
Kentucky	8
Massachusetts	89
Maryland	48
Maine	2
Michigan	12
Minnesota	9
Missouri	26
North Carolina	37
Nebraska	3
New Hampshire	4
New Jersey	48
New Mexico	3
Nevada	1
New York	90
Ohio	31
Oklahama	3
Oregon	4
Pennsylvania	82
Rhode Island	1
South Carolina	4
Tennessee	2
Texas	38
Utah	10
Virginia	9
Washington	21
Wisconsin	14

TOTAL USA: 847 Registrants in 40 States.

2001 - 42nd Annual Conference - March 21-25 - Washington, DC

Washington, DC and the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel, and the Omni Shoreham Hotel for overflow, were selected and contracted for the 42nd Drosophila Conference. There will be meeting space rental charges if fewer room pickup falls below 90%. However, since we have only 555 rooms blocked peak night, unless there is a significant drop off in registrations or if a significant number of attendees find other housing on their own, likelihood of falling below this number is not high. Between the two hotels, total peak night rooms blocked are 615--87 rooms fewer than picked up this year. We anticipate fewer rooms will be picked up due to the much higher room rates that will be in the $195-215 single/double per night range (hotel to finalize rates 12 months in advance). Should pick up be higher than anticipated, additional overflow hotels will be sought.

2002 - 43rd Annual Conference - March 6-10 - Town & Country Hotel, San Diego, California

The Board selected the Town & Country Hotel in San Diego, as the venue for the 2002 conference. Overall, the Town & Country was selected over Tucson for several reasons. These include: meeting space configuration, location and convenience; meeting space on same property as sleeping rooms; no space rental for meeting/poster space; concessions made by the Town & Country to address problems and situations that arose at the 1996 conference; and the addition of convenient, inexpensive access to nearby Old San Diego and downtown San Diego. Room rates guaranteed in the contract range from $135-155 single/double per night.

2003 - 44th Annual Conference - March 5-9 - Sheraton Chicago Hotel & Towers

Sheraton Chicago contacted the GSA office with an attractive meeting package for 2003. Based primarily upon conference attendees' positive response to two previous conferences held at this property, combined with the hotel's offer to increase meeting space set aside to accommodate posters and larger concurrent sessions, the Board agreed upon the Sheraton as the 2003 site. Though the possibility of inclement weather in early March was considered, the majority of the Board agreed that the risk would be significantly higher than that of other Midwestern cities. Rates will be finalized one year in advance, but will fall in the same range as the 2001 rates in Washington, D.C. These rates represent a real value for a high quality property in Chicago.

7. REPORT OF THE TREASURER (Steve Mount, Steve Wasserman)

a) Annual Drosophila Conference income/expense

	2000 PROJECTIONS	ACTUAL 1999
Revenue		
Registration	$171,600	$191,395
Exhibit Fees (8 @ $700)	8,000	8,000
Mailing Fees	1,500	0
Miscellaneous	400	724
Total Income	**$181,500**	**$200,119**
Expenditures		
Fixed Expenses:		
Hotel and Travel-Staff and others	3,000	$ 3,395
Printing and mailing	25,500	32,524
Telephone, fax & FlyBase room computer lines	2,000	1,638

Office Supplies (badges, signs, misc.)	1,500	1,050
Projection/audio-visuals/electrical/sound	31,000	12,796
Space and equipment rental	40,500	41,176
Contracted Services	6,300	3,860
Housing Services	3,500	5,000
Computer Services	1,000	13,652
Insurance Expense	700	769
Salaries/Wages/taxes/benefits	55,900	49,379
Variable Expenses: (Based on 1300 attending)		
Catering	42,000	37,223
Credit card/bank fees	4,000	3,794
Miscellaneous Expense	350	0
Total Expenditures	**$217,250**	**$206,256**
NET REVENUE(EXPENSE)	**($35,750)**	**($6,137)**

b) Meeting attendance

Pre-registration by category this year:

Members	435 @ $130 =	$56,550
Non-members	192 @ $250 =	48,000
Student Members	161 @ $ 25 =	4,025
Student Nonmembers	250 @ $ 90 =	22,500
Total	1,038	$ 131,075

Pre-registration by category 1999:

Members	450 @ $130 =	$58,500
Non-mem	254 @ $235 =	59,690
Stu Mem	63 @ $ 70 =	4,410
Stu Non	375 @ $ 90 =	33,750
Total	1,142 =	$156,350

Total registration by category 1999:

Members	450 @ $130 =	$58,500
Members on site	94 @ $150 =	14,100
Non-mem	254 @ $235 =	59,690
Non-members on site	49 @ $255 =	12,495
Student Members	63 @ $ 70 =	4,410
Student Members on site	8 @ $100	800
Student Nonmembers	375 @ $ 90 =	33,750
Student Nonmembers on site	64 @ $120 =	7,680
Complementary registrations	9	
Total	1,366	$191,425

215 on site registrants in 1999

c) Account balances

1. Drosophila Main Fund

Meeting Year	Net Income	Fund Balance	Excess Over Reserve	# Meeting Attendees
1993	$17,105	$ 25,146	$ 146	1,165
1994	2,800	27,946	2,946	1,222
1995	8,417	36,363	11,363	1,103
1996	15,035	51,398	26,398	1,423
1997	31,663	83,061	58,061	1,382
1998	21,894	104,955	79,955	1,378
1999	(6,053)	98,530	**73,530**	1,366
2000 (Estimated)	(35,750)	62,780	37,780	1,077+

2. Sandler Fund

Meeting Year	Net Income	Fund Balance	Excess Over Reserve
1993	$1,417	$26,720	$18,720
1994	-1,207	25,513	17,513
1995	1,891	27,404	19,404
1996	1,009	28,413	20,413
1997	1,467	29,880	21,880
1998	1,386	31,266	23,266
1999	894	32,160	**24,160**

8. BOARD DISCUSSION OF MEETINGS AND FINANCES

a) Account management

The Board discussed the status of the bank accounts. It was decided that although we have carried a substantial balance over the past few years, we cannot continue to lose $35,000 at each meeting and expect to stay solvent. The costs of meetings are going up precipitously, especially costly are the rentals of projection equipment, including digital projectors. It was decided that we need to take measures directed at ensuring that the meetings at least breaking even. The Board discussed offsetting meeting expenses by increasing the registration fees, choosing cheaper venues, and obtaining commercial support (see below).

The bias of the Board has always been to maintain low registration fees, especially for students, and this view was reinforced during the discussions. It is important that this meeting be accessible to as many members of the community as possible. However, it was decided that moderate increases in registration fees may need to be considered in the future, depending on our ability to obtain funds from other sources.

Concerning choosing cheaper venues, the Board discussed the pluses and minuses of this issue. Cheaper venues such as Pittsburgh have not been met with enthusiasm by the community, and the attendance reductions this year reflect that bias. Cities outside the main airline routes also involve increased travel expenses, which would defeat the purpose of encouraging widespread attendance. Cities that are easier and less costly to travel to, such as Chicago, DC, and San Diego are also preferred by the community because these cities tend to have a more lively restaurants and a more exciting cultural atmosphere. The Board directed Marsha Ryan to continue to investigate other, cheaper venues as part of our usual discussion of meeting sites, and the Board will continue to weigh the pros and cons of each site.

b) Commercial support of meetings

For the first time, the Board discussed the possibility of obtaining addition funds for the meeting by encouraging sponsorship by commercial entities. This proposal was met with great enthusiasm by the board, although it was agreed that any sponsorship needed to be in keeping with the scientific nature of the meeting, and that different companies should be given fair and equal treatment. The Board agreed that the following proposals should be pursued: advertisement in the abstract book, sponsorship of coffee breaks, workshops and plenary sessions, and encouraging the participation of more commercial exhibitors. These goals should be pursued by the meeting organizers. However, it is likely that the Board will need to set up a committee whose sole focus will be obtaining commercial sponsorship for the meetings.

9. 2000 BOARD MEMBERSHIP AND ELECTIONS

a) Current Composition

Officers:

Gary Karpen	President	karpen@ salk.edu
Larry Goldstein	Past President	lgoldstein@popmail.ucsd.edu
Steve Wasserman	President-Elect	stevenw@ucsd.edu
Steve Mount	Treasurer	smount@wam.umd.edu

Regional Representatives:

Paul Lasko	Canada	Paul_Lasko@maclan.mcgill.ca
John Belote	Great Lakes	
Hannele Ruohola-Baker	Northwest	hannele@u.washington.edu
Richard Fehon	Southeast	rfehon@acpub.duke.edu
Scott Hawley	California	shawley@netcom.com
Robert Boswell	Heartland	
Claude Desplan	New England	
Steve Mount	Mid-Atlantic	smount@wam.umd.edu
Jeff Simon	Midwest	simon@biosci.cbs.umn.edu

Ex Officio:

Michael Ashburner	Europe	ma11@gen.cam.ac.uk
Hugo Bellen	SC adv. comm.	hbellen@bcm.tmc.edu
Celeste Berg	at-large	berg@genetics.washington.edu
Kevin Cook	Bloomington SC	matthewk@indiana.edu
Bill Gelbart	FlyBase	gelbart@morgan.harvard.edu
Thom Kaufman	Bloomington SC	kaufman@sunflower.bio.indiana.edu
John Lucchesi	at-large	lucchesi@biology.emory.edu
Dan Lindsley	at-large	dlindsley@ucsd.edu
Kathy Matthews*	Bloomington SC	kcook@bio.indiana.edu
Gerry Rubin	BDGP	gerry@fruitfly.berkeley.edu
Bill Saxton	Sandler Lect. 2000	bsaxton@bio.indiana.edu
Jim Thompson	DIS	jthompson@ou.edu
Ronny Woodruff	Mid-America SC	rwoodru@bgnet.bgsu.edu

2000 Meeting Organizers:

Pam Geyer		pamela-geyer@uiowa.edu
Lori Wallrath		lori-wallrath@uiowa.edu

GSA Representatives:

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

Other Attendees:

Laurie Tompkins	NIH	Tompkinl@NIGMS.NIH.GOV

* not in attendance

b) Changes for 2000-2001

Steve Wasserman will be President, Steve Mount will be the Treasurer, and the President-Elect will be elected by a general e-mail election, after the Nominations Committee chooses nominees. The committee will also propose replacements for the departing representatives. Gary Karpen will chair the committee. There was also a strong sentiment to take direct action to increase the participation of females on the Board (see below). The Board also decided to develop a plan for rotating at-large

members on and off the Board, in order to better utilize the many talented members of the Drosophila community.

The 2000 Drosophila Board includes:

Officers:

Steve Wasserman	President	stevenw@ucsd.edu
Gary Karpen	Past President	karpen@ salk.edu
??????	President-Elect	
Steve Mount	Treasurer	smount@wam.umd.edu
Paul Lasko	Canada	Paul_Lasko@maclan.mcgill.ca
John Belote	Great Lakes	
?????	Northwest	
Richard Fehon	Southeast	rfehon@acpub.duke.edu
?????	California	
Robert Boswell	Heartland	
Claude Desplan	New England	
?????	Mid-Atlantic	smount@wam.umd.edu
Jeff Simon	Midwest	simon@biosci.cbs.umn.edu

Ex Officio:

Michael Ashburner	Europe	ma11@gen.cam.ac.uk
Hugo Bellen	SC adv. comm.	hbellen@bcm.tmc.edu
Celeste Berg	at-large	berg@genetics.washington.edu
Kevin Cook	Bloomington SC	matthewk@indiana.edu
Bill Gelbart	FlyBase	gelbart@morgan.harvard.edu
Thom Kaufman	Bloomington SC	kaufman@sunflower.bio.indiana.edu
John Lucchesi	at-large	lucchesi@biology.emory.edu
Dan Lindsley*	at-large	dlindsley@ucsd.edu
Kathy Matthews*	Bloomington SC	kcook@bio.indiana.edu
Gerry Rubin	BDGP	gerry@fruitfly.berkeley.edu
Bill Saxton	Sandler Lect. 2000	bsaxton@bio.indiana.edu
Jim Thompson	DIS	jthompson@ou.edu
Ronny Woodruff	Mid-America SC	rwoodru@bgnet.bgsu.edu

2001 Meeting Organizers:

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

GSA Representatives:

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

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

The board (Hugo Bellen (Chair), Michael Ashburner, Scott Hawley, Norbert Perrimon, Amanda Simcox) is very pleased with the activity of the Stock Center run by Kathy Matthews, Kevin Cook, and Thom Kaufman (see their report!). As reflected by some of the key statistics shown below, the Stock Center is probably one of the most valuable assets of our community.

Total stocks as of 3/14/00	7,907
Added during 1999	1,044
Use during 1999	71,023

Cost recovery

Funding for FY 99/00

NSF	$307,660
NIH	$100,000
IU	$ 38,192
Fees	$158,500 (estimated -- $171,360 - 7%)
Total	$604,352

Endowment

The value of the endowment as of 2/29/00 was $330,686 (this figure reflects 20% appreciation of capital).

Proposal to expand the collection beyond 10,000

The possibility of expanding the collection to accommodate an additional 6,000 P insertions to be produced by the BDGP (a collaboration between G. Rubin, A. Spradling, and H. Bellen) is currently under discussion by the stock center, the advisory committee, NSF and NIH. This set would be composed of P insertions (with or without an obvious mutant phenotype) in or near genes that are not represented in the current BDGP 'lethal' P collection. The stock center would like to add this collection if a satisfactory agreement can be reached among all parties and funding becomes available.

Deficiency/Duplication project
Kevin Cook and Thom Kaufman's proposal to "complete" the deficiency kits by generating deficiencies for the euchromatic regions not currently covered and to begin generating segregating duplications for the X chromosome (allowing the X deficiencies to be more useful) was funded by NIH. Funding began May 1, 1999 and expires April 31, 2003. Progress to date: The project is analyzing existing deletion and X duplication coverage in detail. This work has led to the addition of 51 preexisting deletions to the collection. The survey of duplication coverage led to the development of an "X Chromosome Duplication Kit" containing the fewest duplications needed to provide 88 to 92% X chromosome coverage. The project has been screening for duplications and deletions to fill gaps in coverage. From the 51 screens to date, two gaps in deletion coverage and one gap in duplication coverage have been filled and many aberrations have been isolated but not yet characterized.

Exelixis agreement
The agreement with Exelixis described in last year's report was never finalized.

We are concerned with the funding situation in Europe. We are not well informed and we hope that Michael Ashburner will tell us what is happening there.

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

Total stocks as of 3/15/00	7,907
	5,575 Main collection
	2,322 P collection
Added during 1999	1,044
Lethal, sterile or visible alleles	853 (462 are P insertion lethal alleles)
GAL4/GAL80/UAS	65
GFP	8
FRT/FLP	42
lacZ	4
Deficiencies	51
Duplications	6
Balancers	13
Marker chromosomes	2

Use during 1999 -- increase compared to 1998 is shown in parentheses
802 (9%) groups received stocks
6,573 (19%) shipments were made
71,023 (43%) subcultures were sent
37% of shipments and stocks went to groups outside the U.S.
98% of stocks went to researchers in academic institutions

Cost recovery

Fee structure for 1999 and 2000

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

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

100+	362	45%	$ 31,172
200+	263	33%	$ 51,152
400+	109	14%	$ 47,944
500+	46	5.7%	$ 26,604
600+	22	2.7%	$ 14,488
Total			$171,360*

* for 1998 use, 7% of the amount invoiced was never paid

Funding for FY 99/00

NSF	$307,660
NIH	$100,000
IU	$ 38,192
Fees	$158,500 (estimated -- $171,360 - 7%)
Total	$604,352

We are currently in year 1 of a 5-year funding period. We have funds to reach a collection size of 8,500 by the end of year one and 10,000 by the end of year four.

Endowment

The value of our endowment as of 2/29/00 was $330,686 (this figure reflects 20% appreciation of capital). Due to the larger-than-expected increases in use of the collection over the last two years, user fees have yielded more income than anticipated when our grant proposal was submitted in July of 1998. Our costs associated with that heavier use are also higher, but we hope to have some funds left over from user fees to add to our endowment (the panel that reviewed our proposal recommended that increasing our endowment be given a high priority and NSF and NIH have agreed to allow us to retain any excess funds for this purpose during the current funding period).

The Board raised the question how long can these funds be held, which will be answered by the Stock Center directors in the future.

Proposal to expand the collection beyond 10,000

The possibility of expanding the collection to accommodate an additional 6,000 P insertions to be produced by the BDGP in collaboration with Hugo Bellen is currently under discussion by the stock center, the advisory committee, NSF and NIH. This set would be composed of P insertions (with or without an obvious mutant phenotype) in or near genes that are not represented in the current BDGP 'lethal' P collection. The stock center would like to add this collection if a satisfactory agreement can be reached among all parties and funding becomes available.

Deficiency project

Kevin Cook and Thom Kaufman's proposal to "complete" the deficiency kits by generating deficiencies for the euchromatic regions not currently covered and to begin generating segregating

duplications for the X chromosome (allowing the X deficiencies to be more useful) was funded by NIH. Funding began May 1, 1999 and expires April 31, 2003.

Progress to date: The project is analyzing existing deletion and X duplication coverage in detail. The overlap of preexisting deletions or the existence of gaps between adjacent deletions on chromosomes 2 and 3 has been confirmed experimentally, allowing an accurate count of gaps in coverage. This work has led to the addition of 51 preexisting deletions to the collection, 9 adding additional coverage to the deficiency kits and the rest providing better subdivision of regions already covered. Also, 6 preexisting duplications were added that improve coverage. The survey of duplication coverage led to the development of an "X Chromosome Duplication Kit" containing the fewest duplications needed to provide 88 to 92% X chromosome coverage. The project has been screening for duplications and deletions to fill gaps in coverage. From the 51 screens to date, two gaps in deletion coverage and one gap in duplication coverage have been filled and many aberrations have been isolated but not yet characterized. Once the analysis of existing coverage is complete, screening efforts will be intensified.

Exelixis agreement
The agreement with Exelixis described in last year's report was never finalized (after initiating the discussion and receiving a detailed proposal from us, which we heard informally through Gerry Rubin was acceptable to Exelixis, Exelixis ceased communicating with us for reasons that were never communicated to us). We are not directing users to patent information nor providing stock recipient information to Exelixis.

Advisory Committee - current members
Hugo Bellen (Chair)
Michael Ashburner
Scott Hawley
Norbert Perrimon
Amanda Simcox

12. DIS REPORT (Jim Thompson)

Volume 82 of Drosophila Information Service was published last summer and included research and technique notes, new mutant descriptions, and a reprint of teaching notes from out-of-print back issues. In addition to the traditional areas of coverage, DIS is actively soliciting articles that describe exercises that can be incorporated into genetics laboratory courses. For the second year, an email call for papers has been distributed to addresses provided by FlyBase, and I thank Kathy Matthews for again facilitating that distribution. A web page is being developed for the journal, and when implemented in the next few weeks, its address will be: http://www.ou.edu/journals/dis. In addition to encouraging *Drosophila* geneticists to share teaching exercises, a focus this year will be on profiling the programs of regional *Drosophila* research conferences. Many contributors at these meetings are postdoctoral researchers or graduate students. By publicizing their work as reported in small regional meetings, DIS can help bring their interests and expertise to the attention of a wider audience of research groups. Very few conference organizers have taken the time to mail a copy of their program for inclusion in DIS. Hopefully, members of the Board will help in this effort to promote the work of postdoctoral and graduate students. I predict that the size of the annual issue will be significantly smaller than previous years. This has been a recurring prediction, but it seems that a major article has ultimately been submitted each year. The idea of reprinting important research articles that originally had limited distribution remains attractive, since this can be done essentially free of cost. To order DIS volume 83, the charge will remain unchanged at $12.00 per copy plus $3.00 shipping/handling in the U.S.A., with slightly higher shipping costs to subscribers abroad.

13. BERKELEY GENOME PROJECT REPORT (Gerry Rubin)

Release 1 of the annotated sequence of the D. melanogaster genome will be published in the March 24th issue of Science and will be available through GenBank and FlyBase. This version still has many gaps and low quality regions and we will devote the remainder of our current grant year (until Oct 31, 2000) improving the quality of the sequence. (Full details will be presented at the workshop on Thursday afternoon.) Working closely with our FlyBase colleagues, we will also be improving the associated annotations.

We are currently negotiating with the NHGRI to revise the goals for the third and final year of our current grant period. These funds were originally awarded to sequence the last third of the genome. Some of these funds will likely be "repossessed" by the NHGRI, but it is also likely that we will be allowed to sequence full-length cDNA clones. This was, after completion of the genomic sequence, the highest priority goal for the fly community as reported to the NIH following the non-mammalian model organisms workshop held at the NIH a little over a year ago (for full text see http://www.nih.gov/science/models/nmm/):

Completion of high quality sequences of full-length cDNA clones corresponding to all genes in the genomic sequence (and their major alternative splice forms) and the assembly of a complete "unigene set" of all major expressed transcripts. The cDNAs should be made available in appropriate vectors in anticipation of their use in proteomic analyses. This "rosetta stone" will be crucial to fully comprehend the range of proteins encoded in the Drosophila genome. This goal can likely be accomplished for $8,000,000 and could be accomplished in 2 years."

We currently have cDNA corresponding to about 6,000 different fly genes and have plans for finding the rest, including sequencing 200,000 more ESTs, but these depend on approval of the NIH of our revised goals. Final approval of revised goals will need to wait until the NHGRI Council meeting in late May.

14. FLYBASE (Bill Gelbart)

The FlyBase project continues to work to provide an up-to-date and robust resource of genomic and genetic information on Drosophila melanogaster and other drosophilids. While continuing our usual data capture and presentation operations, we have had a considerable focus on issues pertaining to three areas:

(1) anticipating the explosion of information on the genome sequence of Drosophila melanogaster, both in terms of the FlyBase responsibility for maintaining and updating these annotations and in terms of how this will change the science that Drosophilists do.

(2) working toward complete integration of the BFD and FlyBase public databases.

(3) developing effective ways to evaluate and redesign the FlyBase www interface as part of the BFD - FlyBase integration effort.

(4) the implementation of a layered controlled vocabulary describing the function, biological role and cellular location of gene products: GO (Gene Ontology).

A brief summary of where we are follows. This will be supplemented by a discussion of the results of the 2.5 day FlyBase Project and Advisory Committee meeting, which will take place in Pittsburgh immediately in advance of the Drosophila Board meeting.

(1) Some of this information is also in the BDGP report from Gerry. The Celera/BDGP collaboration will culminate as you know in publication of the work in the March 24, 2000 issue of Science. At that time, the sequences and their annotations will be made public through the BFD - FlyBase servers as well as through GenBank/EMBL/DDBJ and perhaps other sites. The annotations represent a set of predictions of the structures of CDS's across the assembled genome. These

predicted gene models will then be the starting point for FlyBase to automatically re-compute those predictions as BDGP finishes the sequences, and to curate this information by expert review and by integrating experimentally-derived annotation. How to best obtain input from the community into this process of annotation is under active discussion by FlyBase.

(2) We are actively integrating some of our data sets and presenting highly integrated and/or crosslinked views of our data. Areas of highest priority are genomic annotations and transposon insertion data. A subcommittee has been formed to make recommendations on long term integration objectives. Several different models for integration can be considered and we are not yet in a position to choose among these options. Because the integration effort itself will occupy considerable resources, it is important that we take the time to do it right.

(3) We have established a FlyBase Web Design Committee (WDC) with curators from each of the four FlyBase sites to evaluate and where appropriate, recommend redesign of our high level web pages. This committee has worked extremely well together and their work has led to some very good changes in our web site. In addition, the WDC ran a FlyBase survey that was posted not only on FlyBase and the BFD, but also on OMIM, NCBI and MGD. The results of this survey are currently being evaluated, and are available to the Board. The Board proposed that responses should also be solicited by email, as the web-based approach yielded too few responses to get a strong sense of the community opinions.

(4) The GO (Gene Ontology) project is currently a collaboration between members of FlyBase (Michael Ashburner and Suzanna Lewis), SGD and MGD. The idea is to develop a database of controlled terms describing non-sequence level information about gene products, such that biologically related molecules can be organized and retrieved according to function, role and cellular location. A first pass at assigning GO terms to the predicted Celera/BDGP gene products occurred at and subsequent to the November Annotation Jamboree at Celera. FlyBase is now actively using the Gene Ontology both for internal purposes and for making robust crosslinks to other organism databases.

As stated earlier, FlyBase will supplement this report with information about the outcome of our Project and Advisors meeting.

15. NIH SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY RESOURCES (Laurie Tompkins, Bill Gelbart)

Bill Gelbart:

I had a long talk with Laurie Tompkins about the whitepaper status and her role on the Trans-NIH NonMammalian Model Organism resources committee.

It sounds like things are well under control for her Drosophila subcommittee (that she chairs). The most important of the whitepaper issues have been addressed by NIH, and this workshop will be useful to update some of the others ... sequencing other species in the light of the current technology, thinking about expression pattern in the light of chips, microarrays, etc.

I suggested to Laurie that I and perhaps some other board reps to NIH meet with her subcommittee as a follow-up to the Thursday evening resources workshop. She would like her subcommittee to have "access" to the community through some combination of FlyBase postings and bionet.drosophila announcements. This is of course fine with me.

How the board might encourage national consortia on resources (such as microarray centers) is something that we might talk about at the board meeting.

Laurie Tompkins (NIH):

NIH Process for Considering Support for Genetic and Genomic Resources for Non-Mammalian Models

This document describes NIH's process for considering planned applications for projects whose goal is to develop genetic and genomic resources for non-mammalian model systems. This process will be used for projects that are large (generally greater than $500,000 in direct costs per year) or that require a long-term commitment (such as databases and repositories). Applications for projects that are known to be of interest to specific institutes should be submitted in the standard manner. However, applicants are encouraged to discuss these projects with the appropriate institute staff member.

The process described below is designed (1) to provide guidance to investigators prior to submission of a grant application and (2) to provide a mechanism for determining whether there is sufficient programmatic interest in the proposed project before the investigators prepare and submit an application.

1. A representative of the model organism community should discuss the plan with the NIH contact person (or the NMM committee co-chairs, if there is no contact person).

2. If NIH considers the planning process to be far enough along, the applicants should submit a concept paper to the NIH contact person (or to the NMM committee co-chairs, if there is no contact person). The concept paper must address the following questions:

- By what process did the community obtain input and reach a consensus about the priority for the proposed project?
  - What other sources of support, including non-U.S. sources, exist?
  - What are the advantages and limitations of the model organism for research purposes, including genome size, tractability for genetic studies, ease of use, generation time, storage of organism or gametes, etc.?
  - What is the justification for needing the genomic resources now, rather than later, when costs are likely to be lower?
  - Do the proposed resources exist, or are there plans to develop such resources, outside the U.S.?

- What are the unique advantages of having the genomic information of this organism?
- What scientific advances will be made possible that otherwise would not, given the current state of the genomic tools?
- With as great precision as possible, what is the cost of the project?
- What is the duration of the project?
- How will resources, such as databases and repositories, be supported after the completion of the project?
- How will data and resources generated by this project be made available rapidly and efficiently to the research community?
- What genomic resources, including databases and repositories, currently exist?
- What is the size of the research community for the organism?
- Who will benefit from the improved genomic resources? The immediate community? The broader biomedical research community?
- What will be the benefits?

NIH staff have formed working groups to coordinate and share information about genomic activities related to some model organisms. If a working group has been established for a particular model organism, the contact person will distribute the concept paper to that working group. If no working group exists, the contact person will distribute the concept paper to the NMM committee and to its liaisons from other agencies.

- If one or more Institutes and Centers (IC's) and/or other agencies express an interest in providing support for the development of the proposed genomic resources, the applicant will be invited to submit a grant application.
- If no IC is interested in accepting a formal application, the applicant will be notified.

16. OTHER BUSINESS

a) Status of women in the fly community (Terry Orr-Weaver, Celeste Berg, Pam Geyer, Helen Salz)

There has been serious underrepresentation of female principal investigators on the Board, especially the President position, as well as other high level community projects, such as the Celera jamboree and the panel that attended the Model Organisms. The problem, as I see it, is that this becomes a self-propagating problem, meaning reduced involvement of female Pis in 'high-level' events and meetings perpetuates the perception that there aren't women 'trained' to perform such functions. I therefore asked this group to address the issue of female representation and come up with some practical suggestions. Here is the response:

You asked us to comment on ways to increase the representation and involvement of women in the Drosophila community and to make suggestions to the Drosophila board.

We agree that increased representation of women on the Drosophila board will permit women to have more input into decisions that affect fly research. We think you have received a number of suggestions from other women about mechanisms to increase the number of women on the Drosophila board.

We think, however, that it is essential to recognize that simply providing women with more opportunities to do service functions for the community will not enhance their research efforts. Women do a tremendous amount of service for the Drosophila community, for example look at the number of women who have organized the National meeting in recent years. This service benefits the community, and the visibility of women in these roles does serve as a good example to younger women. The problem is that these service jobs are a sacrifice, they take away from women's research efforts. So we think it is critical that any endeavors to increase the representation of women do not

solely add more administrative jobs for them. Women in the fly community need equal access to research information and opportunities-this is what is really critical.

We support your efforts. We urge you to heighten awareness and take steps that will ensure women have access to information, technologies, and reagents in the post-genome era of Drosophila research.

Proposal:
The Nominations Committee should make every effort to maintain adequate female representation among the regional representatives, the President and the Treasurer, board committees, and in any community events. In all cases we should attempt to achieve complete parity (50%), which approximately reflects the composition of the fly community. If there are not enough women currently on the Board to populate committees, we should pick ad hoc representatives from the community at large. The long-term goal is to encourage female participation in all 'high-level' Drosophila business. It is hoped that these strategies will result in being able to approach nominations in a gender-independent fashion, in the not-too-distant future.

The Board heartily approved the institution of measures to increase female participation in the Board and other activities of the Drosophila community. However, the Board favored an approach that was not 'hard-wired' with respect to percentages; instead, the Nominations Committee was strongly encouraged to ensure appropriate representation of women in the nominees.

b) Status of P element license (Larry Goldstein)

Exelixis has not yet produced a final license proposal, despite numerous attempts to complete this task. George Scangos has pledged to bring the language into line with the agreed upon intent.

The Board was not concerned about the absence of an agreement, as the patent will expire in about 2 years. It was decided to let Exelixis dictate the timing, and that we would not continue to push them on this issue.

c) Press release on the completion of the genome

In order to take advantage of press interest in the completion of the genome, we needed to provide a press release from the Board, as representatives of the community. Here is the text of the final release.

THE DROSOPHILA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
41st Annual Drosophila Research Conference
News Release

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Media Contact: Gary Karpen, President, The Drosophila Board of Directors
(412) 281-3700 ext. 2606; karpen@salk.edu

The Drosophila Research Community Thanks Celera Genomics and the Publicly-Funded Genome Projects for Delivering the Fruitfly Genome Sequence

PITTSBURGH, PENN. March 23, 2000 - The publication and release of the complete DNA sequence of the fruit fly Drosophila in the current issue of *Science* reports an achievement that will have

enormous impact on understanding human biology and disease. Nearly two-thirds of the genes known to cause human disease are present in the Drosophila genome, including genes responsible for birth defects, neurodegeneration, and cancer. These findings demonstrate that basic research using Drosophila has enormous value in the fight against human disease.

This occasion caps a century of ground-breaking discoveries made using Drosophila, several of which were recognized by Nobel prizes. These include the demonstration that radiation causes mutations and the discovery of genes that control the basic body plan of all organisms.

Drosophila has the largest genome sequence produced to date. This daunting project was only accomplished at an accelerated pace because private industry and government funded public efforts collaborated in a true partnership. The Drosophila Board, representing the community of Drosophila researchers, sincerely thanks Celera Genomics, Inc. and the Drosophila Genome Projects for providing this important resource to our research community.

The completion of the Drosophila genome sequence heralds a new era of biomedical discovery. The Drosophila community welcomes this leap forward and the opportunity it affords to advance our understanding of how organisms function and how genetic defects cause disease.

The Drosophila Genome Project is a consortium of the Berkeley Genome Project, European Genome Project, Baylor College of Medicine Human Genome Center, and FlyBase. The Drosophila Board of Directors represents the interests of the international community of Drosophila researchers.

For further information contact :
Dr. Gary Karpen
President of The Drosophila Board of Directors
The Salk Institute
karpen@salk.edu
(858) 453-4100 ext. 1473