

2017 National Drosophila Board Meeting Agenda

Wednesday March 29, 2017,

Town & Country Resort & Convention Center, San Diego, CA

Pacific Ballroom Salon 1

3:00 - 6:00 PM

Schedule of Events

1. Introduction (Laura Johnston) 3:00-3:05

ADRC

2. Report of the 2017 Meeting Organizing Committee (Leanne Jones) 3:05-3:15
3. Treasurer's Report (Michelle Arbeitman) 3:15-3:20
4. Report of the GSA Senior Director (Suzy Brown) 3:20-3:30
5. GSA and the Drosophila Board (Lynn Cooley) 3:30-3:35
6. Sandler Lectureship Committee (Bob Duronio) 3:35-3:40
7. Victoria Finnerty Undergraduate Travel Award (Alexis Nagengast) 3:40-3:45
8. Image Award (David Bilder) 3:45-3:50
9. 2018 & 2019 Fly Meetings Update (Tin Tin Su) 3:50-3:55

Community

10. Drosophila Board Election Report (Ken Irvine) 3:55-4:05
11. Janelia Drosophila Research Ecosystem Meeting (David Bilder) 4:05-4:10
12. Alliance of Genome Resources Meeting (David Bilder) 4:10-4:15
13. Primarily Undergraduate Institutions (Alexis Nagengast) 4:15-4:20
14. Advocacy & Communications (Andreas Prokop (teleconference), S. Mohr) 4:20-4:30

BREAK 4:30 - 4:50

Resources and Projects

15. NIH Cryopreservation Workshop (Toshiyuki Takano-Shimizu) 4:50-5:00
16. Commercial Antibody Verification (Bing Zhang) 5:00-5:05
17. FlyBase (Norbert Perrimon) 5:05-5:15
18. Bloomington Stock Center (Kevin Cook) 5:15-5:20
19. VDRC stock centers (Lisa Meadows) 5:20-5:25
20. Kyoto Stock Center (Toshiyuki Takano-Shimizu) 5:25-5:30
21. Species Stock Center (Patrick O'Grady) 5:30-5:35
22. Drosophila Gene Disruption Project (Hugo Bellen) 5:35-5:40
23. Harvard Drosophila RNAi Screening Center (Stephanie Mohr) 5:40-5:45
24. Harvard Transgenic RNAi Project (Jonathan Zirin) 5:45-5:50
25. Berkeley Drosophila Genome Project (Sue Celniker) 5:50-5:55
26. DGRC (Andrew Zelhoff) 5:55-6:00
27. DIS (Jim Thompson) 6:00-6:05

Adjourn

In Attendance (alphabetized list)

Deborah,Andrew
Michelle,Arbeitman
Amy Bejsovec
Hugo Bellen
Celeste Berg
David Bilder
Sarah Bray
Susan Celniker
Sarah Certel
Kevin Cook
Lynn Cooley
Tracey DePellegrin (conference call)
Bob Duronio
Bruce Edgar
Michael Galke
Shigeo Hayashi
Gary Hime
Ken Irvine
Laura Johnston
Leanne Jones
Thom Kaufman
Amy Kiger
Chuck Langley
Kim McCall
Lisa Meadows
Stephanie Mohr
Alexis Nagengast
Amanda Norvell
Patrick O'Grady
Brian Oliver
Andrea Page-McCaw
Norbert Perrimon
Juan Riesgo-Escovar
Chris Rushlow
Susan Russo Gelbart
Allan Spradling
Tin Tin Su
Jim Thompson
Esther Verheyen
Coral Warr (conference call)
Bing Zhang
Jonathan Zirin

Minutes of the 2017 meeting:

Laura Johnston (1) thanked everyone for all the work they put into the impressive meeting reports, noting the huge amount of effort from all contributors. The few changes that still need to be made will be uploaded into a final version of the full report.

Leanne Jones (2) provided the report from the Drosophila meeting organizing committee. There was an ad hoc committee (Leanne Jones, Howard Lipschitz and Denise Montell – the DGRC Rejuvenation Committee) that reviewed the current set-up for the Drosophila meeting. While recognizing that many events are helpful for everyone, there were some key changes and additions. Lots of changes made at once. Abstract categories were changed and new key words associated with abstract submissions were added. There was a discussion of the role of the keynote held on the first night of the meeting. The historical talks may no longer be so popular, so perhaps having a keynote speaker on a specific topic might be better. So far, no overall changes have been made. This year a single speaker – Sean Carroll – will present. It was felt that workshops were marginalized because of their late times, so the schedule was rearranged to put them at more reasonable times. There was the addition of an PI early career forum for welcoming in new PIs, committee felt this was an opportunity for the new cohort of PIs to get to know one another and to motivate their attendance at meeting, as well as providing opportunities for networking. Early feedback is positive, this opportunity may now occur at other meetings linked to GSA. Kept technical platform presentations separate from the others, so everyone could attend. There was a reformatting of the platform sessions because not enough room and overlap in topics. The Science Slam was introduced, which is supposed to be a three-minute introduction (elevator speech) to the science one does as a means to encourage science communication. A special award was presented to Dan Lindsley for his contributions to community (e.g. the hard copy original of Flybase). More active fund raising was also discussed.

Lynn Cooley How does slam work? **Leanne Jones:** Not entirely sure, but Mike Eisen has it “under control”. There were 300 people registered, but its unclear how many will speak. There will be some mechanism for choosing speakers if more than 20. Apparently, graduate students and postdocs are familiar with the format. Computer and video equipment are available. Judges are not scientists, they will choose top presentations for cash awards and the audience will pick one awardee (4). Cash bar starts at same time and will follow the event.

Tin Tin Su Is there a mechanism for learning if changes to meeting are working?

Leanne Jones Yes, feedback on changes will be asked for on evaluation form.

David Bilder commented on the early career lunch for PIs (which he had just attended). Said there was great energy and lots of ideas for improving it next year. An email survey will be sent to attendees for feedback. This worked better than expected given “haphazard” way in which it was pulled together. **Esther Verheyen** expressed a need to get a full membership list to support new faculty. **David Bilder** suggested other ways of supporting new faculty and indicated that this support is important to keep community alive. Ideas included tele-mentoring, PUI groups, other methods that fly board could facilitate. To facilitate a more structured mentoring system, it was felt that a comprehensive list of researchers was needed. **David Bilder** promised to discuss mechanisms for identifying (new) PIs later in the meeting.

Laura Johnston revisited issue of the number of plenary speakers from outside the US and whether a limit should be placed on international versus national, since, at least in theory, this is

a national meeting. **Ken Irvine** suggested this was not an issue. **Sarah Bray** said she liked having international representation and **Celeste Berg** felt that more interaction [across the world] was better.

Laura Johnston brought up more discussion regarding workshops. **Leanne Jones** indicated that there is now a 2 hr limit on all workshops except the ecdysone workshop, which begins on the first day of every Drosophila meeting and goes most of that day, potentially creating space issues and temporal conflict with new PI meeting. Talks in workshops often better (PIs) than platform talks (students and post-docs). **Laura Johnson**: Ecdysone workshop is the longest standing workshop but many talks would fit into physiology platform session. What would be problem of limiting all workshops to 2 hr (including ecdysone, which is now 6 hr)? A discussion of why workshops are needed ensued, since there are platform talks and posters that should cover most of the topics covered in workshops. Number of workshops is okay now – i.e. there is space/time to accommodate the ones requested. **Brian Oliver** discussed what workshops should be doing – new late-breaking areas of science. If the same ones are held several years in a row, why not incorporate topics into regular platform sessions. **Michelle Arbeitman** indicated that “Sex is best” as a workshop since it is cross-disciplinary and **Alexis Nagengast** said that it is important that Primarily Undergraduate Institutions (PUI) have a break out meeting. **Lynn Cooley** suggested that maybe just deal with the issue of workshops on a year-to-year basis.

Resolution: ***Laura Johnston charged Leanne Jones, Michelle Arbeitman and Alexis Nagengast to meet and discuss how workshop issues can be resolved.***

Michelle Arbeitman (3) provided the treasurer’s report, which had very little change from the previous year since the GSA covered the balance of the TAGC (July 2016 multi-model organism meeting in Orlando FL) meeting costs. Our overall reserves did decrease by \$11,000, with \$6000 going to the Finnerty (undergraduate travel) Award and \$5000 going to support additional student travel to the TAGC meeting.

The issue of resources in general was then discussed. **Ken Irvine** noted that the Sandler Fund makes investment dollars and wondered why the balance of our meeting reserves (we are obliged to have enough to cover at least half the cost of a meeting in case of a disaster) could not be invested so that we could also generate returns on that money. Suzy Brown was not sure how this could be done – reserve money is just held in balance by GSA and the way it is set up, it cannot easily be invested. Also, potential problem with money being tied up long enough to have reasonable yield. Maybe invest only half? **Allan Spradling** supports investing this money.

Resolution: ***Lynn Cooley said she would find out the options on investing this money and relay what she learns to Michelle Arbeitman.***

Suzy Brown (4) weighed in on meeting attendance. The numbers are down about 25% this year with >1200 current registrants and estimated loss of \$30K. There were also some platform speaker cancellations, which does not often occur. Are travel bans, TAGC meeting, or the funding situation at the root of problem? Exhibitor revenue is up a little. Tried to get exhibitors to fund new PI luncheon. One other issue is that people are not staying at the meeting site hotel, with whom negotiations are made regarding the balance of costs for the meeting services

provided (i.e. coffee) and the return revenue from hotel rooms. 60-70% of registrants are staying at the hotel this year. In the future, this may impact our ability to get the same concessions we have now if our room block size goes down. This will have a financial impact on expenses. One option that **Suzy Brown** will explore is the possibility of charging slightly higher registration fees for people who do not stay at the meeting site. **Ken Irvine** suggests that staying offsite may be an option only chosen by those who are stretching their budgets and that they may not attend the meeting if registration was higher for that subset of people.

Resolution: *We all voted in favor of giving **Suzy Brown** flexibility to look into charging slightly more in registration fees for off-site attendees.*

Lynn Cooley (5) indicated TAGC meeting was very well received based on extensive surveys of attendees. Plenary speakers were fabulous. It was noted that it is easy to get stellar speakers (scientific and political) for such a meeting. The ability to see other organism talks was seen as an advantage. We are “stronger together”. Some snags – food plans, issues of how spread out everything was. GSA board would like to repeat this and need fly board on board. Shall we have TAGC again? If so, 2020 would be the next meeting if we keep on a 4-year cycle. Is there a way to improve on this meeting? Should we change from the parallel model organism platform sessions to a more integrated format? For example, more cross organism events such as mixed concurrent sessions that would make it possible for all to attend would increase interactions. Fly people were the largest represented group and a lot of people from other organisms went to fly talks, not so much the other way around. We have already reserved San Diego for 2020, so that would have to be changed. **Suzy Brown** thinks that issue can be worked out. Perhaps she can move San Diego meeting to 2021. Time of year is an issue. Look into April versus June versus July for the next TAGC – June is very bad based on some board members weighing in on the date. Location must be chosen. Majority of people who went to the meeting want to do it again, not clear what the non-attendees think.

Resolution: *Drosophila Board voted to do TAGC again.*

Lynn Cooley suggested having a Drosophila Board person be on the GSA board - maybe a past president? **Laura Johnston** suggested that a past president would be better than having the current president, given the challenges of doing both jobs.

Resolution: *We agreed this is a good idea.*

Lynn Cooley also asked if the fly meeting would be willing to be the home for the **Gruber Genetics Award**. Would we host the award ceremony at some interval? Perhaps when it's a Drosophila researcher (**Ken Irvine**)? Considerable discussion in both directions ensued.

Resolution: ***Lynn Cooley** will look into this further.*

Bob Duronio (6) discussed the Sandler Award Lecture Award (committee included Tin Tin Su, Kim McCall, Laura Johnston, and Bob Duronio). Kim agreed to be new chair next year. 23 nominees total, with approximately equal representation of men and women (13 male: 10 female nominees; 17 male: 6 female advisors). Winner is M.D./Ph.D. student Danny Miller from

Scott Hawley's lab who sequenced all the balancer chromosomes, a topic that should be of general interest to most of the community.

Alexis Nagengast (7) presented outcomes of Finnerty Award applications. Thirteen applications (undergraduate travel awards) received, with top seven chosen. Some issues with GSA person involved no longer working for GSA. New person will be on the committee for 2018 awards. Maximum award given was \$599 (this avoids taxes that start with \$600); one award was only \$250.

Follow-up: *Other mechanisms for funding the Finnerty Award should be explored through discussion with **Suzy Brown** or **Lynn Cooley**.*

David Bilder (8) discussed the Image award. Award is still alive and vibrant – plenty of applications for award. David Bilder will turnover control of this competition in the next year or so since he has been doing it for 13 years (Indeed, I believe he is the one who started this award). David is wondering if posters of images can be made. Cost is low since vendors could do it for about \$1 each; posters could be mailed or picked up at meeting by participants who want them. Perhaps we can get a microscope company to pay for the archive images being produced as a poster/or there could a meeting charge and/or there might be other mechanism to cover costs. Screen savers and posters for LOGO on bottom from company might be a way of getting posters made. Winner of still image award (C. Montell lab) will have his image featured in a blog post by Francis Collins – the NIH Directors blog will link to the image award, giving these images some air time. Perhaps also see if the posters could be offered to additional venues (Airport art, others). The screen savers are free. Someone suggested that the image awards could be the meeting T-shirt logo. Question of whether there are copy-right issues? Apparently, none have been raised so far.

Resolution: ***David Bilder** will look into possibilities by talking with GSA.*

Tin Tin Su (9) provided the 2018 Meeting Update. Organizers for next meeting include Tin Tin Su, Giovanni Bosco, Pam Geyer, and Noah Whiteman. Committee will stick with new changes for at least two years to see impact. List of plenary speakers exist, final list should be ready this summer. Question of how to get attendance up was discussed. There is a general worry about the political climate and funding, and ability to afford attending the meeting.

Andreas Prokop (14) Advocacy and communication – in teleconference from Manchester England. **Andreas Prokop** is the head of a committee that was established based on discussions of the need for advocacy and communication at the Janelia Ecosystem Meeting. **Stephanie Mohr** is also on that committee. **Andreas Prokop** points out that we have a problem with communication in the current fly community that puts us at risk. There is no longer a complete list of contact information, making it difficult to communicate with the population at large when needed. Flybase gets 300,000 hits per month but it is not a communication resource, i.e. it does not cover other topics related to Drosophila research, such as community resources, education, training, advocacy and horizontal communication. The community websites are currently not heavily used despite the enthusiasm expressed for these websites in a variety of forums. Currently, **Andreas Prokop** maintains a community website in Manchester and **Stephanie Mohr** has set up a community website at Harvard. A new link icon to the community websites has been added to the opening page of Flybase. As pointed out by **Thom Kaufman**,

NHGRI funds Flybase as a resource for genomic and genetic information, not a community website. Thus, Flybase should provide only the link to the community websites.

Andreas Prokop also brought up the issue of whether funding could be obtained to finance the upkeep of the community websites. Ideas of groups to approach are the Company of Biologists, Welcome Trust or GSA. Estimates maximum cost of \$20K to support a web company.

Regarding the community advocacy and communication, it has been decided that there is a single committee – of which **Andreas Prokop** is the chairman.

Stephanie Mohr stated that Harvard community website is off to a great start. She also indicated that, at least for now, financial support is not needed. She does need help with content. She suggested that if each person (on the Drosophila board) could add a single item once a year that would be sufficient. Another challenge is getting feedback on what is working and what is not. Both **Andreas Prokop** and **Stephanie Mohr** indicate that we still need a mechanism to reach out to entire fly community to have them submit information. Ideas include having **Thom Kaufman** send out mailings and/or post information on Flybase. The annual fly letter from GSA is another way of letting people know to post information.

<p>Resolution: <i>The board gave its okay for Stephanie Mohr and Andreas Prokop to reach out to GSA on this topic and Fly Board is willing to help provide feedback.</i></p>
--

Ken Irvine (10) reported on the Fly Board election results. Ken thanked other members of the election committee as well as **Jim Thurmond** and **Thom Kaufman** who distributed ballots and obtained results. Six new regional representatives were elected to the fly board and positions within the fly board were filled (new president – **Bruce Edgar**, new treasurer- **Michelle Arbeitman**). The election failed to identify a trainee representative; a ballot was sent out asking trainees to self nominate and no one did. Not sure why. It was decided that the trainee appointment to the fly board should be a two-year term, and that a financial commitment from the advisor was needed to send the trainee to the fly meeting for two consecutive years. The purpose of having a trainee representative is to have representation from the next generation who would provide a different perspective and would bring fresh energy and enthusiasm to the board. One idea to get a trainee rep was to advertise more and to waive the registration fee for the meeting. This position will not be an elected one. The election board will select from the applicants that can include both graduate students and postdocs (some sentiment was expressed that it might be better to have a postdoc). Resolution: *It was decided that we see how it goes this next time with a little more advertising.*

Break

David Bilder (12) reported on the Janelia Ecosystem meeting.

Meeting was held to discuss actions that we could/should do to benefit the fly community and preserve the major role of Drosophila in scientific discovery. Some of the action items have been done, others are either in the works or under consideration.

Done: **Ken Irvine** revised the White paper and **Ken Irvine** updated the Flybase Charter.

Howard Lipshitz, Leanne Jones and others worked on new ideas for revitalizing the fly meeting. **Ken Irvine** and **David Bilder** wrote up a paper overviewing the discussions at the Janelia meeting – this paper will be published in Genetics.

Not done: Fly worker contact list is much needed for communication (brought up many times during the meeting). We do not have this; new people do not register at flybase, thus it is difficult to keep the list up to date. This list is important, for example, it was much needed when the issue of Flybase versus AGR was suggested by Francis Collins and needed to be addressed.

David Bilder proposed the previously discussed opt-in mechanism for obtaining contact information through Bloomington stock center lists. Apparently only one in three people agree on this when polled. To get people on board, need to indicate that communications will be rare and lists will not be sold. **Ken Irvine** points out that many people in fly community are not being communicated with – e.g. fly elections. **Kevin Cook** brought up issue of maintaining the list once it is obtained. GSA registration for fly meeting list is also another source. Problem with decay of contact lists – a natural process (**Thom Kaufman**). Privacy policy is also an issue – reason for “opt-in” option. Corresponding authors of Drosophila papers could be another source of fly people list. Suggestion was made that regional reps do an annual census of fly people in region. Email list from Taiwan can be made available.

Resolution: Norbert Perrimon says he will work on such a list and see where things are in a month. <i>Norbert did come through on this with an ~6000 fly person list.</i>
--

David Bilder also brought up issue of a standardized reagent table: an initiative to curate fly reagents. One idea is to make a standardized table for integrating information into Flybase. **Norbert Perrimon** has reached out to some journals on this issue. This helped in the development of the *STAR methods section* from Cell Press and *Author Reagent Table* from Genetics. **Thom Kaufman** states that the fly community is taking a lead on standardizing information on reagents used in publications.

David Bilder (13): Alliance of Genome Research meeting – AGR (Norbert Perrimon) Idea is to make sense of information across model organisms (six MODs). Original meeting on progress held a month ago – long term vision is unclear. Funding source is unclear. Currently, Flybase is funded entirely by NIH. Need to expand Flybase but also fulfill commitment with AGR. Balance will be challenging. Renewal for Flybase just submitted. AGR is not dedicated to serve fly community. Funding issues – many users outside US. Maybe donations could be made to cover the costs. Will Flybase be moved to AGR website? Thom Kaufman suggests that current G2F is what AGR will look like, most is good and based on human disease, but that database does not contain the kind of detail that is helpful to fly researchers; it will mainly serve translational community. **Brian Oliver** took a pro-AGR position since it highlights the value of model organisms. **Allan Spradling** stated that we should support integration, but we cannot afford to let Flybase go away. We just need to find a way to fund it. **Laura Johnston** asked if any progress has been made toward getting large funding agencies to contribute to Flybase – HHMI, Wellcome Trust, Ludwig, Max Plank, others. **Norbert Perrimon** suggested that foundations are not so keen on the idea. Instead, they suggest that labs make small contributions to Flybase based on their funding levels. for voluntary donations could initially be done for a year, to see how people respond Asking. In six months, will know about NIH Flybase grant. **Thom Kaufman** noted that we should consider the cost to all of us if we had to generate

what Flybase provides in our individual labs.

Norbert Perrimon (17) update on Flybase. Some nice new features have been integrated into website, including gene summaries, links to outside tools, other new features, genome-wide study links, gene to function and disease. Flybase is doing well, right now.

Alexis Nagengast (13) spoke on Primarily Undergraduate Institutions (PUIs). There are two workshops at the meeting, one traditional workshop with undergraduate presentations and one on education of faculty, open to anyone involved in education, not just PUI faculty.

Resources: *Due to time constraints, each of the following topics was covered only very briefly during the meeting. Please refer to the meeting reports for the very detailed well-organized and comprehensive reports on these resources.*

Bing Zhang (16) was not present to report, so **David Bilder** brought up that one issue at that emerged from the Janelia meeting was the lack of antibodies for fly proteins. Bing is going to make a list of antibodies made to proteins in other organisms that are known to cross-react with fly proteins.

Resolution: *Bing and Thom Kaufman wrote a letter and initiated a weblink for people to add their antibody information:*

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1bUKOmbYtXMUfp3ERdRFI3Arwj3aqrQWwH5ilt-UOWqY/edit#gid=0>. We can send the letter out to everyone (using Norbert's new comprehensive list) and hope that people fill in the information from their labs.

Toshiyuki Takano-Shimizu (15) could not be at meeting, so **Hugo Bellen** reported from the NIH Cryopreservation Workshop that nothing works. If flies are preconditioned before freezing, then some brief survival. Anti-freeze proteins do not really work. Right now nothing is working. Hugo pointed out that freezing protocols are too complicated. We need a simple protocol and there is nothing useful right now. Freezing would be useful for stocks only rarely requested and to protect against stocks picking up modifiers.

Kevin Cook (18) gave the report on the Bloomington Stock Center. Behind the scene changes: two scientists were hired since the current heads of the stock center cannot easily be cryopreserved (and functional) and they will not be there forever. Some reorganization is being done, making it easier to find stocks.

Lisa Meadows (19) reported that the VDCR Vienna Fly stocks are being updated, search engines improved, a few more lines have been added.

Masatoshi Tomaru and Shigeo Hayashi (20) reported that the Kyoto Stock Center/DGGR, which has 37,000 stocks, is supported by the university and the Japanese government. Funding for the stock center and NIG Fly - NBRP will be renewed this year for another 5 years. The Kyoto Stock Center/DGGR is trying cryopreservation of pole cells from embryos.

Laura Johnston asks if maybe they could get list of people who use Kyoto Fly Stock Center and VDCR. **Shigeo Hayashi** says J-Fly is a database of fly people that could be accessed.

Resolution: **Shigeo Hayashi** reports that due to a legal issue of personal information protection they cannot release the information without consent from each registrant. He proposes that any messages from FlyBase be forwarded to the JFly mailing list, and they would then disseminate the messages to researchers on the JFly list.

Patrick O'Grady (21) reported that there is a lot going on with the Species Stock Center with moving stocks from UCSD to Berkeley, stocks are being sent out in meantime. Previous director of center, **Maxi Richmond**, retired.

Hugo Bellen (22) Drosophila Gene Disruption Project – stated that he will give a talk on Saturday will cover many aspects of what is being done. GFP, Gal4, other constructs, trying to hit genes not yet hit. Grinding through stocks to create reagents for each gene. This is very labor-intensive work. A library of ~7000 UAS-human cDNA constructs being created with targeted integration.

Stephanie Mohr (23) provided an update on the Harvard Drosophila RNAi Screening Center, which has some exciting new technologies, human protein ORFs, other technology for screens, including a pooled CRISPR-based screen. New state-of-the-art imaging capabilities. dsRNAs targeting fly orthologues of human genes hit by FDA-approved drugs.

Jonathan Zirin (24) Harvard Transgenic RNAi Project, CRISPR gene knockout libraries, production ramped up. 500 stocks, goal of 2000 next year. Need to advertise so people use resource.

Sue Celniker (25) stated Berkeley Drosophila Genome Project is continuing to make new expression plasmids, cis-regulatory modules, extension of Mod-encode project (2 posters will be presented), tagged about ½ of transcription factors, RNAi constructs of transcription factors, human clones for expression in flies, putting them back into flies. It is the 25th year anniversary of BDGP.

Andrew Zelhoff (26) reported that DGRC has a renewal NIH grant application coming up. Letters will be needed. Would like people to cite DGRC. And, in the future, would like people to please provide information on what reagents are needed, what should DGRC be housing, etc.

Jim Thompson (27) stated that Volume #100 of DIS was published this year.

Laura Johnston offered her thanks for the comprehensive reports that were provided, but, more importantly, she thanked everyone for the work that goes into those reports. She thanked the new reps and everyone for coming.