

TEMA 11 Meeting

Minutes of TEMA Parent Committee Meetings held on 2nd June 2002 at 10.30 a.m. and 4th June 2002 at 4pm Claremont Hotel Meeting Room

Present: Nick Costa, Janet King, Peter Fischer, Roger Sunde, Alain Favier, Rosalind Gibson, Joseph Prohaska (Chairman), Sean Strain, John Arthur (Secretary)

1. JP opened the meeting thanking the Local Committee and in particular Janet King for all their efforts in setting up TEMA 11. JA then gave a brief secretary/treasurers report commenting on the funds available to the Parent Committee for seeding future meetings. At present we have approximately £16,000 (GBP) in deposit and current accounts in Aberdeen. This was sufficient to seed a further two TEMA meetings without any financial returns from Local Organising Committees. The TEMA web site was discussed and improvements suggested were pictures from this and previous meetings. JA reported that in Aberdeen he had copies of a picture of all the original participants and he would put this on site with identification of individuals wherever possible (further "historical" information would also be placed on the web). The possibility of soliciting financial contributions to the central funds was also discussed but regarded as unfeasible since we were such a loose organisation.

2. Alain Favier provided a final report on TEMA 10 in Evian. It was attended by 437 people approximately 80 from France, 88 from the United States and other participants from a total of 44 different countries. There was special registration for members of the European Trace Element Society, which helped boost numbers. Approximately 200 posters were presented with 100 communications and 46 lectures. Approximately \$256,000 came from registrations with a further \$100,000 from sponsors. There were 28 sponsors for which were obtained by 10 people raising money. There was then a general discussion on the difficulty of raising sponsorship and whether a particular sponsor could have, for example, a round table assigned to their name. The ethics were discussed and it was felt as long as discussions were free and open there are no ethical problems from such as sponsorship. However, the final decision should be up to the Local Organising Committee. Alain also reported that some exhibitors had paid to be at the Conference.

3. Barbara Sutherland joined the meeting and along with Janet King gave a report on the organisation of TEMA 11. Janet King welcomed the Committee to Berkeley and the Claremont resort. They had put together a programme with 57 invited and plenary speakers, and reduced the length of the meeting to finish at noon on Thursday to make travel convenient for the participants and because it was felt a meeting that was a day longer began to be very tiring. They had asked the speakers to stick to about 20 minutes and make two or three main points. They had received between 250 and 260 abstracts, 50 were then selected for oral presentation with a further 190 posters. The main talks are to be published in the Journal of Nutrition along with the abbreviated abstracts of the others. They then discussed editorial control of the abstracts which would be confined to matters of spelling etc. (there was then a discussion as to control of content of abstracts etc. and where appropriate Local Organising Committees should refuse to publish contentious or abstracts that were purely advertising). Barbara Sutherland also reported that many of the

submitted abstracts had come with viruses and this was a problem that should be addressed by every Organising Committee. The end of June was the deadline for submission of the manuscripts for the Journal of Nutrition. A flyer was put into the participant's information to note that the supplement of the Journal of Nutrition was available for \$27.50. The total estimated cost of production was \$25,000. This compared well with the production costs of the TEMA 10 book by Plenum. Barbara Sutherland reported there was 152 registered delegates, 36 students and 52 invited speakers. In addition 3 exhibitors were attending the meeting. This totalled 243 registrants with 12 guest registrations. Sponsorship had brought in \$167,000, \$75,000 of this had come in from large contributions from the USDA and NIH. Because of the effects of terrorism and resultant downturns in the economy it was felt fewer people had come to the meeting and furthermore part of the second mailing had been lost due to the anthrax scares in recent times. There was then the discussion of the use of the e-mail to contact delegates and it was felt that this list should be used to advertise the TEMA website to the participants and further built up to advertise the next meeting.

Barbara Sutherland further noted that 170 delegates would be going to the banquet and that an additional reception had been arranged for the invited speakers at the Children's Hospital Research Institute (CHORI). There was also to be discussion sessions within the posters which it was hoped would increase participation and interaction. Joseph Prohaska thanked Barbara Sutherland and Janet King for all their efforts in organising the meeting and Barbara then left the discussions.

4. The composition of the Parent Committee was then discussed since Peter Fischer, Roger Sunde, Nick Costa and Joseph Prohaska were all due to rotate off the Committee. The consensus was that the Committee should still reflect the different geographic locations where trace element work was being carried out and also try to include people who covered most of the disciplines represented at the meeting. The replacements it was thought should be people who would bring new ideas for the interactive and nature of the conference. However it was also felt we should not get too broad and reflect why people actually came to conferences although TEMA does have a tradition of encouraging interdisciplinary discussion. It was decided that the current committee should suggest people for filling the vacancies and this to be decided at the next meeting on Tuesday 4th June. At this stage it was decided that Joseph Prohaska should stay on for another 3 years or possibly 6 years as Chair of the Parent Committee to allow some continuity and also for him to continue the ideas he had for strengthening and updating TEMA.

5. Parent Committee matters

(a) The travel awards were again discussed. This was a priority however dependent on the funds available to the Committee. The Local Committee had awarded 5 travel grants as graduate student prizes and investigator prizes. It was decided to try and develop young investigator awards for the next meeting for example \$500 for people within 3 years of their first appointment. It was also decided we should formalise the Underwood nominations procedure as well and that the Chairman and Secretary/Treasurer should propose protocols that could be approved by the Committee.

(b) The venues for TEMA 13 were then discussed and it was decided to discover whether some of the proposed venues were serious about holding the meeting. This was to be discussed in full at the meeting on Tuesday 4th June.

(c) Graduate student sponsorship. This was raised by Rosalind Gibson and again the desirability of such a programme was emphasised. The limited funds available to the committee however meant that local organisers would have to provide finances and this may not always be possible.

6. Sean Strain then updated the meeting on plans for TEMA 12. The scientific committee was to consist of Sean and Albert Flynn from Ireland with assistance from John Arthur, Harry McArdle and Malcolm Jackson. Sean has also proposed that they should add a European perspective to the Committee. The date of the meeting is to be June 19th –23rd June 2005 using the same Sunday-Thursday format as TEMA 11. Sean then described connecting flights to Belfast and how travel could be arranged to Coleraine.

Second Parent Committee Meeting – 4th June 2002 – Claremont Hotel

1. The size of the Parent Committee was discussed and again the issues of wider regional representation and the need to include people of all scientific disciplines was emphasised. After extensive discussion of all the eminently suitable proposals for new committee members Joseph Prohaska distilled the arguments and it was decided that Mary L'Abbe, Bo Lonnerdal, Dennis Thiele and Deitrich Behne should be asked to join the Committee.

2. Professor Skalny and Berislav Momcilovic then joined the meeting to discuss the very clear Russian proposal to hold TEMA 13. The logistics of holding a meeting and for raising sponsorship were discussed and Professor Skalny described an impressive list of Russian academicians who would be involved in the organisation of the scientific programme. On behalf of the Parent Committee, Joseph Prohaska thanked Professor Skalny for attending the meeting and his efforts. Professor Skalny and Dr. Momcilovic then left the meeting, which was joined by Dr. Magdalena Araya from the University of Chile, Institute of Nutrition who described how the TEMA congress could be held in either Santiago or in the South of Chile. Again the Committee were impressed by the ideas for the meeting. It was also emphasised that there are direct flights to Chile from New York, Madrid and Heathrow. Again the difficulties in raising sponsor money were discussed and recognised. Local agencies were also keen to raise money for attendance of young people at meetings. Dr Araya then left the meeting. There was then extensive discussion of both proposals and it was decided on balance to offer the meeting to Chile with encouragement to the Russians to develop their proposal with the possibility of attempting to hold the meeting in Moscow at some future time. This decision reflected the tradition that successive TEMA meetings move from continent to continent to give different participants the opportunity to attend meetings. Additionally this reflects trace element work in different parts of the world. Joseph Prohaska then thanked the Committee for all their efforts and the meeting adjourned at 7.15 p.m.