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Notes

§ 1 Composition of Steering Committee

Tommy Nilsson suggested that it is time for a more democratic procedure of choosing members of the Steering Committee (SC). There is also the need for a treasurer since there is a huge amount of money involved in arranging the meetings. A four year running period was suggested for all positions in the SC. TN wants to stay on as a Coordinator for one more year and suggests that a new Coordinator, starting in 2009, is elected at the next meeting (2008). The Coordinator and Scientific Coordinator (Rainer Pepperkok, EMBL) should not be replaced at the same time. The meeting was asked if it could take a decision on these matters and the answer was “Yes”. The meeting participants were asked to propose candidates for the election of a new Coordinator.

There was a discussion on if there has to be a formal Steering Committee and a formal SC meeting. TN stressed that inclusiveness is important. Kurt Anderson meant that there is no real function for a SC. Patrick Schiwa suggested to transform the SC to a three-people executive group.

The meeting decided to wait with the restructuring of the SC until the EU infrastructure project is more finalized (see Section 4) and that a number of five people could be appropriate.
§ 2 Size of ELMI meetings
Everyone present at the meeting agreed on that the ELMI meeting should be kept at a reasonable size and not grow much bigger, in order to keep it an informal and social event. There is also the question about obtaining funding, since EMBO and FEBS has a limit on the number of participants.

§ 3 Future meetings
At the SC meeting 2006 it was decided to have the 2008 ELMI meeting in Switzerland, with Gabor Csucs and Patrick Schwarb as main organizers. Gabor and Patrick said it might be located in Davos, but it is not decided yet. They think the location should be in a small place and not a big city.
There have been requests to arrange a future meeting from several different ELMI members: Eric Scarfone in Stockholm, Alberto Diaspro in Genua and Kurt Anderson in Glasgow have all expressed their willingness to become organizers. At this SC meeting it was also suggested to hold the next ELMI meeting in Greece. However, there has already been one ELMI meeting in Sweden and one in Italy, and there is no Greece member volunteering to be the organizer. Therefore, it was decided to have the 2009 meeting in Scotland, with Kurt Anderson as the main organizer. There was a discussion on whether other kinds of microscopy than light microscopy, e.g. whole animal imaging and correlative imaging, should be included, or not, at the meetings. It was agreed that there could be a correlative LM-EM session the next meeting as well (there was such a session at this year’s meeting).

§ 4 Infrastructure (a.k.a. the ELMA project)
Tommy informed about that there is an S3 roadmap for scientific infrastructure in Europe. Therefore, we should make Brussels understand that we need funding and support from the EU for creating such an infrastructure within advanced light microscopy. Tommy estimates that there is a time window of around 6-9 months during which we could lobby for a call to be put forward. This could be done centrally from ELM, but Tommy asks everyone to help lobbying this issue. This should be a distributed infrastructure consisting of physical entities, not only a network. The pan-European hub should be situated at EMBL, since it does not belong to any special country but is common EU property. There should be main sites, one in each country, around Europe and national networks should branch out from the main site. There are already national networks arising in different countries (e.g. Switzerland, Finland). The aim of the infrastructure is to be able to exchange equipment and personnel. Spencer Shorte suggested that the national networks should provide a list of people that can use the facilities and of the specific applications that can be offered in each country. He thinks it would be positive to have company support and links outside Europe (e.g. with developing countries in Southeast Asia, Africa, South America). Tommy plans to make a draft document/plan. He asked for assistance from Spencer, Patrick and Chris Power.