

Meteoritical Society Council Meeting
October 10, 2023, 3 pm - 5 pm (UTC)
online only

Council Meeting Online:

Agenda for the 5th Meeting of the Meteoritical Society in 2023

Council Members Invitees

Nancy Chabot (President)	Elena Dobrică
Guy Consolmagno (Vice President) (left earlier)	Lan-Anh “Ann” Nguyen
Brigitte Zanda (Past President)	Denton Ebel
Tasha Dunn (Treasurer)	Alvaro Crósta (excused)
Jutta Zipfel (Secretary)	Marina Ivanova (left earlier)
Henner Busemann	Byeon-Gak Choi
Sarah Crowther	

Guests

Ming-Chang Liu (UCLA 2023)
Kevin McKeegan (UCLA 2023)
Vinciane Debaille (Brussels 2024)
Steven Goderis (Brussels 2024)
Alex Ruzicka (McKay Award)

The following documents were sent to councilors prior to the Meeting:

McKay and Wiley Award to Council-v2 1.pdf

WileyAward_Rules.2023-10-09.docx

letter to Council (Wiley).pdf

Agenda

1. Welcome from President and review of electronic votes since last meeting 3:00 pm UTC

The President welcomes councilors and guests.

Minutes of the council meeting at the Annual meeting of the Meteoritical in Los Angeles Society on August 13 had been circulated by email. There were no objections and the minutes were approved.

Motion: Approve the minutes for the August meeting.

Move: Denton Ebel
Second: Tasha Dunn
All present are in favor

2. Annual Meetings

2.1. UCLA, Los Angeles final report (Ming-Chang Liu & Kevin McKeegan) 3:15 pm UTC 20 min presentation + discussion

Ming-Chang Liu and Kevin McKeegan reported on the meeting and showed the numbers for the finances. In total the meeting costs amounted to about US\$ 223,900. Unexpected expenses like unfilled guest room, extra audiovisual equipment rental, higher venue rentals for banquet and welcome party (originally underquoted by the UCLA events office), and a lower than anticipated participation (321 attendants registered as in-person, 342 in total), lead to a deficit of about US\$ 38,000. This deficit is less negative than anticipated at the August Council meeting.

Costs for the meeting were reduced by receiving support from UCLA Division of Physical Sciences for the Wednesday afternoon event in the Schoenberg Hall, using Zoom for the virtual meeting, running the webpage on the UCLA departmental server, and offering less expensive drinks.

The president thanks Ming-Chang and Kevin for their great job of organizing the meeting and doing their best to keep costs and the deficit as low as possible.

A concern was expressed that in upcoming meetings lower attendance may become the rule because after Covid, people might be travelling less than they used to. Is it correct that the number of attendants is lower than for typical North American meetings? In reply the numbers for the last North American meetings were checked and found consistent with the current meeting. In general, the attendance of North American meetings is always lower than those in Europe. Covid may change things in future. It will be hard to budget for the uncertainty of how many people will attend a meeting. It may be best to compare meetings on the same continent with each other rather than meetings in general.

There was also concern that other meetings, e.g. Goldschmidt become competing meetings as they have cosmochemistry sessions. Vinciane Debaille reports that the Goldschmidt 2023 in Lyon had only a small session on cosmochemistry, and that MetSoc will remain the leading meeting for cosmochemistry.

The president asks the UCLA organizers to express their advice for future meetings and lessons learned. Instead of having a cultural experience on Wednesday afternoon having a symposium was a good idea. Only 21 people registered for virtual attendance. This low number may not justify the amount of effort put into organizing it. The advice to future organizers is that whatever decision is made to let the membership know ahead of time about the rules. It was a good decision not to have a virtual poster session following a recommendation given after the Glasgow meeting in 2022. The possibility for virtual attendance was a good thing on the other hand. There were a couple of covid cases during the meeting and those could at least attended virtually from their hotel rooms.

Kevin McKeegan emphasized how great it was to have LPI support with collecting the money. Unfortunately LPI cannot handle that aspect for meetings outside the US. He further thanks treasurer Tasha Dunn for her great job in how she handled the student awards and taking care of getting the money to all awarded.

2.2. Brussels, Belgium for 2024 (Vinciane Debaille & Steven Goderis)
35 min presentation + discussion

3:32 pm UTC

Vinciane Debaille reports on current standing and progress in organizing the annual meeting in Brussels in 2024.

- They are making progress in establishing an association for a single purpose to handle the finances. This association is less than non-profit but needs a lot of paperwork to proof that is not a means for money laundry.
- Suggestions for the Local Organizing Committee; chair Vinciane Debaille and Steven Goderis, local colleagues, ex organizers Hasnaa Chennaoui and Maria Valdes, and as ex-officio members the Executive Committee. Suggested Science Committee members are mainly from Europe covering a wide range of topics. Suggestion to have Ming-Chang as past organizer becoming a member on the scientific committee to help with LPI support, and he agreed to join.

Motion: Approve these two committee lists subject to addition at the discretion of the chair.

Move: Denton Ebel

Second: Tasha Dunn

All present are in favor

- Typical organization of the week. Workshop on Saturday and Sunday morning; social events on Monday and Tuesday, and possibly Thursday and a farewell drink on Friday.
- How about having 15 minutes breaks during a session? Ming-Chang reports that there were no complaints on having 15 minutes break during sessions so he interprets that as a good sign.
- Plan on three parallel sessions depending on number of abstracts. Three large lecture rooms at the Palace of the Academies of Belgium are available.
- Counting on 500 people which is a typical number for European meetings; there is room for 600 and 250 persons attending talks and poster sessions, respectively.
- Still waiting for confirmation for the Ice breaker in the City Hall of Brussels. The banquet will be a walking cocktail for maximum 450 persons at the Natural History Museum. It will be first come first serve. The Barringer lecture will take place in the Hotel Plaza which has room for 500 people. The lecture will be held by Prof Michaël Gillon, main PI of the TRAPPIST project that discovered the TRAPPIST-1 exoplanet system in 2016. The awards ceremony is planned in the venue in the Salle du Trone

(250 people) and will be broadcast to the other rooms. They will plan for using one of the rooms for the business meeting on Thursday after the morning session.

- Plans for two field trips on Wednesday afternoon to Waterloo and Gent.
- Current plans include two post conference trips to the Battlefields of WW1 and WW2 and TRAPPIST abbey.

Should they plan for more field trips? During past meetings the post conference meetings were cancelled because of low attendance. Suggestion to offer, e.g., Rochechouart or Nördlingen with the caveat it will be cancelled if the number of people is too low.

- Two workshops which could be combined about extraterrestrial curation and Antarctic micrometeorites as workshops. 1 or 1 1/2 days (Saturday/Sunday) workshops.
- Preliminary accounting: Still hoping for sponsorship from the City of Brussels and the Belgian science policy paying for the rental of the Museum and the City Hall. Costs: Conference center will be about € 38,500
Assumption is attendance of 500 people, which amount to registration fees of € 550 for full members and € 350 for students.
- Clarified in person only! No virtual option, maybe optional to broadcast; people listening is fine but not presenting.

Only in person meeting and potentially competing with Olympics in Paris which will likely make travel more expensive and should be emphasized to members, e.g., in the Newsletter. Further recommends to raise membership's awareness to making travel plans early and register early. Late registrations in large number make planning especially difficult for organizers. One option could be substantially higher late registrations fees to push for early registration.

Walking cocktail has a great list of food. It should facilitate the planning for the banquet as no seating is needed. Kevin McKeegan thinks it looks fantastic and the plan covers everything but how about costs for poster sessions? Only renting boards is needed. Those costs are not yet included in the calculation. He further recommends contacting committee chairs, to see if they plan to hold a pre-conference workshop, e.g., Impact cratering committee, Astromet. Those should be given a deadline to allow for time planning for rooms and support.

Should they plan for childcare? Support it and be as accommodating as is possible but also reasonable. Check with prior meeting hosts, e.g. Berlin about their experiences.

What do you need:

Council needs to approve the budget in the March time.

Role of LPI? UCLA started serious discussion about the abstracts during LPSC time. Face to face meeting for 1 1/2 hours. LPI gave them a generic schedule that worked very well and that they can share.

Think about setting up an Awards committee for Travel Awards, etc.

3. Award Reports

3.1. McKay Award (Alex Ruzicka)
15 min

4:00 pm UTC

Alex Ruzicka reports on the procedures and outcome of the McKay and Wiley awards. It was a fun experience but a time issue to get all judges on board. Eventually they had five judges per student using the same criteria that were used last year. He explains score 1 and score 2. Score 1 is the overall score per student and averaging it. However, there is a lot of variability among the judges which may cause a bias. Score 2 is a ranking for each judge. They took the mean score of an individual judge and scale its evaluation to that. Both scores correlate and are giving some consistency. Committee liked score 2 and think it brilliant, so that was the one used to inform the final recommendations. Top two candidates were suggested for the McKay award and 5 students for the Wiley award. The committee was unanimous in the recommendation.

Questions: How about close rankings and differences between score 1 and score 2? Score 2 is the one that should be used. How about non-native speakers? Is there a bias? What are the statistics of an institutional break-down and are there extra points? There were no extra points for non-native speakers and no institutional break down. The numbers to check the statistics for institutional break-down are there and it should be done. It was suggested that judges should state whether student and evaluator are native speakers. It was further raised that questions are likely more difficult to answer for non-native speakers than for native speakers as it involves free speech. It may be worth to take that into consideration when weighing that criterion. There was need to specify that criterion, e.g., how to deal with cases when the student ran out of time and no questions could be asked. The committee developed a guidance to be passed on to future committees. Guidance as to how to weigh this criterion for non-native speakers can be added.

Helpful would be to collect information (e.g., language, etc.) at the time of registration when identifying as a student. That could help to get a detailed information about the affiliation of the candidate pool.

There was notice that introducing a score 2 this year produced an outcome different from using score 1. So the consequences of changing the score can affect the recommendation. Therefore it was suggested that it should be made a rule from now on to use score 2. The president reminds that there are no specific rules for the committee on scoring and it's up to the committee to apply the scoring tool they see fit to come to their decision. Tasha Dunn, a prior committee chair, explains that the procedures to evaluate judge's average and ranking, had been applied probably for the last 8 years.

Motion: To accept the Award listing as presented by the committee and accept the rationale of the committee for that ranking of candidates.

Move: Denton Ebel

Second: Tasha Dunn

All present are in favor (Two councilors left before the motion. One of them left a note that she would vote in favor to accepting the Award committee's listing).

Since there are no rules for the Wiley Awards, the president asked the Committee chair to come up with some rules. In this process the Award committee evaluated three options as to how many times the award could be won.

Op1: no restriction

Op2: only once

Op3: more than once but some restrictions, e.g., more than once but not in consecutive years.

All voted and were in favor for option 2.

The committee drafted rules that shall be published on the website.

Motion: Accept the recommendation of the Award Committee in regard to the Wiley Award.

Move: Denton Ebel

Second: Elena Dobrică

All present are in favor (9 councilors)

4. Other business

4:30 pm UTC

5.

- The dates for the annual meeting of the Meteoritical Society in Frankfurt, Germany in 2026 were announced by Jutta Zipfel. The meeting has been scheduled for August 10 until Friday August 14, 2026. The hosts made sure that there is no overlap with the Goldschmidt Conference which will be held in Palais des Congrès de Montréal, Canada in July 12-17, 2026. The secretary, who is also a co-host of the Frankfurt meeting, asked for approval of these dates by council.

Motion: Approve the dates for the annual meeting of the Meteoritical Society in Frankfurt, Germany on August 10-14, 2026.

Move: Jutta Zipfel

Second: Elena Dobrică

All present are in favor

- Henner Busemann: Brings two points to the attention of council: (1) He was approached by members of the society who, for environmental reasons, were unhappy about the plastic gifts (goodies) given out at the UCLA meeting. He suggests that meeting organizers should be asked to not to give out plastic gifts. This could be included in the handbook/guidelines for meeting organizers. (2) Younger students are more and more opposed to travel far for annual meetings because of CO₂ emissions. Is there a way to select meeting localities that do not require far travel? He is sensing that ignoring this demand will cause the society to lose younger membership on the long run.
- Discussion about (1): Different opinions were expressed: Meeting organizers should be advised to minimize the "stuff"; bags are nice and not made out of plastic and may be used for long times; the mug was better than using paper cups because it could be reused - advise not to use paper cups may be needed; decision should be left to the organizers but one could advise more generally to be environmentally conscious; an opinion was shared that symposiums on Wednesday afternoon are better than excursions to a place someone does not want to be seeing; another opinion pointed out that sharing cultural experience with

colleagues was part of the initial motivation for having the annual meeting moving; **Advice to organizers:** Give the organizers a feeling that there is no expectation for them to provide free gifts, and encourage people to be environmentally responsible as possible.

- Discussion about (2): Young members benefit the most from the meetings. One could advise to use trains as travel means, if possible; Also to make it clear to students to use the opportunity to spending more time at the venue to make things beyond the meeting, e.g. visiting other institutions. This may open up post doc or other job opportunities. Also, MetSoc members are spread across the globe, so there is no one place that is close to all members, and hence the annual meeting moves around to share the opportunity to have a meeting local to members in different countries and continents.

The president thanked council for constructive discussion and ended the meeting.

6. Adjourn

4:55 pm UTC