Minutes for OCNS Board Meetings in Jeju in July 2016

July 20th 2016, 09:30-16:30 & July 22 2016, 12:00-14:30

Attending: Astrid Prinz, Daniel Wojcik, Volker Steuber, Anthony Burkitt, Padraig Gleeson, Thomas Nowotny, Martin Zapotocky, Erik De Schutter, Pierre Yger, Sharon Crook, Jaeseung Jeong, Ben Torben-Nielsen, Ingo Bojak
Not In Attendance: Victoria Booth, Maurice Chacron, Michele Giugliano, Szymon Leski, Nicoladie Tam, Eleni Vasilaki, Daniele Marinazzo, Antonio Roque

0. Approval of Agenda
Approved

1. Approval of Minutes
Approved

2. Legal Matters

2a. Election of the President
We need to elect a president for 2017-2018. The board has re-elected Astrid for another term.

2b. Board Composition 2017
We need someone shadowing the Treasurer to become the Treasurer when Volker's term is complete, preferably from the US. There are ideas about someone to approach. Astrid will follow up on this.

2c. Directors Rotating Off
Padraig, Marja-Leena, Petr, Thomas, Antonio and Martin are rotating off the board. Also, Szymon has taken an industry job.

2d. Task Divisions
Tasks needed are Social Media, Postdoc Workshop Organizer, Program Book Assistant, Travel Awards Assistant, Tutorial Assistant, Member Approval (could overlap). If a student is specifically elected for social media, the Secretary could handle other communications. For the rest of these positions, they will be offered to newly elected board members.

There was some discussion about the Program Book and what is needed for this position. We also discussed issues with abstract submission. Astrid will follow up on this after the meeting and solicit ideas for someone who could do this ex-officio.

A Program Committee Chair Trainee is needed. If this person is not currently on the Program Committee, they should be put on the PC for a year to shadow Tony. We discussed a few possible names, and Tony will discuss this further with Astrid after the meeting.

2e. Director Elections for 2017
Based on this discussion, we will elect four new members, where one is a student, one is a postdoc, and two are faculty. Depending on the ability to get a Treasurer Trainee, we may include one more faculty member in the elections.

Prior involvement in CNS is part of the candidate information and will affect the election results so there is the feeling that we do not need to worry about this during director elections. However, we voted unanimously to add a rule that candidates must demonstrate prior involvement in the field of computational neuroscience. The Nomination Committee can ensure that candidates are not from the same lab, but currently there is no formal rule about this. We want to have a new rule that there is at most one person from a lab on the list of candidates, and candidates cannot come from the lab of a current board member. We voted (11 yes and one abstain) that no candidates will be accepted that would cause two board members from the same lab.

Nomination Committee: Daniel, Erik, Sharon

2f. Executive Committee Composition
Astrid (President), Volker (Treasurer), Sharon (VP/Secretary), Erik (past President), Tony (PC Chair), Victoria (past Treasurer), Michele (LO)
Board Representatives: Daniel and Pierre (voted unanimously)

3. OCNS Members

3a. Report on membership and dues
OCNS has
- *172 faculty members (2015 was 200)*
- *118 postdoc members (2015 was 147)*
- *304 student members (2015 was 360)*
- *1104 inactive members (2015 was 792)*

The majority of the attendees are from Korea, but very few of them became members. Membership numbers vary depending on whether the meeting is held in Europe or US/Asia. There was a brief discussion of how to make membership more attractive including multi-year membership. Multi-year memberships may not always be reimbursed by universities but we could still have it as an option. We might email more inactive members to warn them to re-apply.

3b. Members meeting
At the members meeting we should encourage multi-years memberships. We should try to get more feedback from the members in general. Perhaps we could have a raffle/lottery just for the

members. The agenda for the board meeting should be sent to the members two weeks before the meeting to elicit questions and comments that could be discussed at the meeting. We could also send a survey to get more structured feedback. After the board meeting, members should receive a summary of the discussion. The process for engaging with the members should be improved.

3c. Honorary members
This point was removed from the agenda.

3d. Social media
We would like to see a board member who is very active in social media. There is an idea to get a student or younger board member whose specific job would be to increase the social media presence as discussed in item 2.

4. CNS meetings
4a. Report on CNS*2016
Out of 341 registrants, 73 registrants have not yet arrived, where 30 registered only for the workshops. For future years, the PC should verify attendance of the speakers, checking up a week before the meeting. We might also have one or two backup speakers, which is usually done. One idea is to coordinate with the registration desk to see whether people have arrived. There also was some discussion of confirming that students are getting supervision in creating their talks. Jaeseung went through the numbers and costs for the social events. Jaeseung was very successful in obtaining local funds which were mostly used to pay for the social events. There was some discussion of other budget issues including T-shirt sales.

4b. Report on CNS*2017 planning
No hotel discount is planned. All locations can be reached by walking only. The provisional budget is 61,000€ for 400 attendees and 90,000€ for 700 attendees (excluding the banquet). The website for 2017 should be online as soon as possible in order to start filling in info as it is known. The grants and sponsorships are estimated to be around 10,000€. The dates are 15th-20th of July. Erik proposes to give some funds to Michele to hire some admin support, and also proposes that he may need help from neighbours for the organization since no one else in Antwerp seems to be interested in being involved in the meeting. There was further discussion of the banquet and that we may need to subsidize the banquet cost to help keep costs down to $50. There also was discussion about the lack of a social event beyond the reception and the banquet. Any large venue that would hold everyone would be very expensive. We voted unanimously to accept the budget. (We agree that we will look at budgets on a case by case basis rather than making rules.)

4c. Planning for the Program Committee
Tony has sent a summary file with quantitative information. In summary, there are a large number of submissions from Korea, but Japan and China are not well represented. There are no attendees from South America. In the future, we might need to coordinate with other

societies. This year it was difficult to find keynote speakers, due to overlapping with the dates for FENS (12 declined). There are three people to replace on the Program Committee, which will need to be done after the meeting by email. Additionally, we should recruit a new PC Chair in order to have some overlap. We will need to recruit seven people to the PC in 2017, which we may want to announce this year so that people can plan. There was some feedback that the message for oral rejection should be revised and the documents for ConfMaster should be shared online.

4d. Planning for Tutorials
Ben served as the Tutorials Assistant this year and has learned to start earlier with planning. There was a consensus to keep the same structure for the tutorials for next year, but the structure and topics should be known and advertised before registration begins. Also, for tutorial speakers it should be very clear that the registration waiver is for the entire conference. There should be a shared Google doc with procedures and information in order to improve communication for organization of tutorials.

4e. Planning for Workshops
The workshop call went out a bit late, and only seven proposals were submitted. All were accepted with only one local proposal. There was some confusion about the vouchers and travel grants. The policies for this should be shared in a document. Information about registration waivers and travel funding should be included in the call for workshops on the website. Additionally, we should be ready to contact people to ask them to organize workshops in years where attendance is anticipated to be lower.

4f. Travel grant and tutorial/workshop support procedures
See Daniel's file for quantitative information. In summary, there were 50 applications, and all applicants with abstract scores higher than 4 were funded. 29,000€ was spent plus 2,000€ funding from Brain Corporation. There was discussion of some issues with fraudulent requests for visa letters. We are already verifying registration but there was an issue with stolen credit cards so the Travel Chair should check on identities if possible.

4g. Call for CNS*2018

Seattle proposal
There is a feeling that the budget is too expensive for the dinner and socials, and it is not clear whether the location of the halls is included in the projected budget. Also the lecture rooms are not multiplied by days in the budget. It is not clear what the cost would be for a higher number (say 450) of attendees. We should ask them: Is there is a limit on the number of student accommodations that we can get since the prices for housing are very expensive? Is the student housing available to all attendees or to students only?

In principle, we all approve of the location but the budget must be sorted out as soon as possible (11 for and one abstained).

Joint meeting with INCF

There has been discussion of a joint meeting with the INCF but there are concerns about the overlap with CNS since there are areas covered by INCF that may not be of interest to CNS attendees. But this might be fine if there is only one day or one afternoon of overlap. If 2018 is in Seattle, then the joint meeting with ICNF in Canada would be for 2020, so there is time to debate this.

There is a feeling that having CNS in Brazil will be problematic for Americans due to requiring a visa which reduces the attractiveness for people who are not accustomed to having to obtain a visa.

4h. Call for CNS*2019

We should seek proposals from Europe. Barcelona has a growing computational neuroscience presence and would be a good location. Sharon would be happy to discuss this with people who are there to see if they would be willing to put together a proposal. The application needs a few updates before the call for proposals is announced.

For 2020 there is the possibility of INCF but also Australia or somewhere else in Asia

5) Financial matters

5.a Financial report on FY2015 and estimate of FY2016 expenses and CNS 2016 budget

See the financial report by Volker. Incomes are smaller, but expenses are also lower for CNS 2016. The balance is rather constant. The meeting is definitely not at a loss from a financial point of view.

5.b Sponsors

We will encourage more sponsorship for next year.

5.c Financial planning for 2017

It would be great to have more sponsors on board. Otherwise, the financial situation is quite healthy. There was some discussion about the numbers for registration waivers and travel funding for next year with a general consensus that the travel budget does not need to be increased. There are likely to be many attendees with many people who are relatively local. We propose 10,000€ for the tutorials, 12,000€ for the workshops, and 30,000€ for the travel grants.

5.d Budget approval

Budget is approved with a quorum, despite the weather!

6) Registration, submission, payment, and review procedures

6.a. Eligibility for full refund
Padraig updated the wording on the website to make it clear that this case is actually a full refund minus processing fees. There was some discussion about who should be eligible (perhaps only someone whose abstract is not accepted) but since some people may not be able to attend without a travel award, it was decided that the policy should not be changed.

6.b. Fraudulent registrations and refund requests
This has been discussed during the report from the Travel Coordinator.

7) Abstract and publication issues

7.a. Blind review
There is consensus that this is not a good idea. Tony would not know where they come from, and it would be a logistic nightmare.

7.b. Abstract revision after reviewer comments
The main question here is of feasibility. IEEE provides reviewer comments, then there is the opportunity to update the four pages with a deadline for the revised version. Here for abstracts only, there is the question of whether it is worth it or necessary.

7.c. Previously published abstracts
We discussed that we need to be more explicit about what BMC (or future publisher) needs for publication. The authors cannot deal directly with BMC. It is not clear whether we need to indicate that abstracts should not contain previously published information.

7.d. Change in BMC publication format
Prices went up from 32 to 40 dollars per abstract, and the abstracts are grouped together in a single pdf. Ingo will look at other options for next year, because BMC may not be our solution for the future. Frontiers applies a fee of 12€ per abstract.

8) Miscellaneous and matters arising

8.a. OCNS hosting of compneuro mailing list
We have control of the emails @cns.org, but moderators need a google account. New moderators are needed, and we need to find a way of how to add users without a Google account. The mailing list should be much more visible on the OCNS website if we are taking over the management and the text associated with the mailing list should also be changed to reflect this.

8.b. Matters arising
Already discussed.

8.c. Discussion of the structure of the meeting
Daniel expressed concerns with the structure of the meeting. This is a very long meeting if you want to attend everything. There is the option to have multi-tracks and mix the workshops and

the main meeting, shortening the meeting by one or even two days. Daniele will draft a multi-tracks proposal. People agree that there is a balance between the main meeting and the workshops. There possibly could be more poster sessions and fewer talks. There was a survey in Paris which was sent around to the board, which did not seem to suggest that attendees strongly prefer a different format but should be consulted for feedback.