

1 and 2. Please identify your primary and secondary fields of expertise**Other Primary (please specify)**

- Field station director
- AAAS fellow
- For-profit business executive
- research scientist at academic institution
- citizen-scientist (non-profit org ED)
- Research Scientist at academic research lab
- Federal Agency
- Scientist at academic research lab

**Other
Secondary**

Microbiology
 Microbial
 ecology
 Microbiology
 Oceanography
 Climate
 ecotoxicology
 Climatology

4. Specified countries of origin

USA
 China
 Germany
 Colombia
 Chile
 Canada
 New Zealand
 United
 Kingdom
 Taiwan
 Ireland
 NIGERIA
 Brazil

5. Other Ethnicities

European
 native european
 Iberian

6. Representation and Diversity

- 3rd world countries should be more involved
- Biogeochemistry needs more attention in GLEON.
- More undergraduates and master's students might be encouraged to participate
- Need for physical limnologists
- Much better than other meetings I have been to
- More African Americans and African delegates needed
- Student organization public speaking seemed dominated by male participant.
- Very few mid-careerish females. Very few from non-research institutions. Good male and female representation among grad students, although most appeared to be from US.
- good job with diversity!
- Seemed like there were fewer women in front-and-center roles than at GLEON 8
- More people from computer science would be good.

7. Receptivity

- Postdocs slip through the cracks...
- different cultures should be taken into account

- Non-academics I feel were a little slighted. The way TK talked about Mike's presentation I thought could have been worded better. I also thought some of the older researchers didn't always think about their actions around students. It is good, but from those researchers that have never been involved before, they don't quite understand the emphasis on treating students well.
- maybe due to the language barrier, the working group is not easy for non-English speaker to join in
- The working groups tend to separate along discipline lines, which inhibits interdisciplinary development in each research track.

8. Reason for attending

- To learn how other GLEON sites are doing. To learn new things in the field.
- Meet and talk to people about possible buoy deployment in the lake that I work in
- Connecting with other scientists
- Requested by supervisor
- communicate with scientists worldwide
- networking
- Expose my work in progress to the community and obtain feedback
- to update my knowledge about ecology and modeling
- Exchange of information with other GLEON members sites
- interested and getting ready to deploy a buoy installation
- scientific cooperation
- To finish a ms related to GLEON and get new ideas
- Continue cutting edge scientific participation
- Collaborations, action items
- scientific collaboration on a global scale
- Discuss projects and see other examples
- Working groups
- Participate in Science
- Networking
- To assist in running GLEON buoy at our site and IT side
- international science networks
- To learn more about the organization and if it fits with my research goals.
- meeting people, sharing idea
- I've wanted to attend a GLEON mtg for awhile, this was the first time it was convenient.
- Closer to home; Traveling to Wisconsin for other business
- chance to work on collaborative research
- searching collaboration opportunity
- Networking
- To get in touch with other people doing studies similar to mine; to learn from others, and to be productive with them
- collaboration, research, great science
- Trying to decide if I should push ahead with major research project related to buoys
- Make personal contacts and advertise products
- to share experience and idea with other members
- Follow up on ongoing projects, and get inspired for new research
- networking science
- learning from GLEON mbrs; contributing C-S activity
- Communicate with metabolism group
- Interact on science topics
- To keep in contact with old colleagues and meet new ones.
- Networking; science; find new collaborators
- New research projects; haven wanted to go for awhile now; location

- Looking for better Science
- Networking
- Interact with collaborators
- Buoy/sensor/IT information, collaborative projects
- Continued interaction researchers involved with monitoring efforts
- Possible future buoy deployment
- to maintain my involvement in the network
- Networking
- Information management aspects of the project
- People networking
- lake science
- The low travel time made the meeting attractive and the workshop on physical limnology was valuable to my research
- learning
- To learn more about using sensors in my own system
- networking
- learn more a lot
- To gain exposure to varying aspects of limnology
- I love GLEON!!
- TO interact with other scientists who are conducting high frequency long term ecological monitoring
- Networking and sharing views
- Information Management
- Learn about the network and meet colleagues with similar interests addressing similar problems
- interest in the science and information technology issues
- Networking, collaboration
- keep and expand my work network
- For IT supporting and understanding the GLEON
- communicate with someone in the same research field
- Career, networking and job
- learn and make contacts

10. Participating in Future GLEON Meeting

- I realised that there is still a lot to learn and share. Participating in more GLEON meeting will strengthen my understanding for this matter
- It's a great meeting
- Group meetings could be better by mixing people from different fields
- I would consider it if my future work gets oriented toward lake ecosystems
- Depends on the fellowship
- really valuable experience, welcoming group
- I learned a lot in a very short time by getting connected to the right people.
- I appreciated the NPP greatly. Thank you very much!
- An excellent forum for meeting other persons interested in lake science and instrumentation. Enjoyed the experience very much!
- Can not afford to go to every meeting
- That can provide me new ideas in study.
- A new member orientation was recommended by one of the passengers in our van - sounds like a great idea to bring people up to speed on the agendas of the different breakout groups.
- If funding were available
- The frequency of meetings makes it difficult for me as a faculty member to attend each meeting. This means that I cannot be as involved with the network as I would like.
- I'd be most likely to attend meetings in North America because of travel time and costs
- NO

- You can't keep me away
- I learn a huge amount at Gleon meetings
- Travel to meetings outside N. America will not work well for me, but that is not GLEONs problem. I will try to attend N. America meetings regularly.
- the best science meeting
- With the hope that GLEON will expand its scope
- very nice meeting

11. Hope to gain from meeting

- To generate scientific contributions
- Continuing/completing work currently underway
- Gain momentum in various action items (review papers, proposals)
- This meeting greatly helped give my research more direction. I look forward to attending future GLEON meetings. Thank you for this opportunity.
- Identify possible sources of funding to maintain buoy networks.
- Make the community aware of my company's environmental measurement products.
- share my perspectives
- Make new collaborations
- Find collaborators interested in applying the GLEON data to big-picture science questions. To establish research partners, in other words.

13. General meeting comments

- Sally MacIntyre's opening lecture was excellent!
- The selection of workgroups could be increased...
- Littoral/pelagic working group
- Biogeochemistry group was excellent!
- It would have been helpful to have summaries of the previous meeting's working groups presented, perhaps before the cool things presentations. I recognize that this information is partly on the web, but updates of what has happened since the previous meeting would be valuable in creating new working groups. Also, some of the working groups were too large to be maintained.
- The cool things session would have benefitted by the addition of 1-2 minutes (of the 10 minutes) allocated for questions.
- Extremely difficult to foster all members of working group due to different stages (some new, some well developed collaborations and outcomes, etc.). This needs to be addressed.
- EU funding opportunities breakout group. Important to get that started
- Other working groups very good = GLAMMR and biogeochemistry + sediment/water interaction
- I liked the ad-hoc groups. Worked out very well.

Not very happy about the student workshop. Very little work, all presentation. Still an ok introduction, but no hands on work.

Cool ideas seemed a bit much. Too many, too long. They seemed like just normal presentations at ASLO and such. Cool things was supposed to be very quick introductions to half baked ideas, not full presentations. I would prefer less of such presentations, and more feature presentations or maybe a expert panel of something important to GLEON.

- There were zero questions asked of the presenters during the "cool things" session. This is unacceptable. Speakers seemed pretty rushed and had no time for taking questions. 10 minutes is too short ... I would recommend 15 minutes with "required" time for questions.
- Other working group: Buoy deployment. A good start on this.
- EU funding group
- Lentic/pelagic working group
- A little more attention could be made to setting up additional work groups rather than doing it Ad Hoc.
- The plenary/"Cool things" could be broken down into two categories: New sites/new

member info and then real "cool things" that are cutting edge projects, ideas, and calls for collaboration. I think that the talks were too long in some cases, and that perhaps new members introducing themselves and their site could be limited to 5 minutes, and then cool things to 7, with 3 minutes for questions/discussion if necessary.

- Meetings need more free time. There are many ad hoc groups, and finding time (other than evenings) to meet was challenging.
- A few too many 'cool things.' There are some challenges in balancing moving forward with on-going projects and integrating new people into working groups. There also seems to be a need for cross-talk between groups. The physical, modeling and IT expertise are needed to move some of the biological projects forward and this can't happen if they're sequestered in their own groups.
- "Cool ideas" session seemed to be less about cool ideas than the presentation of individual research
- The meeting with Journalists was good but went on a bit long - some of the journalists seemed to like the sound of their own voices!

15. Why not contributing data at this point

- My lake is not on the network yet. We are still looking for ways to deploy a buoy. Once that is done, we will contribute
 - We do not have an instrumented lake
 - Because we don't work in limnology
 - Buoys not yet active
 - Connected in every way except that we operating our own data collecting network.
 - one day! we worked on ideas for funding from our county to do this
 - No data
 - Just joined GLEON. Will eventually contribute data.
 - No buoy.
 - My business manufactures measurement equipment. We do not directly obtain measurements. So we have no measurements to contribute.
 - Restrictions on the type of equipment which can be deployed within a national park.
 - Don't have relevant data.
 - No buoy, but we are considering installation and joining the network.
 - Not quite there yet...
 - I don't belong to a site.
 - Don't have a site yet - still trying to get it funded.
 - No buoy data at this time. We do have lots of streamflow and lake level data on the internet.
 - We don't have a buoy.
 - There is no buoy affiliated with my institution
 - We don't have data to contribute
 - I didn't have combine with GLEON data.
 - We still have no site, but probably soon
 - Have plans to contribute.
 - My use of continuous monitoring buoys is sporadic and in a river. For now I am assuming that this sort of data collection is not the central focus of GLEON
 - still working on the hardware for that purpose, behind the schedule
 - Site not functional
 - dont have buoys

18. Why not using network data yet

- I am a new member. still learning how the GLEON data can be used in deep tropical system
- No need for it at this time
- scientific reasons

- no project that requires such data (yet)
- I haven't found a scientific question necessary or congruent with the data.
- I'm still new, so I probably will be participating in data exchange soon.
- Haven't had the need yet, but plan to
- I don't have big research focus for my job
- I am not at a data analysis stage.
- I am working on other projects at the moment.
- I'm new to GLEON and am just now integrating myself with the community.
- Data not required for my business.
- Only now becoming interested in collaborations.
- We have questions brewing that could use GLEON data. Just not there yet...
- cooking up the idea!
- Not a scientist.
- Thus far, I have only been able to provide data to other Gleon members working on projects. However, I expect in the near future to contribute to interpretation, writing, and possible publication of the data.
- I haven't figured out how best to use this data for my own research, but I see the potential....
- Just haven't had the opportunity, yet.
- I am doing information management and not limnological research
- Have just about time to look after our own data!
- No need to use it.
- no need for it now
- No work done yet to require the use of data

19. Concerns about open sharing of data

- Concerned about auditing who downloads what and how they are using it
- no
- We are still learning how to do this effectively and fairly.
- Slight concern in that if others using data then there needs to be appropriate recognition of time and effort that has gone into establishing the data collection program.
- institute restrictions, duplication of work, compromising ongoing projects, co-authorship
- welcome it!
- some countries maybe prohibit long term meteorological data share
- I think students writing dissertations on GLEON data are in a catch-22: they are dependent on collaborators from other sites giving them data for their research (and these collaborators expect co-authorship); however, dissertations in general cannot always include co-authors.
- Not yet.
- I do not. I am impressed by GLEON's commitment to data sharing.
- no concerns
- None

20. Attending future workshops/meetings

Workshops

Funds limited

I found this meeting hard to get engaged in.
availability

21. Greatest challenges ahead for GLEON

- As more sites are added to the network, the amount of high frequency data is going to be huge. This is going to be a great challenge - in my view. Secondly, this may also cause budgetary constraints at deferent levels.
- Maintaining small meeting feeling with growing numbers

- Straightening out the IT and cyberinfrastructure so that it is more robust and is better able to stand on its own.
- how to show itself to world
- get representative sampling sites and data exchange and monitoring
- -Incorporate new types of data that helps to improve the understanding of lake ecosystems.
-Integrate the lakes within the context of the watershed or ecoregion they are located (terrestrial/aquatic interactions)
- GLEON must be a GLOBAL network of data exchange, technology and knowledge.
GLEON needs to support initiatives in developing countries
- Remaining small enough to be grass roots.
- Climate change
- Funding and New science questions
- A still rapidly growing membership with people at various levels of expertise and familiarity; these disparities have potential to lead to disappointment as people's relative levels not catered for in one large working group.
- Continuity in working groups
- Top quality scientific outputs
- too many people; scope creep
- There are so many great collaborations and ideas generated and so little time.
- Funding
- GLEON's increasing size could be intimidating for new members to get involved in the small working groups.
- Validating and integrating sensor data with ecosystem models
- Long term sustainability of funding for network
Growing from grassroots organization
- Continuous funding
- Adapting the working group with a growing number of participants.
- Obtaining funding to continue long-term buoy deployments.
- If the project continues to grow there could be some problems in maintaining the sense of community that now exists. However, it is not clear this will be a problem given that the project has grown considerably since I first became involved and the meetings and group dynamics just keep getting better
- lack of scientific topics
- Maintaining the same GLEON atmosphere at meetings as membership (and thus meeting attendees) continues to grow.
- expanding/growing and remaining inclusive and productive
- Growing beyond a Uni Wisconsin core group.
- Persuading the community to contribute quality data.
- 1) Using the myriad of data to investigate science questions. 2) getting further funding to continue GLEON. 3) writing a song praising GLEON
- managing growth and maintaining funding
- Adapting to fast growth; communicating with non-science groups
- Growing pains; the organization membership is growing rapidly and integrating those new members and their increasing breadth of experience and expectations will be a challenge while maintaining the small, informal, and open atmosphere which GLEON seeks to foster.
- Bringing a broader use of models into the collaborative efforts.
- Identifying the optimal size and transitioning between the founding members and the next batch of network leaders.
- Turnover in leadership. Up to now, I would have said funding, but I think that's not so much of a concern now (evidenced by all of the grants in the network that have been funded).
More importantly, what will happen when Tim, Peter, Paul want to focus on different non-GLEON projects?
- It is good that the organization is growing. I will be interested to see whether and how GLEON stays focused.

- Generate science that cannot be done otherwise....
- Growth in membership and how that affects group dynamics; Funding for network-level activities; Transitioning to more and more science products
- Becoming too big or too top down driven, possibly nullifying the bottom-up "grass roots" character of the organization.
- Developing science products from the data in such a way that it justifies funding of these sites on the long-term.
- Funding. Other than NSF, or similar agencies in other countries, it is very difficult to get funding for a buoy monitoring basic lake mixing processes.
- growth
- Pushing the science forward from the endless, burgeoning amount of data collected towards a global synthesis. I feel that we are very busy with the management and developing analysis tools, but the science questions are not being identified or addressed.
- Managing growth. I think funding will come.
- Appropriately using/analyzing all this wonderful time series data.
- Effectively employing buoys to rigorously address ecosystem change at the global scale.
- growth and productivity
- QA/QC and keeping the grassroots feel as GLEON grows
- I think GLEON can connect more
- Getting bigger
- I think as interest in the network increases, it may be hard to maintain the workshop casual approach to workshops/meetings that allow everyone to interact with everyone – maybe there will have to be parallel sessions etc.
- Maintain interest and meeting goals while group grows substantially
- Institutional memory. This is particularly important with documentation of data services/web sites; Institutional knowledge. Knowing when to use already existing knowledge (data protocols/ standards) and when to develop new ones.
- One of the challenges (and it was acknowledged at the meeting) is how to make the working group concept as productive as possible. My suggestion would be to consider having different styles of "working groups". It seemed that within the metabolism working group there were several distinct goals that folks had. Some folks wanted to break into small groups and brainstorm proposals. Others were interested in learning more about metabolism. Others were interested in a broad discussion of what sort of metabolism ideas could be pursued in the future. All of these are good ideas and good things to do. The question is how to best organize to do all of them. I wonder if you might have "discussions" or "technical sessions" that are designed more for information exchange and for folks to learn about an area they are interested in and "working groups" would be more paper or proposal oriented. To be clear, this isn't a complaint, and the working group structure could probably accommodate this as it is. But there may also be a way to facilitate achieving these important, but different goals w/in a meeting.
 - integrating new sites
 - Refining science with large datasets -- streamlining research questions
 - Keep a small high geared group working, needed urgently some more products and, expand site exchange, foster new associations
 - Data storage and management
 - have a more complete use of the data sharing

23. Quality of logistics

- excellent meeting
- The food was not balanced.
- great venue for collaboration
- Coffee left a lot to be desired.
- maps of meeting location in folders would be helpful
- Meals were very rigid and structured. I would recommend more flexible timing for meals.

Not everyone is on the same schedule. Also, meetings rooms were VERY cold.

- The dance was great and everyone really liked it. The only problem with social events is that they essentially encourage excessive drinking. Alternatives evening activities on site (like a movie) or something might be good.
- increasing the sub-group organization (specific places, times)
- As a vegetarian who had to share a room with 10+ other people; I would just like to comment on how important good food and lodging are. It was hard to sleep in a room with 10 other people on different schedules, and I was as a result tired and hungry throughout the meeting. Next time, please restrict to <4 to a room- I know that it's not always possible, but it makes such a difference.
- The pre-meeting workshop room could have been a bit larger to accomodate more participants who arrived early.
- I'd like to see a workshop on equipment with a demo buoy setup that can be examined and discussed with the tech experts.
- Distribute as soon as possible the working group's reports

24. Participation in partnership program

- Yes
- Yes
- yes
- Yes, I am interested in participating at a future GLEON meetings.
- Yes
- na
- I don't know ... what is it?
- Maybe
- I'm not sure what this is...?
- Mayby if I knew what it was
- Yes
- yes
- Yes
- Don't know what it is, so can't really say.
- I tried but my partner left before we made contact.
- yes
- Yes I would
- I am not uninterested, but I am also unsure about how valuable my contribution to this program would be.
- yes of course
- not sure
- YES

30. Comments about the partnership program

- It would be probably useful to have partners communicate previously to the meeting so better understanding/confidence exist between them. This would probably help also to verify whether the partnership needs to be reevaluated due to differences in scientific interests.
- I felt a little guilty that I couldn't spend as much time with the student as I would have liked due to other commitments during the meeting
- The only difficulty is that there is very little time to spend with your NPP, unless you are in the same working groups.
- I had the best mentor of the week.
- This is a great program! Please keep it going!
- Mought have been nice to have a specific social to break the ice for this group at outset and maybe some suggestions of what would be useful for our student partners

- Not terribly useful. If program continues, suggest that senior partners not be new to GLEON. Felt forced and awkward, but that's ok. Maybe make this optional for students?
- I think the program should continue to be conducted in a similar way, but with less emphasis on advertising it as a way to be grouped with a Partner who has similar studies; while I think that it is good to be grouped with someone who has similar interests, there are advantages to being grouped with someone who has slightly different interests, and these advantages shouldn't be overlooked!
- I was not sure what the goal of the program was.
- Perhaps add more structure to what students/senior people are supposed to do in the NPP? I was unsure what our roles were/supposed to be.
- A good program I think, but very challenging to make meaningful time for it given all of the other activities that one is trying to pack into a short meeting
- This program is a keeper! My senior partner went above and beyond the call of duty to mentor me. Perhaps one comment is being aware of English-as-a-second-language student partners so that they may be paired with senior partners that are patient and accommodating to this. One additional comment is that perhaps a very brief, pre-partnership survey could be distributed to students attending upcoming GLEON meetings to ask them what their most important need/goal is in working with their mentor, so that they could be best matched with an appropriate partner.
- Great meeting -- I felt the social climate was very supportive of new ideas and collaboration. As a graduate student, I felt our value was recognized by the other attendees, and that made working groups comfortable.
- Students should ask questions otherwise the "mentor" is not helping a lot

34. Intro to GLEON Session

- The group of students was very big and the room in which we held the session was not adequate; Have two different sessions that may attain two different interests between the group.
- Graduate working group should be more hands on. Cool science presentations should be limited. I would suggest weeding out presentations that seem more like site overview etc. I love the half-baked ideas of the earlier cool things, but it seems like a lot of presenters are giving a poster session as a ppt.

35. Gained by attending

- Good friends
- Also meeting new friends

36. Recommendations to improve meeting for students

- The level of autonomy that the students have in GLEON is commendable
- more workshops
- More organized working groups.
- It has been done pretty well.
- Spend less time on the "cool things" session, more time on working groups which should report back from previous work.
- Postdocs might slip between the cracks a little bit, but they are a fairly small group.
- Don't go back to your room in the evening- the social hours are where most collaborations are formed.
- Keep up the good work! I've never been to a meeting where people were more engaged in posters.
- increase diversity - ethnic, age, cultural, language should be focused on while gender is good as it is.
- maybe more conversation between students and postdocs.
- Require students to attend 2 (instead of 1) different working groups. This would give us more interactions with others, and also give us an excuse to escape one without offending anyone.
- Yes, but would be forwarded to GLEON Steering Committee

37. Comments for GLEON Leaders

- No.
- Great meeting
- I think a tutorial in R could be useful to some people.
- Thank for a great meeting!
- If current growth trends in GLEON continue, I would consider adapting the current all hands twice annual meeting schedule. Keeping twice annual meetings where one is an all hands meeting and one is a more focused working group meeting might be more productive. Provided working groups are active between meetings, the time together might be utilized efficiently towards developing specific products.
- Marilyn was extremely helpful with my travel logistics and should be commended for all of the work she did night and day during and before the mtg.
- Thanks for a great meeting!
- NO
- Yes, that would be done later

39. Recommendations for topics for GLEON 9

- microbes
- -Techniques for data analysis and processing
- Biogeochemistry
- Nearshore environments and monitoring; Fluctuating aquatic ecosystems
- - spaeco might benefit from a more intensive workshops at this time (new domains of control)
- - more development of outreach materials for Lake Associations (great idea)
- Building physical limnology into existing GLEON working groups
- -network models (from systems biology)
- -Database handling
- Photoinhibition of phytoplankton; Matlab, R, and modeling
- Carbon-UV ecosystem coupling
- Calibrating pigment sensors; New autonomous sensors and sampling devices
- Looking at climate teleconnections (ENSO, PDO AMO etc) as drivers of lakes and how to separate out long term climate change from climate variability related to these teleconnections
- - need to recruit some atmospheric physicists to tackle this one.
- I would be interested in such a workshop, but I will not likely be able to attend the GLEON 10 meeting.
- I think that the idea of a lake modeling workshop that was mentioned at the meeting could be a good one. Another idea might be to encourage the working groups to meeting prior to and after the meeting, by making it easy for members to stay at the meeting site. It seems like many group projects are at an advanced stage where they would benefit from a focused day of work together. The cost would be minimal if they were already traveling to the main meeting anyway.
- Biogeochemistry
- Signal Processing!
Algal Physiology
- Statistical analyses
- Some sort of methods workshop for environmental sensing. For example I could provide a loaner LakeESP (<http://www.pme.com/HTML%20Docs/LakeESP.html>) which could be deployed for the duration of the conference and removed at the conclusion. It's self-serving I know, but the experience of actually deploying a buoy system would be a unique workshop. There would be shipping and anchor weight costs. Imagine how rewarding it would be to actually see the measurements flowing in during the conference...
- effect of pollution on freshwater ecosystem or lake metabolism
- Will not be attending GLEON 10

- modelling your lake
- New Technologies and methods
Climate Changes
- Hydrodynamics Model implementation (bring your own data with a hands on run through -perhaps led by David).
- 1. Intra-lake spatiotemporal variation in microbial ecology, metabolism, and respiration.
2. Fusion of remote and embedded sensing products.
- Lake Metabolism (sub-diel dynamics)
Using coupled physics-biogeochemical to learn about physical influences on lake metabolism.
- How to do large dataset time series analysis
- Something to do with Amazon river and her watershed
- That is if I were going.
- using buoy (DO) data to interpret lake metabolism
- Metabolic models "for dummies", student-led science paper/project (for instance, comparing metabolism or DO dynamics, etc across GLEON sites)
- Time series analysis techniques
- Basic mechanics of deploying sensors
- This could be something for a workshop or for some more working groups, but I would be interested in talking about linking the high resolution data (which is predominantly physical or chemical) with the more traditional biological variables measured in lakes – phytoplankton, zooplankton, fish, benthos - can they be linked? what information can the buoy data give us to better understand the openwater food web etc.
- Lake-stream interactions
Artificial lake water quality
Coastal lagoons
Knowledge transfer to developing countries regarding low cost equipment and techniques
- Instrumentation -- overview and training.
Science and the public.
- Subtropical Shallow lakes metabolism: processes, trophic structure and modeling.
- Apart from data collection from lakes, what next?
If there are no lakes, where does GLEON collect data?

40. Any additional comments?

- This was an overwhelmingly positive experience- thank you!
- no
- Effects of Climate change
- Better to have yearly all hands meetings.
- The cool things session should run to completion before beginning other business (i.e., not broken up by working groups, etc.). This is the way that people find out what others are doing, and at GLEON 9, some people had to wait until the 2nd to last day. Also, I would recommend moving many talks to posters. I find poster sessions to be much more effective. In fact, I would recommend having after-dinner drinks and poster sessions on each day of the meeting. People mingle at these really well. Drinks before dinner is less effective. Have an early dinner and then let them drink and mingle as long as they want afterwards.
- On the question of meetings I have often wondered if it makes sense to move so many people around the world twice a year for these meetings. But after attending a meeting I always feel it has been very valuable and well worth the effort. I understand the concern with the time and commitment required, but it is working. And my advice would be "if not broken dont fix it"
- I may have liked for the working groups to have more time to meet.
- provide more chances to help non-English speaker and non-limnology background attendant to get involved in the working group
- Communicate specifics a bit earlier. (Overall great job!)

- While much of the "cool things" sessions was great, there seemed to be a desire to present technical results (perhaps due to the need to justify travel?). Difficult to balance spontaneity, but perhaps have brief technical sessions and cool things separately.
- Invite some meteorologists or someone involved in one of the marine buoy programs to share insights into data use and science products.
- Keep up the good work!!
- NO
- Great work, these meetings have gotten better every time I have attended. I come home inspired and full of new ideas/collaborations.
- List people interested in a parallel agenda with locals
- When available, these would be communicated with the Steering Committee.