

[Print Page](#) | [Close Window](#)

14) ISSLR Future

Printed from: ISSLR Forums

Topic URL: http://www.isslr.org/forums/topic.asp?TOPIC_ID=199

Printed on: 03 Sep 2014

Topic:

Topic author: rjellison

Subject: 14) ISSLR Future

Posted on: 27 Jan 2008 11:24:19

Message:

Beginning in 1979 a loose confederation of salt lake scientists under the aegis of SIL (and more formally with incorporation of ISSLR in 2000) have held a series of successful international conferences on salt lake research: Adelaide, Australia (1979); Saskatchewan, Canada (1982); Nairobi, Kenya (1985); Banyoles, Spain (1988); La Paz, Bolivia (1991); Beijing, China (1994); Death Valley, USA (1999), Shira Lake, Khakassia, Russia (2002); Perth, Australia (2005), and Salt Lake City, USA (2008). Despite the success of these conferences, the formally incorporated Int. Soc. of Salt Lake Research has had marginal success in attracting and holding dues-paying members or engaging in activities beyond the hosting of the triennial conferences.

I suggest we have three basic alternatives:

- 1) Aggressively try to attract new members and volunteers to conduct the society's activities,
- 2) Maintain our current activities, but structure fees, website, media, and other publicity to that required to hold successful triennial conferences,
- 3) Dissolve our corporation and fold back into SIL and maintain the most active working group in that organization.

After considerable thought and our experience over the last 9 years, I prefer the latter. Here, I provide my primary reasons for your consideration.

1) I have always thought that a dues-paying membership of 250-300 was the minimum required to justify the formal structure of a society with its accompanying overhead. For whatever reason, lack of interest, demand, or leadership, we have failed to reach this and I think our experience shows there is little prospect of attaining it unless something radically changes.

2) I think there is nothing that we currently do that cannot be done just as well or better under the aegis of SIL's working group on Inland Saline Waters. There is an economy of scale that cannot be ignored, not only with respect to administration but also with respect to talent and a critical mass of researchers with related interests. An active SIL working group could receive higher visibility, involve much less overhead, be more professionally rewarding, and possibly promote our stated goals better. An active saline working group at the upcoming SIL meeting in Capetown, SA is an exciting prospect. I'm sure we could even organize our traditional post-conference tour there.

3) The study of saline waters has, in some respects matured, since the first conference in 1979. While still understudied, saline waters are no longer unknown and much of the research on saline waters is better viewed and contrasted as part of a continuum of limnological research (e.g. trophic dynamics, productivity, etc.). A look at the program from the last SIL meeting indicates saline lake studies scattered throughout the program. SIL is also less Eurocentric than in the past and has actively promoted limnology in developing countries where many salt lakes are found.

I think any decision can wait until after the GSL meeting, but I do think it appropriate to form a Futures committee that could report to the membership at the GSL conference. Please note that

we are required to have a members meeting at the conference. We should discuss the when, where, and agenda of this meeting and coordinate with Wayne.

Replies:

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 11:50:05

Message:

Bob,

I tend to agree with you that alternative no. 3 may be attractive. Maybe I have always been one of the more pessimistic members of the board, but the number of active - and paying - members that we currently have does not leave much place for optimism. With each meeting some colleagues residing close to the meeting venue always join the society if anyhow the membership dues are more or less included in the conference fee, but they will fail to show up at the next meeting held in another geographical location.

I am not a member of SIL and I have never attended one of their meetings, so I do not have the full picture of what it means to be a working group under the aegis of SIL, but it is clear to me that SIL is a large, viable organization that promotes the same kind of activities and interests as we do, only with a broader scope.

SIL also now has a journal, and that may be valuable for us as well. The extremely slow handling and publication of papers following the Khakassia meeting simply were an insult to those who made an effort to write up their stories, and what is happening now with the Perth meeting may turn out to be even worse. But that belongs to another agenda item.

Aharon

Reply author: shurlbert

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 16:20:17

Message:

When Bill Williams and Ian Bayly started this organization in 1979, a key objective was to make it more than an organization of just limnologists and biologists but to bring in geologists, geochemists, sedimentologists, etc. who were focused on phenomena not normally put under the ecological limnology umbrella. Bill worked especially hard to do that, though we never had large success in this.

If we regard it as unrealistic to try further to achieve this geological-biological interdisciplinarity, then folding back into SIL seems reasonable. That is the key issue in some ways.

Reply author: rjellison

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 16:57:55

Message:

I think Stu is right about the original intent in 1979, but limnology has broadened greatly in the intervening years and now accommodates or accepts these disciplines. You'll find microbiologists, geochemists, sedimentologists, etc. at SIL meetings as the recent one attests.

Reply author: shurlbert

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 17:29:04

Message:

Right, but Bill's concept was broader. For example, geologists who study evaporite deposits - often associated with salt lakes - don't come. I think Bill's concept was larger than limnology, which really is a branch of ecology.

Reply author: rjellison

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 19:44:42

Message:

I don't see that there would be any problem continuing triennial conferences as a SIL workgroup (Although I think we should with the SIL conference in Capetown). Actually most of the conferences were organized under the aegis of SIL. As I see it the main difference is trying to maintain separate memberships, journals, etc.

Reply author: adegermendzhy

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 19:51:32

Message:

Yes, but still there is a psychological difference in promoting conference having behind society or just working group. The status is different.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 19:56:03

Message:

Bob, you make a lot of sense. Just a few niggly points:

1. Who is going to administer the Williams Fund?
2. Who chooses the convenor of the group? At present he/she he chosen by SIL on the recommendation of someone, perhaps the previous convenor.
3. Who is going to organise the traditional post conference trip?

Does this mean we need more than just a convenor for our group (as all other SIL study groups have). I think we need a convenor (and who helps edit papers), a secretary treasurer and one other (perhaps the trip organiser). Or can the Williams Fund be handed over to SIL, though I would like think we (whoever we are) keep control on its awardees. On the Williams Fund is it topped up by our fees or is it living solely on bank interest? If the latter it will die if ISSLR folds up and it is handed over to SIL.

A agree the need to advance salt lake studies is not as great as in 1979 (though perhaps they are even greater given anthrogenic salinisation) and the need for a separate website not as great as 6-9 years ago. Certainly limnology has become somewhat more interdiscerplinary, though I too wonder that we are not quite there, e.g. purely geological papers. But we haven't had too many of these papers in recent years. Mianping is our only advocate. I doubt that he/his type could attend SIL meetings. So this is another possible shortcoming with the proposed new arrangements.

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 20:20:18

Message:

I agree with a lot of what Bob says, but I think ISSLR has the potential to attract more diverse scientists, managers and industrialists than does SIL. For example, with the coming meeting we've worked hard in advertising to reach out to the microbiologists. We should have done better with the industrial group with interests in commercial production.

We're anticipating 200-250 people at the meeting, so there is certainly a chance that we'll attract a more diverse group of people. It will be good to judge from the Salt Lake City meeting as to whether there is the potential for growth and diversity, or whether we should go back into SIL and focus on limnology.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 20:24:56

Message:

Relating to Wayne's input: it may well be true that the Salt Lake City meeting will attract

industry, new local members, etc., but they will probably not stay in the association when next meeting will be held in a different geographical area.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 23:59:10

Message:

Boy Aharon you are a wet blanket! But I think you are right.

However because of the site (at Great Salt Lake; In USA; and great organisers) we are going to attract more people than usual and a wider range of disciplines. SIL meetings would rarely, if ever, do that for salt lakes. And another minus for SIL meetings, is their large size; I prefer smaller meetings where I can see/talk to the same people every day. There is a family feel about them, rather than a clinical experience. I have to admit though, that folk do not like attending meetings in remote places like Perth and Lake Shira. So we probably cannot repeat the upcoming Great Lake Experience any time soon. This is an argument for SIL Cape Town 2010 as long as a good post conference tour is proposed to include saline sites.

Reply author: mcoleman

Replied on: 28 Jan 2008 02:37:08

Message:

I have attempted to follow this but have had a lot of difficulty, including what it means to be associated with the SIL. I do not disagree with what people have said but I am not willing to agree with dissolution as I think it would be premature. I readily admit that I do not have the experience of the other board members on these matters. I can say that more cross discipline researchers/field workers in WA are becoming interested in saline wetlands. Could they could participate if we reformed as part of the SIL?

Reply author: rjellison

Replied on: 28 Jan 2008 07:01:09

Message:

Brian raises several issues that would need to be addressed if we chose option 3. I don't think any of them cannot be suitably addressed as a working group.

Regarding small international conferences in remote locations, there is nothing to prevent a SIL working group from organizing these. In essence, we have been acting as an active working group for many years.

My intent in raising this issue was to receive others' initial responses and then to form a "Futures" committee to report to the board (and perhaps membership) at the GSL conference. In no way should this dampen enthusiasm for or impact planning and conduct of the GSL meeting. The meeting's success and merit is entirely independent of this issue.

The timing of raising this issue was two-fold. First, the triennial meetings are the only time a majority of us can sit down together and discuss these issues face-to-face. Second, our annual board meetings tend to discuss the same issues with no or little action taken in between. We really do need to consider which of the three options I first put forward we are pursuing. If we think we are trying to build a viable society (option 1) we need some serious volunteer effort. In option 2, we might do away with dues and just collect a surcharge from conference registration to fund the Williams' award. Option 3 would need to be explored with SIL.

I suggest a Futures committee be formed consisting of interested board members, that it fleshes out what each of the three options entail, and that they set aside a significant amount of time to meet at GSL. We could meet during Wednesday or during a 3-day post-conference tour.

Reply author: rjellison

Replied on: 28 Jan 2008 08:25:03

Message:

Wayne has just emailed me concerning the scheduling of a members meeting at the GSL Mtg and suggests Monday night as a possible time to schedule it. By law, all corporations with members are required to hold regular meetings of the members. Our bylaws specify members' meetings are held at the triennial conference. This is an opportunity to inform the members of the society's activities, recruit volunteers, and let members voice their concerns or provide other input.

I suggest that Brian, as president, create the agenda and conduct the meeting. One of the smaller meeting rooms and an hour's time is probably sufficient.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 28 Jan 2008 12:05:03

Message:

I see the Williams award dying through lack of funding if we disband and go for the SIL option. This is a definite negative for this proposal. I might add though that Uni of Adelaide has a Williams Fund earning interest and through Micheal Geddes it may well be able to fund one award (or more) every three years.

Reply author: rjellison

Replied on: 28 Jan 2008 13:08:59

Message:

I do not see the Williams' Award dying for lack of funding. I think it would be a simple matter to raise \$350/yr to ensure this continues. I am much more inclined to ask for monies to fund a student award than dues for a society with only 46 members. I think an active working group could easily ensure this continues to happen.

Reply author: adegermendzhy

Replied on: 29 Jan 2008 02:36:13

Message:

I feel both pro and contra being just a SIL group. I think we would like to continue ISSLR if enough enthusiasm and volunteer work support its activity. Now it seems that we are running out of them. Probably the GSL meeting will bring some younger enthusiasts who can give a new impetus to society. I think that we should seek for the new President of society who should be relatively young and ambitious person from US (US – because we should admit that US science dominates the scientific world). Otherwise, of course, continuing as a SIL group is more appropriate at the current stage.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 29 Jan 2008 05:41:23

Message:

I do not agree with the statement that the US dominates the academic world. Science is international, and not restricted to national borders. The new president may have any nationality, the only condition is that he is enthusiastic and will promote the interests of the society.

Reply author: rjellison

Replied on: 29 Jan 2008 07:34:39

Message:

I think a reality check is in order here. I started this topic saying we have basically 3 alternatives.

- 1) Aggressively try to attract new members and volunteers to conduct the society's activities,
- 2) Maintain our current activities, but structure fees, website, media, and other publicity to that required to hold successful triennial conferences,
- 3) Dissolve our corporation and fold back into SIL and maintain the most active working group in that organization.

At present, the society is basically a small group of interested persons maintaining continuity between triennial conferences. That's option 2. That's okay, but if that is all we aspire to we should structure ourselves accordingly. Under that option I think it silly to maintain a VISA/MC merchant that costs almost as much to have as the dues collected with it or even to have dues. Also, as I've argued above, I think we could conduct that mission more successfully as a SIL working group (option 3). We would reach more people and it would likely be more professionally productive and satisfying.

From the discussion above, it seems most of you are holding out for the idea of a viable Int. Soc. Salt Lake Res as originally envisioned (Option 1). I see no evidence that we are moving toward this. Yes, membership ebbs and flows with the triennial conferences, but we still only have 46 dues-paying members after 9 (or 30 depending on how you count) years of existence. I think those of you who are arguing for option 1 and want to remain on the board should realistically assess what you have done to promote the society and what you are willing to do differently the next couple years so that we begin moving toward a viable society of 250-300 members.

Reply author: mcoleman

Replied on: 29 Jan 2008 17:01:06

Message:

I like the way that you get to the point Bob. The options are really objectives with Option 2 being our current 'apparent' objective.

As stated we need to broaden our range of appeal and approach people outside of the biological academic stream if we wish to go for Option 1 or even stay as Option 2. There are very few hydrologists and conservation managers as far as I know in the organisation. I will make a concerted effort to approach them now I am aware that is what we need to do.

On the matter of funds I am aware that Bob feels that credit card expenses are high and it is no big deal to drop it but I am sure that it will get heavy use on a conference year. It may be a cost that we have to bear for the third year. I am sure that this point is an aside to the main topic.

But it does raise a little niggle I have about our structure. I spent a lot of effort hunting for sponsorship last conference from my clients. I had assurances for \$10k from clients and they asked to be invoiced but as far as I know no invoices were issued - it did not work basically for lack of structure within ISSLR. This was dealt with by the local committee in Perth of which I am part - so I am responsible too and not trying to blame anyone. Wayne may have a system that he can pass on.

My point being is that there is a lot of work to do if we wish to get 'bigger' and go for Option 1. Frankly I think we run the risk of collapsing the current organisation if we try too hard but we need to improve even if we follow Option 2.

Option 3 means that we will never have the opportunity of coming back to Option 1 or 2 if we are not happy. It seems to have a lot going for it especially for the academic members. I think that we will lose a lot of the non academic members but attract a different group.

I think that we need to flesh out the benefits and risks of each option, present it to the members and then I am afraid identify the strategies to implement it and allocate resources ie people.

Reply author: rjellison

Replied on: 30 Jan 2008 08:24:26

Message:

In fleshing out the alternatives as Mark suggests I received the following reponse to an inquiry of Brian Moss, the current SIL president.

Hi Robert, I'm sure SIL would welcome the salt lake group, especially as it has maintained activity continuously. I see no reason for not levying a small fee for communications etc, but have copied this to Morten Sondergaard and Denise Johnson in case they know of any arcane rule that says not. I doubt there is any restriction.

Working groups are positively encouraged to organise regional meetings! We need to keep the profile up and if SIL can help in any way, through publicity in SIL News, for example or on the Web site, it will. Technically the chair and members are nominated by the Executive Committee and approved by the National Representatives at a Congress, but I think the Exec Cttee can take executive action on this and approve the group you have in the interim. I think its members should be SIL members though.

The new journal is still in the hands of the Publications Committee (chair Gene Likens) and is negotiating with various publishers for the best deal. I hope we will have concluded this by the middle of this year. Planning for the Cape Town Congress is in the hands of Jan Grobelaaar (University of Bloemfontein. Morten may have some more details, but if you wanted to suggest a salt lake session, then the thing would be to contact Jan directly. I'm pleased to see the salt lake group still thriving, having had a dalliance with an endorheic African lake (Chilwa) at an early stage in my career and having consistently taught my students (a la Williams) that salt lakes are just as important as exorheic basins and the normal sort of basin on half or so of the land surface! I even go to the extreme of annoying our marine biologists by referring to the Ocean as the world's largest salt lake. Cheers, Brian

> Hi Brian,

>

> As you know a group of die-hard salt lake researchers have maintained a small society initially formed and promoted by Bill Williams for almost 30 years now. Our main activity is organizing triennial conferences with the next one occurring in Salt Lake City, UT this coming May. I have been the general secretary, treasurer, and board member since we officially incorporated in 1999. In my opinion I see little reason to retain a separate identity from SIL and would like to propose to our board that we just maintain ourselves as an active SIL working group. In making this proposal to our board, I have a few questions of you.

>

> 1) Do SIL bylaws permit a working group to charge a small annual fee (eg. \$10) for the purposes of maintaining group activities?

> 2) Are working groups free to organize small regional meetings under the auspices of SIL?

> 3) Can working groups select their own chair and committee members?

>

> On other topics, what is the status of the proposed new SIL journal and planning for the 2010 meeting in Capetown?

>

> Sincerely,

> Robert

>

> --

> Robert Jellison, Assoc. Res. Biologist

> UC/Sierra Nevada Aquatic Research Laboratory

> HCR 79, Box 198; 1016 Mt. Morrison Rd.

> Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 USA

>

> Office: (760) 937-4640 Lab: (760) 935-4626

> Home: (760) 873-6445 Fax: (760) 935-4867

--

Prof. Brian Moss, School of Biological Sciences, Biosciences Building, University of Liverpool,
LIVERPOOL L69 3BX, UK

Tel: 0151 795 4390; Facsimile 0151 795 4401

Reply author: sarosj

Replied on: 30 Jan 2008 13:48:24

Message:

Like all of you, I certainly see a number of pros and cons to these options, and given Brian Moss' comments, I think joining with SIL is at least a viable option when you consider the possibility for regional conferences. I still think, though, that we really should wait and see how the GSL meeting turns out (no pressure, Wayne...). As Wayne says, we've put quite a bit of effort into re-structuring this meeting to attract more people, one of those groups being students. I think the format with special sessions may also help a great deal. My sense from some of my colleagues who don't attend is that the past meetings lacked focus, or tended to highlight systems rather than concepts. I think it's great to highlight the famous, large systems, but that should be balanced with concepts that unify salt lake research, and I think we're doing that pretty well at the upcoming meeting.

If we did go back to SIL, I think the regional meeting would be important to pursue- it would be a big loss in my opinion to just have a session at the enormous SIL meetings.

Reply author: adegermendzhy

Replied on: 30 Jan 2008 20:20:46

Message:

Yes, this is actually my idea which I posted before but it was accidentally deleted by Bob:) As SIL wants to promote mid Congress smaller conferences our meeting will be just what is current priority of SIL. To have just a salt lake session during SIL congress will be a great loss... All other activities probably might be well conducted as a SIL group but the conference is really valuable event.

Reply author: rjellison

Replied on: 31 Jan 2008 05:36:54

Message:

This email from Morton Sondergaard and my reply.....

Dear Morten,

Thank you for the prompt and encouraging reply. Please do not ask the SIL executive committee for acceptance at this time. As I stated in my communication with Brian Moss, I was only asking a few questions to clarify for my board what such an action would entail. Our board is currently meeting and actively debating my proposal. It will likely not make a decision until some time after our upcoming Salt Lake City conference or even later.

Sincerely,

Robert Jellison

General Secretary and Treasurer

Morten Sondergaard wrote:

> Dear Robert,

>

> I totally agree with the response from Brian and welcome an active
> working group.

>

> I shall ask the SIL executive committee for acceptance.

>

> Concerning membership of SIL. Working group members working under the

- > SIL name must be members of SIL. If a working group decides to take a
 - > token fee from members they just go ahead and do so. I should also say
 - > that working groups do not get specific economical support from SIL, but
 - > of course they can apply (we do not have working groups in our budget).
 - >
 - > Concerning Cape Town: Johan has not yet made a call for Special
 - > Sessions, he most probably will do so in the first circular for the
 - > congress otherwise I will remind him.
 - >
 - > "Your" group is most wellcome in SIL.
 - >
 - > Morten
 - > General Secretary and Treasurer
-

Reply author: rjellison

Replied on: 31 Jan 2008 05:42:56

Message:

I've greatly enjoyed ISSLR's small regional meetings and there is nothing I've proposed that would preclude continuing them. The conference we organized in Death Valley specifically listed SIL as one of the two hosts, the other being Univ. Calif. The six conferences held before that were all done without an official society.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 31 Jan 2008 12:48:37

Message:

In looking through all that has been said on this topic it seems we are somewhere between options 2 and 3, perhaps closer to 2 than to 3. Thus if we scale down a little (eg. on the website, paying fees just at conferences and not having card use) and concentrate on running conferences between SIL meetings as well as having a presence at SIL meetings as we had the in last few) many of us may be happy enough. The thing is do we as a board make a decision on this now or put it to a general meeting? So much else depends on the decision (e.g. calling for next conference, nominations for next lot of officers and maybe how much we charge for fees)

Brian

Reply author: jalcoer

Replied on: 31 Jan 2008 13:18:30

Message:

A positive thing in alternative 3 is by having two –SIL & ISSLR- meetings at the same time and place, is saving money (flight, accommodation, etc.) and a large number of limnologist that could potentially be interested in been part of ISSLR or at least take part of our sessions. Also, getting funds to attend to two separate meetings is harder than attending at two meetings been held at the same time and place.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 31 Jan 2008 16:45:02

Message:

I am confused on the point Javier raises. I thought by folding into SIL, the meeting becomes part of their agenda, with sessions devoted to salt lakes and under the control of the salt lake convenor/committee. Then as Bob suggests we could still have our own meeting at some other place at some other time in between SIL meetings, i.e. what occurs now. Maybe we are meaning, as Javier seems to understand it, that we meet during, before or after SIL at the same site and have our typical 3-4 days of papers, excursion etc. Perhaps also Javier envisages a session within SIL too. If we have many sessions (e.g. 2 or more days) at the same time as SIL this will be unworkable. Also some of our members are not SIL members. I need to be set straight on this.

Brian

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 31 Jan 2008 22:24:16

Message:

I think there can be no doubt that this is an issue for the general meeting. The board does not have a mandate to dissolve the society etc.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 01 Feb 2008 00:10:56

Message:

You are right Aharon. But this means going ahead in blind faith calling for submissions for the next conference and charging \$60 for society fees when a new structure may mean less or none. But so be it.

Reply author: jalcocer

Replied on: 02 Feb 2008 21:35:20

Message:

It seems not only our society but in general limnological societies are having troubles in increasing membership and collecting funds. In the last SIL meeting held in Montreal, these issues were highlighted. There has been a reduction in the number of SIL members (of course, fewer members, less income from membership fees) and increasing costs to keep the functions of the society. These were some of the reasons (in addition to the scientific ones) that lead to carry out the strategy of "transforming" the Verhandlungen into a new and more attractive limnological journal. It seems that L&O make up a large percentage of ASLO earnings.

Reply author: Zhengmianping

Replied on: 03 Feb 2008 20:46:24

Message:

First, I want to pay tribute to Bob for his arduous and volunteer work and contribution to the society's activities these years. In the present situation, I think that we should still insist in and carry on the objectives of the society and actively broaden the society and build a viable society according to option 1. Salt lakes are a complex system and involve geology, biology, physics, chemistry, and even engineering science and technology. The idea of geological-biological interdisciplinarity put forward by Bill Williams, Ian Bayly, and Stu when they started this organization conforms to the objective law of the saline systems and is favorable for the development of saline science and also accords with the direction for development of contemporary science and technology.

I think the key is that all of us should strive to enrich the research content and broaden the range of activities of the society in accordance with the society's objectives. Many disciplines and industries are related to salt lakes. In addition to salt lakes and halobios, salt lake ecology, salt lakes and medicine, salt lake and health, conservation and management of salt lakes, and other relevant industries (e.g. *Artemia*, *Danaliella salina*, brine floatation, and medical mud), there is a wide range of scientific and technological research such as saline mineral deposit geology and exploration, total use of saline resources, saline mineral exploitation and environmental protection, minerogenic relations of saline minerals with petroleum, metals and nonmetals, salt lake records and environment change, materials and engineering science of saline-alkali land.

Salt lakes, salt pans and salt deposits are widespread over the globe and their relations with human life and economic development is increasingly important. There are many people who engage in salt lake research or teaching and salt industries. Take China for example, according to the incomplete statistics there are more than 20 institutions (including research institutes under ministries, departments in universities and research divisions in enterprises) with more than 300 senior researchers, senior engineer, professors, and associate professors that engage in salt lake

research or teaching and salt industries. We should actively give publicity to the ISSLR objectives. I propose that a flyer be distributed through various media to appeal to interested persons to participate in the society's activities and become its members. Those countries that have conditions may establish groups or relevant academic organizations like the Siberia Group. For this, I have notified interested institutions of China to take an active part in the 10th ICSSL; thus the Chinese researchers who will attend the 10th ICSSL will increase as compared with the 9th ICSSL. Furthermore, I am planning and preparing to establish the Chinese Society of Salt Lakes and Saline Systems, which will be affiliated to the Geological Society of China.

Only dues are not sufficient to support the society's activities. I suggest that we seek for financial funding from enterprises and even government agencies in charge of academic institutions. For example, we did so when the 6th conference was held in Beijing in 1994. If ISSLR should be located in Beijing, we can also expect to get such a financial support.

ISSLR Forums : <http://www.isslr.org/forums/>

© **International Society for Salt Lake Research**

[Close Window](#)