

Dear colleagues,

I would like to contribute a bit to the discussion on a fate of Fluid inclusion meetings. All of us would agree that something must be changed in our meeting tradition.

Actually many things have already changed in our field of science.

First of all fluid inclusion research have already grown from the science, oriented to itself (development of the method, the study of inclusion properties, application of precise state-of-art techniques, etc) to a conventional method of mineralogical and petrological investigation. As a consequence, many large Earth and Planetary science meetings become more attractive for Inclusionists than smaller and strictly oriented Fluid Inclusion meetings.

Second, formal organizations of Inclusions become less active than in the past. Not many people in Fluid inclusion community (especially younger ones) know that there were two organizations of Fluid Inclusionists: COFFI (a part of IAGOD) and Working group on Inclusions in Minerals (WGIM at IMA). I don't know exactly what is a fate of COFFI right now. But WGIM is still alive and Mineral inclusion section at 32 IGC in Florence will be held under its aegis. I hope that some of us can meet in Florence on August and will have an opportunity to discuss this subject informally. However, we have informal organization of Fluid inclusion researchers that is maintained by Phil Brown and is more active and effective than the formal ones.

And the third. Fluid inclusion activity now is worldwide. There are a lot of well equipped and highly active research groups not only in Europe and North America, but also in Asian part of the world and in Australia. These groups are far from Europe and America and their people have fewer opportunities to attend ECROFI and PACROFI. I like the proposition of Bob Bodnar to convert ECROFI and PACROFI to the International Conference, which travels around the world. This way has a lot of pros. I don't believe that it would be good to widen the scope of the meeting by removing 'Inclusions' from the name, as Vratislav proposed to do. In that case it will lose its identity and won't differ from special symposia of larger meetings. It should not be as large as Goldschmidt and it should be strictly dedicated to Inclusion study and Applications. On my mind there are two types of Inclusionists: those who working on inclusions and those who simply use them. Actually many of us are two-in-one. The meeting would attract preferentially those of the first type and two-in-ones. The larger conferences attract mainly the users of inclusions and the problems discussed there are related mainly to mineralogical and petrological problems rather than methodology of the Inclusion study. I don't think that it is easy to change from well-developed ECROFI and PACROFI brands to a completely new one. I would suggest doing this step by step. The establishment of Asian or Asian-Pacific version would be a good first step. However it will require longer periods between the meetings. Recently we have one meeting per year. What would you say about one meeting per two years? Say last year ECROFI, in two years - PACROFI, or ACROFI (APCROFI) if it is organized, in two years the next conference and so on. In this case the Inclusionists in one region would have their meeting in four years (as Olympics!!). So they would have a chance to participate in other conferences or select which one is better in any particular case.

Sorry for the wordy message and best regards to all,

Sergey Smirnov
Working group on Inclusions in Minerals of IMA,
Secretary
ssmr@uiggm.nsc.ru