January 12, 2026

Attendees: Caleb Robbins, Lenny Smith, Jon Borelli, Abby Lewis, Jody Peters, Christian John, Hassan Moustahfid
Regrets: Cole Brookson may make it for the last 20 minutes of the call, Pamela Rueda Cediel

Agenda:

1. EFI2026 Conference in Toronto on August 4-7. New conference website!
    a. Abstract and Travel Support requests now open until April 15.
    b. Working Group proposal ideas - due January 23 (Cole)

2. Predictability of Nature synthesis -
    a. Check in with Bilgecan about the paper outline
        i. Paper will be 3-4,000 words. Current outline is ~2,000 so think it is detailed enough
        ii. Go over how to split up the work
        iii. Has suggestions for number of co-authors for each section/subsection
            1. For first round, let people write sections they want and Bilgecan will work on editing
            2. If not enough people to fill each section, then Bilgecan can write multiple sections
            3. Start with opening co-authorship to people who have been involved. Keep authorship open limited to start with for realized and intrinsic prediction
            4. Then open to broader community for broader co-authorship for input for the discussion section
        iv. Timeline - goal is to get it submitted by EFI2026 Conference so the EFI2026 conference working group can move on to another topic and to
            1. But also acknowledge that
        v. Want to be transparent with people who attended EFI workshop. Could send email to that team - we have been moving forward on this on the monthly working group calls. If you are not able to make the calls and really want to stay involve, reach out so we can figure out how to have you contribute
        vi. What was the written co-authorship agreement?
            1. Tasks: Writing, figure development, hypothesis development, literature review (this includes participation on monthly theory calls and for people who participated at the EFI2025 working group and the two extended follow up calls)
            2. It is easy to be included as a co-author if you involved in meetings.
            3. If you provide 3 forms of contribution, then can be a co-author
        vii. Bilgecan will provide list of ways that people can contribute. Will write an email to explain the stage and remaining ways that people can contribute
        viii. Discussion of the paper outline
            1. Goal of paper is to motivate people to consider how to make individual forecasts more generalizable. Get to a place where we can compare across forecasts to be able to make the generalizations
            2. Realized/intrinsic predictability sections of the paper set the stage. It won't necessarily be novel. It is what has already been done and highlights shortcomings of what has been done. (Fig 1)

3. Then that feeds into the following section with the suggestion with workflow for predictability (Fig 2)
4. Third section is the list of suggestions to get to section 2/Fig 2 goals
5. This will not be a long paper 3-5,000 words. We won't be able to include everything we want, but want group to write as much as needed and then Bilgecan will work on editing down
6. Don't want co-authors to feel limited on writing. There is suggested word limit, but authors do not need to stick to that. Bilgecan can edit down after writing is in.
7. Also, not limited to submitting to TREE - if we think we want all the details, then could send to Ecology Letters (7,500 words)
8. Advantages - right now, message is simple, so nice to keep paper simple. But if there is more that needs to be added and can't keep it at 5,000 words, then have Ecology Letters as an option

ix. Next step for the group
1. Look at the overall outline and story - does the story make sense.
2. Then assign authors to each section
3. Right now for people on the calls and in the core organizing group - let Bilgecan know what specific sections you want to write

b. Community Manuscript Guidelines
   i. Community Manuscript Description
c. Figure ideas: Theory group meeting
d. Table of all the papers compiled so far.
e. Predictability manuscript folder
f. Note from Freya after the December call
   i. I wanted to (re)share this philosophy paper from Wendy Parker (who gave an interesting talk at the EFI conference last year) as another view on these types of questions
   Parker, W. S. (2020). Model Evaluation: An Adequacy-for-Purpose View. Philosophy of Science, 87(3), 457–477. https://doi.org/10.1086/708691
   The paper is a nice read and gives a great overview of this idea of evaluating models in science based on their suitability for their intended purpose rather than some overall measure of their fit to observational data.
   Wendy also has a load of other papers about the philosophy around models, data, and uncertainty (esp. in climate science