

SIP Annual Meetings Survey, 2017

Prior to 1992, the Society held 3 consecutive annual meetings in North America followed by an International Colloquium elsewhere. In addition, every second year the meetings included an International Conference on *Bacillus thuringiensis*. The format of the 3-year consecutive North America meetings was dropped in 1992 and the Annual meetings alternating between North America and a non-North American venue has mostly continued to date. Both International Colloquia and an International Conference on *Bacillus thuringiensis* were eventually dropped and a more international title sometimes used as “International Congress on Invertebrate Pathology and Microbial Control and the xxth Annual Meeting of the Society for Invertebrate Pathology” The reason for the last name change was to facilitate local sponsorship and to be more attractive for attendees. For 2019, for several reasons the society has broken with tradition and has approved the 2019 meetings for Valencia Spain that will follow the 2018 meetings in Brisbane, Australia.

The on-line survey included **16 questions** which were answered by **184 participants**.

1. Traditionally, SIP meetings alternate between North America and a non-North American venue. Do you like this arrangement and would you like to keep it as it is?

Result	Responses	Percentage
Yes, please keep it	90	49%
No, it can be changed	79	43%
No opinion	15	8%

184 responses in 184 results

Comments/Suggestions

This alternation facilitates attention by members all over the world. Nevertheless, exceptions from the rule (like for 2019) should always be possible - depending on the availability of offers for venues, I suppose.

Let it become a more international society with more meeting outside USA

SIP is an international wide conference thus it is not necessary to keep a certain pattern of hosting. This should not be a fixed rule.

While political issues in USA affect delegates opportunity to attend the meeting, the meetings should be held outside the US.

I have several concerns: 1. Location attraction, exciting new places. 2. Convenience for travelling. Better to have a direct flight. And 2 concerns listed in question 2.

The main change is needed is the frequency of the Meetings more than the place. It should not be annually but every 2 or 3 years. This will allow more members to attend as there will be more chances to obtain funds; besides many presentations will be complete instead of being intentions of things to do or half of the reults being presented.

I suggest it be completely open. Certainly currently, travel to the USA has become very difficult for some of our members.

alternate between North America and a non-North American venue

I generally like the 1:1 arrangement but I think the society might be better served (more attendance) by a not-so-strict 1:1 ratio. For example, varying the ratio to 1.5-2 : 1 (North American : other) would permit better attendance for the largest block of members (especially students). However, I would only favor this after the current US administration is out of office.

I think it is good to switch between continents in general.

North America every 3rd year would be fine too. We are an international society after all.

I think it encourages international collaboration and allows local attendance in areas where international meetings are difficult to fund. It also widens perspective and provides opportunities to better understand wider research issues in different countries/ regions. Keeps the society international and prevents the potential for narrow/ national focussing

Does not have to strictly adhere if venues are not available. As long as at least 1/3 of meetings are in NAm and at least 1/3 are in Europe.

Great way to expose the Society internationally.

For myself this doesn't present a large issue, other than if meetings were sequentially held in locations far from Europe, but that is just geography that would mean it was expensive to travel.

The alternating meetings are nice as it provides opportunities for regular international travel. I suggest keeping this format, although travel budgets may limit my travel to some locations. In my opinion, it's also OK to occasionally break from the norm (as is this case for the 2018 and 2019 meetings).

It is sometimes difficult for organizers to find a host institution, so I think that we should be flexible. However, we should also try to move the meetings around to different continents as much as possible, to make them accessible to many people.

Whatever makes most sense regarding venue, costs, availability etc

How about North America every 3 years: Europe, North America, then Asia/South America on a 3 year rotation.

I understand most of the SIP members are from North America, but having the flexibility to organize the meetings in other places will allow us to reach out to those regions that are not represented in SIP or at its meetings.

Since it is an international society, the meetings should also reflect that

I can usually visit meetings in Europe

I will not complete the rest as I did not attend the latest meeting. Wayne Brooks

Science budgets play a key role in meeting attendance. The alternating approach may allow for the overall continued attendance from the maximum number of places.

However, many of our members come from North America, so I think we should have a meeting at least once in 1 in 3 years there.

As a NAmmerican member, I feel this is no longer a critical issue. Originally over 1/2 the membership was NAmmerican and it insured a majority could have opportunities to attend. Non- NA venues have generally not been an impediment to a strong NA member participation. For sure there are policies that limit NA member travel out of country, esp for government employees, but these are temporary and unpredictable. Also, if maximum attendance is a criterion, some international meetings have been our strongest, meaning more scientists and students have the opportunity to benefit from SIP and perhaps become more strongly a part of it. For some, having an in-country meeting provides their only opportunity to ever attend for financial or political reasons or other, but this enhances our society.

There will be times when this needs to be altered as for 2018 and 2019, but the general idea seems to work well.

We need not strictly adhere to this as it will depend on where people will volunteer to organize meetings. But to have 50% or at least 33% of our meeting in North America makes sense given how many members are in NAM. Because the other big chunk of membership is in Europe, I would think that out of every 3 meetings at least 1 each should be in NAM and Europe.

From the bacteria side, it looks like the major players are in Mexico, Spain and US. So keeping the venues the same makes sense

Better to be in Europe because is at least centre world wide

For us, Latin Americans, it is easier (cheaper) to travel within the continent. Our major limitation to attend the SIP meeting is funding. Traveling to Europe, Asia or Australia (like next year) makes it almost impossible to obtain the appropriate funding.

The switching between North America and the rest of the world became more of a tradition. I think the original intent was not so much to alternate, but to make sure venues outside of North America were welcome

you might want to do a literature search or papers with insect pathology topics and see where the insect pathologists are.

I think should be done one in South America, long time without to have a meeting in South America

Although I do not have any objection to having the SIP meetings in countries outside North America, there may be cost issues others may face in attending the Annual Meeting. Not sure if attendance has gone up when hosted outside N. America, but an analysis would help make an informed decision. Also, we do not want another France-like meeting where cost overruns and attitude issues with organizers had negative effects on the SIP.

Prefer North America no more than every 3 years. Better attendance outside of N. America

The alternation of venues has been of good service to SIP over the years, but as with the Olympics, it is a burden to prepare proposals for meetings and to execute them. Increasingly it may become difficult to obtain proposals from such a self-limited selection of venues.

I know that several groups had difficulty obtaining visas to attend the US meeting.

Every part of the world needs to be encouraged to attend SIP meeting and on the importance of the society. This can be easily achieved by fixing SIP meeting in such continents or countries as well.

I would like to say it's better to meeting be in coutry which be easy for most interested scentists, so i think it's better to change this role, in a way that European countries find more chance than today.

This would be nice to pursue, but I would not stricly adhere to it, as it also depends on offers to organize.

I think that more meetings outside North America would be better e.g. SE Asia, to enable

more people to attend. This might encourage more to join SIP.

Not necessarily every other year in North America. Alternating between countries spread over the world looks like a good option.

I of course think that the SIP meetings should have some kind of circulation around the world, could be US, Europe and other places. For me it doesn't have to be specified but should be taking into account when it is decided.

I suggest 1/3 in North America, 1/3 in Europe, and 1/3 elsewhere

Just needs to be in places that a. People are keen on going to and b. Ease/economy of getting there

Possibly consider a tripartite meeting arrangement - North American, Europe and Other - perhaps to reflect growing membership from China/Asia.

47 responses in 184 results

2. Is this alternating arrangement between North America and a non-North American venue important for your personal decision to attend SIP meetings regularly?

Result	Responses	Percentage
Yes	77	42%
No	85	46%
No opinion	20	11%

182 responses in 184 results

Comments/Suggestions

Well, that is a difficult question :-) - so, I can't really say yes (although I choose to say yes, in order to facilitate the evaluation) or no and still I have an opinion: I would love to attend the meetings more frequently, but have no money for doing so every year. So, sometimes the venue is more attractive if it is closer (less expensive) and sometimes it is more attractive due to the location, or for another reason, like jubilees, or a broader focus e.g. when it is the International Congress-type of meeting.

Fankly, yes. You have to always consider the traveling investment.

But safety is a global concern. Many places are not so calm nowadays. Free communication is also a concern.

It is a huge cost for young researchers to go abroad

It is. As it is cheaper to fly to USA than to other countries.

Somewhat - but most based on cost.

Yes, I can't always afford to travel outside of North America

Sometimes.

I am more likely to send most personnel from my lab when the meeting is held in North America.

It is easier and less expensive for me to travel to a North American site. But we should do what is best for the most people.

See above

The different locations permits different groups to attend which is critical to the health of SIP. Can easily be a rotation of for example, North and South America, Europe, Asia

Sometimes - If the meeting is in North America, it may be more accessible and affordable to someone living in North America.

sometimes my decision to attend might be related to where it is but travel within north America can be just as expensive as to some locations outside NA. My decisions are usually financial

This becomes important when funding is limited from grants and institutional support for travel. International travel adds significantly to the cost of meetings for all members, whether for NAmericans or from any country.

I think this arrangement is critical for maintaining a strong focus on an international research community while acknowledging the large proportion of North American members. Should that ratio change significantly, perhaps we could do 1 year in North America and 2 years in non-NA countries.

Sometimes financial limitations can impinge on attending meetings in places when travel expenses are high. This obviously tends to apply even more so for members of programs other than the PI.

Industry frowns on the increased expenses of an international meeting, and therefore attendance from industry (that is a major player and SIP funder) typically goes down during non-North American venues

SO far and expensive especially if participants come from Africa

I never go to meetings in the US (personal choice)

(See above)

Indirectly, coming from North America I would prefer to go to a meeting outside of North America. For someone from NA the costs of a NA meeting and outside NA can be very similar anyway (unless more that half way around the world)

it is not but i do think this is a plus and give the opportunity to the attendees to visit various places in the world and to favor the venue of some minorities when we meet in non-North American countries

The meeting held in North America are easier and less costly for me to attend.

based on financial considerations, meetings close by are easier to attend.

In any practical sense, of course it has to be important because of the expense of travel and attendance.

In my lab, except if we have a financial help, we usually go to the non-North American SIP for financial motives.

It's better to cancel this agreement.

I assume that over the coming years I will have to prioritize heavily due to financial constraints. European meeting are easier for me to manage (time, money). Also, sometimes European meetings can be combined with COST Action meeting, meaning that travel costs will be paid from EU COST

Including a European venue on a regular basis means we can afford to send several members of our team every other year.

A range of venues is important, for me sites outside N Am can be easier to reach

31 responses in 184 results

3. Traditionally, SIP meetings take place in late July or early August. Do these two months fit best with your other professional and private activities?

Result	Responses	Percentage
Yes	133	72%
No	24	13%
No opinion	23	12%

180 responses in 184 results

Comments/Suggestions

Here, the answer is similar like with the venue - sometimes it fits, because than I decide to have holidays attached to the SIP meeting. Sometimes it just clashes with the summer holidays. As a comment to the question below: The decision to attend the SIP meeting is made quite early - sometimes in December of the previous year, and than logically the annual schedule is made in consideration of the SIP meeting date.

can be in September as well

Would be better to shift it to late August or September

travel founding in my university (Argentina) is decided in July. Therefore, if I am elected it is so close to august that i miss early registrations and cheap air tickets.

In general it is OK. Because if I have decided to go to SIP, everything has to be arranged as it should be.

Having the meeting in mid August was one of the reasons why I sometimes did not attend the SIP meeting. Late July or first week of August would be wonderful

usually this time for active field experiments. It can be better if it will be at the end of August or early September I think.

August is difficult as it is during the teaching year for me.

July and August although convenient for professors and students to join SIP meeting, the airfare is expensive and traffic is difficult. Personally I would prefer go by other time.

Last 2 weeks of July are holiday vacations and first weeks of August coincide with the beginning of the teaching quarter, so those times are really bad.

matches the permissions

No impact for me but people with field seasons are affected by timing -- and field seasons vary depending on the type of work and the region - so you will never please everyone.

July - September is ok for me

But for meetings in Europe, perhaps the months of June and September should be tried. Airfares are slightly lower, and there are fewer tourists during those months. Our meetings in August often conflict with Mycology and Nematology meetings.

My personal preference would be for meetings to take place earlier (keep to within July).

As I am a professor, July and August fit (frequently) in my vacation period (what can't be changed because of the classes); plus I am not allowed to be funded during my vacation time. So, June would be a good month.

This is a good time for those of us who teach. Our classes usually start in late August.

Not too late in August is very important.

sometimes yes and sometimes no. Eg. This year the vertebrate microsporidia workshop and SIP overlapped.

Usually the event is held in the northern Hemisphere. So these months are months of school holidays and the prices of hotels, tickets, etc., are more expensive. I suggest that events be held in October or November.

September would also work, but the summer months do allow for the use of university campuses that can keep costs down.

Some meetings in August overlap with the start of the academic year in the USA, making it increasingly difficult to accommodate into your schedule.

There isn't really a time that would suit everyone. For me, summer coincides with our field season and highest staff time, so it's just busy

A yes or no is difficult here. The summer meetings (for those of us north of the equator) are good for teaching faculty, but there are no perfect dates that do not conflict with something

for individual members, myself at times in some years, or for entire subject matter groups. I think we should stay with what has worked for 50 years and let the local arrangement committees set the time per their local venue availabilities within the July-September time frame.

Other dates are problematic for those with teaching responsibilities.

Prefer August

Definitively. That is the time with less academic work in our institutions. Even, late August may cause a problem.

yet, this is in the middle of the field season for many of us and could be postponed slightly to maybe accommodate more of us

Foreign locations may warrant other times of the year.

Depending the place it could be done in January or February, since it is summer holidays in South America

I prefer July

It might be interesting in the future to see what would happen if a Southern Hemisphere meeting were scheduled at a time that is fully convenient for the local calendar but that would have it occurring in another part of the year than the usual July/August timing.

July is often a congested month for conferences so I have had to make a choice between attending SIP and for example, the FASEB Virus Assembly meeting

Personally I would appreciate the conference in late September - Holidays are over and field work has already been completed!

Even later in summer like September is better.

This window probably suits members with young families best. It certainly did us when we had children.

Irrespective when meetings are planned, some people cannot attend due to teaching, other meetings, research or holiday. So just keep the meetings to be held in August

They coincide with summer holiday in Europe at least. Better to hold them outside of this period (e.g. Sept, Oct, Mar, Apr, May)

Earlier in July would be easier for me

Combination with family vacation is possible, so that's a good thing.

June or until mid July would be better, August is holiday month in many countries and many times it is difficult to attend meetings in early-mid August

Winter months (December - March) would fit better.

42 responses in 184 results

4. Do you plan your annual schedule in accordance with the date of the SIP meeting?

Result	Responses	Percentage
Yes	98	53%
No	58	32%
No opinion	27	15%

183 responses in 184 results

5. Do you know of a fellow scientist who would like to attend SIP meetings but doesn't because the meeting takes place in late July or early August?

Result	Responses	Percentage
Yes	26	14%
No	135	73%
No opinion	20	11%

181 responses in 184 results

6. Suggestions to improve meetings

I very much enjoyed each of the meetings I attended and find it difficult to think of improvements ... since I'm working in the regulatory context now and get the feeling, there is so much fear and expectation of evil from microbial and natural control, I'm wondering whether an improvement of meetings could also be a stronger involvement of policy makers, other stakeholders (e.g. US EPA, EFSA, Greenpeace -?!)

Reduce the registration fees

It would be important and relevant if travel awards would also include the inscription fee, because more than 50% of the travel award is used to pay the fee. Depending on distance and if other foundings are available, sometimes even with the travel award it is impossible to attend. And in my short experience, SIP meetings are unique in its kind, it is so sad having to miss most of them because of founding.

No comments .

I know of at least two scientists that do not attend if the meeting is in August
everything is good!

Give more awards to the junior and senior scientists. This will be attractive to the scientists to join. Of course got to be fair scientifically and not too much excessive.

advance invitation with the schedule of activities

I think the meeting is too long. While the social times are great, I think it makes the meeting too long- with both a BBQ day and a banquet. Most societies have only one. I would prefer combining the two events into one, and shortening the meeting by one day.

It would be helpful to remind presenters that not everyone in the audience studies insects or will know their particular system. It helps to better set the stage to spend 1-2 minutes on background.

More workshops:molecular nomenclature, techniques and analysesmolecular techniques for field use

I suspect many would have teaching conflicts if the meeting was held during term / semester time.

I sometimes hear people suggest that the meeting could be shorter/ cheaper if the social events were reduced. I think this would be a mistake as it has always been my opinion that the most fruitful discussions, productive collaborations and longest-lasting working relationships and friendships stem from meetings (some due to serendipity) during the social events.

Reduced registration fee for participants from developing countries would be helpful.

Feedback I have had from colleagues and others at the last SIP meeting is that it is becoming increasingly difficult for people to attend annual meetings - this is financially, but also because there are other meetings that they attend that means making a choice. SIP may need to consider holding the meeting every other year, as many organisations currently do. The increased pressure to find people willing to organize the meeting seems to be a consideration.

Classes start in August. My colleagues would prefer the meeting in late July; most of them are not allowed to leave the university during classes period.

More posters and fewer talks. There are so many talks that it is difficult to attend all that are of interest because many are running concurrently. This makes it difficult to attend talks in more than one division as well.

increase in the number and diversity of scholar

My only complaint about the San Diego meeting was the confusing signs on the first day. One building had a "SIP conference" sign, and I spent some time searching for the registration desk there. Eventually I realized that this sign referred to a Board meeting (or similar) that was to occur there on a different day.

Meetings are generally well organized. Put an emphasis on balancing basic and applied aspects of insect pathology and microbial control.

Lommer travel awards should be given to reserachers that do research in the third world and not to students from US or Europe labs

Earlier in August would be better because if you are attending a meeting in a far away place that you would like to explore , having the time before the school year starts would be nice.

Example is next year Australia meeting, don't want to go that far and have to rush back.

More keynote speakers
Less virus-contributed sessions too allow visiting other divisions (e.g. max 4)
More cross divisional activities

N/A

regarding 5. We have a lab of scientists and usually only one person can be sent to SIP meetings and not every year. Prices for summer flights and accommodation are high season. On the other hand, the meetings are predictable when they're at the same time each year and that's a good thing. When meetings are on university campuses, it would be better to have more on-site accommodation. The residence in San Diego was extremely reasonable however I didn't get travel approval before the rooms were all gone and the cost of the hotel was quite high. Regarding 7 & 8 below: one person from our group attended the indicated meetings but not necessarily the same person. We are hoping to have funds to send someone to Australia and Spain but they are "maybe"s

This year, no name tags were provided for guest registrants. Most embarrassing for them. While a meeting specific issue this year, on campus housing was short for a significant number of attendees. Many of us found ourselves as couples in units that could hold eight people. We thought we were reserving units that held 1-3 guests until we got into our assigned room. As a result, many beds went unused. Better planning could perhaps have done better at maximizing space and prevented the difficulties for many members who had to figure out and pay for transportation between campus and hotels. Something for future LOC's to consider.

Please note that I checked all topics and divisions below. That is intentional because of my role as JIP editor. My meeting preferences are Microsporidia and Beneficials.

Make symposia longer
If a Division has a very strong secondary symposia topic, vet within the Society and see if it is appropriate (not just basing it on filling a Division quota)

Meetings are usually very good. Cost of Registration is a major issue (for me). Visa issues are also important for ease of access to meetings (I've never had a problem, but I imagine that getting into the US is becoming difficult for members from some countries) When travel (flights) to the meeting is an issue due to cost I imagine that attendance falls off (eg. Australia 2018) but this is not necessarily bad as attendance will always vary from year to year, and having meetings in different parts of the world underlines the international nature of SIP.

The place choose for presentations should be big enough to receive people, the last meeting some times there was no place available to sit.

Some of our field scientists have the busiest time in July/August due to harvest and other field activities. I have encourage a few of them to join the SIP, but so far work schedules have interfered with their participation.

Current format is good. Possibly organize sessions to focus on new technologies and how they are or might be applied to SIP fields. This could be for anything from remote sensing to molecular technologies. The sessions would be more educational than presentation of results.

It is indeed in the middle of the holiday season, and not everyone can manage to come. But these are the two months without teaching obligations. if it would be June or September. it

will be more difficult for a lot of people to attend. For me, late August would work best.

Food: Better breakfast (ie- the breakfast in Tours, France was amazing!)- and cheaper for postdocs/grad students...

But it does make travel to the meeting more difficult with juggling with family commitments

Review the way prizes are awarded to student presentations to avoid one discipline area to avoid/reduce behaviours in assessment that result in one discipline gaining all the awards.

It should be cheaper and support junior scientists.

Change the date from mid August to June or July

38 responses in 184 results

7. Which of the following meetings have you attended? (please check all that apply)

Result	Responses
Guanajuato, Mexico (2000)	37
Noordwijkerhout, Netherlands (2001)	42
Iguassu Falls, Brazil (2002)	38
Burlington, USA (2003)	51
Helsinki, Finland (2004)	45
Anchorage, USA (2005)	47
Wuhan, China (2006)	39
Quebec City, Canada (2007)	53
Warwick, United Kingdom (2008)	59
Park City, USA (2009)	48
Trabzon, Turkey (2010)	58
Halifax, Canada (2011)	52
Buenos Aires, Argentina (2012)	58
Pittsburg, USA (2013)	62
Mainz, Germany (2014)	81
Vancouver, Canada (2015)	76
Tours, France (2016)	84
San Diego (2017)	122

8. Are you planning to attend the following meetings?

Result	Responses
2018 Gold Coast, Australia	99
2019 Valencia, Spain	116
2020 to be announced	50
Do not plan to attend in next 3 years	14

9. Would you consider organizing a meeting in the future? (If yes, please contact the SIP Meetings Committee Chair, Mark Goettel at bstedit@telusplanet.net)

Result	Responses
Yes	22
No	127
Unable but suggest	22

10. What is your professional background?

Result	Responses	Percentage
Student	20	11%
University	93	51%
Research Institute	46	25%
Company	15	8%
Other	9	5%

183 responses in 184 results

11. Which topic(s)/division(s) are you interested in?

Result	Responses	Percentage
Bacteria	66	15%
Diseases of Beneficial Invertebrates	54	12%
Fungi	75	17%
Microbial Control	113	25%
Microsporidia	29	6%
Nematodes	36	8%
Viruses	75	17%

12. For how long have you been a member of the Society for Insect Pathology?

Result	Responses	Percentage
Not a member	40	22%
< 5 years	53	29%
5-10 years	13	7%
> 10 years	76	41%

182 responses in 184 results

13. In what age group do you belong?

Result	Responses	Percentage
Under 30 years	16	9%
30-45 years	67	36%
45-65 years	83	45%
>65 years	17	9%

183 responses in 184 results

14. What is your present membership status?

Result	Responses	Percentage
Not a member	39	21%
Student	16	9%
Full	121	66%
Emeritus	3	2%
Honorary	3	2%

182 responses in 184 results

15. If an emeritus member, would a reduced meeting registration encourage you to attend future SIP meetings?

Result	Responses
Yes	26
No	9
Does Not Apply	114

149 responses in 184 results

16. Where do you reside?

Result	Responses	Percentage
Africa	10	5%
Asia	28	15%
Europe	54	29%
North America	64	35%
South America	23	13%
Australia/New Zealand	4	2%

183 responses in 184 results

Cross-tabulation Report

A) 1. Traditionally, SIP meetings alternate between North America and a non-North American venue. Do you like this arrangement and would you like to keep it as it is?	B) 16. Where do you reside?					
	Africa	Asia	Europe	North America	South America	Australia/New Zealand
Yes, please keep it	3	10	20	41	15	0
No, it can be changed	5	11	32	20	7	4
No opinion	2	7	2	3	1	0

A) 2. Is this alternating arrangement between North America and a non-North American venue important for your personal decision to attend SIP meetings regularly?	B) 16. Where do you reside?					
	Africa	Asia	Europe	North America	South America	Australia/New Zealand
Yes	1	11	23	33	8	1
No	7	11	27	25	12	3
No opinion	2	6	3	6	3	0

A) 1. Traditionally, SIP meetings alternate between North America and a non-North American venue. Do you like this arrangement and would you like to keep it as it is?	B) 13. In what age group do you belong?			
	Under 30 years	30-45 years	45-65 years	>65 years
Yes, please keep it	7	34	39	9
No, it can be changed	6	26	39	8
No opinion	3	7	5	0

A) 3. Traditionally, SIP meetings take place in late July or early August. Do these two months fit best with your other professional and private activities?	B) 13. In what age group do you belong?			
	Under 30 years	30-45 years	45-65 years	>65 years
Yes	11	46	60	16
No	2	12	10	0
No opinion	2	9	12	0

A) 1. Traditionally, SIP meetings alternate between North America and a non-North American venue. Do you like this arrangement and would you like to keep it as it is?	B) 12. For how long have you been a member of the Society for Insect Pathology?			
	Not a member	< 5 years	5-10 years	> 10 years
Yes, please keep it	23	24	6	35
No, it can be changed	11	23	6	39
No opinion	6	6	1	2

A) 3. Traditionally, SIP meetings take place in late July or early August. Do these two months fit best with your other professional and private activities?	B) 12. For how long have you been a member of the Society for Insect Pathology?			
	Not a member	< 5 years	5-10 years	> 10 years
Yes	28	33	9	62
No	7	10	2	5
No opinion	5	9	2	7