**Survey: Satisfaction survey among participants to the Puerto Varas meeting**

**Report: Default Report**

| Survey Status | | Respondent Statistics | | Points Summary |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Status: | Live | Total Responses: | 86 | No Points Questions used in this survey. |
| Deploy Date: | 11/16/2016 | Completes: | 80 | |
| Closed Date: | | Partials: | 6 | |

**1. Please indicate which of these previous ICAR meetings, you attended.**

| | Responses | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| 2010 - Riga (Latvia): | 33 | 53.23% |
| 2011 - Bourg-en-Bresse (France): | 25 | 40.32% |
| 2012 - Cork (Ireland): | 43 | 69.35% |
| 2013 - Aarhus (Denmark): | 37 | 59.68% |
| 2014 - Berlin (Germany): | 56 | 90.32% |
| 2015 - Krakow (Poland): | 38 | 61.29% |
| Total Responded to this question: | 62 | 72.09% |
| Total who skipped this question: | 24 | 27.91% |
| Total: | 86 | 100% |

## 2. Where did you travel from for the Puerto Varas Meeting

| | Responses | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| North America: | 11 | 13.1% |
| South America: | 7 | 8.33% |
| Europe: | 46 | 54.76% |
| Asia: | 4 | 4.76% |
| Oceania: | 9 | 10.71% |
| Africa: | 1 | 1.19% |
| Middle-East: | 0 | 0% |
| If other, please specify: | 6 | 7.14% |
| Total Responded to this question: | 84 | 97.67% |
| Total who skipped this question: | 2 | 2.33% |
| Total: | 86 | 100% |

2. Where did you travel from for the Puerto Varas Meeting

| Response | Comments |
|---|---|
| 1 | from Santiago de Chile |
| 2 | Chile |
| 3 | Chile |
| 4 | Chile |
| 5 | did not |
| 6 | Equador |

### 3. Approximately how much did pay for the traveling only to and from Puerto Varas (in € please) ?

| | Responses | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| €500: | 8 | 9.64% |
| €500 to €1.000: | 7 | 8.43% |
| €1.000 to €2.000: | 50 | 60.24% |
| 2.000€ to 3.000€: | 11 | 13.25% |
| >3.000€: | 7 | 8.43% |
| Additional comment on cost of travelling: | 3 | 3.61% |
| Total Responded to this question: | 83 | 96.51% |
| Total who skipped this question: | 3 | 3.49% |
| Total: | 86 | 100% |

3. Approximately how much did pay for the traveling only to and from Puerto Varas (in € please) ?

| Response | Comments |
|---|---|
| 1 | For someone travelling from Oceania, this was less than I normally pay to attend ICAR meetings. |
| 2 | Less than €500 |
| 3 | We ordered our tikits late and had a meeting in USA before |

**4. Please rate the following aspects of the venue**

| | Excellent | Very good | Average | Below average | Poor | Not applicable | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The location in Puerto Varas: | 36(42.35%) | 36(42.35%) | 12(14.12%) | 1(1.18%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) | 85 |
| The quality of Hotel accommodation: | 21(25.3%) | 46(55.42%) | 12(14.46%) | 1(1.2%) | 1(1.2%) | 2(2.41%) | 83 |
| The value of Hotel accommodation: | 9(10.84%) | 42(50.6%) | 24(28.92%) | 4(4.82%) | 1(1.2%) | 3(3.61%) | 83 |
| The accommodation of the large meeting rooms: | 17(20%) | 52(61.18%) | 15(17.65%) | 1(1.18%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) | 85 |
| The accommodation of the smaller meeting rooms: | 15(17.86%) | 40(47.62%) | 20(23.81%) | 7(8.33%) | 0(0%) | 2(2.38%) | 84 |
| The audio quality in the meeting rooms: | 17(20%) | 45(52.94%) | 20(23.53%) | 2(2.35%) | 1(1.18%) | 0(0%) | 85 |
| The quality of food and refreshments for the technical sessions: | 20(23.53%) | 42(49.41%) | 20(23.53%) | 1(1.18%) | 0(0%) | 2(2.35%) | 85 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Total Responded to this question: | 85 | 98.84% |
| Total who skipped this question: | 1 | 1.16% |
| Total: | 86 | 100% |

## 5. What aspects of the venue would you like to see improved for the next Meeting related to the venue ?

| | Responses | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Responses: | 24 | 100% |
| Total Responded to this question: | 24 | 27.91% |
| Total who skipped this question: | 62 | 72.09% |
| Total: | 86 | 100% |

5. What aspects of the venue would you like to see improved for the next Meeting related to the venue ?

| Response | Response Text |
|---|---|
| 1 | Small meeting rooms need to have better facilities for round table discussions. Large meeting room was too big for audience. |
| 2 | Places to work and / or rest |
| 3 | Lighting - it was too dark to take notes, and for travellers from different time zones, the darkness makes it hard to stay awake. |
| 4 | rooms were very dark and it was hard to do notes |
| 5 | Nothing |
| 6 | AC |
| 7 | N/A |
| 8 | It was perfect, from my point of view |
| 9 | Please make sure that the next time the room for the manufacturers stands will be no cold noisy garage with terrible climate. |
| 10 | None |
| 11 | i liked the web based app for technical meetings and scheduling and would like it to be a stand alone app that I could have opened at anytime not just when I could access the internet |
| 12 | Puerto Varas is excellent once you are there. But it adds an extra leg to a long trip. These meetings should be held near a major airport. Santiago would probably be a more adequate/convenient option. |
| 13 | It was very dark in the meeting room when presentations were being run, and not ideal that the there was no natural light coming through during the day - made it quite tiring. |
| 14 | Easy logistic. |
| 15 | Møre fruit |
| 16 | The meeting rooms were extremely dark during presentations. It was limiting eye contact between the presenter and the audience, and it was almost impossible to write a note. |
| 17 | I recommend improving audiovisual systems to improve presentations, including videos. |
| 18 | I have no recommendation |
| 19 | The location was very far away for most of people (final connection from Santiago to Puerto Varas was very, very long!). It may have dissuaded some people. However it was a wondefull place and very interesting regarding to farming area, and we better undestood why the place was chosen when we were there... Room for Interbull Steering commitee was not fully separated from lunch room and it was a bit noisy |
| 20 | Conference room was very dark for seeing your own notes |
| 21 | Places that are reachable with maximum of two plane rides. |
| 22 | Could hear speaker from other room through partition |
| 23 | why were the session in the dark ??? it was almost impossible to take notes on a paper (sorry I don't use a notebook for the first version of my notes) It would have possible to keep the light from the back of the room on ! and it would have been still possible to see the slides... |
| 24 | better small meeting rooms |

**6. Please rate the following aspects of the Social Program**

| | Excellent | Very good | Average | Below average | Poor | Not applicable | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Opening ceremony and cocktail - Teatro del Lago in Frutillar: | 59(71.08%) | 19(22.89%) | 3(3.61%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) | 2(2.41%) | 83 |
| Gala Dinner in Hotel Patagonico: | 20(24.69%) | 22(27.16%) | 17(20.99%) | 6(7.41%) | 0(0%) | 16(19.75%) | 81 |
| Technical tour: | 25(32.47%) | 31(40.26%) | 5(6.49%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) | 16(20.78%) | 77 |
| | | | | | Total Responded to this question: | 84 | 97.67% |
| | | | | | Total who skipped this question: | 2 | 2.33% |
| | | | | | Total: | 86 | 100% |

## 7. What improvements would you like to see to the social program for the next Meeting?

| | Responses | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Responses: | 14 | 100% |
| Total Responded to this question: | 14 | 16.28% |
| Total who skipped this question: | 72 | 83.72% |
| Total: | 86 | 100% |

7. What improvements would you like to see to the social program for the next Meeting?

| Response | Response Text |
|---|---|
| 1 | None, everything ok |
| 2 | A served dinner during Gala Dinner is more suitable. For welcome coktail self-servis is perfectly ok. |
| 3 | no specific comments |
| 4 | Gala dinner at a special location. Technical tour with joint traditional lunch or dinner for better networking. |
| 5 | N/A |
| 6 | During the tour 3, we have only seen the cows in the pastures in the R&W farm but it would have been interesting also to have a look at the milking parlours and other eventual equipments. Visit at Cooprinsem = very good. |
| 7 | none |
| 8 | There could be a happy hour everyday which would basically foster networking. They happen naturally outside the event promoted by companies (usually sponsors). So this is an opportunity to have it as part of the program. |
| 9 | n/a |
| 10 | For technical tour nt to much km. It was perfect. |
| 11 | The translators must be improved, also in my technical tour, ther was no megaphone or speaker for addressing the crowd, which made difficult the listening |
| 12 | It was all excellent |
| 13 | Include a tourist tour parallel to technical tour |
| 14 | The Gala dinner was in a small area where it was not easy to move and meet other people The large tables did not made it possible to talk with people in front of you, that meant it was only possible to talk to your closed neighbour |

## 8. What was your involvement in the Puerto Varas Meeting?

| | Responses | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Member Organising Committee: | 4 | 4.94% |
| Chair of session: | 9 | 11.11% |
| Gave an oral presentation: | 27 | 33.33% |
| Presented a poster: | 1 | 1.23% |
| Participant: | 63 | 77.78% |
| Accompanying person: | 2 | 2.47% |
| Congress host: | 1 | 1.23% |
| Attended one or more parts of the social programme: | 26 | 32.1% |
| Went on the Technical tour: | 29 | 35.8% |
| Represented a sponsor: | 6 | 7.41% |
| Participating as Cooprinsem delegate: | 2 | 2.47% |
| If other, please specify: | 6 | 7% |
| Total Responded to this question: | 81 | 94.19% |
| Total who skipped this question: | 5 | 5.81% |
| Total: | 86 | 100% |

8. What was your involvement in the Puerto Varas Meeting?

| Response | Comments |
|---|---|
| 1 | Part of ICAR secretariat |
| 2 | Dairy farmer |
| 3 | I am intereseted in develping more icar standard animal records in Chile |
| 4 | Interbull meeting |
| 5 | ICAR Staff |
| 6 | Breeders Holando Argentino |

**9. Please rate the following aspects of the technical programme**

| | Excellent | Very good | Average | Below average | Poor | Not applicable | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sessions: | 14(17.07%) | 57(69.51%) | 9(10.98%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) | 2(2.44%) | 82 |
| Speakers in the sessions: | 14(16.87%) | 58(69.88%) | 9(10.84%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) | 2(2.41%) | 83 |
| Presentations in the sessions: | 13(15.85%) | 55(67.07%) | 12(14.63%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) | 2(2.44%) | 82 |
| Discussion during formal sessions: | 13(15.66%) | 42(50.6%) | 25(30.12%) | 1(1.2%) | 0(0%) | 2(2.41%) | 83 |
| Discussion outside of formal sessions: | 23(28.05%) | 44(53.66%) | 12(14.63%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) | 3(3.66%) | 82 |
| | | | | | Total Responded to this question: | 83 | 96.51% |
| | | | | | Total who skipped this question: | 3 | 3.49% |
| | | | | | Total: | 86 | 100% |

## 10. How would you like the technical sessions to be improved at the next Meeting ?

| | Responses | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Responses: | 14 | 100% |
| Total Responded to this question: | 14 | 16.28% |
| Total who skipped this question: | 72 | 83.72% |
| Total: | 86 | 100% |

10. How would you like the technical sessions to be improved at the next Meeting ?

| Response | Response Text |
|---|---|
| 1 | I think these work better with a larger audience. Given the smaller numbers at the Puerto Varas meeting, perhaps we should have reconsidered the number of simultaneous sessions. I felt sorry for the speakers on the last day who had very few participants in their sessions. |
| 2 | The chairmanship of the technical session is very important to orientate the questions. In the first sessions, it was not always done properly. |
| 3 | no specific comments |
| 4 | No parallel sessions anymore. Attendees were brought into a situation were they wanted to attend two sessions at the same time but had to chose between them. |
| 5 | Be careful in the scheduling concurrent sessions to avoid topics of similar interest being in conflict. There were not a lot of concurrent sessions but there were two (manufacturer showcase and milk analysis) of similar interest that were at the same time |
| 6 | N/A |
| 7 | The ICAR open sessions before the ICAR official session and in parallel with the Interbull open sessions was a very good idea because it gives broader possibilities for the participants. |
| 8 | continue to have several options to allow participants to have good experiences that show details of the country we are visiting |
| 9 | Focus on production linked to ICAR regulations. Mostly of the SA countries did not use ICAR regulations. |
| 10 | Oral presentation with few slides is much better, than a presentation with tens of fancy slides which you see only for a few seconds. |
| 11 | There were a lot presentationd of the sponsors . These are commercial breaks witje less added value. |
| 12 | Ensure presentation times to allow time for questions in all presentations |
| 13 | Minsimise Overlaps Progarm to have more detail on topics/content |
| 14 | The presentation overlap between ICAR and Interbull was sometinmes a problem... |

**11. If you made a presentation please rate the following**

| | Excellent | Very good | Average | Below average | Poor | Not applicable | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The process for having your paper/poster accepted: | 5(9.43%) | 13(24.53%) | 12(22.64%) | 1(1.89%) | 0(0%) | 22(41.51%) | 53 |
| The relevance of the session it was allocated to: | 7(12.96%) | 23(42.59%) | 4(7.41%) | 1(1.85%) | 0(0%) | 19(35.19%) | 54 |
| Attendance during your presentation: | 7(13.21%) | 15(28.3%) | 6(11.32%) | 4(7.55%) | 1(1.89%) | 20(37.74%) | 53 |
| Questions and discussion following your presentation: | 7(13.21%) | 14(26.42%) | 11(20.75%) | 1(1.89%) | 0(0%) | 20(37.74%) | 53 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Total Responded to this question: | 53 | 61.63% |
| Total who skipped this question: | 33 | 38.37% |
| Total: | 86 | 100% |

## 12. How would you like the presenter experience improved in the next Meeting ?

| | Responses | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Responses: | 8 | 100% |
| Total Responded to this question: | 8 | 9.3% |
| Total who skipped this question: | 78 | 90.7% |
| Total: | 86 | 100% |

12. How would you like the presenter experience improved in the next Meeting ?

| Response | Response Text |
|---|---|
| 1 | I did find the abstract submission forms on the website confusing, and abstract/paper instructions were sometimes not clear. I did not receive a notification of acceptance; I only confirmed when the program was released and my name was on it. My emails requesting instructions were not answered (maybe not received?). |
| 2 | no comments |
| 3 | I presented in a parallel session and did like the fact that my session was competing with two other ones. |
| 4 | N/A |
| 5 | be sure presenters stay in time frames so as to not rush the next speaker |
| 6 | n/a |
| 7 | It was all great |
| 8 | The balance between time for discussion and papers was heavily weighted towards papers - for some topics, more scope for general discussion would be very valuable. Perhaps leaving 5-10 minutes at the end of a session for general discussion of that session would be useful. |

**13. Please rate these other aspects of the Meeting**

| | Excellent | Very good | Average | Below average | Poor | Not applicable | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Involvement of sponsors: | 13(16.05%) | 47(58.02%) | 19(23.46%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) | 2(2.47%) | 81 |
| Conference app: | 8(10.13%) | 35(44.3%) | 18(22.78%) | 2(2.53%) | 0(0%) | 16(20.25%) | 79 |
| Conference web site: | 10(12.5%) | 39(48.75%) | 20(25%) | 9(11.25%) | 0(0%) | 2(2.5%) | 80 |
| Access to abstracts: | 9(11.39%) | 44(55.7%) | 16(20.25%) | 2(2.53%) | 3(3.8%) | 5(6.33%) | 79 |
| Access to manuscripts: | 6(7.79%) | 35(45.45%) | 21(27.27%) | 2(2.6%) | 3(3.9%) | 10(12.99%) | 77 |
| Conference venue: | 17(20.99%) | 51(62.96%) | 12(14.81%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) | 1(1.23%) | 81 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Total Responded to this question: | 82 | 95.35% |
| Total who skipped this question: | 4 | 4.65% |
| Total: | 86 | 100% |

## 14. What improvements would you like to see on any of these other aspects for the next Meeting ?

| | Responses | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Responses: | 15 | 100% |
| Total Responded to this question: | 15 | 17.44% |
| Total who skipped this question: | 71 | 82.56% |
| Total: | 86 | 100% |

14. What improvements would you like to see on any of these other aspects for the next Meeting ?

| Response | Response Text |
|---|---|
| 1 | better access to the presentation and a list of participants. |
| 2 | Conference web site - particularly the registration process, and accommodation booking process need to be improved. |
| 3 | no specific comments |
| 4 | Conference app with chat option. |
| 5 | Would it no make sense to use the same conference app and website for every ICAR meeting rather than investing money every year creating new ones? |
| 6 | N/A |
| 7 | have the website give more details on tours and what is available to do pre and post meeting |
| 8 | I believe that the ICAR staff needs to be more involved in the organization of the meetings to ensure a quality standard and not depend so much on the local organization. Events could become an important source of income to ICAR as they are for EAAP, ASAS, ADSA, IDF, etc. BUt then ICAR needs to be the driver of the process instead of delegating key aspects of the program and sponsorship to the local organization. |
| 9 | The program on the website in an excel format was a little hard to follow |
| 10 | Not enought information about the application linked to the congress.... I discovered it after teh end of the meeting to have a list of participant (and this list isn't exhaustive) |
| 11 | The app has lots of potential, but not much people put relevant information in it. |
| 12 | It was all great |
| 13 | Plateform to transmit our summaries, présentations and papers should be improved: we didn't know whether our corrections were taken into account (ie was it clear that a new version was replacing a paper that had already been sent), no pdf showing that the presentation was well transmitted etc... |
| 14 | Improved website for meeting |
| 15 | Why were the abstract not available a few days before the conference ? |

**15. Overall how would you rate the Puerto Varas ICAR Meeting**

| | Excellent | Very good | Average | Below average | Poor | Not applicable | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Quality of the technical program: | 25(30.12%) | 51(61.45%) | 5(6.02%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) | 2(2.41%) | 83 |
| Quality of the social program: | 25(30.12%) | 45(54.22%) | 11(13.25%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) | 2(2.41%) | 83 |
| Congress facilities including accommodation: | 23(28.05%) | 46(56.1%) | 11(13.41%) | 1(1.22%) | 0(0%) | 1(1.22%) | 82 |
| Value for money: | 13(15.66%) | 34(40.96%) | 32(38.55%) | 3(3.61%) | 0(0%) | 1(1.2%) | 83 |
| | | | | | Total Responded to this question: | 83 | 96.51% |
| | | | | | Total who skipped this question: | 3 | 3.49% |
| | | | | | Total: | 86 | 100% |

**16. Please rank (1=most important, 5=least important) the following in determining if you will attend the ICAR Meeting which will be held in Edinburgh, UK on 12 – 16 June 2017**

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| An invitation to present a paper: | 16(24.24%) | 14(21.21%) | 13(19.7%) | 2(3.03%) | 21(31.82%) | 66 |
| Availability of funding to cover my costs: | 19(27.54%) | 17(24.64%) | 15(21.74%) | 7(10.14%) | 11(15.94%) | 69 |
| Detailed content of the technical program: | 28(39.44%) | 26(36.62%) | 9(12.68%) | 4(5.63%) | 4(5.63%) | 71 |
| Detailed content of the Social program: | 2(2.99%) | 12(17.91%) | 24(35.82%) | 17(25.37%) | 12(17.91%) | 67 |
| Technical tours to see the level of agriculture in UK: | 17(23.61%) | 23(31.94%) | 14(19.44%) | 10(13.89%) | 8(11.11%) | 72 |
| Cost of registration: | 14(19.44%) | 22(30.56%) | 26(36.11%) | 6(8.33%) | 4(5.56%) | 72 |
| Cost of travel: | 18(25.35%) | 18(25.35%) | 17(23.94%) | 13(18.31%) | 5(7.04%) | 71 |
| | | | | Total Responded to this question: | 73 | 84.88% |
| | | | | Total who skipped this question: | 13 | 15.12% |
| | | | | Total: | 86 | 100% |

### 17. How likely are you to attend the Congress in Edinburgh ?

| | Responses | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Definitely will: | 22 | 27.5% |
| May do: | 26 | 32.5% |
| Not sure: | 18 | 22.5% |
| May not: | 8 | 10% |
| Definitely will not: | 2 | 2.5% |
| If other, please specify: | 4 | 5% |
| Total Responded to this question: | 80 | 93.02% |
| Total who skipped this question: | 6 | 6.98% |
| Total: | 86 | 100% |

17. How likely are you to attend the Congress in Edinburgh ?

| Response | Comments |
|---|---|
| 1 | A colleugue Will go |
| 2 | Unfortunately family commitments but will be represented by a colleague |
| 3 | probably not |
| 4 | Member of the board... |

## 18. Do you have any other comments or suggestions for the organisers of Edinburgh 2017?

| | Responses | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Responses: | 13 | 100% |
| Total Responded to this question: | 13 | 15.12% |
| Total who skipped this question: | 73 | 84.88% |
| Total: | 86 | 100% |

18. Do you have any other comments or suggestions for the organisers of Edinburgh 2017?

| Response | Response Text |
|---|---|
| 1 | Early communication about the programme (even the outline), and pricing and accommodation. |
| 2 | I'd like to go to Edinburgh, but priority (genetics) is for other conferences in the financial year. |
| 3 | Closed working groups are discussing more detailed questions, and overall reports could be given to open sessions, that participants who are not in working groups could be faster introduced with initiatives and activities of the ICAR |
| 4 | Extra attention should be paid to all the latest developments in milk testing, either on-farm or in laboratories |
| 5 | N/A |
| 6 | build on the technical opportunities to give participants a good meeting experience with an app or app like cell phone product. I really enjoyed being able to keep track of topics and speakers I wanted to hear compared to years past |
| 7 | Avoid concurrent sessions for the same demographics. Minimize working groups meetings and technical sessions overlap. Free scotch sampling panels everyday!!! |
| 8 | Have a larger variety for accomodation including some sheaper hotels tah' in Puerto Varas. |
| 9 | Møre focus in big data, genomics and innovations in milkrecording |
| 10 | Technical tours must including sheep farming, and slaughterhose visits |
| 11 | Do it professional and funny |
| 12 | 1) get very competitive hotel rates 2) post as soon as possible a general schedule of the meeting (ie. when it starts (AM or PM of a given day, and then an outline of what happens each day and exactly when it ends). In this way people can plan ahead. |
| 13 | For me the quality of the session chairman is something important. This job should not be underestimated ! |

**19. What is the nature of your current employment ?**

| | Responses | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Public researcher: | 7 | 8.97% |
| Teacher: | 1 | 1.28% |
| Employed by University: | 9 | 11.54% |
| Employed by Research organisation: | 16 | 20.51% |
| Working in a Breeding Company: | 26 | 33.33% |
| Working in extension service: | 11 | 14.1% |
| Consultant: | 7 | 8.97% |
| Undergraduate student: | 0 | 0% |
| Graduate student: | 0 | 0% |
| Post Doc: | 3 | 3.85% |
| Retired: | 1 | 1.28% |
| If other, please specify: | 17 | 21% |
| Total Responded to this question: | 78 | 90.7% |
| Total who skipped this question: | 8 | 9.3% |
| Total: | 86 | 100% |

19. What is the nature of your current employment ?

| Response | Comments |
|---|---|
| 1 | Working in a biotech company |
| 2 | Employed by a services company |
| 3 | Manufacturer |
| 4 | Manafacturer |
| 5 | Working in a Milk Recording, labs and dealer Company |
| 6 | supervision of breeding activities |
| 7 | Instrument manufacturer |
| 8 | Own and operate a dairy |
| 9 | DHIA |
| 10 | Dairy herd improvement CEO |
| 11 | Industry |
| 12 | National genetic evaluation services |
| 13 | Lab |
| 14 | Freelance Vet |
| 15 | Industry body |
| 16 | Operations Manager DHI organisation |
| 17 | genetic evaluation unit |

## 20. Please enter your contact information if you wish

| | Responses | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| First Name: | 34 | 97.14% |
| Last Name: | 33 | 94.29% |
| Institution: | 30 | 85.71% |
| City: | 32 | 91.43% |
| Country: | 33 | 94.29% |
| Email Address: | 34 | 97.14% |
| Total Responded to this question: | 35 | 40.7% |
| Total who skipped this question: | 51 | 59.3% |
| Total: | 86 | 100% |

20. Please enter your contact information if you wish

| Response | First Name |
|---|---|
| 1 | Brian |
| 2 | Aldo |
| 3 | Eric |
| 4 | Brett |
| 5 | Pavel |
| 6 | Chris |
| 7 | kwanghyeon |
| 8 | Carlos |
| 9 | Dalia |
| 10 | Terence |
| 11 | German |
| 12 | Mario Edo. |
| 13 | Tilman |
| 14 | Jere |
| 15 | Jørgen |
| 16 | Jean-Michel |
| 17 | Joao |
| 18 | Juan José |
| 19 | Kacper |
| 20 | Kaija |
| 21 | Laurent |
| 22 | Antonio |
| 23 | Louwrens |
| 24 | Marcelo |
| 25 | Mingche |
| 26 | Mohammad Ali |
| 27 | Noureddine |
| 28 | Harald |
| 29 | Pedro |
| 30 | Raffaella |
| 31 | Robert |
| 32 | Sophie |
| 33 | Tony |
| 34 | Javier |

| Response | Last Name |
|---|---|
| 1 | Wickham |

| | |
|---|---|
| 2 | Girardi |
| 3 | Barras |
| 4 | Ellis |
| 5 | Bucek |
| 6 | cho |
| 7 | Trejo |
| 8 | Laureckaitė-Tumelienė |
| 9 | Dye |
| 10 | Stolzenbach |
| 11 | Olivares |
| 12 | Hoefelmayr |
| 13 | High |
| 14 | Katholm |
| 15 | ASTRUC |
| 16 | Durr |
| 17 | LLanten |
| 18 | Zukowski |
| 19 | Hyppänen |
| 20 | Journaux |
| 21 | Martins |
| 22 | van Keulen |
| 23 | Hervé |
| 24 | Wu |
| 25 | Nilforooshan |
| 26 | Charfeddine |
| 27 | Wenzel |
| 28 | Fornero |
| 29 | Finocchiaro |
| 30 | Banks |
| 31 | Mattalia |
| 32 | Craven |
| 33 | Fernandez |

| Response | Institution |
|---|---|
| 1 | Agri-Traçabilité Québec |
| 2 | rte de Grangeneuve 27 |
| 3 | Tru-Test |
| 4 | Czech Moravian Breeders´ Corporation, Inc. |
| 5 | NIAS |
| 6 | Cooprinsem |
| 7 | State animal breeding supervision service under the Ministry of Agriculture |
| 8 | Dyecrest Dairy LLc. |
| 9 | WMB AG / LactoCorder |
| 10 | Lancaster DHIA |
| 11 | DNA Diagnostic |
| 12 | Institut de l'Elevage |
| 13 | Council on Dairy Cattle Breeding |
| 14 | SAG |
| 15 | National Research Institute of Animal Production |
| 16 | Faba osk |
| 17 | France Genetique Elevage |
| 18 | ANABLE |
| 19 | CRV |

| | |
|---|---|
| 20 | Balvi Chile Limitada |
| 21 | Taiwan Livestock Research Institute |
| 22 | University of Otago |
| 23 | ctra de andalucia km 23,600 |
| 24 | Laboratory Center of Cooprinsem |
| 25 | INTI - National Institute of Techonological Industries |
| 26 | Italian Holstein Association |
| 27 | AGBU, c/- UNE |
| 28 | Institut de l'Elevage |
| 29 | NMR |
| 30 | ACHA |
| Response | City |
| 1 | Longueuil |
| 2 | Posieux |
| 3 | Auckland |
| 4 | Hradistko |
| 5 | seoul |
| 6 | Osorno |
| 7 | Vilnius |
| 8 | Fort Collins |
| 9 | Los Muermos |
| 10 | Osorno |
| 11 | Balgach |
| 12 | Manheim |
| 13 | Aarhus |
| 14 | Toulouse |
| 15 | Bowie |
| 16 | Osorno |
| 17 | Balice |
| 18 | Helsinki |
| 19 | Paris |
| 20 | Aveiro |
| 21 | Arnhem |
| 22 | Santiago |
| 23 | Tainan |
| 24 | Dunedin |
| 25 | VALDEMORO |
| 26 | Osorno |
| 27 | Rafaela |
| 28 | Cremona |
| 29 | Armidale |
| 30 | Paris |
| 31 | Chippenham |
| 32 | Bolívar |
| Response | Country |
| 1 | Canada |
| 2 | Switzerland |
| 3 | NZ |
| 4 | Czech Republic |
| 5 | south korea |
| 6 | Chile |

| | |
|---|---|
| 7 | Lithuania |
| 8 | USA |
| 9 | Chile |
| 10 | Chile |
| 11 | Switzerland |
| 12 | USA |
| 13 | Denmark |
| 14 | France |
| 15 | United States |
| 16 | Chile |
| 17 | Poland |
| 18 | Finland |
| 19 | France |
| 20 | Portugal |
| 21 | The Netherlands |
| 22 | Chile |
| 23 | Taiwan |
| 24 | New Zealand |
| 25 | España |
| 26 | Chile |
| 27 | Argentina |
| 28 | Italy |
| 29 | Australia |
| 30 | France |
| 31 | UK |
| 32 | Argentina |
| 33 | France |

| Response | Email Address |
|---|---|
| 1 | brian@icar.org |
| 2 | agirardi@atq.qc.ca |
| 3 | barras@holstein.ch |
| 4 | brett.ellis@trutest.co.nz |
| 5 | bucek@cmsch.cz |
| 6 | Chris.gerritsen@nedap.com |
| 7 | ckh1219@korea.kr |
| 8 | ctrejo@cooprinsem.cl |
| 9 | dalia.laureckaite-tumeliene@veislininkyste.lt |
| 10 | dye@frii.com |
| 11 | fundoelcopihue@gmail.com |
| 12 | marioedo@telsur.cl |
| 13 | t.hoefelmayr@wmb.ch |
| 14 | Jere@lancasterdhia.com |
| 15 | jk@dna-diagnostic.com |
| 16 | Jean-Michel.Astruc@idele.fr |
| 17 | joao.durr@cdcb.us |
| 18 | juan.llanten@sag.gob.cl |
| 19 | kacper.zukowski@izoo.krakow.pl |
| 20 | kaija.hyppanen@faba.fi |
| 21 | Laurent.journaux@idele.fr |
| 22 | lmartins@abln.pt |
| 23 | Louwrens.van.keulen@crv4all.com |

| | |
|---|---|
| 24 | marcelo.herve@balvi.cl |
| 25 | mcwu71246@gmail.com |
| 26 | mnil@maths.otago.ac.nz |
| 27 | nouredine.charfeddine@conafe.com |
| 28 | owenzel@cooprinsem.cl |
| 29 | pfornero@inti.gob.ar |
| 30 | raffaellafinocchiaro@anafi.it |
| 31 | rbanks@une.edu.au |
| 32 | sophie.mattalia@idele.fr |
| 33 | tonyc@nmr.co.uk |
| 34 | javiero.fernandez@gmail.com |