

1706 original articles were submitted, and 26 reviews and 28 ideas papers invited. There were decisions on 1117, of which 36% were accepted, 29% immediately rejected, and 35% rejected following review. These outcomes are similar to previous years. The mean time from submission to decision was 43 days, and accepted papers appeared online in less than 4 weeks. Leigh aims to get decision times down. The Impact Factor is now 3.083, up from 2.926, which is similar to *Animal Behaviour* and *Behavioral Ecology & Sociobiology*. However, the *Behavioral Ecology* Impact Factor seems to be drifting compared to the other journals, which are still rising. A new initiative is the introduction of an Editor's Choice article, free to view, which will lead to virtual issues. The Journal also has excellent Oxford University Press media officer, who will increase press releases. The electronic journal is also very active, with 20-30,000 html and pdf downloads per quarter, and another initiative is the already popular mobile web site. The QR code on the on back of journal takes you to site, where you can search current and archived papers. Ultimately, the key to long-term success is a good flow of high quality papers, so Leigh reiterated Gunilla's message to publish in *Behavioral Ecology*. He also emphasized that, despite some comments he had heard, *Behavioral Ecology* was not a "bird journal"; for example, in the last two years only 33% of papers were on birds, a similar percentage to invertebrates. The Journal encourages a diversity of papers, including on humans.

Leigh invited discussion and questions about the journal. Two people praised the Journal's double-blind reviewing process, and one of these delegates suggested that the journal could prosper by become more geographically inclusive. Currently, most papers are by authors from the USA, UK or continental Europe, but perhaps the journal could actively encourage and support research and publication from other areas. Leigh agreed to meet and discuss initiatives. This issue was related to another discussion about what differentiates the Journal from other behaviour journals. Trond Amundson suggested that increasing communication and controversy would help the journal. Leigh noted that the Forum section was designed to do exactly that, and the first issue with a full set of Forum papers was in 2011, and this may soon be reflected in journal impact. There was some discussion whether the process of "invitation" of Forum papers disadvantaged young researchers, and how one came to be "invited". Leigh reassured everyone that it was possible to propose an article, after which they could be invited to write it; there is already information on the web site. Finally, there was discussion about the cost of Open Access publication in the Journal. Open Access is available to all authors, but there is limited demand. Cathy Kennedy, from Oxford University Press, said that a small reduction in price would probably have little impact on uptake, while a large reduction would drastically reduce income to the Society.

Leigh concluded by warmly thanking Cathy Kennedy, from Oxford University Press, for her energetic support for the Journal over many years, and wished her well for an active retirement. The vote of thanks was echoed by general applause, as many of us have enjoyed working with Cathy and have appreciated her interest in the success of the Society and Journal.

Walt Koenig, who has been the Treasurer since 2000, reported that the Society was in good financial shape. The bulk of the Society's income comes from our share of the Journal profits, which is split roughly 50:50 with Oxford University Press. In the last few years the Society has received about \$100,000 US per year from the Journal, and a small amount from membership fees. The Society also has an agreement with local organizing committees to return profits from conferences, but in practice organizers have been successful in keeping costs down and avoiding profits. The Society has a reserve of \$400,000, and aims to spend all current income, which means about \$200,000 each two years. Most of this money is spent on travel grants to enable members to attend the biennial conference. This year the grants committee, composed of Walt Keonig, Rob Magrath (Secretary), Bruce Lyon and Roxanna Torres (Councillors) assessed the grants and awarded \$220,000 to support 139 grant applicants out of 179 applications. Priority goes to senior PhD students, early career researchers, and those from developing countries. Many of those that were not funded are likely to be funded next time, as senior PhD students get priority over Masters and early-PhD students. Other Society costs include the Newsletter, and subsidised travel for *Behavioral Ecology* Editors and members of the ISBE Executive to attend the biennial meetings held before the ISBE conference. All financial records are available to members of the Society, so anyone is welcome to contact the Treasurer for further details.

Gunilla rounded off proceedings by asking for opinions on where we should seek to hold the 2016 meeting. Should we seek to have it in Europe – the usual pattern given the proximity to many behavioral ecologists and that the 2014 meeting will be in North America – or should we seek a new destination, such as Asia, Africa or South America? There was little time for discussion, given that conference talks were about to start, but Leigh Simmons voiced a common view that holding the conference in a new location would emphasize that we are a truly international Society.

I would like to finish by thanking Andres Brodin, Chair of the Lund organizing committee, the organizing committee as a whole, and all of the volunteers for a marvellous conference. Given how smoothly the conference ran, and how welcoming everyone was, it is easy to overlook the massive amount of work that underlies organizing and running a conference of this size. I know that at least one member of the organizing committee – Dennis Hasselquist – had sleepless nights working on strategies to balance the budget in the face of unexpected costs. And I'm sure he was not the only one to lose sleep. So I offer my personal thanks and appreciation, as well as those of the Society membership as a whole. We all left with happy memories of both the conference and the lovely city of Lund – and admiration for the organizing committee's Meteorological Officer, who produced the unbroken run of sunny days.

Rob Magrath
Australian National University
ISBE Secretary