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The Goals

Permit submission and acceptance of results any time they’re ready
- Frequent submission opportunities
- Rapid turnaround to published paper
- Reduce incentives to “cram” before deadlines and submit half-baked work

Improve quality of papers and review process
- Start with papers written under less time pressure
- Create incentives for high-quality and constructive reviews
- Facilitate a more collaborative process between reviewers and authors
- Smooth the reviewing workload to a low-volume, ongoing effort
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Reduce community’s overall work on papers that will eventually be accepted

IEEE S&P 2017 rejected 32+ papers that were accepted to USENIX Security 2017
Design Process

Early 2016: Interviews with former and current chairs of VLDB and PETS, as well as members of those communities

Spring 2016: Preliminary, informal feedback from members of the S&P community

May 2016: S&P business meeting approves formal planning process


Advertised to:

- S&P 2017 PC members
- Everyone who expressed interest via last year’s S&P symposium survey
- Community via the 2017 Call for Papers
- Members of the IEEE Computer Society’s Technical Committee on Security & Privacy (TCSP)
- All registered attendees for this year’s symposium
Validating the process

Baseline: Surveys to PC members, submission authors, attendees

After 6 months: PC Chairs consult with TC and community and adjust procedures if necessary

After 1 year: Surveys to PC members, submission authors, attendees
  Discussion and review at 2018 business meeting
  Announcement of any significant procedural changes

After 2 years: Surveys to PC members, submission authors
  If metrics are bad, vote at the 2019 business meeting to revert to the old system
Proposed Process Overview — Author Perspective

1. Submission deadline on the 1st of every month
   a. No bulk submission limits
2. Guaranteed response within 2 months
   a. Accept (estimate 1-5%)
      i. Submit camera-ready version within 1 month
      1. Immediately published open access in the IEEE Computer Society Digital Library
      2. Same one-year blackout starting immediately after the conference
   b. Revise (estimate 10-14%)
      i. Resubmit within 3 months (else treated as new submission)
      ii. Reviewed by same set of reviewers; expect ~80% accept rate
   c. Reject
      i. Wait one year before resubmitting the same paper to S&P
3. All papers accepted by end of February invited to appear at the Symposium

See https://ieee-security.github.io/ongoing-submission-plan/ for details
Proposed Process Overview — PC Perspective

1. PC bidding handled largely automatically (a la CCS)
2. PC member receives new set of 3-5 papers to review every two months
   a. With a probable spike at the very end
3. Reviews submitted within 1 month
4. Online discussion and potential additional reviews
   a. Facilitated by PC Chairs and Associate Chairs
5. To ensure transparency:
   a. All discussions open (modulo conflicts) as they are today
   b. For each paper, 3-5 PC members who did not review it, are also assigned to sanity-check reviews and participate in discussions
6. PC meeting the day before the symposium
   a. Discuss process
   b. Select best paper awards

See https://ieee-security.github.io/ongoing-submission-plan/ for details
FAQ: How will this affect submission volume?

## Submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Acceptance Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Acceptance Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FAQ: How will this affect submission volume?

We expect to enlarge the PC to compensate.
FAQ: Will people wait until the last minute to submit?

73% not submitted at the last minute
The Ask

*We want your vote to begin this experiment to improve the IEEE S&P submission process*