DRAFT MINUTES

IEEE Computer Society Technical Committee on Security and Privacy (TCSP)
Annual Business Meeting (Which Won't be Boring!)
Tuesday, May 24, 2011

Presentations and Organizing chair's reports, are available at
http://www.ieee-security.org/TC/Reports.html

Call to Order – Hilarie Orman

(The meeting had approximately 75 people in attendance).

Recognition and Awards – Hilarie Orman and Deborah Frincke

This is the annual meeting of the Technical Society on Security and Privacy. It's the group that's in between the Computer Society and the conference.

We're extremely grateful to the conference organizers. It's a volunteer organization. Ordinary, uncompensated people. Thank you!

Recognition of General Chair's team – Deborah Frincke presented Certificates of Appreciation to:
- Rob Cunningham – Registration Chair, Vice Chair
- Michael Gagnon - website
- Rachel Greenstadt – posters and workshops
- Kristen Gates – local logistics
- David Molnar – fundraising
- Robin Sommer – Treasurer

Certificate of Appreciation for the Program co-chair, Somesh Jha.

Certificate of Appreciation (and a "glass thingy" specific to the Program Committee) for the Senior Program Chair, Giovanni Vigna. He has given two years of service, and will continue as an advisor. Thanks to Giovanni for all he's done.

Certificate of Appreciation (and a "glass thingy") for General Chair, Deborah Frincke. Thank you!

New Organizers and Officers – Hilarie Orman

What is the TCSP? It is part of a hierarchy:

- IEEE
- Computer Society
- Technical Committee on Security & Privacy (one of 42 TC's)
- Officers
    - o Chair: Hilarie Orman
    - o Vice Chair: Sven Dietrich
    - o Treasurer: Terry Benzel
    - o Chair Emeritus: Cynthia Irvine
- The TC oversees:
    - o Steering Committee for the Computer Security Foundations Symposium
    - o "In cooperation with" & special projects
    - o Steering Committee for the Security & Privacy Symposium, and the Security & Privacy Workshops

The Vice Chair position is especially important, since the Vice Chair becomes the Chair. The future chairs will have to guide us through the tumultuous times ahead, since the conference has become so popular. The nominating committee found some one well suited, available, and willing, in fact enthusiastic. Patrick McDaniel. (APPLAUSE) Hilarie take it as concurrence with the Nomination Committee's selection. Terry Benzel will continue as TC Treasurer.

New Event: Security & Privacy Workshops – Sven Dietrich

The Security & Privacy Workshops are important, and they're important for growth. We want make them more formal, and to grow them a lot. The URL for the 2012 workshops is at http://www.ieee-security.org/TC/SPW2012. There are two deadlines. The first deadline is June 15, and those applications will have priority over applications submitted by the second deadline (mid-August). The number of workshops for next year will depend on the logistics for the S&P Symposium; the two events will remain co-located.

Discussion Topics – Hilarie Orman

All topics are open for discussion at http://mailman.xmission.com/mailman/listinfo/ieeetcsp Join the list and post email, or just read the archives.

- Discussion list: ieeetcsp@mailman.xmission.com
- Program: how many papers?
- Copyright
- Number of attendees and venue

The clamoring to attend this conference is exceeding anything we've seen in past. We can keep an comfortable and intimate ambience, or we can crowd more people into the current facility. Another option is to go somewhere else where we can accommodate more attendees in less cramped circumstances.

Size of Technical Program – Somesh Jha

Brief (SEE SOMESH'S SLIDES)

Acceptance Rates
- CCS 2010
- NDSS 2011
- Usenix 2011

Oakland 2011?
- Average
- Oakland 2011
- What if we had taken average number of papers?

What is Happening in Other Communities?

- Acceptance rates have been steadily increasing
- Example
    o PLDI

Consequences
- Our students and junior professors are at a disadvantage
- When applying for a job or coming up for promotion they are evaluated in a "global context"
    o Comparison to peers in other areas (e.g., programming languages and database)

It's important to keep up with the trends in other communities. We're not in a vacuum. We're part of larger Computer Society community.

Pros and Cons
- Pros
    o More papers
    o …
- Cons
    o Changes to the conference
    o Option 1: Multiple tracks
         CCS did it a few years ago
         …
    o Option 2: Longer conference

Exploring the Options
- Option 1: Multiple tacks
    o … days: will accommodate around 50 papers
    o Probably will need to change venues
- Option 2: Longer conference
    o Three full days

       ❑ Accommodate approx 40 papers)
- o Shorter talks (20 mins)
  - ❑ Accommodate around 50 papers

OPEN DISCUSSION

Question: Dan Wallach – of the papers submitted, how many that were not accepted were of good quality and should have been accepted? Answer: Giovanni Vigna – probably another 10.

Other comments:

– Don't need to raise the number significantly. We were accepting more some years ago. We just need to go back to normal. If we get so many more submissions should probably take more.

– In addition to papers, this year is missing panels. It is sometimes nice to have a panel.

– I support three full days. I like idea having panels. We could also have some shorter talks and some longer talk, e.g., the award papers could be given more time.

– There is a third option – hold the conference twice a year, once in spring, once if fall. Stay here for one, go somewhere else for the other.

– The reason the acceptance rate so low is because the number of submissions is so high. I'm not convinced that the quality of papers is going up as quickly as the number of papers. I worry that if we accept a lot more papers, then we will accept a lot more that people won't want to sit through. I say this having had papers rejected. So we need to be careful drawing the line.

– Tom Baldwin finished analysis across Technical Committee conferences where average was about 27%. Have seen others in similar situation, a lot decided that instead of changing, they kept programs where they wanted and instead looked at the opportunity to use workshops, and adjust the submission scheduling so final decisions on program in line with good work being pointed towards workshops.

Mike Reiter – I want to give credit for increasing number of accepted papers this year. The field is rich enough that none of us is a master in everything covered, so that points to benefits of multiple tracks. Give attendees choices based on what they are interested in at any point at time. The field is no longer narrow. We should consider multiple track options.

Dave Evans – Previous year consensus that accepted papers were a good set and we not leave any great ones out. I support multiple tracks, but it's super important keep high standards, so only pursue multiple tracks with the understating that quality must stay high. Without quality people will not come.

Rob Cunningham – When I signed up to be General Chair, I did not agree to do it two times in one year, so I'm against that proposal. I think 3 full days are fine. Twenty-minute talks are also

ok; we can turn things over a bit quicker. I like the comment on panels; it would be nice to break up the series of talks, and create excitement.

Hilarie Orman – Last remark. Some conferences are maintaining themselves below 10%. There is a downside of conservatism in program committee when acceptance rates remain so low.

Governance – Terry Benzel

The Symposium organizing committee for 2012 will have Rob Cunningham as General Chair, Robin Sommer as Registration/Vice Chair, and Greg Shannon as Treasurer. The incoming Program Chair, to serve with Somesh Jha, is Wenke Lee.

Cynthia Irvine and Terry were asked to chair a Governance Committee. We researched what the Computer Society recommends as a charter for Technical Committees. There was one written for the Technical Committee by John Millen some years ago, but we can't find. It was written in pre-Google days, and John has not responded to email.

We will write up recommendations and post it on the web site. Look for the Governance document on the http://www.ieee-security.org/TC/Reports.html website.

Only elected position is the Vice Chair, since that position ascends to the Chair.
It's a 2-year commitment. Every 2 years we have an election.
There's a nomination period. Nominations sent to Technical Committee chair and Steering Committee, which advises on the nominations.

The conference has 4 appointed positions plus the Steering Committee …
General Chair, Vice Chair, Program Committee Chair, and Treasurer. They create the rest of their teams.

Should the technical papers be available without a paywall? Should we change publishers? What is the impact on careers?

Initial remarks by Hilarie Orman.

Our proceedings are in the IEEE Computer Society's Digital Library, which is behind a paywall. Copyright is held by IEEE. Some other conferences left IEEE due to issues with copyright and the desire to make work freely available.

We received feedback from 14 of the Program Committee members. The most important thing is to have papers freely available. The Computer Society did not reply when we identified copyright as an issue. Others on Program Committee said putting it on personal web sites was great, but must be in the digital library to give it "officiality", so don't give that up.

There are a lot of options. Other people can provide digital library services.

How important is it? Should we give guidance the TC (PC?) to implement? Investigate options and report next year? Where do we want go?

Hilarie's bias – 10 and 20 years ago asked why in the world should we assign copyright, we don't need a publisher. We provide the digital media to attendees.

OPEN DISCUSSION

Dan Wallach – I've been championing this for a while. We should adopt the Usenix policy. You own your copyright, and allow the Usenix Association to publish your paper. You warrant that it's your own work, that it's not plagiarized, etc. It's perfectly reasonable. The Usenix Association publishes your work, but still your copyright. I suggest we adopt same thing, word for word. If IEEE doesn't like it, then we can take the next step. (APPLAUSE)

Cynthia Irvine – at NPGS the imprimatur of IEEE makes a difference in tenure cases, especially when going up against other departments. Would like to be free of copyright, but IEEE affiliation is an issue for tenure.

Other Commenters

– I care a lot about free education in third world countries. It's hard to pay for IEEE papers. Sometimes the cost is double. I believe it should be free. …

 – I support the idea of distribution by authors. Are they not free by de facto? You can Google and find the papers on multiple web sites. So even if we change, it shouldn't make much difference for most papers.

 – I have colleagues working in the Blackhat and Defcon area who say they don't know where to find our papers since they're behind a paywall, so they don't read them. So that's another point in favor of making them publicly available.

 – There are two values to balance – making papers public and free vs. long term archival. We need to make sure our papers stay alive for years if not decades. If we just put them on web sites, that need may not be met. There's also the issue of the seal approval from IEEE. So keep in mind that IEEE provides archival.

 – I did research on this issue. Every time put an IEEE paper online there's a dilemma, since I agreed not to copy it. I can't break the contract, but having my paper online is very important. Google search good assuming authors put their papers online, but it's not good if they must break their contract.

Hilarie Orman – You may put your SUBMITTED paper on your web page, just not what published by IEEE.

– Yes, but then there's the issue of reading one thing, when another is published.

Terry Benzel – Regarding archival, other organizations like Usenix do provide archival. Usenix puts papers into several archive repositories that provide access for free.

Dan Wallach – I'm not advocating that we abandon IEEE, and adopting Usenix policy does not imply that we must abandon IEEE. As IEEE Computer Society community decide how want to publish our papers, then IEEE can put it behind their paywall, we can put it on the ieee-security.org page, and authors can put it on theirs. We can all get along. We just need to push them.

 – Speak in support of Dan's suggestion. Services community. We shouldn't have the Computer Society prevent us from distributing. I'm confident will have place for archival. I'm confident in IEEE capacity. If not, there are others, like Usenix. I'm confident the conference will maintain prestigious nature, and can address all of those. Suggest no, don't provide guidance, vote to send very clear signal that we support Dan's suggestion and that it's not negotiable. (APPLAUSE)

Motion for resolution. Second. All in favor? Many hands. Opposed? A few hands. So, unanimous except for a few.

The Capacity Problem – We can accommodate a maximum of 350 people in our current location, but demand this year exceeded 400. Should we keep the cap or move to a different venue?

Brief presentation by Rob Cunningham (Slides)

Registration Trends by Category
-   60 people who could not attend
-   Is our mission best serviced by small, focused attendee list or …

IEEE S&P Mission?
-   3 categories on slide
-   All seem to support growth

Predictions on Community Growth or Not?
-   DHS
-   NSF
-   DARPA
-   Guess that our community will continue to grow since the Government will continue to put money into it

Some Options for Growth – 1. Staying at the Claremont
-   Seating styles
-   Single-track options
    o   Full theatre style
    o   Sell overflow room tickets
-   Dual-track options

- But 410 tried to register this year

2011 Attendance Distribution by Region
- More than 1/3rd of those who come from California
- Recommend we stay nearby

Some Options for Growth – 2. Staying in the Bay Area
- Options exist
- Improvements are possible
- But breaking the Claremont contract will cost money
  - But not certain, need to negotiate

3 Options
- PARC 55 – Union Square, San Francisco – 350 blended classroom and theatre style
- Fairmont – San Francisco – all classroom 780
- Grand Hyatt – Near Union Square, San Francisco

Next Steps
- Send email
- There will be a survey
- Could host a telecon

OPEN DISCUSSION

Hilarie Orman – This is the first time anyone has done the legwork, so thank Rob. (APPLAUSE) Do you want to stay or do you want to go?

Other commenters:

 – For people coming in from the South Bay it's hard to get here for the start of talks. It will be easier in San Francisco, though not by much. It's a matter of getting up at 5:30 vs. 6:30.

 – How many people can the rooms accommodate? What's the limiting factor? Meals. They can feed about 400 people. So we would use this room and the other large room for talks. We would use all the edge rooms and the restaurant to get to 400 people for meals.

 – Many people were disappointed they could not come since the registration closed. Last year too. If elite conference, then we do not want a two-class society. San Francisco is more exciting anyway. Young people want to have fun.

 – Note that this conference sold out in the middle of the last day of pre-registration.

 – This conference is one of the most venerable and distinguished of all conferences in "conferencedom". This ties to tradition, and to the Claremont. The place has a feel to it, a different feel to it. The feel matches the conference. The single session is an attraction. We have a

30-year tradition. 30 years from now we won't have a 60-year tradition if the current people carrying the flame don't maintain it.

Rachel Greenstadt – As the poster and workshop chair, I selected the posters and coordinated the workshops. It was very hard due to the registration issue. Poster notification ended after sold out. So poster people could not come. Some workshop attendees could not come. A newer workshop had to be cancelled. So consider external events too. That part of the conference was difficult to run.

– We should maintain traditions, but the tradition is not the Claremont, it's the people and the culture. 60 people waiting on waiting list underestimates. Many who saw a waiting list did not bother to register. We need to find a bigger venue. We should not shut out people. People do not know to register early. We're losing people by keeping the conference small.

– Definite fondness for hotel. Beautiful. But we're too big. We succeeded. We have grown to point where we don't fit. We can still be called the "Oakland conference" in SF. We will survive. So if we need to go, then we should go.

– Two years of watching this. Tradition of Oakland is excellence and people. We're missing an important part of the next generation, and that's faculty and students. Leaving Claremont doesn't mean never again. Moving is a way to grow. We can come back at some point.

Terry Benzel – I've been coming here for 31 years, since kindergarten (LAUGHTER). It's a special place. It gives us culture. I've taken on the student travel grants. I'm passionate about reaching out to the new generation. We don't want bunch of old people here sitting around talking about the Claremont with the old generation.

Hilarie Orman – Let's try to get a sense of the room. Those in favor of staying? Just a few hands. Those in favor of exploring places to move to, for next year? (Most of the people in the room raised their hands; no more than 4 opposed it).

Adjourn