Organization

Very helpful to be able to focus on program content!
Thanks to:

- General chair: David Du
- Treasurer: David Shambroom
- Publications chair: Carrie Gates
- Poster chair: Cristina Nita-Rotaru
- Short talks chair: Patrick Traynor
- Registration chair: Ulf Lindqvist
- Web/T-shirt chair: Adrienne Felt
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Ben Adida, Harvard U., USA
William Aiello, U. of British Columbia, Canada
Ross Anderson, Cambridge U., UK
Michael Backes, Saarland U. & MPI, Germany
Srdjan Capkun, ETH Zürich, Switzerland
Miguel Castro, Microsoft Research Cambridge, UK
Hao Chen, U. of California, Davis, USA
Jed Crandall, U. of New Mexico, USA
Bruno Crispo, U. of Trento, Italy
Weidong Cui, Microsoft Research, Redmond, USA
George Danezis, Microsoft Research, Cambridge, UK
Úlfar Erlingsson, Reykjavik U., Iceland
David Evans, U. of Virginia
Michael Freedman, Princeton U., USA
Kevin Fu, U. of Massachusetts, USA
Jonathon Giffin, Georgia Inst. of Technology, USA
Ian Goldberg, U. of Waterloo, Canada
Andrew D. Gordon, Microsoft Research Cambridge, UK
Steve Gribble, U. of Washington, USA
Guofei Gu, Texas A&M U., USA
Peter Gutmann, U. of New Auckland, NZ
Michael Hicks, U. of Maryland, USA
Farnam Jahanian, U. of Michigan, USA
Xuxian Jiang, North Carolina State U., USA
Jonathan Katz, U. of Maryland, USA
Sam King, U. Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA
Tadayoshi Kohno, U. of Washington, USA
Farinaz Koushanfar, Rice U., USA
Wenke Lee, Georgia Inst. of Technology, USA
Kristen LeFevre, U. of Michigan, USA
David Lie, U. Toronto, Canada
John Mitchell, Stanford U., USA
Greg Morrisett, Harvard U., USA
Andrew Myers, Cornell University
Peng Ning, North Carolina State U., USA
Reiner Sailer, IBM TJ Watson Research Center
Stefan Savage, U. of California, San Diego, USA
R. Sekar, Stony Brook U., USA
Umesh Shankar, Google, New York, USA
Abhi Shelat, U. of Virginia, USA
Vitaly Shmatikov, U. of Texas, Austin, USA
Radu Sion, Stony Brook U., USA
Patrick Traynor, Georgia Tech, USA
Doug Tygar, U. of California, Berkeley, USA
Giovanni Vigna, U. of California, Santa Barbara, USA
David Wagner, U. of California, Santa Barbara, USA
Haining Wang, College of William and Mary, USA
Brent Waters, U. of Texas, Austin, USA
Rebecca Wright, Rutgers U., USA
Steve Zdancewic, U. of Pennsylvania, USA
Previous reviewing process

• One round of reviewing (roughly Nov. 10-Jan. 20)
• ~40 members of program committee
• Physical PC meeting
• Authors of papers required to be blinded.

Problems:
• PC meeting too large for good discussion
• 3 reviews per paper sometimes left holes in coverage
• Reviews per PC member manageable: ~21
This year’s process

(Adapted from SIGCOMM 2006, SOSP 2007, ...)

- 50 PC members including chairs: 25 ‘heavy’, 25 ‘light’
  - Heavy members reviewed slightly more papers (~23 vs ~20), attended PC meeting.
  - Light members participated in electronic discussion during review process.
  - Every paper at PC meeting had at least 3 heavy reviews and 2 light reviews.

- Outcome: better informed and more engaging discussion, more author feedback, with reasonable load
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- Worked well, but required constant attention
Other thoughts

• HotCRP reviewing system invaluable throughout (kudos to Eddie Kohler)

• Rating scale is important. We used a 6-point scale: symmetrical but no middle, headroom for extreme opinions.

• Blinding has real pros and real cons.

• Biggest mistake: topic preferences of reviewers

• Authors seem to appreciate and take advantage of getting more reviewing feedback.

• Multiround reviewing helps in focusing PC work on strongest papers.
Authors by institution type

- Academic: 620
- Industry/Government: 148
- Unknown: 22
Authors by geography

Note: Differences in acceptance rate among categories are mostly not statistically significant.
Pros and cons of blinding

- Hard to detect spurious “conflict” declarations by authors.
- Reviewer identity can be revealed to authors accidentally.
- People in a position to bias discussion often know who the paper’s by anyway.
- Papers by “unknown” authors get full consideration.
- Appearance of greater fairness.
- Actually seemed to work well once we were at meeting.