CICM Business Meeting

J.H. Davenport — `J.H.Davenport@bath.ac.uk`

Coimbra: 8 July 2014

MK, as CICM Secretary, opened the meeting. He noted that we had now gone to one business meeting, rather than one per day, as in Bath.

1 Scribe

JHD as usual.

2 Trustees

CICM is an organisation-of-organisations, and has 3 (?+AISC) members; Calculemus, MKM and DML. It is governed by a Steering Committee (SC).

MK is not standing for re-election as Secretary after CICM 2015: the Steering Committee will need to nominate a replacement.

CICM 2015 will be in Wastington DC (Bruce Miller & Abdou Youssef). The SC has nominated a Programme Chair for 2016, but yet tobe confirmed. We have track Chairs for 2015: S&P Florian Rabe, MKM Cesary Kaliszek. DML and Calculemus yet to nominate.

3 Treasurer

2008/10/11 made a surplus (5380euros). There is a surplus from 2012, but MK is still fighting the admin. 2009 and 2013 (Bath) broke even. We have decided that we will underwrite up to 5,000Euro for student travel. Local organisers should still endeavour to raise such funds locally (as 2013 and 2014 did). The 2015 organisers noted that Washington DC was an expensive place.

In response to a question, MK noted that historically student bursaries have been linked to the doctoral programme.

4 Programme Chair

Report on accptance rates etc.: see Figure 4. Springer were generally helpful.

Reported on e-book downloads from CICM 2008 onwards (2008 supplied by SA).

Figure 1: Acceptance Rates

Main tracks:	2014		2013		2012	
Calculemus	8 / 14	57%	5 / 12	42%	7 / 9	78%
DML	6 / 8	75%	6 / 8	75%	2 / 3	67%
MKM	12 / 16	75%	7 / 18	39%	14 / 19	74%
S&P	9 / 14	64%	12 / 16	75%	11 / 12	92%
Overall	35 / 52	67%	30 / 54	56%	34 / 43	79%

Figure 2: e-book downloads (of chapters=papers)

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2013	2013
CICM 2008	1336	1528	1374	598	616	2277
CICM 2009		1398	1183	596	370	2294
CICM 2010			1135	755	370	1563
CICM 2011				440	621	1693
CICM 2012					802	3686
CICM 2013						6748

He was asked a question about "conditional acceptance". JHD noted that the "shepherding" process had worked in the past, occasionally leading to rejection. MK noted that a named shepherd (rather than straight 'conditional') was essential.

JU noted that the "invited speakers" process was not very formal, but had worked. Also, the "best paper" process was rather late. SMW said that the announcement from Maplesoft was somewhat late. In response to a show of hands, the feeling of the meeting was in favour of having "Best Paper" awards.

PS noted that `electionbuddy.com` had worked well for DML.

5 Local Organisers

PQ reported on 81 registrants, We had four workshops plus the doctoral programme, which also funded five students.

He felt that "Base+day" was confusing, having seen that now from both sides. He had had to send 20 chasing e-mails.

Finance had proved tricky, with some expected sources not coming up. But Research Centres had stepped in — thanks. He expected to break even. He had set fees based on three tiers: doctoral programme (free), students and general.

Thanks wer due to Serge Autexier forthe website.

6 CICM 2016

Two bids were proposed, both aiming at July 2016.

6.1 Białystok

Białystok is in the centre of Europe. The university was founded in 1997. Białystok is the birthplace of Esperanto! Historical monuments and decent hotels at reasonable events. Social events could be in Białowieza or the Mazury Lake District. Venue would be the new (but now finished!) CS Building.

Białystok is 200km from Warsaw, with direct buses from Warsaw airport.

6.2 Innsbruck

Innsbuck is also in the centre of Europe (!): 2 hours by train from Munich[1]. Small airport in Innsbruck itself. Old city centre and University building (Gröbner bases!), but CS has a new building. Winter Olympic venues. The university has 27,500 students.

6.3 Discussion

The SC favoured Białystok, who had already bid two years ago, but would encourage Innsbruck to bid again. The meeting was in favour.

7 Steering Committee

We would like to organise and simplify the CICM self-governance structure.

Mailing lists currently one per track — should probably have one unified one. This would be done immediately.

Current structure Every track with trustees, a steering committee, of delegates per track and *ex officio* members (Treasurer, PR, Secretary). It was noted that no track had actually done trustee elections this year.

Proposed new structure Member communities to phase out their trusee organisation. Track delegates to be elected by popular vote of track members[2]. Track chairs to be selected by SC based on community nomination to delegates.

Proposal 1 *The SC to work up a formal proposal on these lines, to be discussed in the business meeting of 2015. Since this was in North America, there should be an indicative electronic vote of the whole membership (e.g. via* `electionbuddy.com`*) prior to the 2015 meeting.* **Carried unanimously**

---

[1]Zürich is also relatively close.

[2]MK wanted to keep the definition informal. JHD suggested that we should issue some guidance

8 S&P track

The systems side of this was very successful, with strong refereeing by eager young referees. MK claimed that the Projects side of this suffered by comparison, and many papers were rejected on the grounds that they were "not systems".[3]

Q How does "Projects" fit with "Work-in-Progress"

A MK: I think I can see a difference.

SMW I am worried about the acceptance rates. This can't just be "publishing my grant proposal".

JHD The CfP and refereeing instructions need to be clear, and consistent with each other, in time for the first CfP for CICM 2015.

JU [Publications in] These proceedings have no value in Poland or the Czech Republic any more [for academic evaluation purposes]. We should maybe think about a journal spun out of CICM.

SMW If they are formally in a separate track, we should maybe not place the projects in the archival proceedings.

JHD Agreed, especially since the "informal" proceedings have become more substantial, currentlythrough CEUR-WS.

Many expressed varied views.

JHD/SMW It is quite difficult to get EasyChair to give different instructions to referees in one track, so running two EasyChair tracks (even if it was publically one track) might make the Track Chair's life easier and improve the focus of the refereeing.

There was a proposal from the SC to split the track formally, but the vote was tied 12–12. JHD therefore proposed

> In the light of the views expressed, the 2015 Programme Chair and S&P should work together to ensure that the S&P track applied appropriate refereeing criteria, and that the criteria were clear at the Call-for-Papers stage. This *might* mean the use of two EasyChair tracks internally.

This was approved with no objections.

---

[3]However, a post-meeting analysis revealed the following.

	2013	2014
All	75%	64%
All Systems	70%	67%
All Projects	83%	60%
Unconflicted Systems	50%	63%
Unconflicted Projects	100%*	60%

$*n = 1$.
Having seen this, MK withdrew his claim.

9 Any Other business

Rename the conference as "Conference on Intelligent Computer Mathematics" (i.e. drop the final 's' on Conferences) — carried.