Current Situation

- Strong tradition going back to the 1980s (with very little changes even if community has exploded)
- Highly competitive/selective conferences
- Reviews by best qualified people

- High review load
  - Same paper gets reviewed multiple times; often unmodified
- T ime pressure for both reviewers and authors

Limitations of current model

- **Speed:**
  - conferences not very fast (6-7 months between submission and formal publication)
    - other subjects have faster turn around times for journals
  - journal very slow
- **Reputation**
  - "only a conference paper" (problem in broader community)
  - LNCS is exploding, so reputation is shrinking
  - Citations in ISI only as proceedings (need to rely on Google Scholar and Microsoft Academic Search)
- **Quality** (full peer review of the proofs and details)
  - few (10%) final versions appear in journals (too slow?)
  - about 50% (?) has unreviewed full version on eprint
  - we have multi-round refereeing but do not recognize this
  - retractions/corrections to papers are never published officially
- **Bandwidth limitation** (hard to go beyond 45 papers)
- **Complex**
  - multiple versions of all papers (e-print, IACR, Springer, Full Version, Journal Version) – sometimes double publish (conference/journal)

Results

We are competing against physics, maths, chemistry, biology for funds, promotion and status

- Policy makers do not take us seriously, as we don't take our own scientific process seriously
- Senior people find it hard to convince university management and funding agencies to support our work/people
- If we think proofs are important, we should referee them
  - Or at least make presenting papers with invalid/no-proofs a high risk strategy for authors

People with experience of fighting for Crypto against other subjects not in CS realizes we are fighting with one hand behind our back

When we started, the current model made sense. We were young and child like.

<p style="text-align:center; color:red;">It's Time To Grow Up!</p>

A Solution

Proceedings of the IACR

- Follows model of other learned societies
- This is a "journal" to replace LNCS, not to replace JoC
- The Proceedings would be full "Open Access" (Gold)
- Holds papers "submitted" to our conferences
- Multi-round refereeing (duration depends on length)
- No submission deadline: so no "deadline" rush
- Full papers are refereed and published

The above is the basic idea, what follows are possible knock on consequences and implementation details.

Implications

For Authors:
- You submit to journal at any time (VLDB model)
- Guaranteed first response in 2 months (Accept, Reject, Maybe)
  - Would be longer for longer papers. Max time 4 months
- For Maybe's you have 1 month to respond and make changes
- Final decision in another 2 months
- All acceptable papers are published
- Top papers are asked to present at either AC, EC or CR.
  - Alternative all are presented at some meeting in the year
- Authors can "request" consideration for presentation at specific venue (cannot be guaranteed)
- A conference paper cannot be resubmitted in full version to JoC. Since the full version is already published

Implications

For Referees
- A "PC" member (called referee below) is appointed for 2 years
- Instead of agreeing to referee 20 papers in 6 weeks, asked to referee (with sub-referees) over a period of 2 years 20 papers with a delay of 6 weeks (plus 2 weeks for discussion)
- A year's PC is "run" by a committee of six co-chairs. To replicate our current AC, EC, CR PC chair model
- Each co-chair appoints a set of referees, who themselves appoint sub-referees (keep the pyramid structure)
  - Alternative: pool of referees can be shared by all co-chairs
- Referees chosen to represent geographic and subject diversity
- Idea is to reduce reviewing burden

Implications

For Conferences

- PC Chairs pick the papers for a conference of those which have been accepted in last 6 (or 12) months
  - Or perhaps the committee of reviewers, or a subcommittee, or….
- Taking into account
  - Author preferences
  - Diversity of Programme
  - Which papers would make good talks
  - Celebrate the best work
- Conferences become about exchanging ideas and learning
- Stop short talks which no one listens to and no one understands
- Encourage industry/government back into the fold

Knock On Questions

Should PKC, TCC, FSE and CHES stick to their current conference/LNCS model?
- If not what happens to them?

Would suspect CHES would probably continue due to industrial interest.
- Others workshops we are less sure about.
- Would they be rolled into the same model?
- Is this a problem?

What about short papers, can we create a very fast turnaround ?
- e.g.a "Bulletin of the IACR"

If we move to a journal model ,what about anonymous submissions?

Why Now?

Springer contract is up for renewal in four years.

If we are to make a change in 2017, this impacts choice of PC chairs to be made in 2015

We need to set up software, negotiate agreements

Need a decision by end of 2014

We need the community to discuss/understand any changes

Register for the discussion forum on e-print NOW to get involved in the discussion.