



COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY FOUNDATION

Proceedings of the 2015 Business Meeting

Date: June 17, 2015, 8:30pm-11pm

Location: Oregon Convention Center, Portland, Oregon, USA

Chair: Dieter van Melkebeek, President of CCF

Notes: Taken by Jeff Kinne, Secretary of CCF. Edited by the Chair. Approved by the Board.

Agenda:

[CCC'15 Awards](#)

[CCC'15 PC Report](#)

[CCC'15 Local Arrangements Report](#)

[CCC'16 PC](#)

[CCC'16 Local Arrangements](#)

[CCC'17 Location](#)

[Bid from Saarbruecken](#)

[Bid from Riga](#)

[Further Discussion](#)

[Straw Poll](#)

[Treasurer's Report](#)

[President's Report](#)

[CCC logo](#)

[Venue for the CCC Special Issue](#)

[Bid from Transactions on Computation Theory \(ToCT\)](#)

[Bid from Computational Complexity \(CC\)](#)

[Bid from Theory of Computing \(ToC\)](#)

[Further Discussion](#)

[Straw Poll](#)

Convention for attributing quotes:

C: Chair

S: Speaker for the topic (indicated if other than the Chair)

O: Other participant

CCC'15 Awards

Speaker: David Zuckerman, Program Committee Chair for CCC'15

- Best paper: "Correlation bounds against monotone NC1" by Benjamin Rossman
 - Best student paper: "Factors of polynomials of low individual degree" by Rafael Oliveira.
 - Includes a cash prize funded by EATCS.
- O: Are we dropping the name on the best student paper award?
C: Yes, because IEEE may claim ownership on the name of the earlier award.

CCC'15 PC Report

Speaker: David Zuckerman, Program Committee Chair for CCC'15

- Thanks to the other PC members: Andris Ambainis, Andrej Bogdanov, Andrew Drucker, Zeev Dvir, Prakshit Gopalan, Johan Hastad, Russell Impagliazzo, Prasad Raghavendra, Ran Raz, Shubhangi Saraf
- Acceptances and submissions
 - 30 acceptances out of 110 submissions (27%)
 - Comparison to recent years
 - 2014: 29/94 (31%)
 - 2013: 29/90 (32%)
 - 2012: 34/119 (29%)
 - 2011: 31/83 (37%)
 - 2010: 25/76 (33%)
- PC Process
 - Papers due November 26
 - Assignments made by December 3
 - Reviews due by January 14
 - Google Hangout on February 1
 - Discussed 20 undecided papers
 - Decisions by consensus
 - Notifications on February 4
 - A few days earlier than promised
- One change with the past - no page limits.
 - O: Is it a 1 column, 2 column format?
 - S: It is the LIPIcs format, single column.
 - O: The pdf proceedings are not hyperlinked, they should include hyperref in their latex package for producing the pdf proceedings.

- LIPIcs
 - Some learning process involved
 - Seems like extra work for PC chair, who had to do some things that the publisher normally would (e.g., uploading latex files - authors had to send them to PC chair).
 - Jacobo Toran (CCF paper chair) helped dealing with these issues
 - What can be done to alleviate the workload on the PC chair and authors?
 - C: Have asked the authors for feedback and suggestions. It seems like LIPIcs hasn't yet honed their processes as finely as the more traditional publishers, who use automated scripts. LIPIcs seems to be willing to work with us to improve their processes.
 - S: Can we pay more for better service?
 - O: Shai Halevi's software might be tailored to us, since he is someone in our community.
 - C: EasyChair was chosen because LIPIcs suggested their process would work better with EasyChair.
 - S: But there didn't end up being the connection between the two that they planned for, the automated processes weren't ready yet.
 - O: STACS uses LIPIcs, are things smoother for them?
 - S: Have been told it was a lot of work for them as well.
- Wordle from 2015 paper titles - Lower Bounds is most prominent.
- Thanks to many...

CCC'15 Local Arrangements Report

- In FCRC years, the CCF President (previously conference committee chair) acts as the local arrangements chair.
 - Student travel award: 18 applicants, 17 supported, 1 was not eligible.
 - Thanks to NSF for the support (\$10K)
 - Coordinated with STOC (split travel cost)
 - Fewer applied than last time we collocated with STOC (43 applications and 27 supported)
 - Registration was somewhat lower than projected. Had budgeted for 41 students and 55 others; actually had 40 students and 44 others.
 - O: The lecture room seemed full. Perhaps more people attended than registered.
 - O: It seemed like there were perhaps as many people at the CCC talks as the two STOC sessions combined.
- Affiliation of registrants:
- US: 55
 - Japan, Sweden: 6
 - Israel: 5
 - India: 3

- Canada, Czech Republic: 2
- Denmark, Germany, Italy, Saudi Arabia, UK: 1.
- Finances
 - Budgeted expenses:
 - 52%: food \$18,424
 - 7%: rental and A/V \$2,340
 - 5%: business meeting refreshments \$1,800
 - 2%: proceedings \$600
 - 35%: fees \$12,576
 - 13%: FCRC service fee \$4,800
 - 11%: convention center overhead \$4,037
 - 7%: ACM service fee \$2,500
 - 3%: credit card fees \$1,239
 - O: The budget shows roughly \$200/person for food.
 - O: The cost/person here is actually lower than at most other venues.
 - The business meeting refreshments were cut due to the lower registration and an extra fee for child care imposed on us at the last minute (see below).
 - It was unfortunate that we had to pay a fee to ACM even though we aren't an ACM conference and have set up our own organization (CCF) that provides the required insurance and reserve funds. We were told that we would not be charged the fee, but then it showed up as a charge. We eventually negotiated it to ½ of what it normally would be.
- The FCRC experience
 - Many participants enjoy the collocation with STOC, and some the opportunity to interact with people from other areas in CS.
 - The FCRC staff was helpful and very responsive.
 - At a number of occasions it felt like CCC was treated like a play ball:
 - The ACM service fee that was imposed on us in spite of earlier agreements (see above)
 - The fee for child care that was imposed on us at the last minute without any real discussion. We asked not to participate as we felt this shouldn't be done at the last minute and we were already running a deficit. However, the majority of the FCRC conferences voted to include it.
 - The selection and scheduling of the FCRC invited talks. We gave input but didn't hear anything until the decisions were already made, and Andy Yao's talk was scheduled a couple days before CCC.
 - O: In terms of invited talks, STOC didn't have any more input into them than CCC did. CCC's experience seems to be representative.
 - O: Was there any input on the room locations, to have CCC and STOC closer (they were on opposite ends of the convention center)?
 - O: STOC had to move for some logistic reasons. This location is great for CCC, perhaps STOC could have moved for its last day.
 - O: But did the conferences have any input on the location of rooms?

C: I was not asked.

O: I was aware of it somewhat by accident, people at ACM were not aware of how far apart some of the rooms were.

CCC'16 PC

- Chair: Ran Raz
- Other members: Anindya De, Prahladh Harsha, Neeraj Kayal, Jakob Nordstrom, Toni Pitassi, Anup Rao, David Steurer, Thomas Vidick, Amir Yehudayoff, Sergey Yekhanin

CCC'16 Local Arrangements

Speaker: Osamu Watanabe, Local Arrangements chair for CCC'16

- Schedule
 - May 28: Pre Event in Tokyo
 - Special talks, Party
 - Celebrate new organization, 30th/31st anniversary of CCC.
 - May 29 - June 1: Conference in Tokyo
 - @ Hitotsubashi Hall
 - May 29 - business meeting
 - May 30 - rump session
 - May 31 - excursion
 - June 1 - half day (conference is 3.5 days)
 - June 2-3: Post Workshop in Kyoto
 - @ Kyoto University
 - Short talks, reception
 - Dates chosen to be earlier than STOC (mid June) and ICALP (July)
 - Weather usually is very good at the end of May
- Travel
 - Tokyo <-> San Francisco via 9 hour direct flight
 - Haneda airport is closer than Narita airport
 - Hitotsubashi Hall is in the very center of Tokyo, next to the Imperial Palace, within walking distance of Tokyo Station
 - Kyoto reachable in 2 hr 15 min by express train (for post workshop)
 - O: How much is the Tokyo-Kyoto express train.
 - S: About \$100 for one way. You can also buy a one week pass.
 - Institute may provide some travel support for those who need it. It is not yet decided how that will work.
 - O: Will there be support from students?
 - C: We will apply for NSF support as usual.
 - S: Yes, for others as well, still working out the details.

- Expenses
 - Registration fee:
 - early: 25,000yen (~ \$200)
 - regular: 30,000yen
 - student: 10,000yen (~ \$80)
 - Registration includes: pre workshop (session & party), excursion & banquet (also for students)
 - Lunch is not included (very easy to get in the area)
 - Support from ELC (Exploring Limits of Computation) project, which runs 2012-2016
 - Other expenses
 - hotel: \$60/night (reasonable quality)
 - lunch: \$5/day
 - dinner: \$10/day
 - airfare: \$1000 (was possible at time slides were prepared)
- Our local team is very much looking forward to hosting CCC'16 and related events with a mind of "O MO TE NA SHI" (sincere and warm welcoming)

CCC'17 Location

There are two bids, namely from Saarbruecken and from Riga.

Bid from Saarbruecken

Speaker: Thomas Kesselheim, presenting slides by Markus Blaeser, who would be the local arrangements chair.

- Dates: June 7–9 or June 14–16 (with a workshop or tutorial day before or after the event)
- Venue: Saarland University Campus
 - One of the largest computer science campuses in Europe. Many research institutes like Max-Planck on campus. More than 350 PhD students in computer science. 5 kilometers away from the city center. Easy to reach by public transport (every 5 to 10 minutes). Various canteens, bistros, and restaurants of good quality on campus.
 - O: Can you guess what fraction of the PhD students and faculty are in theory?
 - S: Don't have exact numbers, but the institute has around 40 people in theory.
 - Hosted ALGO 2011 and ETAPS 2011.
 - Saarbruecken is a city of about 180.000 inhabitants. Located in the southwest of Germany at the French border. Influenced by French "Savoir vivre". Warm and pleasant summers (June average high is 22 C). Nearest large airports are Frankfurt and Paris. It takes about 2 hours by train to Saarbruecken (from both)

with hourly connections. Small local airport. ICE (train) connections to Frankfurt/Mannheim and Paris. Easier to reach than Dagstuhl.

- Registration fee: approximately 250 to 350 Euros
- Accommodation:
 - Many hotels in the city center. From 45 Euros to 100 Euros. Plenty of shops and restaurants nearby. It takes 10 - 15 minutes from the city center to campus by public transport..
 - The youth hostel is about 2 km away from campus, 23 Euros per night. A nearby hotel offers rooms for 3 and 4 persons, which, if fully occupied, cost 25 Euros per person.
- Activities:
 - Many very good restaurants of all kinds (one 3-star restaurant, one 2-star restaurant). Unesco world cultural heritage "Volklinger Hutte". Great hiking region. French wine region "Alsace" right across the border. Luxembourg less than one hour away

Bid from Riga

Speaker: Chair, presenting slides by Andris Ambainis, who would be the local arrangements chair.

- Dates: 2nd half of June or beginning of July
 - Possible coordination with ICALP? July 6-8: CCC; July 10-13: ICALP (somewhere else in Europe)
- Venue: University of Latvia
 - Located in city centre.
 - O: Central area in downtown Riga is absolutely gorgeous.
 - Lecture rooms for up to 126 people. Provided by university at no cost.
 - Hosted ICALP'13, SWAT'06, FCT'01
 - O: What was attendance like in ICALP '2013 in Riga?
 - C: Don't have numbers, but was told it was successful.
 - Direct flights from 83 cities, mostly in Europe
 - C: Are there direct flights from the US?
 - O: My extended family is from Latvia. You pretty much need to fly through Europe, no direct flights from US
- Registration fee:
 - Early registration: 250-300 EUR regular; 150-200 EUR student.
 - Includes: coffee breaks, lunches, reception on the evening before the conference, business meeting.
 - Comparable to previous CCC's in Europe (CCC'2009 in Paris, CCC'2012 in Porto).
 - C: Registration fees Andris are actually lower than previous CCC's in Europe because lunches and a banquet are included.

- Accommodation:
 - 163 hotels in Central Riga. Substantial choice in 50-80 EUR range (70-110 \$).
 - Hostels: starting from 6 EUR for a bed in a dormitory room, 20 EUR for a single room.

Further Discussion

O: I am concerned because we've had two low attendance years in a row. May have a lower attendance next year in Japan. Do we want to be outside the US two years in a row?

C: We could co-locate with ICALP or LICS if in Europe, or stay in the US and co-locate with STOC. But we don't have formal bids for those.

O: I don't recommend co-location with LICS; the intersection of actual interests seems small.

O: Does STOC know when it's doing its theory festival in 2017?

O: The venue for STOC'17 hasn't been decided. The thinking is to do it either the same week as CCC'15 or the following week, with the goal of doing it when kids are still in school or just out of school

C: We might prefer to wait to decide if we want to be part of the 2017 theory festival. Given the experience this year working with FCRC and not having a say in decisions, it would be good to know what we are heading for.

More discussion ensued, with no clear consensus on how to proceed - whether to locate in Europe in 2017 or hold out hope to co-locate with STOC. Considerations:

- We haven't been to Europe since 2012, and it doesn't seem appropriate to count CCC'16 in Tokyo as a "Europe year". The original CCC charter stated that the conference would be in Europe every 3rd year.
- EATCS has supported us in becoming independent, and they asked for more coordination and want us to come to Europe.
- There are few complexity students in Europe.

O: Do we want to decide this today?

C: With the new bylaws, the decision lies with the board. This is in part because only a fraction of community is here, and the board should be in a good position to do what is best for the community.

C: We can take a straw poll of whether people think we should go to Europe in 2017 or not. The board would take that into account.

Straw Poll

- A straw poll was taken on whether people preferred Saarbruecken or Riga.
 - Results (by show of hands): 13 votes for each.
- A straw poll was taken on whether to locate in Europe in 2017 or stay in the US.

- Results (by show of hands): 19 for Europe, 6 for US.

Treasurer's Report

Speaker: Eric Allender, Treasurer of CCF

- CCF funds
 - CCF funds, Aug. 1, 2014: \$0.00
 - CCF funds, June 11, 2015: \$49,814.29
This does not reflect expenses and income from CCC 2015.
- Income: \$51,866
 - \$24,955 Microsoft Sponsorship
 - Thanks, Satya Lokam!!
 - \$14,685 Individual Donors & Corporate Matching
 - 8 individual donors)
 - \$10,973 Dues
 - 14 members, some paid for 10-20 years.
 - A way for people to use grant or similar funds to help support CCC/CCF

O: I didn't see the option to buy membership dues, looked for it and didn't find it.

C: This was not advertised on the website but was offered to those who wanted to contribute to CCF with funds that can be used for membership dues.
 - \$ 1,254 EATCS Donation
- Expenses: \$2,051
 - \$1,261 Insurance
 - \$790 Fees
 - \$400 for Tax-exempt status
- Why do we need so much money?
 - FCRC required us to have \$53K in reserve funds. This year, IQC (the Institute for Quantum Computing at Waterloo) graciously agreed to back-stop us, since we didn't have those funds back when we had to commit to FCRC.
 - We need a contingency fund. We don't intend to do a similar amount of fund-raising in future years.

O: Why don't we raise more funds?

C: If we bring in more than \$50K/year we have to file more paperwork and are classified differently. We have the reserve funds we need now.

O: If we had more reserve funds we could better support students.

O: If there were a large donation (e.g., another \$50K), we might consider hiring people to take care of the extra requirements.

O: It's okay to accumulate more money over time, just need to stay below \$50K/year.

S: We didn't have a plan to keep fundraising, but if it's decided that we have some goals that we need more funds for, we could.

- O: We shouldn't use CCC funds for things that we can get NSF or corporate funds for (e.g., student travel).
- O: It would be nice to be able to support non-students as well who don't have grants to support their travel.
- S: We have had some donations in the past that were used for non-student travel as well.

President's Report

- Thanks to many...
- Overview of CCF
 - Prior history
 - June '13: manifesto at CCC
 - February '14: discussion forum
 - April '14: vote
 - May '14: decision
 - June '14: open letter & endorsements
 - Activities of the past year
 - June '14: organizational meeting at CCC
 - July-August '14: incorporation, bylaws, tax-exempt status, resignation of old steering committee
 - September '14: LIPIcs, accepted to FCRC, in-cooperation with EATCS
 - January-February '15: donation MSR
 - February '15: in-cooperation with ACM/SIGACT
 - Current status: CCC and CCF seem healthy.
 - Future action items
 - Improving the proceedings process (LIPIcs)

O: How did you manage to save the name of the conference?

C: Slight change, from "Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity", to now "Computational Complexity Conference". Asked a lawyer in WI, and was told this would be different enough.

O: Did you not have to work with IEEE, was there any pushback?

C: Not yet. One part of the CCF insurance is to cover the organization in case IEEE pursued legal action.

O: There was a turnover in leadership in IEEE TCMF (that previously oversaw CCC). There normally is a TCMF board meeting in early June. If there were going to be any IEEE action, it probably would have happened by now.

- Election of new trustee

- The membership of CCF is currently submitting votes through an online ballot system to elect a new trustee of CCF, who will be the chair of the Registration Committee.
- Candidate trustees on the ballot: Andris Ambainis, Boaz Barak, Michal Koucky, Jakob Nordstrom, Ryan O'Donnell, Rahul Santhanam, Rocco Servedio, Ronen Shaltiel, Luca Trevisan, Vinodchandran Variyam
- The current Registration Committee chair, Madhu Sudan, will stay on as past registration committee chair for another year. Thanks, Madhu!

CCC logo

- IEEE may claim ownership over the old logo, so we should develop a new one if we are going to use one.
- In response to a call for designs to the CCC mailing list, two original designs came in (shown at the meeting) as well as two suggestions for professional designers. There is also the option of waiting for more suggestions.
- A straw poll was taken whether we should wait to decide, or decide on a logo at the meeting.
 - Results (by show of hands): 16 in favor of waiting, 1 in favor of deciding.
- There was a suggestion to ask the graphic designer that was used for Theory Matters a while ago.

Venue for the CCC Special Issue

- We usually decide the venue for the Special Issue for a period of three years. It is time to decide again, namely for the Special Issues of CCC'16, CCC'17, and CCC'18. The decision is up to the Board of Trustees.
- There were three bids. A representative of each journal was given time to give a short presentation. The order of presentations was chosen at random.

Bid from Transactions on Computation Theory (ToCT)

Speaker: Eric Allender, Editor-in-Chief of ToCT

- Conflict of Interest: Eric is also a Trustee of CCF. He will not participate in the vote on the decision for the venue of the Special Issue.
- ACM is a longstanding organization.
- ToCT is healthy now. It is the ACM journal most closely aligned to this community.
- Would be great if CCC was in ToCT.
- Encourage others to submit to ToCT as well to keep theory of computing active and visible within ACM.

Bid from Computational Complexity (CC)

Statement by Peter Buergisser, Editor-in-Chief of CC, and Oded Goldreich, Associate Editor of CC. Read aloud by the Chair.

- Our opinion is that it is good for any area within any field, and in particular for computational complexity as part of TOC, to have at least one specialized journal that is associated with it. While papers in the area that have a wider appeal may be published in TOC-wide journals, many good papers in the area have an appeal that is confined to the area, and for such papers publication in a high quality specialized journal should be the natural choice. We believe that CC serves this purpose well.
- It seems that CCC itself is similarly positioned wrt TOC-wide conferences; that is, CCC is the natural conference for good papers in the area whose appeal is confined to the area. Thus, we believe that it is natural for CCC to have its special issues published with CC. Furthermore, this fosters CC's standing as the flagship journal of the area, a status that serves the area (since it endows papers published in it with a "stamp of quality"). We believe that the latter consideration should outweigh the preference for open access policies.

Bid from Theory of Computing (ToC)

Speaker: Laci Babai, Editor-in-Chief of ToC

- ToC's services to authors and readers
 - Grammar/style: reviewed by colleagues who understand
 - Bibliography service: uniform names of conferences journals, full names of authors, DOI links added to conference and journal versions, links added to open access versions of cited papers
 - ToC has a quality control assistant
- Relevance of ToC to the CCC community
 - More than 50% of papers in ToC are related to computational complexity (do a search by category on the web site to verify).
 - Two special issues completed (Rajeev Motwani, APPROX-RANDOM 2012), another nearly complete (Analysis of Boolean Functions), and another two in progress (APPROX-RANDOM 2013 and 2014).
 - Papers can be published online as they complete the review process - those submitting on time don't get penalized because of those who submit late, and those who submit late are given extra opportunity to complete their journal version (rather than having arbitrary cutoff dates).
 - ToC does not need to publish special issues to survive.
- Response to concerns regarding ToC

- Permanent archiving - Will the existing articles be available in perpetuity? Long-term solution is to put ToC on the arXiv, which seems large enough that it will be maintained indefinitely. In the short term, the journal has multiple mirrors (primary sites being in Chicago and New York).
- Permanence of the organization - Will the journal as an organization exist in perpetuity? Will new articles be published and top standards be maintained? Seems less important than permanent archiving in the big scheme of things, but anyway... The ToC organization has been built to be robust, and replacements for the leadership are lined up.
- No/low cash flow. Up to now, avoiding cash flow has reduced administrative headaches. Once CCF has been up and running for some time, perhaps some association with CCF would be possible if both parties deem it worthwhile (which would allow for cash flow, insurance, etc.).
- Issues
 - 2013 subscription prices in USD/page, from the AMS journal survey
 - TCS, by Elsevier, \$0.93/page, 4-year delayed open access
 - CC, by Springer, \$0.70/page, open access by purchase only
 - J. Alg. Comb., by Springer, \$0.44/page, open access by purchase only
 - T. Algorithms, by ACM, \$0.44/page, "authorizer" open access
 - ToCT, by ACM, ?, "authorizer" open access
 - SICOMP, by SIAM, \$0.15/page, open access mechanism?
 - ToC, by TOCX, free and open access
 - Strong arguments can be made against open access purchased by authors ("gold open access"), championed by Springer and followed by others, including some scholarly societies. It discriminates among authors based on their means.

Further Discussion

O: Do we still have the policy that the Best Paper is automatically invited to JACM.

C: Yes, that is still in place.

O: Does ToC make it into the Thomson Reuters index, other places where bibliometrics come from.

Laci Babai: ToC is in negotiations, we are working on it. We would appreciate help with this as well.

Eric Allender: ToCT is not indexed by Thomson Reuters. Journals are not allowed to be considered until published on time for 2 years. That happened a few years ago, ACM did try to get something to happen. CC is indexed.

O: ACM pays Akamai a lot to make sure articles are backed up around the world.

O: My personal experience as an author of ToC papers has been good.

O: ToC should have done something like CCF a long time ago (organize a non-profit to support the journal, which could help with issues related to insurance, expenses, etc.)

Does CCF's charter allow for hosting ToC (in terms of finances, insurance)?

- C: CCF's charter does allow for hosting other things besides the conference, but we wanted to make sure we are running the conference well before considering other things.
- O: It is good for the long term viability of something like ToC to be able to deal with funds, etc.
- O: Elsevier now has better open-access policies than many other places, including society run journals.
- O: ACM's policy will likely be that anything that is required to be open-access (due to government funded research) will be available from ACM (not just from some obscure government repository). Guess is that ACM is heading towards 1-year open access for journals (all articles open-access 1 year after publication).
- O: ACM already has the "authorizer" mechanism whereby authors can post the official paper versions from their websites.
- O: The Springer copyright agreement is really bad right now (many things that would need to be crossed out and/or changed, before someone could feel comfortable signing). There seem to have been changes in how Springer publishes their journals, in a really bad direction.

Straw Poll

- A straw poll was taken on what the venue should be for the Special Issue for CCC'16, CCC'17, and CCC'18. Votes were cast by secret paper ballot. All were asked to give a full ranking of the 3 options so that an instant runoff algorithm could be performed.
 - Results, # of first choice votes received by each: 15 for ToC, 5 for ToCT, 1 for CC