Proceedings of the 2016 Business Meeting

Date: May 29, 2016, 5:45pm-7:30pm  
Location: Hitotsubashi Hall, Tokyo, Japan

Chair: Dieter van Melkebeek, President of CCF  
Scribe: Jeff Kinne, Secretary of CCF. Edited by the Chair. Approved by the Board.

Agenda:

- CCC’16 PC Report and Awards  
- CCC’16 Local Arrangements Report  
- CCC’17 PC  
- CCC’17 Local Arrangements  
- CCC’18 Bids and Discussion  
  Bid from New Brunswick / Princeton  
  Bid from Pasadena  
  Bid from San Diego  
  Further Discussion  
  Straw Poll  
- Treasurer’s Report  
- President’s Report  
  LIPIcs  
  Potential Changes to the Format of CCC  
    Use of STOC Reviews when CCC Submission is right after STOC Notification  
    Accepting More Papers to CCC  
    Tutorials  
- Changes to the Board

Convention for attributing quotes:

C: Chair  
S: Speaker for the topic (indicated if other than the Chair)  
O: Other participant
CCC’16 PC Report and Awards
Speaker: Ran Raz, Program Committee Chair for CCC’16

- Other PC members: Anindya De, Prahladh Harsha, Neeraj Kayal, Jakob Nordstroem, Tonniann Pitassi, Anup Rao, David Steurer, Thomas Vidick, Amir Yehudayoff, Sergey Yekhanin
- Acceptances and submissions
  - 34 acceptances out of 91 submissions (37%)
  - Comparison to recent years
    - 2015: 30/110 (27%)
    - 2014: 29/94 (31%)
    - 2013: 29/90 (32%)
    - 2012: 34/119 (29%)
    - 2011: 31/83 (37%)
    - 2010: 25/76 (33%)
  - Scores: ≥2 (solid accept): 17 papers, ≥1 (weak accept): 44, ≥0 (borderline): 63. Highest score of a rejected paper: 1.3 (1.7 before deliberation lowered scores). Lowest score of an accepted paper: 0.8.
  - S: Accept more papers or reduce scores (but my preference is for accepting more papers)
- PC process
  - Papers due November 23
  - Reviews due by January 14
  - January 14 – February 3: discussion + additional reviews (about 35)
  - Google Hangout on February 3 to decide on the 17 papers undecided by email discussion
- Best paper award: “Learning algorithms from natural proofs” by Marco Carmosino, Russell Impagliazzo, Valentine Kabanets, and Antonina Kolokolova
- S: Thanks to: Program Committee, Local Arrangement Committee, external reviewers, authors, Dieter van Melkebeek, Jacobo Toran, Jeff Kinne, David Zuckerman, other Board members
- C: Thanks also to Ran!

CCC’16 Local Arrangements Report
Speaker: Osamu Watanabe, Local Arrangements Committee Chair for CCC’16

- Other Local Arrangements Committee members: Takashi Horiyama, Akinori Kawachi, Takeshi Koshiba, Kazuhisa Makino, Ryuhei Mori, Jun Tarui
- Registration: Total of 128 (and possibly a few more), of which 34 students and 94 others. Female: 4 (1 student and 3 others). Early registration: 71 (19 students and 52 others). Not-early registration: 57 (15 students and 42 others).
- **Affiliation of registrants:**
  - Japan: 67
  - US: 26
  - China: 9
  - Israel: 7
  - Germany: 5
  - India: 3
  - Canada, Latvia, Singapore: 2
  - Finland, France, Korea, Sweden, UK: 1
- **Travel allowances**
  - CCF obtained a new NSF grant for $15K, restricted to students from US institutions. All 10 eligible applicants were (partially) funded for attending CCC’16, for a total of $15K.
  - In addition, the ELC project (Exploring the Limits of Computation) from the Japanese government supported 3 students from elsewhere as well as 1 other attendee who needed assistance, for a total of about $6K.
- **Finances**
  - Some items are not finalized.
  - Estimates are assuming $1 = 110yen
  - Income
    - Regular early ($227 each) $11,800
    - Regular not-early ($272 each) $11,200
    - Student early ($127 each) $2,500
    - Student not-early ($155 each) $2,200
    - Extra banquet ticket $100
    - Contribution of the ELC project $15,600
  - Total income without the ELC contribution: $27,800
  - Overall total income: $43,400
  - Expenses
    - Facility (hall, etc.) $5,400
    - Banquet, etc. $16,500
    - Reception (place and food): $5,900
    - Reception (only drink): $1,700
    - Business and rump session: $2,700
    - Coffee break: $1,300
    - Registration handling: $2,300
    - LiPIcs proceedings $600
    - Other operational costs $5,100
  - Total expenses: $41,500
  - Projected surplus: $43,400 - $41,500 = $1,900
CCC’17 PC

- Chair: Ryan O’Donnell
- Other members: Manindra Agrawal, Eli Ben-Sasson, Amit Chakrabarti, Kai-Min Chung, Dmitry Gavinsky, Joshua Grochow, Michal Koucky, Shachar Lovett, Dana Ron, Benjamin Rossman
- The PC Chair has agreed to set the submission deadline for CCC’17 a week after the notification deadline for STOC’17. The later submission deadline is possible because CCC’17 takes place later than usual.

CCC’17 Local Arrangements

Speaker: Andris Ambainis, Local Arrangements Chair for CCC’17

- Location
  - University of Latvia campus
  - Located in city center, next to old city, hotels, restaurants
- Dates
  - Thu July 6 – Sun July 9 (half day on Sunday)
  - ICALP will take place July 10-14 in Warsaw, Poland. The dates were coordinated so people could attend both conferences.
  - Pre-conference workshop on Wed July 5 is possible. If you have an idea or suggestion, get in touch with Andris.
- Travel: Direct flights from 79 cities, mostly in Europe
- Costs
  - Comparable to previous CCC’s in Europe (CCC’2009 in Paris, CCC’2012 in Porto).
  - Early registration (projected): 200-250 EUR regular; 120-150 EUR student.
  - Includes: coffee breaks, reception on the evening before the conference, business meeting, excursion.
  - Lunches can be provided with a slight increase in registration fee, or can leave it out to keep registration fee slightly lower (and there are many options for people to go for lunch).
- Accommodation
  - 265 hotels/hostels in Central Riga.
  - Substantial choice in 50-80 EUR range (55-90 $).
  - Hostels: starting from 6 EUR for a bed in a dormitory room, 20 EUR for a single room.
- Local Arrangements
  - Chair: Andris Ambainis.
  - Other faculty members/postdocs/students (TCS research group of 15 people).
CCC’18 Bids and Discussion

- Do we want to co-locate with STOC or not? The sense in recent years was that we like co-location with STOC as long as CCC can keep its own identity, e.g., in 2010 STOC was held in a hotel in Boston, and CCC was held right after on the Harvard campus.
- There was some talk of having a theory festival in 2018. It seems like it will not happen. STOC’18 will be in the LA area in honor of its 50th year (the first STOC was in the LA area). Santa Monica is being considered.
- Arguments pro co-location:
  - Savings in travel time and costs, especially for people from far away
  - Possible increased attendance
- Arguments against co-location:
  - Co-location may increase the registration fee and accommodation costs.
  - Need to coordinate with ACM.
  - Not possible to arrange to have submission deadline after STOC notification.
  - It would be 5th time in a row that a North-American CCC takes place on the west coast.
- We have one bid from the east coast (New Brunswick / Princeton), and two bids that are relatively close to Santa Monica (Pasadena and San Diego).

Bid from New Brunswick / Princeton
Speaker: Eric Allender, who would be the local arrangements chair

- Two options: New Brunswick (close to Rutgers) or Princeton
- New Brunswick
  - Home of Rutgers University, site of FOCS 2012 & 2016
  - Local Arrangements Committee: Eric Allender (chair), Swastik Kopparty, Periklis Papakonstantinou, Mike Saks, Shubhangi Saraf, Mario Szegedy, Rebecca Wright (and DIMACS staff)
  - Hotel: Hyatt New Brunswick
    - 2 blocks from the train station, $170/night
    - Only reasonable option close to Rutgers
  - Venue for talks: Rutgers (possibly with no cost)
- Princeton
  - Local Arrangements Committee: same as above plus Mark Braverman, Gillat Kol, and Ran Raz
  - Hotel: Nassau Inn
    - 1.8 km from the train station, $140/night
    - Where everyone stays when they visit Princeton
  - Venue for talks: Princeton CS (low cost for room)
- Estimated costs for travel: NY/Newark has many direct flights from nearly everywhere.
- Registration cost: May skip a banquet to keep cost low.

O: Is the plan to have 2019 in the US?
C: Yes.
O: If 2019 is in the US, would you be willing to hold CCC in 2019 in New Jersey?
S: Yes.

**Bid from Pasadena**

Speaker: Chair, presenting slides by Chris Umans, who would be the local arrangements chair.

- **Venue:** Caltech CS building (Annenberg)
  - New in 2009
  - Main lecture hall seats 80+
  - Surrounding rooms for breakout areas
  - Coffee breaks/food in common areas + outside
- **Dates:** mid June, following STOC in LA
- **Pasadena is 11 miles northeast of LA**
  - Old Town: 100+ restaurants, cafes, shops walking distance from campus (20-30 min)
  - South Lake District for lunches, etc. 10 minute walk from campus
- **Hotels** (all within 20-30 minute walk):
  - 3 cheaper options $100-$140/night
  - 3 nicer options near Old Town ~$240/night
- **Local arrangements committee:** Chris Umans (chair), Thomas Vidick, Raghu Meka
- **Anticipated registration fees** (rough guess)
  - Comparable to this year: $150 student, $220 regular
  - 40% higher if lunches included or banquet
- **Room mentioned in slides** is only available after June 15. STOC has not yet committed on their dates yet.
- **Location** is about an hour drive from Santa Monica; could arrange for a bus for those going to both conferences.

O: Is there any way to get a larger room?
C: Asked about this, and it is not certain; that could be an issue.
O: Are there any student residences that could be used?
C: Asked about this, and Chris wasn’t sure. Commencement is around mid-June, so I guess there would be availability after that.
O: What has typical attendance been at recent CCCs?
C: Much variation. Attendance has been a bit higher on the East coast. *The attendance since 2000 is as follows. Some years the attendance figures may be low due to local attendees not registering.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Florence</th>
<th>2000 66</th>
<th>Chicago</th>
<th>2001 96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>2002 140</td>
<td>Aarhus</td>
<td>2003 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>2004 82</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>2005 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>2006 75</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>2007 85 (FCRC year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Park</td>
<td>2008 80</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>2009 130+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>2010 140</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>2011 99 (FCRC year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porto</td>
<td>2012 57</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>2013 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>2014 66</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>2015 84 (FCRC year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>2016 130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O: How has co-location with STOC affected attendance?
C: Has been higher. See above - 2010 and 2013 were co-location years.
O: There are definitely larger lecture halls at Caltech.
C: The one Chris mentioned is one he can get control of.

**Bid from San Diego**
Speaker: Chair, presenting slides by Shachar Lovett, who would be the local arrangements chair.

- Local organizers: Shachar Lovett (chair), Sam Buss
- Venue
  - UCSD campus
  - Calit2, Atkinson hall - next to the CS department, state of the art conference room (200 seats)
  - Breakfast / Lunch / Reception in outside patio
- Transportation
  - 2 hours driving distance from Santa Monica. We can arrange a shuttle bus from LA to San Diego for STOC participants
  - San Diego has an international airport for those coming just for CCC
  - Inexpensive parking on UCSD campus ($8/day), 5 min walking distance from venue
- Accommodation: Computer Science department has negotiated reduced prices with local hotels. The prices for 2016 are:
  - La Jolla Shores: $139/night, complimentary shuttle service
  - Sheraton La Jolla: $165/night, walking distance
  - Marriott Residence Inn: $200/night, walking distance
  - Estancia: $189/night, walking distance
- Dates
  - Before/after STOC 2018
  - UCSD spring quarter teaching ends at June 8; exam week ends June 15.
  - Conference room is not used for teaching, any date is fine (but better before end of quarter)
• Budget: Total cost (estimate): $19000. Assuming registration of 100 people, can set registration price at $200 to allow for additional funds for student support, some unexpected costs, etc. Note that the registration includes lunch.
  o Conference room rental: $1800
  o Support staff (event organizers + AV support): $2500
  o Furniture rental for outside breakfast/lunch: $1600
  o Food (light breakfast, lunch, coffee): $6000
  o Reception: $4000
  o Proceedings: $2000
  o Insurance: $1000

Further Discussion

O: I would want to avoid problems that we have sometimes had with STOC on opposite coast close to CCC.
O: Having CCC at least a few weeks after STOC might not be too bad, and could still have CCC submission deadline after STOC notification.
C: But that may not be convenient for people coming from further (e.g., Japan).
O: With this year in Japan, next year in Riga, we’re not having a lot of North American participants. Advantage of being closer to STOC.
O: We could alternate co-locating versus not.

Straw Poll

Show of hands for co-locating with STOC on the west coast versus going to the east coast
• East coast: 3
• West coast: 17

Show of hands for Pasadena versus San Diego
• Pasadena: 4
• San Diego: 11
• Undecided: 3

The board will take all of this into account, and any additional information we may gain.

Treasurer’s Report
Speaker: Eric Allender, Treasurer of CCF

• CCF funds, June 11, 2015 (at last year’s business meeting): $49,814.29
• CCF funds, May 18, 2016 (when these slides were prepared): $56,524.21

This does not reflect expenses and income from CCC 2016. Balance is expected to go up slightly when that is taken into account.
• Why so much money?
  We needed to build up an initial reserve, and our aim is to just keep steady.
• Income for the year: $7,894.17
  - $6,884 CCC 2015 (FCRC)
    (due to some changes in how FCRC billed the conference after the conference was over)
  - $1,000 Individual Donor-intended for 2015
  - $10 Misc. (Interest, minus fees)
• Expenses for the year (not including CCC’16): $1,184.25
  - $756.57 Insurance
  - $400.00 Logo
  - $27.50 Annual fee for non-profit status
• Things are stable. No real news.

President’s Report

• Status: CCC and CCF are healthy. Budget looks good; we have the reserve we are supposed to have. The number of submissions seems stable; people seem to view the conference as basically the same as before becoming independent.
• Logo:
  - Last year we solicited and received some proposals for a new logo from people in the community, but at the business meeting it was suggested to ask a professional designer.
  - This year we contracted a professional designer, who came up with the logo that we are now using (see the website and the top of this document)
• Future Issues
  - Insurance. Still looking for good advice on what we really need and what we can drop.
  - LIPIcs (see below)
  - Potential changes to the format of CCC (see below)

LIPIcs

• One of the transition committees looked at possible venues for the proceedings. LIPIcs was the only option they found that met all of our requirements.
• Issues:
  - Amount of work for PC Chair / Editor. We had an agreement that LIPIcs would automate some parts of the process (collection of meta-data, checking of files). This still has not happened.
  - High standards for aesthetics. Authors were asked last year for feedback on the process. Some felt LIPIcs was too strict with the formatting.
- Pending fee increases. We have been warned that the fees for processing papers will go up significantly because Dagstuhl is no longer allowed to subsidize LIPIcs from their general funds, which come from the German government: from the current 15 euros/paper, to 30 next year, then 45, and finally 60. That is still relatively cheap for an open-access option, though a significant increase.
- Jacobo Toran, Chair of the CCF Paper Committee: I felt that the process was smoother this year for authors. The LIPIcs people agreed to do more of the changes needed to the files as they knew they did not yet get everything done they had promised.
- C: Please email any further thoughts.

Potential Changes to the Format of CCC

- The Board started discussing possible changes to the conference with the goal of serving the community better.
- There is a perception that the conference is only attended by people who have to be there for some reason: to present a paper, to serve on a committee, or because they are the recipient of a travel allowance from the conference. We analyzed the registration data from the past few years, and determined that the fraction of attendees that does not fall in any of the above categories ranges from 25% to 40%. This may not be as bad as some thought. Nevertheless, it is good to ponder ways to better serve the community.
- The following changes are under consideration:
  - The possibility of using STOC reviews when the CCC submission deadline comes right after the STOC notification deadline
  - Possibly increasing the number of accepted papers
  - Possibly including tutorials in the program of the conference

Use of STOC Reviews when CCC Submission is right after STOC Notification

- The idea is for the CCC PC Chair to obtain information from the STOC PC Chair that would allow the CCC PC Chair to contact the STOC reviewers, and ask them to send their prior reviews and/or to review the CCC submission. CCC authors are informed about this mechanism in the CFP, and are offered the option to include the STOC reviews and a response to them (rebuttal and changes), which would be sent to the STOC reviewers if they agree to review again for CCC.
- Arguments pro:
  - Avoid duplication of review efforts
  - Alleviate extra work for CCC PC due to STOC resubmits
  - Possibility for authors to respond to STOC reviews
- Arguments against:
  - Wrong-headed review forever tied to paper
  - Confidentiality issues (for the reviews and for the submissions)
O: If the process is in the CFP, then people could take this into account. I like the possibility for authors to include a rebuttal in their submission.
O: The submission to CCC might not be the same paper (has changed since the STOC paper). May not have same set of authors. And there is the stigma of a paper being rejected from STOC.
C: The response to the STOC reviews would include a description of the changes; if the changes are so large that it is a different paper, the response could just say that. Some of the “stigma” happens behind the scenes, we could put this more out into the open.
O: In my opinion, CCC should be independent of STOC. We should not have an arrangement on a formal basis.
O: Did CCC ever consider having a rebuttal phase of its own? Some other CS conferences do this (e.g., LICS).
C: As far as I know, it has not happened or been considered. It would lengthen the review period, possibly making it infeasible to have CCC submission after STOC notification.
O: I like the proposal as I much prefer to be able to submit to both STOC and CCC. Don’t seem to lose anything by having the reuse and rebuttal.
O: Would we do this for other conferences?
C: Current idea is to just do it for STOC since the timing is so close together.
O: Would STOC reviews be used as-are?
C: The proposal is that initially only the PC chair would have access, and would decide how to share with the PC, which STOC reviewers to ask again, and how many fresh reviews to solicit.
O: Would sub-reviews be known to the CCC PC?
C: We would ask the reviewers whether they would want their names to be revealed or not.
O: With all these rules about confidentiality, etc., will end up being more work than just doing a review twice. Seems like more work than it is worth.
O: But we could give the authors a chance for rebuttal, which seems to be a clear benefit.
O: For FOCS PC, previous reviews were used as a consistency check - using previous reviews for more than just reducing effort.

Show of hands for doing something along these lines:
- In favor: 8
- Opposed: 7

Accepting More Papers to CCC

- When the time comes for the PC to decide on the remaining borderline papers, they invariably want to accept more papers. This year there was an explicit request from the PC Chair to significantly increase the number of accepted papers. The Board agreed to let this year’s acceptance rate reach the maximum rate from the past 10 years, but didn’t feel comfortable going higher. As this would constitute a significant and possibly irreversible change to the conference, the Board felt there should be a community-wide
discussion whether or not to embark on a multi-year process to gradually increase the acceptance rate by a significant amount.

- In anticipation of that discussion, the Board collected the following information from the CCF members:
  - Question: Does your institution discount papers at conferences with high acceptance rates?
  - Responses (11): 11 no’s, but 3 mention that the rates are required for tenure dossiers at levels higher than department.

O: I would object against parallel sessions. *And many agreed.*
O: How could we get more papers without parallel sessions?
C: Longer conference or shorter talks.
Ran Raz, PC Chair of CCC’16: We should accept more papers. The quality was good enough. One reason is that there would be more participation, a larger conference. Another reason is that people are frustrated when good quality papers are rejected.
O: Question is about the prestige of the conference. I feel mixed on this issue. But do like the idea of accepting papers as long as they are good papers.
C: Have heard from some people that we don’t want to become like conferences like SODA that have a very high number of papers.
Ran Raz: There could be a positive feedback loop - more papers, so more people consider the conference, etc.
O: I like having a small number of talks, for the atmosphere we get. I don’t see how to have a significant increase in papers without changing the atmosphere.
O: What about a poster session? Short presentations for some of the papers?
C: Short presentations have been tried, and people didn’t like it then (issue of being thought of as second-class papers).
O: Note - SODA acceptance rate is not much difference than ours.
O: Don’t think you can dramatically increase the accept rate in a single year. It would need to happen gradually.
C: Sure, if we decide to go that route, we’d do it gradually.

Show of hands for significantly increasing number of papers:
- In favor: 3
- Opposed: 6

**Tutorials**

- The idea is to include a tutorial of 6 to 8 hours on each of one or two topics, and spread them over the duration of the conference so people have time to absorb the material. The topics would be in a subarea where there has been a lot of recent progress. The intent would be to introduce the average complexity theorist to those developments and
help them keep up-to-date without necessarily wanting to work in that subarea. We
could start each morning and afternoon with one or two hours of tutorials, and keep the
rest of the time for contributed talks.
• Such tutorials are already offered in some invited workshops/seminars. This would make
them available to all complexity theorists. One can imagine that some people may want
to attend the conference just for the tutorials (using the rest of the time to talk to
colleagues and/or do background reading on the tutorial topic). Some other attendees
may want to skip the tutorials all together.
• Concerns:
  ○ Requires some other changes: longer conference / fewer contributed papers /
    shorter talks / parallel sessions.
  ○ Preparing such a tutorial takes a lot of time. Would there be capable and willing
candidates?

O: Has been a big draw at other conferences I have been at that have done this.
O: Tutorials could be pre or post conference, and let people choose if they come for this part.
O: Please no shorter talks, no parallel sessions.
O: What about shorter than 6-8 hours?
C: Idea would be to go at a pace where people in the audience all can follow. I do not know of
other theory conferences where tutorials are offered in this way.
O: Great idea to have a bigger payoff for the large overhead of traveling.

Show of hands: In favor of such tutorials?
  • Yes: 27
  • No: 0

Show of hands:
  • Who would only be willing to do this if it is separate from the conference? 9
  • Who prefers to have them intermixed throughout the conference? 4
  • Who is fine with either option? 7

Show of hands: How to make room in the schedule for tutorials?
  • Willing to reduce the number of contributed papers? 1
  • Willing to have shorter talks for contributed papers? 1
  • Willing to have parallel sessions? 0

Changes to the Board

• The composition of the Board right before CCC’16 was: Dieter van Melkebeek
  (President), Eric Allender (Treasurer), Jeff Kinne (Secretary), Boaz Barak (Registration
Chair), Venkatesan Guruswami (Awards Chair), Madhu Sudan (Past Registration Chair),
Jacobo Toran (Paper Chair), Osamu Watanabe (Budget Chair).

- The Awards Chair is up for change this year, and is appointed by the Board. As announced to the CCC mailing list earlier, Rocco Servedio has accepted the position. Venkatesan Guruswami will remain on the Board for one more year as Past Awards Chair.
- The Budget Chair is up for change this year, and is elected by the CCF membership. After a nomination period of two weeks, there were seven candidates willing to serve. The election period of two weeks just concluded, and Ryan O'Donnell came out as the winner. Osamu Watanabe will remain on the Board for one more year as Past Budget Chair.
- The position of Madhu Sudan on the Board ended right before CCC’16.
- Due to personal and professional changes, Secretary Jeff Kinne decided in agreement with the President to step down right after CCC’16. The Secretary is nominated by the President and approved by the Board. Sevag Gharibian has accepted to take over the position for the remaining term.
- Welcome to Rocco, Ryan, and Sev!
- Thanks very much to Jeff and Madhu for their service!