MINUTES IACR MEMBERSHIP MEETING *CRYPTO'15*

UCSB, SANTA BARBARA, 19 AUGUST 2015

Opening. At 16.53 Cachin opens the meeting. He begins by giving an overview of the IACR and its activities. In particular he draws attention to IACR's facebook account and the ability to organize petitions among members. He mentions that Alexandra (Sasha) Boldyreva has joined as IACR's ePrint Archive editor in Tal Rabin's stead and highlights a number of areas where the IACR could benefit from additional volunteers.

Treasurer's Report. After overcoming some technical challenges, Rose presents a preliminary financial report for 2014. He asks the membership for approval to keep membership fees at 50USD for members and 25USD for student members; no objections are raised.

McCurley asks what the IT budget of the IACR is. Rose answer that 2kUSD is spent for hosting with some additional costs for incidental development.

Cachin thanks Rose for his efforts throughout the year.

Membership Secretary. Cachin presents shelat's membership report, highlighting some recent trends.

Conferences and publications. Cachin explains that the field has grown and publishing trends are changing. The IACR Board is currently re-assessing the way in which we publish, bearing in mind that *FSE* will move to a journal-conference hybrid from 2017 onwards. Cachin presents a number of scenarios based on both typical costs for open access and the projected IACR publication demand. The Board has formulated a number of questions for the membership to move the discussion forward.

Open Access. One open question is whether IACR should move from Green open access to Gold open access. Moving to Gold open access will carry a cost, which leads to the question how much we value Gold over Green open access and who would pay for possible Gold open access.

- Yung explains that even with Green open access, the ePrint Archive will still enable immediate access.
- McCurley believes that Green and Gold is a trick to distinguish between cost and price and we should drop the term. Cachin explains it explains the licensing schemes well. McCurley says it is not just a commercial decision when taking into account ranking and academic standing of publications.
- Smart explains there are many shades of Green. He posits that IACR's version of Green is way ahead of others.
- Orman explains that even Gold does not mean ownership, adding an extra dimension. Cachin explains IACR currently owns the copyright to its publications (though not for all historical ones).
- Schroeppel asks what happens with historical access when we move away from Springer. Cachin gives an answer.
- Lindell believes we need to educate the authors to ensure they upload their final camera ready versions to the ePrint. There is a discussion how best to support this process and align them with the needs of the IACR.

There is a quick show of hand whether, without a clear cost picture, the IACR should move to Gold open access. There are 15 in favour with an overwhelming majority against.

Moving to costs, Rose explains that Gold open access will cost a six figure digit (per year), which easily accounts for 10% (or more) of our annual budget. Haber posits that publishing is changing and wonders whether the offers for Gold open access have changed much, and whether they are expected to reduce significantly over the next four years.

Handschuh wonders how many papers per year we publish etc. and whether a detailed breakdown of the projections can be given. Cachin explains that the numbers at the moment are primarily meant to facilitate the discussion.

Ferguson notices that any discussion about costs should also take into account the benefit, namely that the research becomes available.

There is an attempt at a second show of hand, whether the IACR move to Gold open access if total cost is around 300 kUSD. This time there are 4 in favour and an undetermined number against.

Further questions are skipped in the interest of time.

Parallel Sessions. Cachin conducts a quick straw poll to indicate the support for parallel sessions (as the conference has been using them so far). There are roughly a dozen neutral, another dozen against, and many in favour of parallel sessions. Cachin opens the floor for further comments and questions.

- Haber explains why he believes that the best paper award should be a plenary presentation.
- Kelsey suggests to ensure videotaping to make parallel sessions work.
- Brassard wants to have immediate online access to the abstracts of the papers to facilitate the choice which presentations to attend. Bernstein responds that Usenix has experienced with one minute lightning introductions (by the author) made available ahead of time.

Publication format. Desmedt warns authors to think very careful about 30 page conference pages to ensure a journal option remains.

Calendar. Cachin gives an update of the calendar.

Closing. Cachin thanks everyone for their attendance and closes the meeting at 16.55.