

ACM SIGGRAPH Executive Committee Minutes (PRIVATE)

Tuesday, 19 November 2024

2 - 3 PM PT/ 5 - 6 PM ET

Attendees:

Eakta Jain, Executive Committee Chair
Brad Lawrence, Executive Committee Treasurer
Darin Grant, Executive Committee Chair - Elect
David Spoelstra, Executive Committee Treasurer - Elect
Ginger Alford, SIGGRAPH 2025 Conference Chair
Elizabeth Baron, Executive Committee Director
Tomasz Bednarz, SIGGRAPH Asia Conference Advisory Group Chair
Marcia Daudelin, Conference Administration
Dena DeBry, Nomination Committee Chair
Brenda Dreier, Conference Management
Hugues Hoppe, Executive Committee Director
Mona Kasra, Executive Committee Director
June Kim, Executive Committee Director
Scott Owen, Governance Advisory Board (GAB) Chair
Mikki Rose, Conference Advisory Group, (CAG) Chair
Alla Sheffer, Executive Committee Director
Courtney Starrett, Executive Committee Director

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PRESENTER</u>
10 October minutes approved by EC.	All
Chair's Update 1. Meeting values- Eakta reminded everyone of the guidelines for the EC meetings. 2. Conducting business virtually- Eakta reviewed the preferred approach to conducting EC business in-person and on zoom as well as virtually by email. For expediency, there are topics addressed by email. It was unclear on how to manage the process of discussion and decision making by email. The governance board has been asked to provide the EC with recommendations on how to manage virtual voting items. Process: a. The EC chair determines when a topic can be addressed by email vs during a zoom/in-person meeting. b. EC chair to determine if the item can be voted on by email. c. All such items that are voted on by email should be sent to the ec-voting@siggraph.org. 3. Eakta will be on PTO 11/24–12/1. Darin will serve as acting Chair 11/24–11/29. Please use ec-chair@siggraph.org for any requests during this time so that Darin is copied. 4. Eakta reminded the EC that there are only two more scheduled EC virtual meetings in this year (12/3 and 12/17). There will be no meeting on 12/31. After that, the EC will next meet on 1/14. If needed, the EC will look to add a meeting on 12/10 or 1/7.	Eakta Jain
Liaison Updates- Courtney Starrett shared an update on some miscommunication about the CAPs budget on the	Courtney Starrett

part of the Early Career Development Committee (formerly S3). The committee thought they had a budget but it had been a mistake that the previous year's budget had been sent to them. Courtney reported that the Early Career Development Committee and Volunteer Engagement Committee will be connected to better track the progression of volunteers from one position to the next (ie- moving from CAP to conference/org volunteer). They are working on a plan to better track that data. After that happens, they'll connect the Volunteer Development Committee with the Nominations Committee. Courtney is also working the Early Development Committee Chair on the budget and annual report.	
SIGGRAPH ArXiv Policy ArXiv Embargo Proposal for SIGGRAPH was shared with the EC. The dissenting opinion of the ArXiv Embargo Proposal was also provided. Alla shared some background on this situation: SIGGRAPH Papers have strong review processes that are scientific and avoid bias. There are two kinds of review - single and double blind. In a single blind- the reviewer knows who the authors are but the authors don't know who the reviewers are. In double blind- the reviewer and authors don't know who the other is in the process. SIGGRAPH has strived for double blind. Up until 5-6 years ago, it wasn't a perfect double blind. There have been discussions to improve the process to avoid potential bias associated with the reviewer or author being known. Separately, authors have started posting papers on ArXiv, which is not anonymous. In certain disciplines, researchers are posting preprints to ArXiv as soon as it is read because it can take several years to review. In computer science, it is not as long of a time frame for the paper to be reviewed and thus not a strong need for authors to post while under review. The possibility of authors to post preprints of their papers before the submission deadline or during the review period has seriously affected the ability to maintain a double blind process. Since 2019, SIGGRAPH submitters can put their papers on ArXiv but they are asked to not put it anywhere else. That isn't always followed. The Papers Chairs are put in a position to determine if people are abusing the current policies. The PAG has been discussing how to remedy the situation. SIGGRAPH Asia did analytics on publications, and around ~7-9% SIGGRAPH papers were on arXiv before they were publicly available via our ACM DL. The PAG is proposing that the only way to ensure a true level playing field and maintain high quality review and high scientific standards is to impose an embargo on ArXiv posts on submissions, two weeks before the deadline until the conditional acceptance email (for 2024/2025 this would be about 2.5 months). The proposal approved by the PAG can be found online. The PAG wasn't unanimous. The dissenting opinion can also be found online. The PAG would like to have it for SIGGRAPH Asia 2025. As such, it isn't an urgent item. No vote was made in EC meeting. There was a proposal for the EC to review the materials and revisit in January. ACTION: EC to revisit the ArXiv Embargo Proposal discussion in January 2025.	Alla Sheffer
SIGGRAPH Conference Discussions The slides presented by SIGGRAPH 2025 Conference Chair Ginger Alford during the meeting have been shared with the EC.	Mikki Rose/ Ginger Alfort

SIGGRAPH 2025 revenue & expense recommendations: The EC will be involved early in the budgeting process, with some urgent items highlighted for EC feedback. The goals were:

- Review budget planning timeline
- Affirm CAG recommended direction on revenue estimates
- Share ballpark estimates (based on history) on net results
- Collaborate on solutions to improve net results
- Decision on in-person vs. virtual meetings
- Ability to sell program-level sponsorships

Some expenses require approval now vs waiting until the budget approval in early February.

The timeline for the budget process is:

- Revenue Assumptions Drafted - Oct/Nov; Presented to EC in Dec. Using history/trends
- Evaluate registration pricing
- Expense Assumptions Drafted - initial due first week Dec. for roll-up
- Meeting formats based on history (in-person/virtual, number of meetings)
- Contracted fees
- Program proposals
- Adjust assumptions throughout Jan. to arrive at break-even budget
- Budget proposal sent to EC in February for approval

Registration and exhibits/sponsor revenue planning is more challenging given Denver results

- 2022 & 2023 revenue consistently beat expectations and while still not at pre-pandemic numbers it was showing positive momentum.
- While Denver was a risk as a new location, revenue was budgeted based on a modest increase over 2023 numbers which were still well below 2019. The results in Denver are likely a combination of location and economic issues in a segment of the SIGGRAPH audience
- It is anticipated returning to a known location (Vancouver) will improve top-line revenue.

Expenses expected to be greater than 2024

- While Denver was a risk as a new location, revenue was budgeted based on a modest increase
- The 2025 Committee Kick-off Meeting was reinstated as in-person in Feb. 2024.
- The CAG and EC approved 2025 moving forward with an in-person Technical Papers Committee meeting.
- Funding to continue to have the Experience Hall adjacent to the Exhibition is desired to draw people to the exhibition.

Budget requirements

- Allocation of ACM Overhead and 3% contingency are required as part of the budgeting process
- EC currently mandates the conference have a net profit of 3.5% on the budgeted revenue to fund other Org. activities.
- The EC also reviewed expected changes in expenses and revenue for registration, exhibits/sponsorships, and any major expense variances.

Potential adjustments to reduce expenses include:

- Secure more sponsorships of programs
- Convert in-person meetings to virtual

○ Technical Papers Committee Meetings ○ Unified Jury ○ CAG Budget Meeting ○ Spring CAG Meeting ○ April Committee Meeting ● Reduce expenses for session rooms ○ Reduce large room by one day ○ Reduce # of concurrent by one (similar to 2018 number) ● Minimal food and beverage until revenue status is known. ● Consider reducing the amount of concurrent live streaming ● Encourage soliciting cash donations via program chairs. ● Reduce number of in-person jurors to Unified Jury (if does not convert to virtual). ● Reduce number of experience days to start Monday vs. Sunday ● EC Special Project to fund Technical Papers Committee Meeting in person ● Minor adjustments to registration fees (pending presentation to EC) Feedback: Following Ginger's presentation, the EC discussed the cost of the Technical Papers Committee Meeting which has gone down as more details are flushed out about location, food and beverage costs, etc. The current draft budget has the meeting at higher than the anticipated costs. There are possible implications of the Technical Papers Committee Meeting going virtual after it was previously announced. It has been five years since they've met in person, and it is an investment in the conference. No decisions were made during the meeting. A vote on the format of the Unified Jury and Technical Papers Committee Meeting was conducted by email.	
SIGGRAPH Asia SIGGRAPH Asia 2026 Location and SIGGRAPH Asia CAG Chair discussions were moved to email because time didn't allow for the conversation during the meeting.	
Meeting Adjourned	