



# AITO Handbook

Bylaws, Guidelines and FAQs

- Version 1.0 — November 5, 1998 (Oscar Nierstrasz)
- Version 2.0 — September 6, 2001 (Gerti Kappel)
- Version 3.0 — April 9, 2003 (Vasco Vasconcelos)
- Version 4.0 — January 26, 2006 (Vasco Vasconcelos)

**AITO Handbook**

©1998, Association Internationale pour les Technologies Objets

This document is available in electronic form from <http://www.aito.org/>.

*Please address all correspondence to:*

Prof. Vasco Vasconcelos  
AITO Secretary  
Department of Informatics, Faculty of Sciences  
University of Lisbon  
Campo Grande, 1749-016 Lisboa  
PORTUGAL  
Tel: +351-21-750 0087  
Fax: +351-21-750 0084  
E-mail: [vv@di.fc.ul.pt](mailto:vv@di.fc.ul.pt)

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction to AITO</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>By-laws</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Code of Conduct for ECOOP Program Committees</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Conflicts of Interest</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>AITO Guidelines for the Operation of ECOOP</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>ECOOP Organizing Chair FAQ List</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>ECOOP Programme Chair FAQ List</b>	<b>25</b>

# Chapter 1

## Introduction to AITO

AITO stands for *Association Internationale pour les Technologies Objets*, a non-profit association registered on May 27, 1998, in Kaiserslautern, Germany.<sup>1</sup>

The purpose of the Association is to promote the advancement of research in object-oriented technology, primarily in Europe, in particular through the organisation of the annual European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming (ECOOP).

Up-to-date information about AITO can be found on the WWW at <http://www.aito.org/> and about ECOOP at <http://www.ecoop.org/>.

### Executive Board (2006-2007)

*Elected Glasgow, United Kingdom, July 26, 2005.*

President	Dave Thomas Bedarra Research Labs, Canada E-mail: <a href="mailto:dave@bedarra.com">dave@bedarra.com</a>
Vice-President	Prof. Eric Jul University of Copenhagen, Denmark E-mail: <a href="mailto:eric@diku.dk">eric@diku.dk</a>
Vice-President	Prof. Mira Mezini University of Technology Darmstadt, Germany E-mail: <a href="mailto:mezini@informatik.tu-darmstadt.de">mezini@informatik.tu-darmstadt.de</a>
Vice-President	Prof. Oscar Nierstrasz University of Bern, Switzerland E-mail: <a href="mailto:oscar@iam.unibe.ch">oscar@iam.unibe.ch</a>

---

<sup>1</sup>AITO was originally incorporated in May, 1993, in Geneva, Switzerland, and moved to Germany in 1998.

Secretary Prof. Vasco Vasconcelos  
 University of Lisbon, Portugal  
 E-mail: [vv@di.fc.ul.pt](mailto:vv@di.fc.ul.pt)

Treasurer Dr. Walter Olthoff  
 University of Kaiserslautern, Germany  
 E-mail: [olthoff@dfki.uni-kl.de](mailto:olthoff@dfki.uni-kl.de)

## Voting Members

*As of July 26, 2005.*

Mehmet Aksit	University of Twente, The Netherlands
Elisa Bertino	University of Milano, Italy
Jean Bézivin	Université de Nantes, France
Andrew Black	Portland State University, United States of America
Luca Cardelli	Microsoft Research, United Kingdom
Denis Caromel	University of Nice, France
Pierre Cointe	École des Mines de Nantes, France
Theo D'Hondt	Free University of Brussels, Belgium
Gert Florijn	SERC, The Netherlands
Rachid Guerraoui	École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Switzerland
Zoltán Horváth	Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary
Eric Jul	University of Copenhagen, Denmark
Gerti Kappel	Johannes Kepler Universität Linz, Austria
Jørgen Lindskov Knudsen	Mjølnær Informatics A/S, Denmark
László Kozma	Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary
Ole Lehrmann Madsen	Aarhus University, Denmark
Boris Magnusson	Lund University, Sweden
Satoshi Matsuoka	Tokyo Institute of Technology, Japan
Arne Maus	University of Oslo, Norway
Mira Mezini	University of Technology Darmstadt, Germany
Birger Møller-Pedersen	University of Oslo, Norway
Oscar Nierstrasz	University of Bern, Switzerland
Martin Odersky	École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Switzerland
Walter Olthoff	University of Kaiserslautern, Germany
Jean-Paul Rigault	University of Nice, France
Markku Sakkinen	University of Jyväskylä, Finland
Dave Thomas	Bedarra Research Labs, Canada
José Troya	University of Malaga, Spain
António Vallecillo	University of Malaga, Spain
Vasco Vasconcelos	University of Lisbon, Portugal
Akinori Yonezawa	University of Tokyo, Japan

## Past ECOOPs

<b>ECOOP 87</b>	Paris, France
Conference Chairs	J.M. Hullot, Jean Bézivin
Programme Chairs	Pierre Cointe, Henry Lieberman
Organizing Chair	(AFCET)
Keynote Speaker	Adele Goldberg
Invited Speakers	Bjarne Stroustrup; Carl Hewitt; Richard Gabriel
Banquet Speaker	Kristen Nygaard
<b>ECOOP 88</b>	Oslo, Norway
Conference Chair	Stein Gjessing
Programme Chair	Kristen Nygaard
Organizing Chair	(DND - Norwegian Computer Society)
Keynote Speaker	Ole Johan Dahl
Invited Speakers	Dennis Tsichritzis; Danny Bobrow
<b>ECOOP 89</b>	Nottingham, United Kingdom
Conference Chair	John Florentin
Programme Chair	Stephen Cook
Organizing Chair	John Florentin and the British Informatics Society
Invited Speakers	L. Peter Deutsch; Kenneth Kahn
<b>ECOOP 90</b>	Ottawa, Canada <sup>2</sup>
Conference Chairs	Dave Thomas, Pierre Cointe
Programme Chair	Akinori Yonezawa
Organizing Chair	Jeff McKenna
Keynote Speaker	Terry Winograd
Banquet Speaker	Bill Buxton
<b>ECOOP 91</b>	Geneva, Switzerland
Conference Chairs	Dennis Tsichritzis
Programme Chair	Pierre America
Organizing Chair	Oscar Nierstrasz
Invited Speaker	Rudolph Marty
<b>ECOOP 92</b>	Utrecht, The Netherlands
Conference Chair	Pierre America
Programme Chair	Ole Lehrmann Madsen
Organizing Chair	Gert Florijn
Invited Speakers	Won Kim; William Verplank
Banquet Speaker	Kristen Nygaard

<b>ECOOP 93</b>	Kaiserslautern, Germany
Conference Chair	Gerhard Barth
Programme Chair	Oscar Nierstrasz
Organizing Chair	Walter Olthoff
Keynote Speaker	Michael Lamming
Invited Speaker	Colin Ashford
Banquet Speaker	Brian Oakley
<b>ECOOP 94</b>	Bologna, Italy
Conference Chair	Maurelio Boari
Programme Chairs	Mario Tokoro, Remo Pareschi
Organizing Chair	Paola Mello
Keynote Speaker	Luc Steels
Invited Speaker	Norbert A. Streitz
<b>ECOOP 95</b>	Aarhus, Denmark
Conference Chair	Ole Lehrmann Madsen
Programme Chair	Walter Olthoff
Organizing Chair	Jörgen Lindskov Knudsen
Keynote Speaker	Dave Thomas
Invited Speakers	Luca Cardelli; Randall B. Smith, David Ungar
<b>ECOOP 96</b>	Linz, Austria
Conference Chair	Oscar Nierstrasz
Programme Chair	Pierre Cointe
Organizing Chair	Gerti Kappel
Keynote Speakers	Adele Goldberg; François Bancilhon
<b>ECOOP 97</b>	Jyväskylä, Finland
Conference Chair	Boris Magnusson
Programme Chairs	Mehmet Aksit, Satoshi Matsuoka
Organizing Chair	Markku Sakkinen
Invited Speakers	Kristen Nygaard; Gregor Kiczales; Erich Gamma
Banquet Speaker	Dave Thomas
<b>ECOOP 98</b>	Brussels, Belgium
Conference Chair	Luc Steels
Programme Chair	Eric Jul
Organizing Chair	Theo D'Hondt
Invited Speakers	Danny B. Lange; Malcom Atkinson, Mick Jordan
<b>ECOOP 99</b>	Lisbon, Portugal
Programme Chair	Rachid Guerraoui
Organizing Chair	Vasco T. Vasconcelos
Invited Speakers	C.A.R. Hoare, Barbara Liskov, Jim Waldo

<b>ECOOP 00</b>	Cannes, France
Programme Chair	Elisa Bertino
Organizing Chairs	Dennis Caromel, Jean-Paul Rigault
Invited Speakers	Ole L. Madsen, Li Gong, Munir Cochinwala
Banquet Speaker	Alan Kay
<b>ECOOP 01</b>	Budapest, Hungary
Conference Chair	Gerti Kappel
Programme Chair	Jørgen Lindskov Knudsen
Organizing Chairs	Laszlo Kozma, Zoltan Horvath
Invited Speakers	Charles Simonyi, Erik Meijer, Alistair Cockburn
<b>ECOOP 02</b>	Málaga, Spain
Conference Chair	José Troya
Programme Chair	Boris Magnusson
Organizing Chairs	António Vallecillo
Invited Speakers	José Meseguer, Clemens Szyperski, Kristen Nygaard
<b>ECOOP 03</b>	Darmstadt, Germany
Conference Chair	Rachid Guerraoui
Programme Chair	Luca Cardelli
Organizing Chairs	Mira Mezini
Invited Speakers	Martin Abadi, Carl Gunter, Mary Fernandez
<b>ECOOP 04</b>	Oslo, Norway
Conference Chair	Birger Miller-Pedersen
Programme Chair	Martin Odersky
Organizing Chairs	Arne Maus
Invited Speakers	Doug Engelbart, Matthias Felleisen, Tom Henzinger
<b>ECOOP 05</b>	Glasgow, United Kingdom
Conference Chair	Paddy Nixon
Programme Chair	Andrew Black
Organizing Chairs	Peter Dickman
Invited Speakers	Bertrand Meyer, Gail Murphy
<b>ECOOP 06</b>	Nantes, France
Conference Chair	(n.a.)
Programme Chair	Dave Thomas
Organizing Chairs	Jean Bézivin, Pierre Cointe
Invited Speakers	(to be announced)



# Chapter 2

## By-laws

Association Internationale pour les Technologies Objets (AITO) e.V. Kaiserslautern.<sup>1</sup>

### 1 Name – Seat – Financial Year of the Association

1. The association bears the name “Association Internationale pour les Technologies Objets” (AITO). The association has been registered with the official register of associations of the District Court of Kaiserslautern.
2. Its seat is in Kaiserslautern, Federal Republic of Germany.
3. The financial year goes by the calendar year.

### 2 Purpose of the Association

1. The purpose of the Association is to contribute to and promote the advancement of research in object-oriented technology, primarily in Europe, by all available means and in particular through the establishment of an annual conference of high academic standards.
2. In order to fulfil its purpose, the Association shall act either directly or through its members or by contractual agreement with other organizations.

### 3 Non-profit Order

1. The Association pursues exclusively and directly non-profit purposes in the sense of the paragraph on “steuerbegünstigte Zwecke” (English: tax-privileged purposes) of the law on paying taxes.

---

<sup>1</sup>The original version of this document, in German, can be found on the WWW at <http://www.aito.org/>.

2. The Association does not work for profit, nor does it in the first place pursue economic goals to the benefit of itself.
3. Financial means of the Association can only be used for purposes which are in accordance with the by-laws. Members shall not receive payments from the financial means of the Association.
4. No one shall benefit from expenditure which is not in accordance with the purpose of the body, or from disproportionately high reimbursements.
5. In the event of a winding-up of the Association or of cessation of its present purpose, the assets of the Association shall go to the University of Kaiserslautern which shall make use of them for exclusively non-profit purposes.

## **4 Membership**

1. The membership of the Association shall consist of Voting Members, Honorary Members and Institutional Members.
2. Individuals who have shown by their contribution to research in object-oriented technology, by their professional activity or otherwise, that they can further the cause and object of the Association, are eligible to become Voting Members.
3. The Association may admit Honorary Members, who shall have the same right as Voting Members to attend meetings and to express their views. They shall not have the right to vote at meetings and they shall not be eligible for service on the Executive Board.
4. Organizations which in the opinion of the General Assembly make a significant contribution to the advancement of object-oriented technology are eligible to become Institutional Members. Each Institutional Member shall nominate a representative who will have the same right as an Honorary Member. The representative may be changed at any time. Such changes are to be notified in writing, by the Institutional Member, to the Executive Board.

## **5 Admission of New Members**

1. Nominations for new Voting, Honorary or Institutional Members shall be put to the General Assembly for acceptance upon the recommendation of two individual Voting Members. The General Assembly shall decide about the admission of nominated members.
2. Every Member who is elected or admitted shall be informed by the Secretariat of his or her admission and shall receive from the Secretariat copies of the relevant documents.

3. Membership of the Association implies strict adherence to the By-laws and to any lawful decision made by the organs of the Association.

## **6 Termination of Membership**

1. Membership may be terminated by withdrawal in writing, submitted to the Secretariat, or by decision of the General Assembly.
2. Expulsion of a member shall be a decision of the General Assembly. The President shall present to the General Assembly a full report on the reasons for the proposed expulsion before the matter is considered by the General Assembly.
3. All controversial matters relating to membership shall be decided by the General Assembly.

## **7 Organization**

1. The organs of the Association consist of the General Assembly and the Executive Board.

## **8 General Assembly**

1. The General Assembly has all such powers as have not been conferred upon another organ under the present By-laws.
2. The General Assembly is summoned in ordinary or extraordinary meetings by the Executive Board, at the date and place fixed by it with a delay of ten calendar days.
3. At least one fifth of Voting Members may present a written request to the Executive Board for the calling of a General Assembly Meeting.
4. The calling of a General Assembly Meeting must indicate precisely the agenda or the items which should be discussed.
5. The General Assembly has in particular the following duties:
  - (a) fulfil the purpose of the Association as it is defined in section 2 and define its programme of work;
  - (b) adopt, amend and repeal the By-laws;
  - (c) elect and dismiss members of the Executive Board;
  - (d) consider reports submitted to it and approve the accounts;
  - (e) accept new members of the Association;

- (f) decide to terminate a membership;
  - (g) appoint committees entrusted with special tasks within the general framework of the Association.
  - (h) dismiss the Association
6. The General Assembly Meeting is chaired by a member of the Executive Board. Should there be no such member present, a Voting Member chosen by a simple majority of the Voting Members present shall chair such a Meeting.
  7. As a rule, a simple majority must be reached in the event of voting. Voting concerning changes of the by-laws or a winding-up of the Association, two thirds of a majority vote must be reached.
  8. Voting Members participating in a General Assembly Meeting shall be entitled to one vote in the decisions. Honorary as well as Institutional Members shall have no vote.
  9. The General Assembly Meeting shall be summoned at least once every year. At regular intervals, this meeting should take place at the annual Conference organized by the Association, known as ECOOP, (so long as such exists).

## **9 Consultation by Mail**

1. The Executive Board can hold a consultation of the members by mail. A consultation by mail may employ the medium of electronic mail, telefax or postal mail.
2. In the event of consultation by mail, the agenda shall be distributed at least 10 days in advance of the deadline for receipt of voting.
3. All decisions within the powers of the General Assembly, with the exception of decisions relating to winding-up, may be made by mail.

## **10 Quorum**

1. Quorum for a General Assembly Meeting, including consultations by mail, shall be at least one half of the total Voting Membership.
2. Voting Members can transfer their vote to other members by means of a written authority.
3. If quorum is not reached, the Meeting shall be summoned anew with the same agenda in eight days and shall form a quorum in any case, if this shall be announced in the invitation for the first Meeting.

## 11 The Executive Board and Presidency

1. According to §26 BGB, the Executive Board shall consist of a President, three Vice Presidents, a Treasurer and a Secretary of the Association.
2. Only Voting Members of the Association are eligible to serve on the Executive Board.
3. The Executive Board manages and represents the Association and shall have general charge of all matters of interest to the Association. All decisions of the Executive Board shall be taken by simple majority. In the event of a tie, the president shall have the deciding vote.
4. The Executive Board has the following powers:
  - (a) to summon a General Assembly Meeting;
  - (b) to present to the General Assembly annual, financial and other reports;
  - (c) to carry out decisions of the General Assembly;
  - (d) to manage the assets and property of the Association;
  - (e) to accept donations to the Association.
5. The association is bound by the individual signature of any member of the Executive Board.
6. The term of office of the members of the Executive Board shall be 2 years, commencing January 1 following the Annual General Assembly Meeting at which they are elected.
7. Executives are eligible for re-election.
8. Any Executive may resign by sending his or her resignation in writing to the General Assembly. An Executive may resign from the Executive Board whilst remaining a Voting Member of the Association.
9. Any vacancy in the Executive Board occurring between two Annual General Assembly Meetings, owing to death, resignation, removal or otherwise may be filled in between by an election by the General Assembly of any eligible member.
10. Any member of the Executive Board shall ipso facto, vacate his office or cease to be a member of the Executive Board as the case may be, if he or she ceases for any reason to be a Voting Member of the Association.
11. Any Executive may be removed from the Executive Board, by a resolution of an Extraordinary General Assembly Meeting convened for that purpose, and in the case of such resolution the following provisions shall apply: the Executive whom it is proposed to remove must first have an opportunity of being heard; not less than two-thirds of the Voting Members participating shall vote in favour of the resolution.

## **12 Court of Jurisdiction**

All disputes arising in connection with the Association, including members or organs of the Association, shall be settled before a competent court of law of Kaiserslautern.

## **13 Transitional Order**

The Executive Board shall be authorized to amend or to change by-laws, in case and inasmuch these should prove as being necessary owing to objections raised by the court of register. The decision of amendment and change respectively can also be set out by written correspondence. This becomes effective in case and inasmuch the recognition of the non-profit order makes changes necessary by the relevant financial department. The Executive Board of the Association shall be authorized to enter any possible amendment or change in the register of associations.

## Chapter 3

# Code of Conduct for ECOOP Program Committees

The following code of conduct has been established<sup>1</sup> by AITO, the formal body that runs ECOOPs, in order to assist and guide program committee chairs (PCC) and program committee members:

ECOOP Program Committees are set up to guarantee highest quality of the technical part of an ECOOP. To achieve this goal, a peer review process is employed consisting of two steps: (1) decentralized screening of each submitted paper by at least 3 Program Committee members, (2) a program committee meeting at which acceptance or rejection is decided.

Since the peer review process is heavily dependent on the confidentiality and anonymity of judgements and evaluations, the PC members must ensure that the submitted papers are not made public or used inappropriately. In particular, any knowledge from the refereeing process (like the judgement of other referees) may not be divulged outside the PC.

Non-disclosure and confidentiality concerns apply especially to referee evaluations circulated by e-mail in advance of the PC meeting: each PC member has to ensure that anonymity is not violated and that authors of submitted papers not gain knowledge about the discussion held during the PC meeting.

Materials provided at the PC Meeting containing comprehensive ratings, evaluations and reviews of submissions may not be copied, and must be returned to the PCC at the end of the meeting.

PC members can use the help of other expert reviewers. Nevertheless, the PC member himself is responsible for extending the confidentiality request to these reviewers. The PC member is also responsible for presenting delegated evaluations at the PC meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup>Adopted November 11, 1994.

# Chapter 4

## Conflicts of Interest

Defining conflicts can be difficult. AITO like to be strict on these matters so that there is no hint of ethical conflict with respect to our deliberations. Our guidelines say that you have a conflict with a paper that has an author or co-author in any of the following categories.

1. Your graduate supervisors and students.
2. Members of your current research team.
3. A co-author of a paper in the last five years.
4. A member of your family or a close personal friend.
5. Someone you have a significant financial relationship with.
6. An employee of the organization you work for (including an academic department)

There is (perhaps fortunately, perhaps not) room for interpretation in many of these. Example: If you work for a large company or a multi-campus university, do you have a conflict with all other employees? Well, even the U.S. National Science Foundation permits members of one campus to waive conflicts with members of the other campuses. There might be similar border line situations with large European projects. Rather than trying to nail this down, we appeal to your reason and judgment. When you're unsure, ask the program chair for advice. Rather than exploring the limits of these guiding rules AITO advice a more conservative attitude in situations where the rules might be hard to interpret.

For papers that fall into the categories above you are asked to not take part in the decision process: you should return any such paper to the PC chair, you should leave the room while the paper is discussed during the PC meeting.



## Chapter 5

# AITO Guidelines for the Operation of ECOOP

*Draft of Feb. 3, 1993, prepared by Walter Olthoff. Adopted Geneva, Feb. 18, 1993.*

This paper has two parts:

- A. Guidelines for ECOOP Organizers.
- B. The procedure for bids for hosting an ECOOP.

### A. Guidelines for ECOOP Organizers

The European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, ECOOP, is one of the most important activities of the Association Internationale pour les Technologies Objets (AITO). Much of the responsibility for the success of an ECOOP lies with the Organization Committee (OC), its Chairperson or Coordinator (OC Chair, or OCC), the overall Conference Chair (CC) and the Program Committee Chair (PCC). The following guidelines have been developed by AITO to facilitate the work of the OC, OCC and CC. Any prospective OC Chair and CC is expected to have understood these guidelines, and to abide by them.

#### 1. General

AITO, and the AITO Executive Board acting on its behalf, have primary and final responsibility for ECOOP. Much of this responsibility, when it concerns the organization of ECOOP, is delegated to the OCC, CC and PCC.

The Conference Chair is responsible for all activities related to the conference, but not necessarily on an operational level. The actual operational aspects are handled mostly by the OCC. The scientific program is the responsibility of the PC Chair. Various tasks may be delegated to additional sub-chairs (for e.g., workshops, panels, tutorials) who will coordinate their activities with the OCC or PCC, as appropriate.

In case of disagreement between AITO and the OCC and/or CC, or between AITO and the PCC, the decisions of AITO (represented by its Executive Board) are preponderant.

The nomination for a candidate for the positions of OC Chair and Conference Chair will be part of a bid to host an ECOOP. Deadlines for such bids will be published or made available by the AITO secretariat, following decisions by AITO. The information to be provided with the bid is described in specific guidelines.

## **2. Responsibilities of the OC Chair**

The OC Chair is responsible for the non-scientific, operational aspects of organizing the ECOOP (organizing rooms, exhibit space, visual aids, tea, coffee, meals, receptions, banquets, transportation, accommodation, excursions, entertainment, etc.), information about and publicity for ECOOP (printing and distribution of call for papers and pre-programs, etc.) and the ECOOP budget (including finding sponsors and subsidies).

The OCC will carry out these responsibilities in close collaboration with the other members of the Organizing Committee, the Conference Chair, the Program Committee Chair and the AITO Board.

We give some details of some of the OCCs responsibilities:

### **2.1. Establishment of the Organization Committee (OC)**

The OC should be able to work efficiently, and will often include a majority of members active near the venue of the ECOOP. However, there should be an effort to involve also some non-local persons, including representative(s) of the AITO Board and previous ECOOP OC's.

### **2.2. Continuity with previous ECOOPs and OCs**

The ECOOPs are a continuing series of similar conferences, and continuity (which does not mean uniformity nor identity) with previous ECOOPs is required. Reports (see 2.5) by previous OC Chairs will be appropriately consulted by the OCC.

### **2.3. Call for Contributions and other material**

Apart from the scientific parts, which are provided by the PCC, the preparation and distribution of the Call for Contributions (CFC) and the Call for Participation (CFP) are the responsibility of the OC.

All printed matter related to ECOOP (e.g. CFC, CFP, stationery, proceedings, etc.) should state the fact that ECOOP is sponsored by the AITO, and list the AITO logo and/or address.

## **2.4. Financial matters**

The OC Chair has primary responsibility for the ECOOP budget. Part of the budget will be for the work of the PC, and will be the responsibility of the PCC.

A (final) bid to host the ECOOP will include a detailed, itemized budget proposal for the OC activities. The budget will include a sub-budget to fund the activities of the PC. The budget should include detailed information on various incoming funds, including subsidies, and should describe the scenarios which will be followed if these subsidies are not obtained. It should also list the estimated conference fees.

The budget should aim for a break-even point somewhat below a conservative estimate of the number of registered participants to the ECOOP. Budget projections for a somewhat higher participation should also be given. Estimates can be based on the attendance of previous ECOOPs.

If the bid by the candidate ECOOP host to host the ECOOP is accepted by AITO, (significant) deviations from the proposed budget require the advance approval of the AITO Board.

Any loans by AITO to the OC or the PC will receive first priority for reimbursement.

Any profits from the ECOOP (including tutorials, expositions, workshops, etc.) will be split equally between AITO and the local member/organisation which organized the ECOOP. Any losses will be split as well, but on AITO's part limited to a maximum of the amount of the loan.

## **2.5. Final Report, Evaluation and Recommendations**

The OC Chair will submit to the AITO Executive Board a report on his or her activities. The report will include relevant statistical information (including budget of the OC and PC Chairs and related activities), an evaluation of the strategies followed by the OC, an evaluation of the members of the OC (in particular noting the good performers and the poor performers), and recommendations to subsequent OC Chairs, PC Chairs and AITO.

A final, detailed account for the ECOOP, together with detailed supporting documents, will be sent to the AITO Secretariat as soon as possible but not later than twelve months after the close of the ECOOP.

## **2.6. Coordination with the PCC**

The OCC and PCC are jointly responsible for preparing the CFC. Early coordination with the PCC must be established to guarantee that the PCC will have available rooms, microphones, projectors, etc. for the technical sessions.

The PCC is responsible for preparing the proceedings, while the OCC is responsible for having the proceedings available at the ECOOP conference for distribution among the participants.

### **3. Coordination with the AITO Board**

The OCC will maintain very close contacts with the AITO Board on the progress of the OC. Examples of such contacts would be: sending the proposed final list of candidate OC members to the AITO Board at a very early stage, description of and discussion with the AITO Board of various OC strategies, significant budget alterations, etc.

Likewise, the AITO and its Board, will assist the OC where possible, for example in matters such as organizing additional publicity for the conference, providing information about previous conferences, obtaining subsidies, etc.

In order to optimize the interaction between the AITO (Board) and the OC, the AITO Board may appoint a member of AITO as a contact person, who can support and cooperate with the OCC.

## **B. Procedure for bids for hosting an ECOOP**

Members of the object-oriented community may submit a bid to AITO for organizing an upcoming ECOOP. A notification of the intention to bid may be required by the AITO Board. The bid will contain at least the following information:

1. Description of venue and facilities (nature number and sizes of rooms for academic sessions and exhibition), geographical location, travel, accommodation costs etc;
2. Planned budget with costings for fees given various levels of participation.
3. A specification of who will be the OC Chair, the Conference Chair and, if possible, the other members of the OC.
4. A statement by the candidate CC and OCC that they understand and will abide by the AITO guidelines for the ECOOP.
5. Indications about previous experience in organizing conferences.

The bid for hosting an ECOOP may not include a suggestion for PC Chair (PCC). The PCC is appointed by the AITO Board.

The AITO Board may ask the authors of the bid to provide additional or more detailed information, before a decision is taken.

Once a bid is accepted, and the other members of the conference team (such as PCC) have been appointed, the OCC and CC are expected to fill and sign a copy of the memorandum of agreement for the ECOOP between the AITO, CC, OCC and PCC.

(Copies of draft memorandum of agreement are available from AITO secretariat).

# Chapter 6

## ECOOP Organizing Chair FAQ List

*Nov. 11, 1994, Walter Olthoff; May 22, 1997, revisions Oscar Nierstrasz*

### **How should the budget be prepared?**

- what items
- what are fixed, variable costs?
- what are the major (risk) items?
- how many participants to expect?

### **How should the fee structure be determined?**

- Do workshop attendees pay a separate fee?

### **What subtasks should be delegated?**

There should be separate chairs to run: tutorials, workshops, demonstrations, vendors' exhibits and panels. Each will be responsible in the CFC for handling contributions and proposals.

Additional responsibilities to delegate are: locale (room assignments, refreshments, crowd control, wireless microphones, video, water for speakers, photocopying, foils & markers . . .), printing (programme, badges, speakers' name cards, signs, flyers, maps), registrations (entries, payments, confirmations), hotels, banquet (special meals . . .), reception, treasurer (budget, petty cash, bank account), publicity (journals, mailouts), delegates' packages (proceedings, maps, flyers), speakers (double-checking arrival, special requests), network services (e-mail, printing), student volunteers.

Some tasks (hotels, registrations) can be handled by professional agencies.

The organising chair (OC) should delegate any well-defined task to another person. The OC's job is to delegate, to coordinate the various activities to make sure nothing is forgotten, and to deal with emergencies.

## **What does the conference chair do?**

The conference chair (CC) is an “executive organiser” who lends a (relatively) well-known name, and provides a “public relations” interface. The CC should oversee all activities, provide guidance (or sometimes simply approval) to the OC, officially contact all sponsors, issue invitations to keynote/invited/banquet speakers (in coordination with the PCC), and assume overall responsibility for the conference.

## **What does the programme chair do?**

The Programme Committee Chair (PCC) is responsible for setting the scientific programme and producing the proceedings. The PCC should also appoint or select all sessions chairs, take responsibility that all speakers are introduced, and open and close the conference. The OC, on the other hand, is responsible for all technical aspects of the local organisation. Close coordination between the OC and the PCC only really needs to take place for a few specific items:

- the Call for Contributions (CFC) is prepared by the PCC but distributed largely by the OC
- the conference budget should include a PC budget (mostly needed to organise the PC meeting and to cover some incidental expenses)
- the scientific part of the Call for Participation (CFP) is prepared by the PC
- the proceedings are prepared by the PC, but delivered to the OC

## **What are the important deadlines?**

- The budget must be approved by AITO at least a year in advance.
- The conference site must often be booked more than a year in advance.
- Sponsors must be contacted soon enough that they can appear on the preliminary CFC.
- The PCC and PC must be selected in time that a preliminary CFC can be distributed at ECOOP one year in advance.
- The banquet must be booked up to a year in advance.

- The CFC must be distributed at least three months before the submissions deadline (i.e., in August or September).
- The CFP must be sent out at least three months in advance, and preferably sooner, as attendees from industry often need approval months in advance.

## **What kind of publicity should be done?**

E-mail, netnews, WWW, journals, local and international mailings, local newspapers.

## **What mailing lists are available?**

There is an AITO mailing list of previous conference participants. Contact the AITO secretary for details. One should also use local mailing lists, and mailing lists of nearby computer societies (such as SI, GI, AFCET, BCS, etc.). Each of these lists can be obtained under different conditions, so you must check in advance what they are. Each PC member, Workshop Organiser, etc. should receive a package of CFC/CFPs to distribute.

## **What sources of funding are available?**

You can obtain a loan from AITO (which was explicitly set up to carry funds from one ECOOP to the next). Profits/risks may optionally be split with a local organisation, if desired. One should also try to obtain support from local sponsors, either in terms of cash, or other kinds of contributions (e.g., infrastructure, machines, delegates' bags, etc.).

## **How does one attract sponsors?**

Sponsors can provide any kind of support, from money, to people, to physical goods. Natural sponsors are (1) computer societies, including ACM/SIGPLAN; (2) academic and research organisations; (3) local companies. Sponsors should be contacted early enough that they can be advertised on the CFC.

## **Should there be a vendors' exhibit?**

This is a very difficult issue. It depends very much on how many people are expected to attend. Generally it is a good idea, but it must also be worthwhile for the vendors. To organise a good vendors' exhibit, it is necessary to actively solicit them. The conference must also be advertised in such a way that this makes the conference more attractive.

## **How do you fix the conference dates?**

Traditionally ECOOP is held in the summer months, in late June or early July. Often, however, the local organisers may be constrained by the availability of the conference locale.

## **What requirements should be considered for the locale?**

- main hall should hold around 500 people
- space for demonstrations, vendors exhibits
- internet connections desirable
- video display

## **How much work is it to organize ECOOP?**

The busiest times are: (1) initially setting up budget, locale, infrastructure, people, sponsors, agencies etc.; (2) mailing out CFC; (3) preparing and mailing out CFP; (4) handling registrations, emergencies; (5) the conference itself; (6) cleaning up.

You will need a good team of motivated local people to handle the various delegated tasks.

## **How do we prepare a bid for hosting an ECOOP?**

See the “AITO Guidelines for the Operation of ECOOP Conferences”.

## **What happens with the profits?**

Profits and risks may be taken entirely by AITO or may be shared with the local organisation. AITO is a non-profit association, and its assets are used solely for the organisation of ECOOPs.

## **Who prepares the CFC? The CFP?**

Both are prepared by the OC, in close collaboration with the PCC and the other chairs (workshops, tutorials, etc.).



## **Who takes care of the proceedings?**

The proceedings are prepared entirely by the PCC, however the CC and OC should contribute some words of thanks to the organising committee to the preface, and a list of sponsors.

## **What can go wrong?**

Hm.

## **Can we hire people to help?**

It may be necessary to hire a professional agency to handle registrations and hotels. For the conference itself, it may be necessary to hire some students, but one should be able to manage mostly with volunteers. One may also invite volunteers from abroad in exchange for free conference attendance and cheap (or free) board.

## **Who is responsible for invited speakers?**

The invited speakers are the joint responsibility of the PCC and the CC. (See the PCC FAQ.) A banquet speaker is desirable, but not always feasible.

## **Who schedules the final programme?**

- should we arrange for lunch?
- how much time is needed for coffee breaks?
- when should sessions start and finish?
- should there be a reception?
- who pays for the reception?
- should there be parallel sessions?

## **What infrastructure/support is need for tutorials and workshops?**

- badge checkers
- evaluation forms

## **What needs to be printed?**

Badges, maps, signs, final programme.

## **How should payments be handled?**

If this is not done by a professional agency, get someone with experience. Make absolutely sure that payments are received in advance. Don't trust checks. If you can handle credit cards, so much the better.

## **Does anyone get in free?**

Organising staff, PCC, tutorial speakers, and invited speakers. Others at the discretion of the CC/OC/PCC.

## **How to handle cancellations?**

If speakers cancel, it is good to be able to organise an impromptu panel. Workshops are a good source: if there is an especially exciting workshop, try to get the organisers to put together a panel of selected workshop participants.

If tutorial speakers cancel, you must offer refunds or alternative tutorials to participants. If the cancellation was not adequately justified, it should be communicated to other conference organisers. [No "blacklist" exists, but unprofessional behaviour should not be tolerated.]

## **What do conference attendees get at registration?**

- bag
- badges
- programme
- proceedings
- local map
- restaurant guide
- reception invitation
- banquet tickets
- tutorial material (if applicable) - commercial flyers (optinal)

- announcements of other conferences

## Chapter 7

# ECOOP Programme Chair FAQ List

*Nov. 11, 1994, Oscar Nierstrasz; revised May 1997 (ON), July 1997 (ON).*

### How is the Programme Committee selected?

The purpose of the ECOOP Programme Committee (PC) is to ensure standards of scientific quality of papers and presentations. Papers are selected by a peer review process that imposes certain rules on committee members regarding procedures and confidentiality. See “Code of Conduct for ECOOP Program Committees”.

The PC has to be set up in time for a Call-for-Contributions (CFC) to be distributed at the preceding ECOOP (i.e., 14 months before an ECOOP).

The PC should be composed of active members of the object community who have shown competence in the academic or applied research field. Additionally, the following criteria should be considered:

**Expertise:** A broad spectrum of object technology should be covered by the combined fields of interest of PC members. Contributions to recent ECOOPs and OOPSLAs serve as a guideline to the topics to be covered. It is particularly important to have enough expertise in formal methods to evaluate the more theoretical submissions. The PC members should contribute to the list of suggested topics for the CFC, and should indicate which subjects they are willing to review.

**Affiliation/Geography:** The PC should have members both from academic and industrial affiliations in Europe and overseas. Any one particular group or area should not be overrepresented.

**Profile:** It is good to have a mix of both established and new PC members. Those who have recently published in ECOOP or related conferences are good candidates.

**Coordination:** PC Chairs of related conferences (e.g., OOPSLA/TOOLS/ESEC/PLoP) may be invited to join the ECOOP PC, particularly to help track papers that are multiply submitted, or undergo revision after rejection from one conference.

**Reliability:** Invite only people who have the time and motivation to do a good job, and who are likely to be able to attend the PC meeting. Ask the PC members to indicate in advance whether they expect to be able to attend (and get an indication whether they may have difficulty covering their own travel expenses). If 2/3 can confirm, you are doing well, though it is not unrealistic to get all but a couple attending. Be sure PC members understand they are personally responsible for defending their reviews at the PC meeting, even if they use additional subreferees [see Code of Conduct].

Assuming that there will be about 150 submissions, that each submission will receive at least 3 reviews, and that each PC member can handle up to 20 reviews, the PC should have at least  $150 \times 3 / 20 = 23$  members.

## What information belongs in the CFC?

Usually, the CFC solicits papers to be submitted by December 1 of the preceding year. Notification of acceptance is typically scheduled for the following February 1. This leaves roughly two months for (a) distributing the submitted papers to the PC members, according to their specified fields of interest (b) collecting filled-in review forms and preparing the PC meeting (c) running the PC meeting and communicating its results (d) assembling the technical program.

- Be precise on: what kinds of papers are expected, i.e., give pointers to on-line guidelines; what should be sent, i.e., how many copies, format etc.; deadlines.
- Indicate if experience reports, short presentations etc. are acceptable, and what criteria they should fill.
- Keywords are useless; give a list of topic areas, and ask authors to indicate the area; suitable topics should be suggested by the PC.
- Indicate precise page limits (word counts are not helpful): but you must also give precise point size and spacing guidelines for this to work! (e.g., 12 on 18 pt)
- Indicate that submissions must be by post (not fax or e-mail). The extra overhead of dealing with e-mail submissions is not worth the convenience of the speed gained.
- Ask for titles, abstract, authors and contact addresses by e-mail (this will save work typing them in); electronic abstracts can also be distributed to the entire PC, and may be used to have PC members bid for papers to review.

- Ask for  $n+2$  copies (where  $n$  is the number of reviews per paper); you will need an extra copy for yourself, and a reserve copy if an extra review is required.

## Are PC members allowed to submit papers?

Yes, though the PCC should not. PC papers are handled specially. The authors should not learn who reviewed their papers, and should leave the room when their papers are discussed at the PC meeting. Normally PC papers should be accepted only if they are of “above average” quality. In practice, this means that PC papers are rejected automatically if there is any objection from one of the referees.

## Is there a standard ECOOP review form?

Review forms vary from year to year. Nevertheless, there is some accumulated experience concerning what information is useful or not to have on these forms.

Experience shows that subjective ratings of papers, like “strong accept” or scales from 1-10, or ratings of particular aspects of papers, such as originality or presentation, do not help very much either in ranking papers, or in providing focus for discussions during the PC meeting. The problem is that these ratings are highly subjective, so one person’s “weak accept” might be comparable to another’s “strong reject.” Worse, when combined with a rating for confidence, a paper with a “strong accept” but “low confidence” may be rated as highly as a paper with “weak accept” and “high confidence”!

The main role of review forms is to help the PCC run the PC meeting efficiently and effectively. (One could easily imagine a review process without review forms, but it would be very inefficient!) This means that every field of the review form should have a clear function with respect to this process. The following parts are recommended:

**Identification:** The following fields can either be filled in by referees, or automatically generated before the forms are distributed electronically to the PC: Paper number (usually in order of arrival), Title, Authors, and PC member number.

The referee should be separately listed (in case it is not the same as the PC member responsible). It can be useful to have PC members add a disambiguating letter to their PC number for each subreferee.

**Rating:** The rating should have an explicit operational meaning with respect to the PC meeting, rather than a purely subjective interpretation. What is most useful to know is whether the PC member responsible will “champion” the paper at the meeting. The following four ratings are probably the most useful:

- A: accept — I will champion this paper
- B: weak accept — I like this paper, but will not champion it

- C: weak reject — I do not like this paper, but am willing to accept it if someone else champions it
- D: strong reject — there are serious problems with this paper, and I will argue against its acceptance

In practice, these four ratings are the only ones that matter. Usually it is the champion for a paper that will start the discussion, so it is important for PC members to establish their position as early as possible. Finer ratings, or multiple ratings of various aspects, only serve to confuse the issue.

**Expertise:** It is important to establish during conflict detection whether the referees are experts or not in the subject matter of the paper. (In a general conference like ECOOP, it is important to get reviews from both experts and non-experts.) Referees should identify themselves as one of: X — I am an expert; Y — I am knowledgeable, but not an expert; Z — I am an outsider.

**Summary:** Whenever a paper is discussed at the PC meeting, the first referee to speak (normally the champion) should summarize the paper. This works best if the referee has prepared a short summary as part of the review. It is also invaluable feedback to the authors. (Authors are notoriously bad at summarizing their own papers!)

**Points in favour/against:** Next, the main thing to discuss at the meeting is why a paper should be accepted (or not). These points should be listed explicitly. The review form can list particular items to consider, such as originality, soundness, completeness, presentation, references, etc., but it is generally overkill to have separate fields for each of these items. Referees will discuss what is important.

**Additional comments for authors:** The summary and the points in favour/against acceptance are not only important for the PC meeting, but they are useful feedback for the authors (whereas the rating and expertise should be kept confidential). If there are additional comments for authors that are not particularly interesting to raise at the PC meeting, they should be kept separate.

**Additional comments for the PC:** Similarly, if there are additional comments that are important to raise at the meeting, but should not be returned to the authors, they should be listed separately to facilitate post-processing.

The above fields are the most essential for supporting the PC meeting. Naturally, if a referee has a conflict of interest concerning the paper or its authors, the paper should be returned to the PCC without being reviewed. No separate field is needed. Fields that tend not to be useful are:

- Topic: the *author* should indicate this when submitting the paper, to facilitate distribution to suitable PC members.

- Research or Experience paper: again, the author should indicate this.

The electronic review form should be designed in such a way that reviews can be easily processed with the help of scripts. It is hard to make review forms “fool-proof”, but it helps if it is very clear what parts of the form may be changed or edited, and which may not.

## Should referees receive any special instructions?

It must be clear to PC members that, although they may make use of additional referees to review papers, they, and only they, are responsible for the reviews at the PC meeting. [See ECOOP Code of Conduct.] Criteria for acceptance of papers should be clear, for instance:

- Each accepted paper should have a clear and novel scientific contribution.
- The usual standards of scientific accountability should be respected (i.e., adequate references to related work, etc.)
- Papers should be of interest to the ECOOP audience (i.e., somehow pertinent to object technology).

*Insist* that PC members use electronic (rather than paper) forms to simplify processing. Review forms should be returned by post or fax only in exceptional circumstances.

Insist that referees be explicit and constructive in their comments both to authors and to the PC. Reviews stating “Good paper. Accept.” are virtually useless (though virtually every PC meeting has to deal with such non-reviews). ECOOP has established a tradition of returning detailed and constructive reviews to authors of both accepted and rejected papers. Rejected ECOOP papers have often been successfully revised and published elsewhere with acknowledgements to the anonymous ECOOP referees.

---

## Is there any standard software to manage reviews?

CyberChair (<http://www.cyberchair.org>) as of September 2001.

There are at least three sets of data to maintain:

- PC members’ coordinates
- Papers (paper number, title, authors, contact address, referees)
- Reviews

Familiarity with a scripting language or text manipulation language like Perl or Python makes it easier to manage this information. In particular, it is useful to be able to write scripts to:



- Generate confirmation letters, acceptance letters etc.
- Check consistency/completeness of reviews (i.e., check for missing data)
- Sort and categorize papers by reviews
- Generate tables of statistics
- Detect conflicts.

## **What constitutes a conflict of interest?**

A paper whose author you work with closely, or have worked with closely in the recent past. See the ECOOP Handbook for details. A PC member with a conflict of interest should neither review the paper concerned, nor participate in the discussion during the PC meeting.

## **How should papers be assigned to referees?**

The papers to be reviewed should be assigned to PC members in a way that reflects their personal interests and expertise, and also distributes the load more or less evenly amongst them. Here are three possible schemes to help achieve the first goal:

- Scan each paper and assign it provisionally to a number of suitable PC members. In practice, you will have to do this to some extent anyway. Watch out for the names of PC members in the list of references. This can either be a sign that PC member should review it, or that there is a conflict of interest!
- Ask authors to identify subject areas from a standard list supplied by PC members as their areas of interest and expertise. Write a script to assign and distribute papers based on matching topics to interests. Of course, this depends on the quality of the list.
- Ask authors to submit electronic abstracts in advance of their full paper submissions. Distribute all the abstracts to the PC, and ask PC members to “bid” for papers they are interested in. (This scheme is used, for example, for ESEC and ICSE.) PC members tend to get the papers they ask for, but not necessarily the papers they would be best to review. Unfortunately, abstracts often don’t tell you much more about the content of a paper than the title does.

Once papers have been provisionally assigned, the load can be balanced by redistributing papers amongst PC members. At this point it is also important to consider whether any PC members already know they cannot attend the meeting. If so, you should ensure that each paper will be represented by at least two PC members at the meeting. This criterion will be impossible to meet in practice (due to last-minute cancellations) but you can at least try maximize the number of papers that are adequately represented.

## What needs to be prepared for the PC meeting?

The PC meeting will typically take place around the end of January of the year of the conference. The PCC should set the due-date for returning reviews about 10 days before the PC meeting. This allows various problems to be detected in advance and will help reduce PC meeting time. For example, conflicting reviews can be distributed to all referees concerned, who can then prepare themselves better for the meeting.

The PCC should:

- If possible, read and review all the papers (!); or at least scan them and get a feeling for which may be problem papers.
- Identify papers previously published or multiply submitted (check for overlaps with old papers).
- Identify papers that will be underrepresented (due to cancellations) and attempt to come to an early decision.
- Collect all reviews at least a week in advance (and pressure late PC members).
- Analyse and rank the reviews to determine an order for discussing papers.
- Determine whether additional reviews are needed for any papers (i.e., with missing PC members, missing reviews, or overall low expertise).
- Set an agenda for the PC meeting; leave optional items (like determining the sessions) to the end.
- Prepare a printed package for each PC member with: (i) a ranked list summarizing the papers, titles, authors and their scores (also useful as a checklist); (ii) an ordered list (by paper number) of all the reviews; (iii) a list mapping referee numbers to PC members/subreferees.
- Be sure to separate reviews of PC member papers and remove them from that PC member's package! (So each package must be named.) Alternatively, have separate sheets or packages of PC reviews, and distribute them only when PC papers come up for discussion.
- Also prepare a package of: (i) all additional reviews (arriving by fax or post); (ii) a printout of all e-mail discussions.
- Organize coffee, lunches, dinners, hotel. (There should be a separate PC meeting budget to cover these items.)
- Take care of essential travel expenses. Normally, PC members' travel expenses are not covered by the ECOOP budget.
- Collect names of all subreferees (for the proceedings).

- Bring copies of all the papers to the meeting.
- Have old ECOOP, OOPSLA etc. proceedings handy.
- Bring: transparencies, pens, scratch paper.
- Have telephones, internet connections, and “gofers” handy.

## How should papers be ranked?

Usually papers are ranked by some kind of magic number that is computed as a weighted sum of various scores on the review forms. This rarely yields an order that reflects the relative quality of the papers, except perhaps for the very best and very worst.

Instead, what is more useful is to group the papers according to the kind of discussion that can be expected. What is useful to know in advance is whether there is general agreement or not concerning the acceptability of the paper.

If papers have been evaluated with scores A-D as suggested above, then a particularly effective way to rank them is to assign a two-letter code to each paper consisting of the high score and the low score. Papers can then be sorted by this code, together with the paper number. This yields 10 groups of papers, of which 7 are interesting:

**AA, AB:** General agreement. These papers have at least one “champion”, and all reviews are positive. These are almost certain to be accepted.

**AC:** Minor conflict. At least one champion, but also some negative points. A probable accept.

**AD:** Major conflict. At least one champion and one detractor.

**BB:** General agreement, but no enthusiasm. Probably a borderline accept.

**BC:** General agreement. A borderline paper. If no one will champion it, reject it and avoid lengthy discussions! It can always be resurrected at the end of the day.

**BD:** Minor conflict. Weak proponent but strong object. Likely reject.

**CC, CD, DD:** General agreement. Almost certain reject.

Note that this approach works independently of the number of reviews received, and avoids assigning an arbitrary magic number to papers. Still, it is useful to assign a numerical rank to each paper so it can be easily found in the list (since the rank will differ from the paper number).

## What kinds of problems can be detected in advance?

There is a long list of these. The most important are the following, which can easily be detected if reviews are received on time:

- *Missing reviews*: pester the delinquent PC members, or solicit additional reviews.
- *Conflicting reviews*: A rank of AD indicates a strong conflict. A PC member can be better prepared for the meeting if he or she knows there will be a debate! If the review was written by a subreferee, it is absolutely essential that the PC member responsible be warned in advance.
- *Non-expert champions*: If the A and B scores are all non-experts, it is likely the paper will die at the meeting unless an extra expert review can be solicited.
- *Missing champions/detractors*: If the high or low scoring PC members cannot attend the meeting, their views will not be properly represented. Check to see if absentees are also champions or detractors for any papers. In these cases, an email discussion should be held in advance, or eventually an extra review solicited.
- *All referees absent*: This inevitably is the case for at least a couple of papers, and in a bad year may happen frequently. It is easy to detect this in advance and take appropriate action (invite email discussion or extra reviews).
- *No referee is an expert*: This is just as bad as absent referees, and can quickly lead to deadlock. Extra reviews must be solicited in advance.

## Are there rules or guidelines for running the PC meeting?

The main purpose of the PC meeting is to select the papers for presentation at the conference. The precise way that the meeting is run can vary from year to year, depending on the circumstances, or the style of the PCC, but there are a few general rules and guidelines that should be adhered to (or adapted, as the case may be). The PCC should make clear *at the beginning* of the meeting what rules will be applied.

- Make sure everyone understands the criteria for accepting a paper: originality, relevance, importance, soundness, presentation (a well-written paper may be rejected because it says nothing really new, or because it is outside the scope of ECOOP).
- The PC meeting generally runs for two days (or a day and a half). It is a good idea to find out right away when people plan to leave. If some PC members must leave early, this should be taken into account when deciding which papers to discuss.

- Typically two passes are needed: in the first pass, all papers are briefly discussed to determine which pose problems or require debate. In the second pass, detailed debates take place. A third pass may be needed for papers requiring additional reviews during the meeting.
- Papers by PC members should be discussed separately in a block (authors will leave the room while their paper is discussed).
- PC members may also be asked to leave the room if they have a conflict of interest with a paper (i.e., if they have a close working relationship with the authors).
- In principle, papers should only be discussed if there is a chance they may be accepted, i.e., if there is a PC member who is willing to “champion” it. (If the review forms have been properly designed, the champions can be immediately identified.) For each paper, therefore, the first step is to identify the champion. (Be sure to check for absent champions!)
- If it is clear there is no champion for a paper, it should *not* be discussed!
- If there is a champion, that PC member should start by briefly summarizing the paper (for the benefit of those present who have not read it!) and then continue with the arguments in favour of (and against) accepting it. The remaining reviews should then be presented, if they add anything new.
- Papers can be discussed in almost any order, but it is usually helpful to start with those that will require little or no debate (i.e., those almost certain to be accepted or rejected), and then proceed to the more problematic ones. (See “How should papers be ranked?”)
- If there is agreement about a paper (whether it is to accept or reject), make the decision quickly and move on.
- If there is disagreement about whether or not to accept a paper, the discussion should focus on clarifying the points of contention, and arriving at a consensus.
- In the rare event that the PC cannot arrive at a consensus, a vote may be held. In this case, everyone present should participate in the vote (not just those who read the paper); PC members should act as a jury, and the referees as “prosecution” and “defense.”
- A vote is a last resort. PC papers should only be accepted unanimously.
- Keep discussions on track (this is the real job of the PCC!): try to get referees to focus on why a paper should be accepted (or rejected) according to the established criteria.

- A decision may be delayed, but *only* to allow time for obtaining additional information that may be relevant to the discussion: allowing an additional PC member to read the paper; waiting for a missing PC member to show up (or exchanging a message with a missing PC member); obtaining a copy of another paper by the same author with possible overlap; waiting to discuss a related paper; etc.
- It is always possible to reconsider a decision at the end, if there is a good reason to discuss it again. (Make this clear to the PC; it will help things to move more quickly.)
- In exceptional circumstances, a questionable decision may be left to the discretion of the PCC and dealt with after the PC meeting is over.
- Try to avoid procedural discussions as much as possible: e.g., whether to keep a “short” list of “maybe” papers (it is better to make decisions, and if necessary, reconsider), or whether to allow “shepherding” of papers (this is usually a bad idea).
- Don’t worry too much about getting too many or too few papers: instruct the PC to evaluate each paper on its own merits and not on the basis of the expected number of papers.
- If there is time after the paper selection is completed, try to assign papers to sessions and appoint session chairs.
- Keep track of special instructions or additional comments for authors: requests for changes of title; suggestions for improvements; reasons for rejection. It may be necessary to update reviews before returning them to authors if there are important points raised during the meeting that are not clear in the reviews.
- Material made available at the PC meeting (i.e., rankings, copies of reviews etc.) should be collected at the end and destroyed.

## What information should be sent back to authors?

Authors must be sent confirmation when their submission has been received, and are notified of the PC’s decision of acceptance or rejection after the PC meeting.

Authors receive extracts of the reviews containing all information that will help them to improve their papers (regardless of the decision), including the evaluation and the comments to the authors, but not including any of the ratings, the identities of the referees, or the comments to the PC. (Some referees insist on identifying themselves in the comments to the authors. This does not pose any problem.)

Authors of accepted papers obtain special instructions for the preparation of camera-ready copy. Authors should be informed that, if they do not adhere to these instructions, their paper may be cut or omitted.

All authors receive the Call for Participation.

## Can a paper be conditionally accepted?

A paper may be conditionally accepted, for example, subject to addition of certain references, or correction of minor technical errors. “Shepherding,” on the other hand, should be avoided.

In case of conditional acceptance, the PCC must ensure that the camera-ready version reflects the request for change. In the acceptance letter, the PCC must inform the author that failure to comply with the condition will exclude the paper from being published in the proceedings and presentation at the conference. The PCC will decide whether a camera-ready version complies with the PC decision.

If the PC decides after the PC meeting that a modification of a paper is required (e.g. because additional information has become available), the PCC has to communicate this to the author with the same caveat as above.

If the PC decides a modification of a paper is required after the proceedings have gone to press, the PCC has to inform the authors that they must address the issue during their presentation at the conference. The PCC should point out that if the authors fail to do so, the PCC himself will communicate the matter of concern to the audience immediately after their presentation.

In all cases of disagreement, the PCC should seek close contact with the AITO Executive Board.

## How are the proceedings prepared?

Relative to the selection process, this is a straightforward task. The publisher (usually Springer) provides detailed guidelines for the preparation of the camera-ready copy, and also makes Latex style files available from its ftp site. AITO also provides compatible templates for other document preparation systems, such as Framemaker and Word.

Authors are strongly encouraged to stick to the guidelines to ensure a uniform appearance to the proceedings. On the rare occasion that this places an unacceptable burden on the authors, at least ensure that the body of the paper set in a seriph type face (such as Times, Computer Modern or Palatino, and not a sans-seriph type face like Helvetica).

Previous proceedings can be used as a template for the contents. It is usual to have a foreword, list of sponsors, list of referees, etc.

At this stage it is convenient to have authors provide you with electronic final copy (since you are only dealing with 20-30 papers and not 100-200). Set up an ftp site where authors can dump their files. You should be prepared to handle at least Postscript, PDF, (vanilla) Latex, Word and Framemaker files. Warn authors that if their paper contains special symbols, they should also send you a hard copy.

Have a high-resolution (1200 dpi) printer available for printing the final copy.

Proceedings are traditionally published by Springer Verlag, but occasionally constraints may be set by the organiser (i.e., if ECOOP is run as a joint conference).

## **Who takes care of publicity?**

Publicity is largely the responsibility of the organising chair (OC), but the PCC should do an electronic distribution of the CFC by: e-mail, news and WWW. An e-mail list of previous participants may be obtained from the local organiser (OC) of the most recent ECOOP conference.

## **How are invited speakers selected?**

The keynote speaker sets the tone of the conference. It is often a good idea to seek someone who is not mainstream OO, but who is involved in some kind of innovative activity that somehow benefits from or is relevant to OO.

Invited (as opposed to keynote) speakers tend to be people who can give more detailed technical presentations on some aspect of OO technology. The PC should be consulted for nominations, but the final responsibility lies with the PCC and the Conference Chair, who will have to make the invitations. Invited and keynote speakers should also be invited to contribute a paper, or at least an abstract, to the proceedings.

The numbers of keynote and invited speakers varies from year to year. See the introduction to the AITO Handbook for a list of past speakers.

There may or may not also be a banquet speaker. The PCC should work closely with the OC concerning the logistics of having a speaker at the conference banquet.

Normally all speakers' expenses should be paid from the conference budget. An honorarium is given to cover any incidental expenses.

## **How should deadlines be timed?**

Springer normally requires 4-6 weeks from the delivery of the camera-ready copy to produce the proceedings. The PCC should schedule 2 weeks to prepare the proceedings after receiving the camera-ready copy. Authors need 4-8 weeks to prepare the camera-ready copy. Submissions are normally due Dec. 1, and the PC meeting is held at the end of January. Notifications can be sent out a few days later. It is convenient if authors can be notified in time to revise papers for another conference (such as OOPSLA), but this is not always possible. Some negotiation with other conference organisers may be necessary.

## **Who decides the format of the conference?**

AITO is responsible for the format of the technical program of the conference. That means that decisions about the number of parallel tracks (if any), about short paper sessions, about experience report sessions, and about the targeted quality level are made by AITO. The PCC is encouraged to touch bases with the AITO Executive Board on these decisions



in advance of the PC meeting. Decisions made at the PC meeting concerning the format of the conference are subject to approval of AITO.