# You Must be Joking...
# The most serious editorial column ever

Michalis Faloutsos
UC Riverside, CA

So what's the idea here? I will tell you.

This an editorial on the social events and lighter topics and issues of the sigcomm community, and networking community in general. The main goal is to enhance the cohesiveness of the community and provide useful information and social commentary.

In this light, we welcome ideas about topics that you would like us to cover, interesting news, strange phenomena, puzzling trends. Knowing our audience, we expect that most of the submissions will be mind-bogglingly boring. To our surprise, we have already received several very interesting ones.

Review-wars part II: The revenge of the journals. (If you don't follow the tccc list, start now, or check the tcc link below.)

In the summer, we had the big hoopla with the Infocom reviewing workload: the main concern there is too much reviewing per TPC member (20 papers at 12-13 pages) and this on top of all the other reviewing engagements. Some brilliant and some crazy solutions were heard... Totally justified objection, completely pointless discussion - did we decide anything? I termed this first phase Review-wars version 1.0.

Now we had the new equally important topic: what

is an acceptable difference for a journal version of a conference paper. And I braced for an equally purposeless email flutter. Surprisingly, the email activity was much more manageable.

Don Towsley said it does not have to be that different, but improved from the feedback of the conference. The good thing: Don Towsley is the Editor in chief of Trans. on Networking. The bad thing: he is not the chief editor of other journals.

The second bad thing: are reviewers going to listen to him? Think about it: when was the last time a professor obeyed to rules? Unless of course Don behaves like Don Corleone in godfather and enforces some rules, occasionally fitting concrete shoes to misbehaving reviewers. I am with you Don, do it.

### TCCC archives:

http://lists.cs.columbia.edu/pipermail/tccc/2005-July/thread.html

to join: http://lists.cs.columbia.edu/mailman/listinfo/tccc/

Also some discussions on these topics take place at:

http://www.postel.org/pipermail/sigcomm/

to join: http://www.postel.org/mailman/listinfo/sigcomm

Note: I cleverly prefer to bitch and complain than propose solutions. Unfair, you might think. Get used to it.

Another excellent discussion in the sigcomm list (see above) this time regarding wether ACM SIGCOMM should support workshops with restricted number of participants. Let me summarize things for you: there were two main positions: (a) I want to have a private party with my friends and someone else help me organize it, and (b) I don't want anyone to do anything useful unless I am included. I agree with both positions: in any case my beliefs do not matter, it is just like when I am shopping for furniture with my wife. After a heated discussion, I am not sure what was decided. So, you see, not only my opinions do not matter, none cares to inform me either of the final decision.

I propose the following multi-step approach. First, make all conferences with limited participation (even if this limit is 10,000).

Second, find a way to distribute invitations (in order of decreasing priority) to people who have participated in organizing, TPC, have accepted papers, have rejected papers, thought at some point of submitting a paper, have a friend who submitted a paper,

know on a first-name basis someone in the TPC. Third, use Ebay to auction invitations. This can make the pricing dynamic and according to free market rules. Interesting swaps would also be allowed.

Admit it: it is brilliant. The only problem may be how to justify to your grant that you bid $2,000 to participate to say SIGCOMM 2008.

### Some relocations:

Going west: John Wroclawski moved to ISI to be the Division Director Computer Networks Division. Having been at MIT for practically ever, he decided to venture west. Good luck, cowboy. By the way, when you see his house at the canals in Venice, you begin to understand why he moved.

Going mid-west: Raj Jain moved to Washington University at St Louis. Good for him, good for them. Bad for Ohio State University, but, hey, things happen. Among other things, Raj is known for his DECbit scheme (featured in 25th anniversary issue of CCR) and from his reign as vice-Chair of Sigcomm (1991-95).

Going home: Christophe Diot went to Paris to start a lab for Thomson R&D. Is anyone surprised? In any case, we may have a contest in the next issue of CCR: guess which country our CCR editor will be next year. In the meantime, I will be fired from my editorial position.

**A sad announcement:**

Professor Kenneth C. Sevcik passed away on October 4, 2005 (B.S. 1966 Stanford University, Ph.D. 1971 University of Chicago). Ken was at the faculty at the University of Toronto since 1971. Ken's work in performance evaluation has been called "an exemplar of experimental computer science." He was a founder of the field of computer system performance and made influential contributions to both the theory and practice of computer system performance.

Writing in connection with Ken's 60th birthday celebration in 2004, four of his early students said, "Ken managed to be our friend as well as our advisor, without letting either of those relationships interfere with the other. This is at the heart of the immense respect we have for him, both professionally and personally. In the final tally, how well one has done as an advisor is reflected in how much one's students have learned. We owe Ken a terrific debt for the lessons he gave us about performing and leading research, and about how to lead our lives."

**University of Toronto announcement:**

http://www.cs.toronto.edu/DCS/News/index.html#ken

The next column will focus on data collection archives and initiatives.

Is this a guarantee? The answer is "maybe," and this is final.

Closing remark: I hope you get it now. Send me your news: michalis@cs.ucr.edu and put CCR in the subject of the e-mail.