

I was expecting questions more related to cultural aspects rather than or besides organizational ones.

Reasons to go to conferences: people I prefer to meet

Personally, I am in strong favor of trying to increase the size of our top conferences. I would slightly increase the acceptance ratio, like up to 25%. Allow for few parallel sessions, if necessary. And definitely limit the number of papers from committee members. Right now, it is almost ridiculous the number of papers from the organizers. I think it is unhealthy for the community. If somebody wants to submit a lot of papers (2 or more) to a conference, he/she should NOT be part of the program committees.

I think there are a few main issues for the conference model in general:

- the costs are high and increase faster than any increase in research funding from granting agencies, and it also does not justify the amount (sometimes 1-2 months of a PhD student's stipend);
- that the review process actually encourages smaller increments rather than really fresh approaches that take longer to review with care;
- that some neat but smaller ideas are rejected for not being a sufficient contribution.

Conferences should be a major networking opportunity and not the competitive process it has become in CS. We should have more short presentations (and not call them posters/WiP, etc.) For the real-time community, the reality is that some papers *do not need* a 25-minute talk. The community just needs to be informed of a result because the talk itself never does justice to important mathematical ideas. I have heard that argument that we not change our practices because other communities are not, but that is not progressive reasoning.

A step forward - in some ways - would be to adopt the VLDB/PVLDB model. That addresses some issues with reviewing timelines.

We need to improve the quality of reviews from the conferences. There is no accountability for bad reviews. Also perhaps adopt a mechanism like VLDB that coordinates submissions across conferences through the year.

(i) I agree on the coordination of dates. However I strongly disagree on a centralized coordination. Rather, it is preferable that Steering Committees of conferences just do as they wish. The coordination will come as a outcome of the decentralized process. (ii) Rebuttal phase is a must.

I did some research on real-time systems many years ago, but my focus has been and is in robotics. Indeed, I have always perceived the real-time system community as a rather closed circle; perhaps this perception has deterred me from delving further in the area.

Results of this survey should be used to inform collaborative efforts with ACM as well as conferences solely run by IEEE TCRTS.

Student prices lower for conference, workshop prices reasonable. Higher prices for industry, and slight increase for non-students.

Collocation with other events (e.g., satellite workshops or multi-conference) makes the conference more attractive.

A significant factor in attracting contributions and participation at key events is the quality and timeliness of information on the website.

I think all this focus on costs, dates, websites, coffee, and proceeding are distractions. As a community, I think there are three other issues that we should focus our attention to:

1. The essential work performed by a conference is the work performed by reviewers. Obviously it selects papers to be accepted. But it also ensures that papers are not only written but also read. And It forms connections between papers. I think the main issue in our community is to get reviewers to put more effort into reading the papers they review. Reading more carefully. Adding a rebuttal phase is not necessarily wrong but it directs the focus on IMHO the wrong thing. Today, reviewing is the most important thing about the research community but it is the least rewarded. I do not know what is the right type of reward. Paying reviewers money is probably not a good idea. I don't know what is the answer. But I do know that getting this right is much more important than logistics, dates, coffee, or the formatting of proceedings.
2. I think that in the longer term, we need to think about how knowledge is shared. Today, we have papers and source code and data separated. I have no direct experience with artifact evaluation but it appears to be a good thing.
3. There is lots of talk about industry-driven research and systems papers in the community. I see a gap between the talking and the doing here. There are great achievements in the real-time systems research that have had impact on society (and made money by serving paying customers). Just to give a few examples. Volcano was acquired 15 years ago. Symtavisision was just acquired. OKLabs was acquired a few years ago. Ottomatika was recently acquired. SysGo was recently acquired. TimeSys, Rapita, and are still alive. There are probably others that I have forgotten. If we want our research community to be seen as important then I believe we should celebrate the successes of the companies mentioned (and the researchers that made that happen) rather than talking about systems research and/or industry-driven research. Note that I am not against academic research or theory research; my point is that the talking/focus on systems and industry-oriented research has been misguided.

It would be really nice to move RTSS to early-mid Jan (or the week before Christmas). Early-mid Nov is also much better than early Dec.

Authors should have the option of purchasing a printed proceedings at a cost (say \$50).

Even there is a rebuttal, it should be within a very limited period, as a rebuttal is only for addressing misunderstandings etc., not revising.

PC meeting should not be taken in a place other than the earlier conference's venue.

The academia involved in these conferences should provide a flexible (in terms of time and costs) research / PhD course for professionals that work full-time, but would like to contribute to the development and advance of technology in a more formal way.

- "Coordinating the dates of conferences" sounds like the big conferences will force the small ones to follow their guidelines. This may turn into a sort of political control, which I'm strongly against to. Instead, I very welcome a "free market" of conference/papers: let the conference organizers compete for good papers.
- authors who are not in the PC should receive the very same information of the ones who are in the PC
- the idea of giving some feedback on the discussion was very good
- thanks for this survey

Appearances matter. Conferences should be about the science and networking. For that, I don't need a fancy ballroom, sexy location, or overpriced catering. A decent lecture hall and a neighborhood with couple of bars are just fine, and just about any university town should be able to provide that.

Regarding location, I don't care about a beach or touristy things (it's not a vacation, it's work!), but connectivity matters a great deal: the venue should be easy to get to from major international airports.

The main reason to attend a conference is the topics that it calls for. Rigorous systems engineering is my preferred target where the theoretical developments are applied to actual systems.

RTSS -also ECRTS and to a less extent RTAS- are purely scheduling theory conferences that is a too narrow scope inside applied mathematics. Mainly RTSS and ECRTS publish the vision of a few research groups year after year with a clear tendency to endogamy. They publish an nearly negligible number of additional contributions on topics really related to systems engineering. It will be interesting to see what the keyword 'IoT' track of RTSS means this year: Probably scheduling theory applied to unrealistic problems marginally related to "real" IoT.

The question missing is: Should RTSS bail out of IEEE to reduce costs. Having said this, IEEE may provide insurance at reasonable costs < 10 EUR. Currently

tax payers pay twice: for the conference registration and very significantly for accessing the paper in the digital library. Moreover, the digital library provides no service whatsoever (submit erratas, broken bibtex, ...). For this reason I vote bail out unless IEEE changes significantly!

Conferences and publications are a main source of revenue for the Computer society. Conferences mainly cater to academics not real world industries.

Lunch on your own -- depends on location/time between sessions and may have to be decided based on these factors year by year.

Student registrations should be as low as possible, giving students the option to register for each event individually, or subsidizing some of the events (e.g., lunches and coffee breaks, but not banquet).

Banquet is typically not really a banquet, but a dinner that costs probably too much. Making sure that it's either something special, or just making it cheaper would be the best.

In my opinion RTSS, and ECRTS would be improved by being more inclusive and having circa 36 papers presented in 22.5 minute slots rather than 24 papers in 30 minute slots. (RTAS would also benefit, such a change is however more difficult due to possible need for consistency with other CPSWeek conferences).