1. **Location:** Berkeley, CA USA

2. **Attendance:**
   Oliver Brock (chair), Pieter Abbeel, Nancy Amato, Wolfram Burgard, Greg Dudek, Dieter Fox, David Hsu, Lydia Kavraki, Sven Koenig, Vijay Kumar, John Leonard, Nicholas Roy, Gaurav Sukhatme, Jeff Trinkle, Stefan Williams

3. **Oliver Brock called the meeting to order at 7pm.**

4. **Approval of 2013 minutes**
   Oliver moved to accept the 2013 minutes. Unanimous.

5. **Report on RSS 2014**
   Pieter provided preliminary numbers on RSS. The registration numbers are approximately 700 people over 5 days. Approximate 200 people registered for the workshops only. Pieter projected a tentative surplus of $50,000 over all, although he was trying to spend down surplus. Oliver observed that the conference was things are going well, and congratulations echoed by all.

6. **Final Report from RSS 2013**
   Oliver reported a final surplus of $46,000 due to unexpectedly high attendance caused by large number of workshops. There was also an unexpected high of $82,500 in sponsorship money. Oliver reported that increasing the number of workshops really increased the surplus.

7. **Financial Report**
   In Sebastian’s absence, Oliver reported that the RSS Foundation balance is currently $142,168.74. Oliver suggested we should double this, allowing the foundation to be self-insured.
   Oliver suggested that the foundation balance should be public, added to the foundation website and included in the October encyclical.

8. **RSS board maintenance**
   (a) Oliver announced that Stefan Schaal’s term on the RSS foundation board had ended and thanked him for his service.
   (b) Oliver moved to add Stefan Schaal to the RSS advisory board, and add David Hsu to the RSS foundation board in his role as the program chair for RSS 2015. Nick seconded. Unanimous.
   (c) Oliver announced that Sven Koenig’s term on the RSS advisory board had ended and thanked him for his service.
   (d) Oliver moved to add Stefan Williams to the RSS advisory board. Nick seconded. Unanimous

9. **RSS paper deadline**
   Nick moved to suggest the paper deadline always at 5pm local time of the Program Chair.
   - **Advantages:** The PC does not have to stay up all night
     Globally fair distribution of having to stay up all night before the deadline
   - **Disadvantage:** People have to look exactly when the deadline is (remedy: add count-down to web site)
Gaurav seconded. Vote: 12 for, 1 against, 2 abstentions
Motion carried.

10. **Early Career Spotlight**

Dieter moved to create a subcommittee charged with the selection of the early career spotlight presentations.

- Advantage: Reduce subject and university bias in nominations
  Maintain consistency across years
  Give better chance to researchers not yet well known to the majority of the board members (due to area)
- Disadvantage: One more committee

Wolfram seconded. Unanimous. Charge of subcommittee given to Dieter.

11. **RSS Assessment**

Oliver moved to ask Gaurav to lead a subcommittee to identify and make explicit the performance of RSS and set goals.
Vijay seconded. Unanimous.

12. **Plagiarism and Double-Submissions**

Wolfram reported on his efforts to reduce plagiarism and double-submissions, including a quotation for a plagiarism detection service. A batch upload of papers was quoted at $2500.

Wolfram moved to ask David to use a plagiarism detection service for one year, so how well it work and continue to work with Wolfram to identify double submissions.

Greg seconded. Unanimous.

Lydia moved to ask David to modify call for papers to clarify that we will use a plagiarism detection service, and change the web page wording.

Dieter seconded and moved to thank Wolfram for his work. Unanimous.

13. **Update on Indexing and DOIs**

Stefan reported that a single PDF will be sent to Inspec for the future. Scopus will take months. DOIs will be issued for all future papers at a cost of $275 + $1/paper. PDFs could be altered retroactively to have citations in previous papers point to DOIs of citations, and this will cost About $400. Stefan suggested that if we can pay someone to do this, we should try this. Nick asked about DBLP, since we haven’t updated since 2009. Stefan will ask Cyrill about DBLP.

Oliver thanked Stefan for his work on this.

14. **Discussion of area chair feedback on the RSS review process**

Wolfram congratulated Lydia on an excellent job. Enthusiasm was echoed by all.

Lydia reported that the workshops solicitation post submission worked well, and led to good coverage. The conditional accept papers were good, but the process did not work well. ACs wrote long requests for changes, this created a lot of work. Dieter suggested asking the authors to write back if they were confused or unsure about feedback. But, resulted in excellent papers that came back. Greg suggested notifying reviewers that papers were being shepherded. Lydia noted this didn’t happen, and went back to reviewers in very few areas. The videos worked well.

For the papers discussed at the AC meeting, a second AC was added. In a few cases, the primary AC asked for a specific second (or third) AC to look at the paper. If disagreement resulted, Lydia asked for additional ACs to be added. CMT made this harder, because no one could tell who was primary.
Having multiple ACs, even though some didn’t like it, is a good idea. Creates a buffer for difficult cases. But having multiple ACs for the outset is not necessary. Bring multiple ACs in for difficult cases.

Lydia provided detailed recommendations.

15. **Salon de refusés**

    John Leonard moves to have a Salon de Refusés for 1 year.
    Dieter seconded. 6 in favour, 2 opposed, 7 abstained.

16. **What is the best way for RSS to maintain/strengthen its identity and culture?**

    From an Email by Nick: “It occurs to me that we have a bit of a structural oddity with respect to RSS. Each year, the program chair is largely given free rein to change the conference as they see fit. This gives us the ability to try any number of experiments, which is great, but there’s very little continuity from year to year. The experiments vanish with little reporting or analysis. is this a good thing? It seems like we might want to be more thoughtful about it. If we recommend a future program chair (David, Nancy, whoever) to add nectar tracks, would we recommend it to each future program chairs each year?”

    After a very brief discussion, Oliver and Nick agreed to collect a “lessons learned” document

    Oliver moved to adjourn, Nick seconded. Unanimous.

---

**The following topics were on the agenda, but not addressed due to lack of time:**

- Reaction to RAS Letters
- Should we include Position Papers at RSS?
- Liaison with AAAI
- Should we change the RSS Format?
- How to improve presentation quality at RSS?

---

Meeting minutes respectfully submitted,

Nicholas Roy, RSS Foundation Secretary