IEEE International Symposium on Hardware Oriented Security and Trust (HOST)

Organizing Committee
Responsibilities, Policies, and Timelines

Revised September 2024

Table of Contents

STEERING COMMITTEE (SC)

This section contains a description of the procedures used to select/remove steering committee (SC) members and their associated responsibilities. The list of steering committee members should be updated annually in this document.

Responsibilities

- Steering committee members are expected to support HOST in all manners possible including but not limited to paper and demo submissions, solicitation of paper and demo submissions, solicitation of sponsors and guest speakers, event attendance, and organizing committee meetings.
- Decisions that rest with the steering committee include:
  - HOST's new directions, and strategies to further grow HOST
  - Identification of the next Vice Program Chair (in cooperation with next General Chair and Program Chair)
  - Future HOST locations
- Approvals from SC are needed for:
  - Significant changes to the HOST technical program and structure, such as decrease in acceptance ratio, number of paper presentations, etc.
  - Filling significant roles in HOST Organizing Committee
  - Creation of new roles in HOST Organizing Committee

Membership Procedure

The steering committee consists of permanent and term appointments:

- *Term:* General Chair of HOST in year x will be promoted to Steering Committee for a three-year term (years $x + 1$ to $x + 3$) unless he/she declines.
- *Permanent:* Steering Committee Chair will move to nominate and remove permanent members. A majority vote will determine if the move passes.

A term or permanent steering committee member may also step down at any time.

Steering Committee Permanent Members

- Mark Tehranipoor (Chair)
- Jim Plusquellic
- Farinaz Koushanfar
- Swarup Bhunia
- Ramesh Karri

Steering Committee Term Members

- Yousef Iskander (through HOST 2024)
- Saverio Fazzari (through HOST 2025)
- Fareena Saqib (through HOST 2025)
- Farimah Farahmandi (through HOST 2026)
- Vincent Mooney (through HOST 2026)

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE (OC)

This section contains a description of the procedures used to select organizing committee (OC) members and the associated responsibilities of each OC role. More detailed policies and timelines for tasks associated with these roles can be found in later sections.

Membership Procedure

General and Program Chair Pipeline Until 2020

- Program Chair of HOST in year x is promoted to General Chair of HOST in year $x + 1$ unless he/she declines.
- Vice Program Chair of HOST in year x is promoted to Program Chair of HOST in year $x + 1$ unless he/she declines.

General and Program Chair Pipeline Starting in 2020

- Program Chairs of first and second deadlines of HOST in year x are promoted to Co-General Chairs of HOST in year $x + 1$ (unless declining).
- Vice Program Chair of HOST's first deadline in year x is promoted to Program Chair of HOST in year $x + 1$ (unless declining).
- Vice Program Chair of HOST's second deadline in year x remains as Vice Program Chair of HOST in year $x + 1$'s first deadline (unless declining).

Nominations and Other Roles

- Nominations for next Vice Program Chair are communicated to Steering Committee Chair. Steering Committee Chair provides consolidated feedback to HOST OC during OC meeting/dinner to agree on next Vice Program Chair.
- Awards Chair is determined by Program Chair with SC approval after the accepted paper and demos are finalized. **Awards Chair should not have COI with best paper candidates. Award chair must remain anonymous until the moment of award announcement. The award chair must be different each year.**
- All other positions can be discussed at the OC meeting/dinner. If some positions are not filled during the OC meeting/dinner, these will be filled by the General, Program, and Vice Program Chairs, with SC approval.
- All new chair and co-chair positions must be approved by the SC.

General Chair Responsibilities

1. Coordinate all activities with members of the organizing and steering committees (including biweekly teleconference calls with OC and SC)
2. Provide proper and timely communication of the necessary information about the paper deadlines, registration deadline, extensions, and final program to the publicity chair and webmaster
3. Track the deadlines that are met and missed in the Timeline section of this document by adding comments to the schedule
4. Consult with SC on decisions requiring SC approval
5. Work with finance chair on TMRF and HOST related expenses
6. Prepare and submit HOST travel grant proposal to NSF

7. Manage HOST travel grant application process
8. Prepare CFP in collaboration with Program Chairs
9. Invite guest (keynote/visionary) speakers when appropriate
10. Prepare/coordinate signage for event
11. Prepare plenary slides to give a 5-minute presentation about HOST
12. Chair one of the keynote/visionary sessions
13. Schedule the organizing committee meeting on the first evening of HOST
14. Emcee the Awards dinner or reception
15. Introduce next General and Program Chairs during closing remarks
16. Prepare and manage attendee survey
17. Prepare a zip file with all docs that the next General Chair can leverage, e.g., NSF travel grant proposal, source CFP file, important elements of any hotel and IEEE negotiations (important emails), instructions/links on software tools that were used, difficulties encountered that year, things that worked well, etc.

Program Chair Responsibilities

1. Prepare CFP in collaboration with Vice Program and General Chair at least two months before the submission deadline
2. Assemble TPC according to constraints and evaluation criteria discussed in later sections
3. Topic coordinator chairs TCs are appointed by the PCs.
4. Migrate/open the paper submission website (EasyChair)
5. Send out TPC invitations and CFP to TPC members at least one month before submission deadline in order to recruit more papers
6. Manage the entire review process: bidding, reviewer assignment and COI, reminder emails, rebuttal process, managing the discussion process, paper ranking, and making final decisions based on the final rankings
7. Program chairs survey the set of submitted papers and decide on a set of Topics
8. PCs will make final decisions on assignment of papers to TCs
9. PCs will assign a group of TPC to each TC, using recommendations from TCs
10. For papers submitted by members of the TC and TPC that would be assigned to their group, the Program Chairs will choose a suitable alternative TC to handle the paper. The TC will be asked to drop off the call during the final review during discussions related to their paper
11. PCs make the final decision on the assignments of papers and make the actual assignments on the conference website
12. PCs schedule a final review meeting, which must be attended by the PCs and TCs
13. Provide additional reviews for papers for which required reviews are missing
14. PCs will make final accept/reject decisions based on the feedback from the TCs and a need to maintain a certain amount of diversity in the program

15. Take lead on preparing a preliminary list of invited speakers six months in advance of HOST with feedback from OC/SC
16. Take lead on inviting guest (keynote/visionary) speakers
17. Prepare the final program and share with Publicity Chair and Webmaster
18. Prepare list of HOST volunteers two weeks in advance of conference, and assign duties and points of contact to volunteers
19. Assemble best paper award committee with Awards Chair
20. Prepare plenary slides to give a 10-minute presentation about HOST-201X (review process, program, social activities, etc.)
21. Chair one of the keynote/visionary sessions
22. Give out awards at Awards dinner or reception with Awards Chair
23. Provide closing remarks as next year's General Chair

Vice Program Chair Responsibilities

1. Assist Program Chair in all of the above duties
2. Document TPC related activities such as performance of TPC members and success of rebuttal process
3. Assist tutorial, demo, and workshop chairs with submission website (EasyChair)
4. Chair one of the keynote/visionary sessions
5. Provide closing remarks as next year's Program Chair

Finance Chair Responsibilities

1. Manage TMRF – initiate a new TMRF for the next year HOST and close out the previous year TMRF – in collaboration with the previous Finance Chair and General Chair
2. Create a preliminary budget with General Chair to share with IEEE after previous HOST
3. Solicit feedback from OC on changes to main conference, tutorial, and co-located event registration rates
4. Provide updates to General Chair on the total expenses and work with Registration Chair on updating the budget to help understand meeting IEEE requirement and the potential surplus to be used by the General Chair and Registration Chair for gifts, snacks during breaks, social activities, etc.
5. Collect honorarium forms with Tutorial Chair
6. Pay honorariums to tutorial presenters based on attendance numbers provided by Registration Chair and Tutorial Chair
7. Reimburse OC members for HOST-related expenses

Tutorial Chair Responsibilities

1. Develop Call for Tutorials with General Chair, and share with Publicity Chair and Webmaster
2. Determine honorarium and tutorial registration rates with feedback from OC/SC
3. Work with General Chair and SC to determine number of tutorials, length of tutorials, etc. **Do not exceed number of tutorials agreed upon by SC.**

4. Assemble and chair Tutorial Review Committee **(members should not overlap with TPC; members should be a mix of industry, govt., and academia; there should be one or two members from the OC)**
5. Manage tutorial review process (communicating criteria with review committee members; holding teleconference/Webex/Zoom call and/or EasyChair with committee to select tutorials)
6. Communicate with accepted tutorial presenters (collect slides, distribute honorarium agreement and forms, and e-mail other instructions)
7. Work with Registration and Finance Chairs to calculate and pay honorarium to tutorial presenters
8. Work with Registration Chair to print list of attendees and badges
9. Work with Local Arrangements and A/V Chairs to manage HOST Tutorial day (microphones, projectors, laptops, student volunteers, registration desk, etc.)
10. Develop, distribute, and collect Tutorial evaluation forms; and communicate feedback to presenters and next year's Tutorial Chair
11. Determine two top tutorials for priority consideration in next year's HOST

Publicity Chair Responsibilities

1. Prepare call for papers and expand contact database in collaboration with General Chair, Program Chair, Vice-Program Chair, Asia-Pacific Liaison, and Industry Liaisons
2. Prepare call for participation in collaboration with Registration Chair
3. Distribute all CFPs, calls for participation and program through all possible channels (web, conferences, etc.)
4. Develop a database of the possible channels to advertise HOST CFP, call for participation and program
5. Create 3-minute video of HOST activities (poster sessions, participant feedback; their interactions)
6. Assemble and manage student photographers for all HOST sessions and awards dinner (tasks 6 and 7 – solicit help from student volunteers)
7. Manage the HOST social media pages (Facebook, Linkedin, etc.) and post photos after event
8. Maintain HOST mailing list (including addition of last year's attendees) and share with next year's Publicity Chair
9. Keep right slides on the screen during the breaks (company sponsors logo, reminders, pictures from the conference, etc.) – in collaboration with General Chair, Industry Liaison, and Local (A/V) Chair

Registration (Vice Finance) Chair Responsibilities

1. Work with General Chair to address registration issues
2. Send out reminders to the authors for registration (in collaboration with Publicity Chair)
3. Prepare call for participation in collaboration with Publicity Chair
4. Manage HOST location/travel related issues with IEEE, including travel visas
5. Order the attendee gifts in collaboration with the General Chair and Finance Chair

6. Print materials needed for HOST (attendee list, badges, survey, HOST announcements, etc.)
7. Cross check author registration for one full early registration (not student registration) per paper
8. Manage registration desk at HOST with help of student volunteers

Topic Coordinator Chair Responsibilities

1. Program chairs survey the set of submitted papers and decide on a set of Topics
2. PCs will finalize the selection of TCs
3. TCs will bid on papers to review
4. PCs will make final decisions on assignment of papers to TCs
5. PCs will assign a group of TPC to each TC, using recommendations from TCs
6. The TC will bid on the papers to review, where PCs will make final decisions on assignment of papers to TCs
7. TCs make recommendations on paper assignments to TPC, PCs make the final decision on the assignments and make the actual assignments on the conference website
8. The TCs can petition the PCs for additional TPC in cases where the quality of the review process is threatened by the inability to get a solid set of reviews for each paper.
9. TC will lead the paper review effort in a specific area, by scheduling regular meetings with the TPC that are assigned to them by the Program Chairs.
10. TCs will also be assigned papers to review and therefore they need to be fluent in the research area.
11. TCs schedule regular meetings, once a week as the final review (see below) approaches, and ranks the papers in their area, with accept and reject decisions included in the ranking
12. TC MUST be proactive to ensure that each paper receives the minimum number of reviews recommended by the SC and OC, and discuss problems with the PCs IN ADVANCE of the final review
13. The TCs assist the PCs and need to work closely with the PCs to conduct a thorough review process defined as ensuring each paper has the minimum number of reviews and that each review is good quality.
14. PCs schedule a final review meeting, which must be attended by the PCs and TCs
15. Each TC will provide a written proposal in advance of the meeting on the papers they recommend for acceptance, and a ‘strength’ rating which reflects how strongly their group feels about the paper
16. TCs will bid for sessions and provide session titles based on the number of papers they recommend for acceptance
17. PCs will make final accept/reject decisions based on the feedback from the TCs and a need to maintain a certain amount of diversity in the program

Awards Chair Responsibilities

NOTE: Awards Chair shall remain anonymous until the Awards Dinner, except to SC, General Chair, Program Chairs, Demo Chair, and judges

1. Develop evaluation criteria and forms for best paper and best demo selections for associated committees
2. Help solicit nominations for HOST Hall of Fame (lead rests with Hall of Fame members)
3. Take lead in assembling best paper award committee/judges with Program Chair, and managing the process
4. Take lead in assembling best demo award committee/judges with Demo Chair, and managing the process
5. Assemble HOST Hall of Fame selection committee with HOST Hall of Fame members (lead/approval lies with HOST Hall of Fame members)
6. Purchase keynote/invited speaker gifts and best paper/demo awards/plaques with help from Finance Chair, General Chair, and Program Chairs.
7. Prepare awards dinner slides containing list of nominees, evaluation criteria/process, list of judges, and list of winners
8. Present awards with Program and Demo Chairs

Demo Chair Responsibilities

1. Develop Call for Demos with General and Program Chair, and share with Publicity Chair and Webmaster
2. Filter accepted demos based on hardware requirement criteria
3. Work with Registration Chair to ensure that at least one member of the hardware demo has a student or full registration.
4. Handle all communications with participants regarding information about travel awards and deadlines.
5. Handle all hardware demo conference related logistics (allowable amount of space per demo, location of each demo, setup and collect power supplies, easels, pushpins, poster boards, and video submissions) with help from Local Arrangement Chairs and student volunteers
6. Communicate all logistics, rules, and expectations to the demo presenters in advance (e.g., hardware, posters and requirements regarding presence during demo sessions to be eligible for awards)
7. Coordinate with Awards Chair on how many judges will be needed, how the judging will be partitioned among the demos, suggested judges and/or areas of expertise, etc.
8. Announce and present demo awards to winners with Awards Chair and Program Chair

Ph.D. Competition Chair Responsibilities

1. Develop Call for Competition with General and Program Chair, and share with Publicity Chair and Webmaster
2. Select how many judges will be needed and provide them access to the submission system to review, grade, rank and filter accepted competitions based on evaluation criteria

3. Work with Registration Chair to ensure that presenters of the selected competitions register for the conference
4. Handle all communications with participants regarding information about travel awards and deadlines
5. Handle all competition conference related logistics (e.g., competition room reservation, AV setup, and slide submissions) with help from Local Arrangement Chairs and student volunteers
6. Communicate all logistics, rules, and expectations to the competition presenters in advance (e.g., requirements regarding attendance and presentations during the competition to be eligible for awards)
7. Coordinate with the judges about in-person presentation. Set up the in-person or online grading system (e.g., using a form on Google, etc.)
8. Announce and present the competition award to the winner with Awards Chair and Program Chair

Local Arrangements Chair Responsibilities

1. Work with the General Chair and discuss possible locations to hold the conference
2. On behalf of the OC, visit selected locations and meet with their managements to evaluate how well the locations can serve as the conference venue
3. Assist Registration, Tutorial, Workshop, and Demo Chairs with all accommodations and setup for the event (printing, poster boards, easels, push pins, projectors)
4. Accept HOST shipments and bring them to the event
5. Manage parking permits (if any)
6. Provide laptops for the sessions and registration desk
7. Provide local student volunteers to help with the event

AV/Publications Chair Responsibilities

1. Prepare the proceedings for distribution on the web
2. Prepare a folder to include all sponsors' documents (it will be given to the attendees during the registration) – in collaboration with the Registration Chair
3. Develop a guideline for proceedings generation and distribution (for the next publication chair)
    a. Get the IEEE approval and Letter of Acquisition (work with Gen Chair)
    b. Send IEEE Approval and LOA to publisher; get publisher deliver the CDs to the conference in time.
    c. Work with publisher to finalizing the CD (paper formatting, pages per paper – (charge additional pages/ work with Registration chair)
4. Obtain all required permissions from authors regarding publications, presentation slides, pictures, and videos)
5. Send the paper formats to the authors of the selected papers
6. Send video requirements (if any) to the authors of the selected papers and demos
7. Prepare Audio/Video (AV) instructions and communicate them to presentation/presenter

8. Manage Audio/Video (AV) presentation uploads and be present in all sessions to manage AV issues with staff
9. Prepare the brochures for HOST program (nice and colorful version of the program with the logo of the sponsors) with General and Program Chairs

Panel Chair Responsibilities

1. Work with Program Chair, industry liaison, and the panel proposer to put together one panel on a new problem or hot story.
2. Solicit panel proposals around same time as the paper deadline or earlier. In lieu of solicitation, prepare panel proposals. Panel chair will be responsible in collecting reviews and making a decision on what panel to choose. This is done in collaboration with the SC, Program Chairs, General Chair, and Liaisons.
3. Assist the selected panel proposer(s) to identify panel moderator, panelists, and potential questions that the panelists would address.
4. Prepare panel info with proposers for the program and web

Exhibition Chair Responsibilities

1. Prepare HOST sponsor and exhibitor prospectus with General Chair, Liaisons, and IEEE
2. Provide guidelines on various exhibition and sponsorship levels
3. Prepare list of exhibitor leads and work with General Chair, Liaisons, and IEEE to contact them
4. Work with Registration, General, and Publication Chairs to include the exhibitors in the program, on the web, etc.
5. Work with General Chair and staff to manage exhibition floor plan before and during event

Industrial Liaison Responsibilities

1. Attract new industry sponsors
2. Provide guidelines on various sponsorship levels
3. Work with Registration, General, and Publication Chairs to include the sponsors in the program, on the web, etc.
4. Work with Panel Chair to invite individuals from industry to attend panels
5. Help Program Chair for scheduling industrial practice session(s)
6. Arrange exhibit accommodations with General Chair

European and Asian/Pacific Liaison Responsibilities

1. Provide a list of **at least 50 new individuals** from Europe and Asia respectively to the General and Publicity Chairs. Alternatively, communicate all calls for papers, tutorials, participation, etc. with publicity chair to personal contact lists
2. Solicit papers, demos, and talks by new authors and presenters from Europe and Asia
3. Suggest new TPC members from Europe and Asia to the Program Chair
4. Work with General Chair on travel grants for students from Europe and Asia

Webmaster Responsibilities

1. Create and manage the HOST website
2. Update all materials from previous year from OC feedback (deadlines, sponsorship, registration, etc.)
3. Send timely reminders about deadlines to all OC members regarding website content

Session Chair Responsibilities

1. Obtain contact info of session presenters from Program and/or Vice Program Chair, and use it to collect presenter bios before HOST. Shorten long bios if necessary so that introduction takes less than 30 seconds.
2. Be present in the session's room at least 15 minutes before the session begins in order to help presenters upload/update slides on the presentation laptop and to collect any missing bios.
3. Discuss presentation time, hand gestures for time remaining, etc. with presenters before the session begins.
4. Inform the Program Chairs if any presenter is missing before the session starts
5. Be responsible for starting the session at the time specified in the program (unless the Program Chairs tell you otherwise.
6. Provide a brief welcome to the audience to start the session (no more than 20 seconds).
7. Introduce each presenter before associated presentation, and thank each presenter after associated presentation.
8. Moderate presentation and audience Q&A in order to maintain the time allotted in the program for the session (ask the Program Chairs if you are unsure about the amount of time allotted for presentations and Q&A).
9. Prepare at least one question for each presenter in the event that the audience does not have any questions (time permitting)
10. Thank the presenters and audience at the session's end, and provide short remarks about the program's next session (break, lunch, etc.).

GENERAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Papers and Paper Submission

1. Maximum paper submission length is 10 pages including references, appendices, and other supplementary material.
2. The paper review process is double blind.
3. Program Chairs are **not allowed to submit papers** to the deadlines that they manage. However, their students are allowed to co-author papers.
4. General Chair and Vice Program Chair can submit one paper per deadline **if he/she does not have access to the papers**
5. Other members of OC and TPC are allowed to **submit up to 2 papers per deadline.**
6. Generally, the HOST paper acceptance rate shall be **20-25%** to remain competitive will hardware design and computer security peers. The **minimum number of papers (minimum acceptance rate)** for any given year shall be determined by the number required for security conference ranking (20 papers). The **maximum number of papers (maximum acceptance rate)** shall be decided by the maximum number of papers that a 2.5 day program can handle (about 28 papers).
7. Papers can be conditionally accepted (with shepherding) at the discretion of the Program and Vice Program Chair. Shepherds can include one or more reviewers of the paper with communication occurring though the Program Chairs.

Rebuttal Process

1. The HOST rebuttal process is also double-blind.
2. During this phase, no changes to the actual paper submission can be made.
3. Authors will be given one to two weeks to prepare and submit a brief response to the reviewer comments (abiding by rules specified in later sections).
4. Recommended word-limited response length is 500 words.
5. If desired, authors can also withdraw their paper during the rebuttal phase in order to submit to another conference. For papers that are withdrawn, the process will end, i.e., the steps below will not occur.

Tutorial Submission and Selection

1. The number of tutorials to be held at the current year's event will be decided prior to tutorial solicitation by the General Chair.
2. For tutorials that were given at the prior year's event, the presenters can submit a short proposal for the next year citing past experience and minor changes to be made to address attendee comments.
3. The **top performing tutorials, up to as many as two**, (in terms of attendance and evaluation) from the prior event will be **guaranteed a slot** in the current year provided that (i) the presenters submit a short proposal as described in #2; (ii) significant changes are not made to the topic and presenters; and (iii) no tutorial is repeated more than three times in a row.
4. After acceptance, any changes to tutorial (including presenters) must be approved by the Tutorial Chair. Unapproved changes are grounds for cancellation.

Demos and Demo Proposal Submission

1. The demo proposal review process is single blind.
2. There are no current limits on number of demo proposal submissions or acceptances per author.
3. Demo proposal submission is open to everyone, including all OC members.

Best Paper Awards

1. Program and Vice Program Chairs will select 3 to 5 papers as best paper candidates based on ranking and TPC recommendations. **At least 2 candidates should be student papers.**
2. Best paper candidates must be announced during plenary session
3. Best paper candidates should be marked appropriately in the program (proceedings, brochure, etc.)
4. Best paper winners should be announced on the web
5. Awards Chair will select 3-4 judges with input from the Program Chair (from both industry and academia without COIs) to review the best paper candidates and attend the speakers' presentations. They provide their final evaluation to the Awards and Program Chair.
6. The best paper is announced during the social program. This requires all best papers scheduled on or before the second day of the conference.

Best Demo Awards

1. There are 3 best demo awards (first, second, and third place)
2. Awards Chair will select up to 10 judges with input from the Demo Chair (from both industry and academia ideally without COIs; Any judge with COI cannot provide input on conflicted demos) to review the demos. They provide their final evaluation to the Awards and Program Chairs.
3. The best demos are announced during the social program. This requires that demos be reviewed on the first 1.5 days of the event.
4. Best demo winners should also be announced on the web

Panels

The suggested manner for organizing and determining panels is as follows:

1. Solicit panel suggestions from community and select the best two before paper submission.
2. Over the course of the current year, develop another candidate panel on the year's hot topic.
3. If a suitable hot topic is found, it will occur at the current year's event. Depending on the space in the technical program, 0-2 of the previously solicited panels will take place at the current year's event.
4. Panels are restricted to 1 hour and must be managed carefully to adequate time for interaction with the audience.

HOST Hall of Fame

HOST Hall of Fame Award was introduced in HOST 2018 by the Organizing Committee of HOST 2018. Future HOST organizing committees reserve the right to modify this section.

Award Description: HOST Hall of Fame award recognizes significant and sustained contribution of an individual towards successful organization and advancement of HOST over the span of five or more years. The candidate should have exemplified dedication and strong service for HOST in any role. The award will be announced and delivered in the award ceremony of HOST in each year. The award will consist of a plaque and citation.

Nomination / Selection Process: For the first few years, the General Chair of HOST will solicit nomination from the members of the organizing committee. The nomination document (one page) will consist of nominee's name and a justification for the nomination highlighting the candidate's contribution for HOST. Self-nomination is not allowed. The steering committee and the past recipients of the "HOST Hall of Fame" award will then select the award recipient, who would become the HOST Hall of Fame members.

Once three or more members are selected, the HOST Hall of Fame members themselves will administer the process of nomination and selection of new Hall of Fame awardees/members.

Hall of Fame Members

1. **Class of 2018:** Mark Tehranipoor, Jim Plusquellic, Saverio Fazzari and Farinaz Koushanfar
2. **Class of 2019:** Ken Mai
3. **Class of 2020:** Matt Casto and Srini Devadas
4. **Class of 2022:** Yousef Iskander and Gang Qu
5. **Class of 2023:** Swarup Bhunia
6. **Class of 2024:** Cliff Wang

Plenary Session

1. General Chair, Program Chair, and Vice Program Chair will sit on stage until the keynote speaker is introduced
2. General Chair will provide welcome message and slides
3. Program and Vice Program Chair will deliver slides about program
4. General Chair will induct new class of HOST Hall of Fame members
5. General Chair will introduce new IEEE Fellows from HOST community
6. Keynote speaker will be introduced and present
7. Visionary speaker (if any) will be introduced and present

Awards Dinner / Reception

1. General Chair will open the awards ceremony after dessert
2. Awards Chair will present slides on evaluation criteria, etc.

3. Awards Chair and Program Chair will announce and present awards to Best Paper Winners.
4. Awards Chair and Demo Chair will announce and present awards to Best Demo Winners.
5. Present gifts of appreciation to judges, student volunteers, etc.

E-mail List

1. The Publicity Chair **SHOULD NOT SHARE** the HOST e-mail list with anyone, since HOST has not requested permission from attendees to use their information for any communication other than HOST.
2. Lists of previous or current attendees (names only) can be shared with any OC member looking for either judges or members of technical program, workshop review, tutorial review, and demo review committees. If suitable candidates are identified, the Publicity Chair can their contact information only with the OC member. These OC members would also be responsible for maintaining confidentiality of the shared contact information.

Webpage

1. General Chair, Program Chairs, Publicity Chair, Registration Chair, Publications Chair, and Industrial Liaison can have access to the webpage. If any other update is needed, the TPC or the other members of the OC should contact the Webmaster (cc'ing General Chair and Program Chairs) to update the webpage.
2. Keynote information, final program, sponsors info, deadline changes/extension, TPC updates, registration updates, etc. must be made by the individuals listed above.
3. General chair is responsible for providing a short summary of past HOST

Registration and RegOnline (or Alternative)

1. Invited keynote and visionary speakers shall receive free registration, but are responsible for their own travel arrangements and accommodations.
2. Panelists shall receive a reduced registration rate.
3. RegOnline access should be provided by the Registration Chair to the Finance Chair, General Chair, Program Chair, Vice Program Chair, Tutorial Chair, and Local Arrangements Chair (only those assisting with on-site registration).
4. Tutorial Chair and presenters should go through the above folks to receive up-to-date information about tutorial attendance.

Sponsorship Categories

The sponsorship categories and benefits should generally follow the prior year's event. Rates shall be updated annually to account for inflation. Major changes to the sponsorship categories and benefits should be discussed with the SC and OC.

TECHNICAL PROGRAM COMMITTEE (TPC)

TPC Size, Term Limits, and Other Constraints

1. The TPC size shall be limited to 40 members assuming 100 submissions annually with 4 reviews per paper (approximately 10 papers per reviewer). Each year, the TPC will initially include 40 members. If number of submissions ends up exceeding 100, the TPC shall be increased accordingly.
2. Membership terms shall be limited to **three years**. This can be calculated as the number of years served on the TPC in past 3 years divided by 3, and shall not exceed a constraint of 1. Serving as the Program and/or Vice Program Chair shall **not count** as membership in the TPC when calculating this value.
3. The Steering Committee (SC) shall determine the following constraints: 1) minimum number of members from current/past OC and SC; 2) minimum percentages of TPC members from academia, industry, and government; 3) maximum number of TPC members from a single institution; 4) maximum percentages of TPC members from academia of full, associate, assistant, and other rank (e.g., research scientist, post doc); and 5) number of TPC members possessing specific areas of expertise (see keywords).
4. The 40 TPC candidates who fulfill the above criteria and rank at the top of the evaluation scoring system described below shall be selected for the TPC.

TPC Member Evaluation Criteria

The Vice Program Chair shall evaluate each TPC member in the current year and update their score in a document circulated among the Program Chairs each year. Criteria categories and scores shall be updated as follows:

1. **Submissions:** One point will be added to candidate's score for each paper, demo, tutorial, or workshop submitted to HOST last year
2. **Attendance:** One point will be added to candidate's score if candidate attended HOST last year
3. **Lateness:** One point will be deducted from score for every review submitted past the deadline to HOST last year (assuming candidate was a TPC member in previous year)
4. **Short Reviews:** Two points will be deducted from score for every review submitted last year that is too short – less than 100 words (assuming candidate was a TPC member in previous year)
5. **Missing Reviews:** Three points will be deducted from score for every assigned paper that candidate did not a submit a review for last year (assuming candidate was a TPC member in previous year)
6. **Discretionary:** Five points shall be added / deducted for any reviewer that participates way above / below the average TPC member

List of TPC Expertise Keywords

1. (Adversarial) machine learning
2. (Anti-)Counterfeit
3. (Anti-)Reverse engineering
4. (Anti-)Tamper

5. Analog and Mixed Signal
6. Architecture
7. Automotive/autonomous vehicle
8. CAD
9. Cipher
10. Cloud
11. Cryptanalysis
12. Cryptographic Protocol
13. Cyber deception
14. Cyber-physical system security
15. Digital circuits
16. Embedded systems
17. Fault injection
18. FPGA
19. Hardware primitives
20. Hardware Trojan
21. Implantable device security
22. Invasive attack
23. IoT security
24. IP Trust
25. Memory and storage security
26. IC Metering
27. Nanoscale device security
28. Obfuscation
29. Privacy
30. PUF
31. Sensors and sensor network security
32. Side channel analysis
33. Smart grid security
34. SoC
35. VLSI Test
36. TRNG
37. Trusted execution environment
38. Formal Verification
39. Wearable device security

Applying for TPC Membership

Those interested should e-mail the HOST Program and Vice Program Chairs with the following information:

- Name and Current Affiliation
- Sector (Government, Industry, Academia)
- Rank/Position (Full, Associate, Assistant, other) if in academia
- Up to ten keywords from the above list to describe their areas of expertise
- Examples of previous participation in HOST (paper/tutorial/workshop/demo submissions, attendance, provided external reviews, etc.)

PAPER REVIEW PROCESS AND GUIDELINES

Definition of Roles and Dates

Roles in the review process include

- *Author*: any person who submits a paper to HOST
- *Reviewer*: any person who can give a score to a manuscript
- *TPC*: member of the Technical Program Committee
- *PC*: Program Chair and/or Vice Program Chair

Key dates in the review process include (in chronological order)

- *Abstract Registration Deadline*: date when the title and abstract of a paper are due
- *Submission Deadline*: date when paper manuscripts are due
- *Bidding Deadline*: date when manuscript bids are due
- *Review Deadline*: date when the initial reviews are due and sent out to authors
- *Rebuttal Deadline:* date when authors submit their responses to reviewer comments
- *Discussion Initiation Date*: date when the reviews are accessible for the TPC
- *Paper Decision Date*: date when all reject/accept decisions are completed
- *Author Notification Date*: date when authors are notified
- *Camera Ready Date*: date when authors submit final papers

Assumptions

- The review process will make use of EasyChair
- The TPC and PC is known before the review process starts

EasyChair Configuration Settings

- The above review process can be supported using the following EasyChair Configuration Settings
    - The PC (Chair and Vice Chair) has "superchair" role and "track chair" role for main track (Note that the Tutorial, and Demo Chairs have "track chair" roles for their respective tracks)
    - The TPC has "PC member" role
    - Submissions are "anonymous"
    - Non-chairs can see information on submissions not assigned to them
    - Submission topics and sub-topics are
        - Hardware
            - Security primitives, computer-aided design (CAD) tools, emerging and nanoscale devices, hardware Trojans and backdoors, side-channel attacks and/or mitigation, Fault injection and/or mitigation, (Anti-)Reverse engineering and physical attacks, Anti-tamper, Anti-counterfeit, trusted execution environments

        - Architecture
            - Trusted execution environments, cache-side channel attacks and/or mitigation, privacy-preserving computation, system-on-chip (SoC)/platform security, FPGA and reconfigurable fabric security, cloud computing, smart phones and smart devices
        - System
            - Internet-of-things (IoT) security, sensors and sensor network security, smart grid security, automotive/autonomous vehicle security, cyber-physical system security, adversarial machine learning and cyber deception
        - Other
    - The number of reviews per paper is a minimum of 4 reviews. The Program Chair can solicit an additional review or two as needed, but there should be no more than 6 reviews for any given paper.
    - The list of submissions can be viewed by all PC members
    - The reviewer names are known (visible) to PC members
    - The 'status' menu (i.e., access to reviews by ordinary PC members) or paper ranking is enabled only for reviews on papers assigned to PC members (for most of review process) and for all PC members (three days before final decisions are made)
    - Sub-reviewers are not allowed (PC members must enter reviews of external reviewers and discuss papers on their own)
    - Review Response Period (for rebuttal process)
        - This should be initiated for all papers at once and only after the review deadline. It is initiated by sending a letter (w/reviews and instructions) to the authors
            - Recommended word limit for responses is 500
            - Set "authors can respond" to yes
            - Set "Responses can be viewed by non-chairs" to yes
    - *Scores*: 3: strong accept; 2: accept; 1: weak accept; 0: borderline paper; -1: weak reject; -2: reject; -3: strong reject
    - *Decisions*: REJECT, reject?, (blank), accept?, ACCEPT

Initial Review by PC

- Immediately after the Submission Deadline, the PC reviews all abstracts and verifies all manuscripts.
- The PC identifies and removes all irregular submissions. This includes all submissions that do not conform submission requirements (non-anonymous submissions, overlength submissions), or which have file formatting errors. The PC may offer such Authors to correct an irregular submission.

- The PC evaluates conflicts of interest between the submissions and the TPC.
    - EasyChair will automatically find the following undeclared conflicts of interest (COIs)
        - TPC member is a co-author of a submission
        - TPC member has the same affiliation as at least one of the authors
    - The TPC can also declare a conflict of interest on themselves during the paper bidding process
- Once a conflict of interest exists between a paper and a TPC member, the TPC member is excluded from any further interaction with the paper during the review process. The TPC member is treated, for that particular paper, in the same way as other authors. The TPC member will not know the outcome of the review process for that paper until the Author Notification Date.

Paper Bidding

- After initial manuscript review, the PC enables access to all submissions to all members of the TPC (apart from those papers excluded by Conflict of Interest).
- The TPC can make a bid to review a paper. A bid is an expression of interest to review a paper. A bid helps to steer the review assignment. For each paper, each TPC can make four different bids.
    - "I prefer not to review this paper"
    - "I want to review this paper"
    - "I can review this paper"
    - "I have a conflict of interest"
- The TPC can make bids until the Bidding Deadline.

Paper Assignment

- Immediately after the Bidding Deadline, the PC will perform review assignments.
- Each paper will receive a minimum of 4 reviews. Each TPC member will receive an average of 10 papers to review. The PC must ensure that the TPC is large enough to meet these two constraints.
- Review assignments may be performed by a combination of two elements: The TPC paper bids, and the review assignment of papers to TPC members by the PC. The conference submission system has a manual/automatic review assignment function which can be used for this purpose.
- The review assignment will be visible to the TPC members, but only after they have turned in their review.

Paper Review

- After Review Assignment, the TPC performs Paper Review.
    - The TPC may either review a paper themselves, or else they may appoint a sub-reviewer. The latter will not be performed through EasyChair to ensure that TPC members are held responsible for reviews and discussions

    - After submitting a review for a paper, the TPC will see the list of reviewers assigned to that paper.
    - After submitting a review for a paper, the TPC will see the reviews written up for that paper.
- Each reviewer numerically expresses the perceived quality of a paper with a paper score and a confidence.
    - Paper scores range from -3 to +3 (Strong Reject, Reject, Weak Reject, Borderline, Weak Accept, Accept, Strong Accept).
    - Reviewer confidence ranges from 1 to 5 (Null, Low, Medium, High, Expert)
- The Paper review process concludes at the Paper Review Deadline.

Format for Paper Reviews

- The following is the format of an NSF proposal review. It includes sections for overview, positive and negative aspects section, and closes with a brief recommendation discussion.
    - **Overview:** The Overview sections describes in 2 to 3 paragraphs the topic of the paper being reviewed, the approach taken and the results. This provides the authors with reassurance that their paper was read carefully and entirely and that the reviewer understood the objectives.
    - **Positive aspects of the paper:**
      +: Describe a significant contribution of the paper
      +**:** Continue with other significant contributions
    - **Negative aspects of the paper:**
      -: Describe a drawback of the presented methodology
      -: Continue with other drawbacks
    - **Recommendation:** Describe in 1 paragraph your final recommendation. *NOTE: failing to follow this format will negatively impact the reviewer score we assign to you at the end of the discussion phase*. The reviewer scoring criteria was added last year as a mechanism to track reviewer quality.

Rebuttal Phase

- At the start of the rebuttal phase, PC will send all reviews associated with papers to associated authors without a final decision.
- Authors will be given two weeks to prepare and submit a brief response to the reviewer comments. The following rules should be communicated to the authors in the letters sent to them **(breaking any of these rules can result in an immediate reject decision)**
    - Authors should continue to maintain their anonymity in their response.
    - The recommended rebuttal length is 500 words. Reviewers are not required to read beyond 500 words so authors should succinctly address all comments they deem most critical in the first 500 words.

    - Rebuttals should be largely self-contained, only pointing to generally published literature. Reference to any external documents edited by the authors after the submission deadline (even anonymously) is not allowed.
- During this phase, no changes to the actual paper submission can be made.
- If desired, authors can also withdraw their paper during the rebuttal phase in order to submit to another conference. For papers that are withdrawn, the process will end, i.e., the steps below will not occur.

Discussion Phase

- The objective of the Discussion Phase is to obtain consensus among the TPC and PC on the accept/reject decisions for all papers. This process is gradual, and it is crucial that TPC members participate.
- The PC will initially go over all reviews and especially identify papers for which the span (the difference between minimum and maximum score) is high. For those papers, the PC will encourage discussion. TPC members are first encouraged to read the author response/rebuttal to see if their initial review comments have been answered.
- The conference submission system allows the TPC to track discussions by automatically emailing any comment made to a given paper.
- Upon completion of the Paper Review, a weighted score is obtained for each paper. The weighting is defined by the paper scores and confidence. The weighting is defined on http://www.easychair.org/conferences/wiki.cgi?a=c01c8f0023c8
- Next, all papers are ranked from high to low by overall weighted score. Obviously, papers with a higher score are more likely to be accepted. The ranked scores, however, do not imply acceptance or rejection.
- A paper enters the Discussion Phase in the 'Undecided' status. Throughout the Discussion Phase, each paper will gradually change status depending upon the overall ranking and consensus among the Reviewers and the TPC. A Paper can have one of the following status:
    - Accept: A confirmed accept.
    - accept?: A probable accept.
    - Undecided: Undecided.
    - reject?: A probable reject.
    - Reject: A confirmed reject.
- A Paper follows the trajectory: Undecided->accept?->Accept or Undecided->reject?->Reject. Each step of the trajectory is reversible, although reversing the Accept or Reject state be reserved only for exceptional situations.
- Paper status changes are done by the PC. The TPC can advise, but not decide on the status change for a paper.
- The TPC can modify the review, as well as the review scores, given to a paper. This often happens as a result of paper status changes, and to confirm consensus.
- The discussion phase ends on the Paper Decision Date. At that time, all papers must have reached either the Accept status or the Reject status.
- In exceptional circumstances, a paper can be conditionally Accepted. In this case, a TPC member (a shepherd) will volunteer to help the authors revise the paper.

This situation may typically occur as a result of the Discussion Process, when the consensus is that Accept will only hold under specific conditions.

Author Feedback (after final decision)

- On the Author Notification Date, authors receive paper reviews, as well as accept/reject decisions.
- Authors will not receive individual reviewer scores for a paper. What counts for an author is the final decision, and the reviews. Individual scores often differ among reviewers, and they may not reflect the conclusions obtained during the discussion process.

List of Accepted Papers

- Before the first draft of the program is released, a list of accepted and conditionally accepted paper titles shall be posted to the web

TPC Evaluation by PC Chairs

PC will make note of anomalous and extraordinary activities during the paper review and discussion phases and add/subtract from TPC scoring as noted earlier. Examples of good, bad, and average TPC performance and awards/penalties are given below:

- A TPC member who does not submit reviews may be removed from the committee if the program chairs are not informed about their unavailability.
- A TPC member who submits a review with only a couple lines of text, even if that reviewer re-submits a longer review afterwards, will be penalized in the previously discussed scoring system. TPC members are expected to contribute independently to the review process and not rely on the comments from other reviewers.
- TPC members who submit a thorough review, defined as a summary of the work + comments regarding strengths and weaknesses, and participate in the discussion phase in a meaningful way, particularly in cases where feedback is explicitly requested by the PC, will maintain their status.
- Those TPC members who go above and beyond, e.g., provide additional references to support or reject claims, and/or express genuine concern over the status of the paper (as judged by the PC) will receive bonus points. **The top three reviewers, determined by this type of scoring, will be acknowledged by name during the plenary by the Program Chairs as significantly contributing to the quality of the HOST program.**

Examples of Good, Poor, and Unacceptable Reviews

- The following examples are drawn from reviews submitted by past HOST conferences and have been anonymized to protect the actual papers they are associated with. The good and poor reviews provided below were originally a full page in length and are reduced here to emphasize important aspects of the review.
    - **Good Review:** A good review adheres to the format and is concise. It opens with an overview of the paper acknowledging its content and proposed work. Positive and negative aspects are clearly discussed and supported. It closes with a recommendation based on the presented points.

Overview:
A PUF based on a xxx circuit is proposed, where a yyy and zzz delays serve as the entropy source. Claims are made that the proposed xxx PUF has higher entropy content and a smaller footprint then RO and ARB PUFs. A aaa is proposed to measure the variation in delay with respect to a reference. Hardware experiments and simulations are used to compare delay variations of the proposed xxx PUF with an RO and ARB

Positive aspects of the paper:
+: Overall the paper presents an interesting PUF architecture
+: Experimental results are presented that support the claims that the PUF produces high quality bitstrings
+: A reliability analysis is provided that uses data from hardware devices over temperature and voltage variations.

Negative aspects of the paper:
-: The main drawback is related to the reliability analysis. First, the authors investigate voltage and temperature separately, instead of looking at all combinations of temperatures and volt- ages. Therefore, the results presented are conservative.
-: Second, the bit flip % are normalized with 0% occurring at zzz. This is not typical and it's not clear why the authors chose to 'normalize'. It is important to know what the bit flip per- centage is under nominal conditions too.
-: Third, the concept presented for the strong PUF implementation is not convincing. It assumes that combining multiple yyy produces a random zzz value.

Recommendation*:*
The paper has several pluses and some significant minuses as discussed above and therefore represents a borderline paper. My recommendation is weak reject pending arguments provided by the authors during the rebuttal phase.

- **Poor Review:** The following is an example of a poor review, with annotations discussing why it is not valuable to the author as feedback.

Overview:
The authors analyze a xxx PUF on yyy SoC using zzz as a means of enabling 100% zzz. [NOTE: Overview does not adequately describe the content of the paper.]

Positive aspects of the paper:
+: The authors propose to use of xxx for accomplishing the goals set forth in this paper. [NOTE: do not be descriptive in these comments, instead provide evaluative statements, e.g., "The authors proposed use of xxx for accomplishing the goals set forth in this paper represent an innovative approach"].

Negative aspects of the paper:
-: The usage scenario here is to utilize as much of the FPGA as possible but this can be accomplished with a set of yyy too.
[NOTE: provide enough context here to make it clear to the authors and other

reviewers what it is that you are concerned about, e.g., "The usage scenario here is to utilize as much of the FPGA as possible for yyy by designating regions as zzz and yyy them to use all possible loca- tions. But this can be accomplished with a set of fixed zzz too.]

***Recommendation**:*
I recommend the paper for weak acceptance.
[NOTE: This is descriptive, instead provide an evaluation, "I recommend the paper for weak acceptance because it describes an innovative approach to implementing xxx on FPGAs. Although the negatives are of concern, they do not outweigh the positive aspects of the technique."]

- **Unacceptable Review:** Here we give an example where the reviewer has submitted a review that is unacceptable and will not be considered in the final decision for the paper. Although these are rare, they do occur and the program chairs are left with little choice but to delete the review and thank the reviewer for his or her service.

  ***Overview:** This paper describes an yyy that utilizes zzz. The fundamental idea is to use xxx for the generation of zzz. The paper presents an implementation of the yyy.*

  Positive aspects of the paper:
  ***+:** The paper is interesting in its conception.*

  Negative aspects of the paper:
  ***-:** The biggest issue this reviewer sees is that this paper seems more suitable to a conference on yyy. It is doubtful that HOST community is the right place for a paper that fundamentally focuses on zzz.*
  (NOTE: This review provides a poor description of the paper's content, and provides no state- ments on the merits or drawbacks and instead simply disqualifies the paper based on the topic. There is no evidence that the reviewer actually read the paper in this case.)

TIMELINE

April (in previous HOST year)

Last week of April:

- Vice Program Chair (next Program Chair): Preliminary CFP ready with all deadlines and location of next year's HOST ready for dissemination at current year's HOST

May

@HOST OC Dinner: Finalize all chair positions for next year's event

Second/Third Week of May:

- Web Chair, General Chair, Program Chair: Launch next year's website with new CFP, deadlines, info for sponsors, etc.
- Publicity Chair: Post all pictures and video of last year's event on social media.

June

First week of June:

- General Chair: Begin monthly meetings between the following OC members – Steering Committee members, General Chair, Program Chair, Vice Program Chair, Tutorial Chair, Demo Chair, Panel Chair, Publicity Chair, and Web Chair.
- Publicity Chair, Program Chairs, Liaisons to Europe and Asia: Start publicizing CFP's first deadline via e-mail and social media
- Program Chair: Launch new submission website and migrate all prior year settings; Complete evaluations of prior year TPC members.
- General and Exhibition Chairs: Finalize prospectus, post to web, and start soliciting exhibitors

July

By end of July:

- General Chair, Program Chairs, and Steering Committee: Develop preliminary list of invited speakers
- Program Chair: Invite TPC members
- Panel Chairs: Develop preliminary list of panel topics

August

First week of August:

- Web Chair, Tutorial Chair, and Demo Chair: Calls for Tutorials and Demos finalized and uploaded to website

Week of August 15:

- First paper submission deadline
- Program Chairs: Start paper bidding and complete assignments within one week

Third Week of August:

- Publicity Chair, Tutorial Chair, Industrial Liaison, Liaisons to Europe and Asia: Begin publicity of Call for Tutorials

September

First week of September:

- General Chair: Begin bi-weekly meetings for entire OC
- General Chair: Submit travel grant proposal to NSF
- Industrial Liaisons and Finance Chair: Begin outreach to sponsors

Third week of September:

- Publicity Chair, Industrial Liaison, Liaisons to Europe and Asia: Begin publicity of second CFP deadline
- Tutorial Chair: Finalize tutorial review committee

October

First week of October:

- Program Chairs: Complete rebuttal process for papers in first deadline; Reject papers with (sufficient number of) all negative reviews
- Publicity Chair, Tutorial Chair: Tutorial submission deadline

Second/Third week of October:

- Program Chairs: Manage paper discussion and prepare final decisions for papers submitted in first deadline.
- Tutorial Chair: Solicit reviews from committee
- Web Chair, Program Chair: Post accepted papers from first deadline to HOST website
- Publications Chair: Collect forms from authors of accepted papers from first deadline; Solicit paper videos and communicate template/instructions
- Program Chair: E-mail final reviews and decisions to authors

November

First week of November:

- Tutorial Chair: Meet with committee and prepare tutorial ranking list; Discuss list with OC for final decisions; Communicate decisions (accepts and rejects) to proposers

Week of November 15:

- Second paper submission deadline
- Program Chairs: Start paper bidding and complete assignments within one week
- Publicity Chair, Demo Chair: Begin publicity of Call for Demos
- Tutorial Chair: Collect forms and agreements from presenters; Finalize tutorial schedule and confirm availability of all presenters

December

First week of December

- General Chair: Estimate student travel support based on NSF budget and student hotel rate
- General Chair, Finance Chair, Web Chair: Student grant website/system available for travel grant applications (first-come-first-serve, priority to female and underrepresented groups – approved as they come in)
- General Chair, Publicity Chair: Publicize student travel system and support (hotel expenses covered at conference hotels, free registration for HOST and WISE, and free tutorials)

End of second week of December:

- Panel Chairs: Finalize panel topics and begin contacting moderators and panelists

January

End of first week of January:

- Program Chairs: All TPC reviews due and start of rebuttal phase; Reject papers with (sufficient number of) all negative reviews

End of second week of January:

- Program Chairs: Rebuttals due and online deliberation begins
- Demo Chairs: Final decisions for demos

Third week of January:

- Web Chair, Tutorial Chair: Tutorial schedule posted to web with bios
- General Chair, Program Chairs: Begin contacting invited keynote and visionary speakers

Last week of January:

- Web Chair, Workshop Chair (with proposers): Preliminary program for workshops uploaded to web
- Web Chair, Demo Chairs: Demo decisions finalized, communicated to authors, and posted to web

Two days before final decisions: Post paper ranking / preliminary decisions for TPC

Jan. 31/Feb. 1:

- Web Chair, Program Chair: Post accepted papers/posters from second deadline to HOST website
- Program Chair: E-mail final reviews and decisions to authors
- Web Chair, Publication Chair: Camera-ready instructions (forms, etc.) sent to authors and posted on website
- Web Chair, AV/Chair: Poster/Presentation instructions and templates sent to authors and posted on website
- Program Chair, Awards Chair: Notify best paper candidates

February

First week of February:

- Registration Chair, Web Chair, Finance Chair: Registration website opens for all events (main conference and tutorials)
- Web Chair, Program Chair, Publicity Chair: Post preliminary program to web and circulate for publicity
- Awards Chair: Put together paper and demo awards committee list

By end of February:

- General Chair, Program Chairs, Workshop Chair (with proposers), Tutorial Chair: Update Hotel/venue contract to accommodate any new conference, tutorial, and workshop needs
- General Chair, Publicity Chair: Student grant application system closes (final deadline)
- Awards Chair: Finalize/invite paper and demo awards committee members

March

First week of March:

- Tutorial Chair, Finance Chair: Collect all necessary forms from tutorial presenters
- Program Chair, General Chair: All programs (conference and workshop) finalized
- Sponsor Chair, Finance Chair, General Chair: All sponsors confirmed
- Publication Chair: Camera-ready paper deadline
- Publication Chair, General Chair, Program Chairs: Welcome message finalized for proceedings
- Awards Chair: Solicit nominations for HOST Hall of Fame with current HoF members

Third week of March

- General Chair: Decisions and instructions for disbursement, hotel, etc. communicated to travel grant students
- Awards Chair: Deadline for HOST HoF nominations; Assemble HoF committee with HoF members

April

First week of April:

- General Chair (w/input from OC): Compile list of student volunteers
- General Chair (w/input from OC): Compile list of conference and tutorial necessities (A/V, tables, laptops, etc.)
- Registration Chair, Tutorial Chair, General Chair: Cancel tutorials without enough attendees

Second week of April:

- Awards Chair: Determination of new HoF class and communication with below for awards
- General Chair, Awards Chair, Program Chair: Order all awards and gifts for speakers