

Minutes of the Control Systems Society Board of Governors Meeting June 30, 2015, Chicago, Illinois.

Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

Elena Valcher called the meeting of the Control Systems Society (CSS) Board of Governors (BoG) to order at 12:50 PM on June 30, 2015. She began the meeting by asking the attendees to introduce themselves. The following members of the BoG were in attendance: Anuradha Annaswamy, Panos Antsaklis, Robert Bitmead, Linda Bushnell, Maria Letizia Corradini, Fabrizio Dabbene, Mario di Bernardo, Warren Dixon, Frank Doyle, Magnus Egerstedt, Jay Farrell, Alessandro Giua, Sandra Hirche, Jonathan How, Jun-ichi Imura, Hideaki Ishii, Marco Lovera, John Lygeros, Kirsten Morris, Lucy Pao, Thomas Parisini, Ian Petersen, Maria Prandini, Jakob Stoustrup, Dawn Tilbury, Maria Elena Valcher, and Yorai Wardi. Additionally, the following visitors attended the meeting: Venkataramanan (Ragu) Balakrishnan, Rick Middleton, Daniel Rivera, Tariq Samad and Amber Madison. She reminded the BoG of the rules of the meeting including reminding individuals that an abstention is a no vote.

Quorum was established and the agenda was approved with unanimous consent. Following approval of the agenda, she explained that a mistake was made in a motion approved during the BoG meeting on December 2014, held in Los Angeles, California. The page count for the *IEEE Control Systems Magazine* was meant to remain the same but it was incorrectly stated that the total number of pages would have been 816 pages plus 64 pages for advertisements, while it should have been 816 pages total, including 64 pages for advertisements. There were no comments on the clarification, and the minutes were approved unanimously.

E. Valcher proceeded to ask if anyone would like to remove items from the Consent Agenda (see Appendix A). No items were removed from the Consent Agenda and it was approved unanimously.

Action Items

Appointments

J. Farrell, Chair of the Nominating Committee, presented the 2016 CSS Executive Committee (ExCom) nominees as a slate. The slate included: E. Chong as President Elect, M. Prandini as the Vice President of Conference Activities, R. Bitmead as the Vice President of Financial Activities, S. Hirche as the Vice President of Membership Activities, F. Dabbene as the Vice President of Publication Activities, and K. Morris as the Vice President of Technical Activities. The candidates left the room. He opened the floor for discussion. M. Egerstedt asked if M. Prandini would step down as the Electronic Publications Editor. J. Farrell and F. Doyle confirmed that she would. After no further discussion, the slate was unanimously approved.

J. Farrell then informed the BoG that a ballot for the election of six members to the CSS BoG, consisting of nine candidates that were selected by the Nominating Committee was sent on March 31, 2015 to all IEEE CSS members by IEEE. IEEE indicated the following candidates are now elected for a three-year term from January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2018: Francesco Bullo, Antonella Ferrara, Karl Henrik Johansson, Angelia Nedich, Rodolphe Sepulchre, and Lihua Xie.

In her role as the incoming chair of the Nominating Committee, E. Valcher indicated that she is an ex officio member of the Nominating Committee along with Ed Chong. She reminded the BoG that the 2015 Nominating Committee was elected through an electronic vote. BoG members were asked to vote for four members from a slate of eleven candidates. The four elected members are: Frank Allgower, Jay Farrell, Tariq Samad, and Dawn Tilbury.

E. Valcher then discussed a need to revise the CSS Bylaws. She indicated that the BoG was mailed the revised Bylaws more than 30 days before the meeting. She provided background on the need to revise the Bylaws based on the fact that the International Affairs Committee is no longer needed because its role had been absorbed in the Outreach Committee. She then presented the following motion:

- **Motion: To delete the International Affairs Committee from the Society Roster (cancellation of Article V in Section 6 of the Bylaws) starting in 2016.**

Specifically, this motion results in the deletion of the following text in Article V of the CSS Bylaws:

“Section 6. International Affairs Committee. This committee shall report to the Vice President for Member Activities, and shall be responsible for (1) promoting activities of Society Chapters and members located outside the USA, (2) facilitating relations with other national and international organizations related to the Society's Field of Interest and (3) making recommendations to the Board of Governors for actions to be taken on behalf of the Society for the benefit of members or colleagues whose participation in Society activities is impeded by financial or political hardships in their respective countries.”

Also, Article V Sections 7-12 are renumbered as Sections 6-11, respectively. E. Valcher opened the floor for discussion. After no discussion, the amended Bylaws passed unanimously.

A. Annaswamy then presented the motion:

- **Motion: To approve the preliminary budget for the CDC 2017.**

She provided some background and financial details for the motion. She asked if Rick Middleton, co-General Chair of the CDC 2017, wanted to add anything. He indicated that the committee had tried to keep the costs at a minimum. For example, based on a

recommendation by the CSS Conference Coordinator, Bob Judd, they renegotiated the Professional Contract Organizer (PCO) contract. P. Antsaklis asked if the differences in fees between conferences held in the United States and internationally is due to the variance caused by the PCO. Rick commented that the PCO is not the main expense, and their value in negotiating is worthwhile. A. Annaswamy indicated it would be the most expensive CDC to date. R. Middleton indicated the CDC in Florence was approximately the same when the currency rates were taken into account. R. Bitmead indicated the PCO paid for themselves based on the value they added in his past conference organizing experience. M. Egerstedt indicated that there is a price creep that the BoG should be aware of. He indicated that we should not sanitize ourselves to higher cost conferences. There was no further discussion. A. Annaswamy asked for a vote, the vote passed unanimously.

A. Annaswamy then presented the motion:

- ***Motion: To approve the preliminary budget for the CCTA 2017.***

She provided some background on the motion. She also provided the financial summary and a comparison to previous MSC conferences. She opened the floor for discussion. M. Vidyasagar asked about the budget surplus and asked about the number of registrations. E. Valcher indicated that the budget met the 20% margin required by IEEE. There was a discrepancy in the financial numbers noticed by J. Stoustrup and the discussion was postponed until the spreadsheet could be corrected.

T. Parisini left the room. A. Annaswamy then presented the following motion:

- ***Motion: To approve Thomas Parisini as the Co-General Chair, CCTA 2018.***

There was no discussion, so she called for a vote. The vote passed unanimously and T. Parisini returned.

She then presented the motion:

- ***Motion: To approve Kristin Pettersen as the Program Chair, CCTA 2018.***

The motion passed unanimously.

M. Egerstedt left the room. A. Annaswamy then presented the following motion:

- ***Motion: To approve Magnus Egerstedt as the Program Chair, CDC 2018.***

There was no discussion, so she called for a vote. The vote passed unanimously and M. Egerstedt returned.

A. Annaswamy presented the following motion:

- ***Motion: To approve Carlos Canudas de Wit as the General Chair, CDC 2019 and France as the venue (possible cities: Paris, Nice; details presented at the BoG meeting).***

She provided background information on C. C. de Wit and details on possible venues in France: Nice and Paris. E. Valcher indicated that the procedure is to approve the general chair, but the general chair is linked to the venue. This is why the venue information was provided as preliminary information. P. Antsaklis asked when the BoG would get a motion about the venue, and when suggestions and feedback could be provided. He indicated a preference for Paris due to better access. After no further discussion, the vote passed unanimously.

B. Bitmead then provided some background financial information. He indicated that Al Dunlop, IEEE TAB Treasurer, sent an email to E. Valcher asking her, in her role of CSS President, to attend the IEEE Financial Committee meeting in November. Motivation for the meeting summons is that IEEE predicts that the CSS will have a negative balance for the third year in a row (2013, 2014 and 2015). He presented the CSS actual expenditures from 2009-2014, and the 2015 and 2016 budgets. He explained the process of spending money from the reserves through initiatives. He indicated that the approved 2015 CSS budget from IEEE is a \$250K deficit and is on track to be a deficit. He indicated that running a negative balance is not necessarily bad since the CSS does not have direct access to the reserves. He argued that in 2014, the CSS was not in a deficit state since the operating budget was in surplus. The addition of initiatives resulted in a negative balance. He indicated the 2016 budget has a projected surplus of \$96K based on a renegotiated Renewal Purchase Offering and improved conference financial outcomes. He indicated that CSS needs to respond with a revised version of the 2015 budget by July 2015. Also, the 2016 budget must be submitted within the same month. Some lifestyle changes may need to take place within the society, but there is no serious concern. E. Valcher commented that she was more concerned than R. Bitmead about the fact that CSS has a deficit, but that the CSS had limited control over it, since the deficit is mostly a result of increasing IEEE charges. R. Middleton indicated that in 2011 he, as CSS President, was asked by IEEE why the CSS was not doing more to spend its reserves. M. Vidyasagar asked for a description of the initiatives. R. Bitmead reviewed some initiatives. M. Vidyasagar indicated that the CSS should not exclude the students from the CDC banquet, which was an upcoming motion. He then asked how much funding CSS receives from corporate sponsorships. J. Farrell indicated it is approximately \$20K. L. Bushnell asked what other IEEE societies were doing. R. Bitmead said they were also trying to have a near zero net operating budget. E. Valcher indicated that CSS can not easily spend the reserves, but we should not have deficits. R. Bitmead indicated the significant factors of our budget are our conferences and publication revenues. R. Bitmead then presented the motion:

- **Motion: To approve that 2016 CSS Subscription Pricing for CSS publications adopt the IEEE recommended pricing for non-members, while all the other prices and conditions for members remain the same as in 2015.**

He explained the different subscription prices. He indicated that IEEE suggested that we raise the subscription pricing for non-members, while keeping the member rate the same.

He opened the floor for further discussion. E. Valcher indicated that this non-member rate is a small percentage of the budget, and that the membership fee will remain the same. A. Giua asked if the increase would impact the subscriptions of our journals. After no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

A. Annaswamy then presented the following motion:

- **Motion: To discontinue the CDC student banquet subsidy.**

She reported that student attendance has increased, resulting in restrictions on compatible banquet venues. Moreover, the student attendance has caused the cost of the banquet to significantly increase. M. Vidyasagar indicated that there are two main issues. The financial issue could be resolved if a sponsor paid the cost, or if the students were asked to pay for the banquet cost. The venue is another constraint. He felt that the students add value to the banquet. He asked which motivation is more significant. E. Valcher indicated that the main motivation is the venue size constraint. Further, there will be a suggestion to the general chairs to consider not having a banquet at all. She indicated that the CSS cost to pay for students to attend is maybe not the best return on investment since the students may not appreciate the banquet. J. Farrell indicated in 2013 and 2014 the banquet size reached saturation and some people had to be turned away, or be given discounted registration. M. Vidyasagar asked if the banquet should be made optional for everyone. E. Valcher indicated that this might be very complicated for planning purposes, but would also be discussed separately later in the meeting. Y. Wardi asked if the banquet was voluntary for everyone, how the banquet attendance would be affected. R. Bitmead commented that he would like to hear from the general chairs if the banquet really adds value to the conference versus some other social outlet, and questioned whether the current banquets are an inefficient use of resources. A. Annaswamy indicated that the size of the banquet drives the venue selection, so it is very difficult to plan. J. Lygeros asked why the student attendance is different. T. Parisini asked if it was true that CSS is paying for the student attendance. J. Farrell stated that the student registration is not included in banquet ticket cost; instead CSS pays for the student attendance to the banquet via a grant to the conference. J. Farrell indicated that there was a previous BoG motion that indicated that student banquet tickets would be supported by CSS. D. Tilbury asked if the general chair still had the option to include student registrations. E. Valcher said this is their choice, but the cost would be covered by the conference not CSS. It was clarified that although CSS would not be paying the student cost of attendance at the CDC banquet, students were welcome at the banquet, in fact encouraged to attend, if they paid for their banquet ticket. There was no further discussion and the vote passed unanimously.

A. Annaswamy indicated that with some non-IEEE entities CSS has a multiple year MOU for conference technical co-sponsorship (TCS) and proceedings acquisition (PA). She indicated that SICE is one such entity. She explained that the IEEE fee structure for proceedings acquisition has changed. In light of that change, the multi-year MOU's should change, both SICE and ISCS will pay the fixed fee of \$1K (possibly split among the various IEEE sponsoring MOUs) and the per paper cost (currently \$15/paper) will be absorbed by the CSS. She indicated that SICE is comfortable with this additional cost in the multi-year MOU. E. Valcher indicated that last year the BoG approved a similar motion for the other conferences for which we acquire the proceedings not covered by a multi-year MOU.

A. Annaswamy then presented the following motion:

- ***Motion: To renew the multi-year MOU with SICE (from 2016 to 2020).***

The motion was approved unanimously.

E. Valcher asked if the BoG was supportive of giving conference General Chairs the choice of having a banquet or not. M. Vidyasagar indicated that if there is no banquet, then there needs to be a place for people to eat. He further asked how much of the space restriction is based on a sit-down dinner versus a buffet. J. Farrell indicated that if the BoG waived the need for a sit-down banquet this would allow more flexibility. A. Annaswamy commented that the need for the banquet is questionable. M. Egerstedt indicated that the banquet provides a common venue to meet, but otherwise the use was questionable. L. Bushnell indicated the awards banquet was previously synchronized with the banquet, but recently it has been a separate function. The sentiment of BoG was that GC's should have the flexibility to experiment with not having a banquet, but possibly having alternative mixing and meeting social events.

A. Annaswamy then presented revised financial information for the preliminary CCTA 2017 budget (a follow up from the motion discussed earlier, that was temporarily tabled because of some inconsistency in the data appearing on the projected slides). She asked for a vote, and the vote was unanimous.

K. Morris provided some background on the history of the Aerospace TC award. She indicated in that in 2008 the award was approved provided the TC could raise \$50K. It was approved by IEEE in 2009. After some years of fundraising, the TC has raised \$16K and they would like to fund the award with a smaller payout. R. Middleton indicated that the revision to the award will have to be approved by IEEE. M. Egerstedt asked if CSS wants the TCs to form awards. K. Morris indicated that this has been in progress since 2009. M. Egerstedt asked if this was a practice to be encouraged. K. Morris indicated that would be a great idea. T. Samad asked if it has been awarded in the past and if it would be part of the CSS Awards Banquet. K. Morris answered that the award has never been given and that the plan is for the award to be part of the CSS Awards Ceremony. A. Annaswamy indicated that the award has been previously approved and this is just a

revision. R. Middleton indicated the motion needed to come back to BoG because they have not raised \$50K, which was a constraint included in the original motion. J. Farrell stated that with the lower funding the TC award would have a lower place in the CSS awards hierarchy. D. Tilbury expressed a concern that if the award is given at the CSS Award Ceremony, then it may be elevated to the same level as CSS awards. Following the ASME structure, perhaps it could be given out at the TC meeting. R. Middleton indicated that there is no official division between a CSS award and a TC level award. K. Morris indicated that if a number of additional awards are approved, this issue would need to be further investigated. She then presented the motion:

- ***Motion: To revise and implement the previously approved IEEE CSS Award for Technical Excellence in Aerospace Control.***

and it was unanimously approved. There is no financial impact of this motion for CSS since the award will be funded by an endowment handled by the IEEE Foundation. The annual income from the fund will be used to fund the award in perpetuity. The total amount of the award (plaque plus travel expenses) will be limited to the amount of income generated by the endowment. In other words, the CSS will not subsidize the award in case the endowment will no longer be able to cover the award in the future.

W. Dixon informed the BoG that following a discussion period of December 21-December 24, and a voting period of December 25-December 29, 2014, the following motion was approved by email.

- ***Motion: To appoint Alessandro Astolfi as Chair of the Antonio Ruberti Young Researcher Prize Awards Subcommittee.***

Activity Reports

Report of the President

E. Valcher indicated that after the BoG meeting there will be an Awards ceremony for Bruce Francis because he was not able to travel to the CDC in Japan due to health reasons.

She indicated that there is a timing mismatch between CSS appointments and IEEE-USA committee appointments. In March this year, after the 2015 CSS Roster was approved at the December 2014 BoG meeting, it was discovered that two IEEE-USA Committees have been eliminated. She indicated that this is bound to potentially happen every year, since the CSS roster is approved in December but the IEEE-USA appoints in March. The 2015 Roster has been updated and the two CSS Representatives have been informed.

She reported that IEEE sought to revise the constitution. The revision would delete half of the articles of the constitution. There were concerns that this change would diminish the democracy of IEEE. For example, the elected volunteers from the technical activities

board would have been eliminated, and the process for changing the constitution would be easier. Based on negative feedback and active actions from a number of volunteers, including the IEEE TAB, the IEEE Board of Directors voted to remove the constitutional amendment from the ballot.

She reported that the MOU with the Ruberti Foundation for the *Antonio Ruberti Young Researcher Prize* was sent to IEEE in late January, and that it has been approved by the IEEE Technical Activities Board Awards Committee (communication on May 31, 2015) and by the Technical Activities Board (June 2015). She also reported that at the end of February 2015, R. Middleton and Y. Paschalidis prepared a proposal for the IEEE Transactions on the Control of Network Systems (TCNS) Best Paper Award (approved by the BoG in June 2014) that was also approved by the IEEE Technical Activities Board Awards Committee (communication on May 31, 2015) and by the Technical Activities Board (June 2015).

She then provided motivation for the development of a new CS-Letters journal. She overviewed the motivation that the evolutionary model for publishing expanded versions of conference papers is more complicated with new interpretations of reuse of material. She indicated there is a negative trend in our society in terms of time to publication. Therefore, there is a need for a rapid publication outlet. She also reported on the duplication of review effort: reviewing the conference paper and then an expanded version of the paper for journal publication. She also indicated the conference proceedings are not valued as highly as journal publications by some academic personnel review committees.

The CS-Letters journal would provide a rapid publication outlet and in addition it could be integrated with the *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control* (CDC). She highlighted the new Letters journal that is proposed by the IEEE Robotics and Automation Society (RAS). The model by the RAS solves several problems. Based on the promise that this model may provide the CSS, she formed a task-force to examine the possibility of the new journal. The current draft of the proposal was sent to the BoG for review. She then presented the proposal. The main points of the proposal included: the journal title would be something like *Letters of the Control Systems Society*, there would be approximately 4 issues per year initially, with a limit of 6 pages in length with no possibility for over length papers, with two rounds of review with at most 8 weeks of review per round. She indicated that there is an estimate of 1200-1300 pages/year, which compares to other Letter journals by IEEE. She indicated that there is more flexibility in page counts. She clarified that this is a forecast, not necessarily what may occur. She clarified the process according to which authors may submit a paper to the Letters and also select the option of having the manuscript considered for presentation at the IEEE CDC.

M. Vidyasagar indicated that to synchronize with the *IEEE CDC* then submitting 6 pages is a good idea, but this will result in a bump in submissions once a year in the Spring. The letters model has to only allow minor revisions because major revisions would incur more review rounds. He indicated that the number of submissions would potentially be very large. E. Valcher indicated that the RAS has an earlier deadline than the conference

submission date and the first round of review is handled by the Letters editorial board. After the first round of review, the reviews and recommendations are submitted to the conference program committee without further review. The conference program committee then decides if the paper will be presented at the conference or not, while the journal editorial board pursues a second round of review (if needed) to determine if the paper will be published in the Letters. This second round of review must be completed before the conference proceedings are prepared. If the paper will be published in the Letters it will appear in IEEE Xplore as a journal paper. If it is also accepted for the conference, the pen-drive with the conference proceedings will include the paper, but the paper will not be on the online version of the proceedings on IEEE Xplore. All papers accepted for the CDC would be presented at the CDC regardless of the paper publication venue.

Y. Wardi asked what happens if the review passes for the journal but not the conference. E. Valcher explained that the paper will not be presented at the conference and hence it will not be included in the pen-drive, but this does not seem to be a high probability event. M. Vidyasagar stated his support for the journal. He asked if the submission dates would be staggered. He suggested that the date should be four weeks ahead. He also suggested that everyone would submit to the CS-Letters versus just the conference. E. Valcher indicated that some authors will want to publish a larger effort or in a different venue. M. Egerstedt indicated that the whole model is based on the RAS model, and he also suggested that the volume will be high and that most people will submit to the Letters. He indicated that CSS should watch the RAS to understand the volume. E. Valcher fully supported this point of view.

T. Parisini indicated that he has several concerns. The first concern is the impact on the CDC and on the *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control (TAC)* Technical Notes. E. Valcher said she has more slides to present that would address these concerns. Y. Wardi asked if there was concern about the number of reviewers. E. Valcher indicated that overall there will be a reduction with respect to the current situation, since the papers will not be reviewed twice, by the CEB and the Letters Editorial Board. Y. Wardi indicated that reviewing for a journal takes more time than reviewing for a conference paper. I. Petersen asked if CSS could just add a new category in the TAC. E. Valcher indicated that this would not be reasonable in light of the fact that presently the IEEE TAC are proposing to remove the technical category papers (6 pages) and move to the brief papers (8 pages) category. In this way, the new Letters would propose a category of papers that is different from the ones proposed by the TAC.

J. Stoustrup indicated that he was excited to see the proposal and that the presented model addresses many of the concerns that have been raised. He indicated his concern is that the new journal papers will be more similar to conference papers, less mature than typical journal papers. E. Valcher indicated that the author always has the option to publish a more mature paper in a different venue.

She reported that with two rounds of review the time to publication would be on the slower end of other IEEE Letters journals. She then presented some possible concerns:

competition with TAC, competition with CDC, too many control journals, quality, and financial stability. She remarked again that P. Antsaklis, as Editor-in-Chief of TAC, was examining the idea of eliminating technical notes in TAC and in their place offering a brief paper option that has longer page lengths. In this regard, the CS-Letters will work in concert with TAC. With regards to the CDC, the impact factor of the CDC may decrease, but the new journal will have a higher impact factor. Moreover, there may be already an ongoing trend to reduce the content and hence the quality of current conference papers, once they are accepted, to avoid the dual use issue. A. Giua asked if the attendance at the CDC would be impacted. E. Valcher indicated that publishing in the proceedings is not the main motivation for most to go to the conference.

T. Parisini indicated that the CS-Letters would compete with the CDC. The CDC is an interactive venue for discussion. He suggested an alternative where papers would be first submitted to the CDC and then those that are selected for publication would be reviewed for a second round and then they could be published in the journal. E. Valcher indicated that is a model that could be considered along with the current proposal.

R. Middleton indicated that this time should be used for collecting feedback and to gauge if there is enough support to pursue this effort. If so, there will be a letter of intent that is submitted to form the journal and then the details of the journal will be debated by a larger committee. M. Egerstedt asked what the problem to be solved was. He indicated that the workload might outweigh the benefit. E. Valcher indicated that the workload would not increase; M. Egerstedt reiterated that we should watch the RA-Letters. Y. Wardi indicated that he was not supportive of having a conference review stand for a journal review as indicated in T. Parisini's model, whereas the proposed model would start with a journal review.

E. Valcher asked for a show of hands indicating whether they supported further exploration of the CS-Letters concept. T. Parisini indicated that we should debate the name further. J. Lygeros indicated that he liked the name, but he had a concern about competition with MSC and ACC, and whether these conferences would be weakened. Y. Wardi indicated that the decision to launch a journal should be decided on the quality of the journal and the contribution to our society: perhaps the journal is being motivated by the wrong issues. E. Valcher indicated that journals are started based on other needs, but quality is something that must be preserved. J. Stoustrup indicated that this is an important issue to raise and that the Executive Committee should continue to examine how to continue to make the CDC a flagship conference. E. Valcher asked for a straw poll to consider a bigger group to explore refining the CS-Letters journal concept. There was unanimous support. I. Petersen, Y. Wardi, M. Vidyasagar, T. Parisini, M. Egerstedt, W. Dixon, D. Tilbury, and A. Teel agreed to be on the extended taskforce, in addition to the standing taskforce of E. Valcher, F. Dabbene, C. Cassandras, P. Antsaklis, J. Baillieul, and F. Doyle.

Report of the Vice President of Membership Activities

S. Hirche provided some statistics on CSS membership development: there is an overall decrease in CSS membership by 1.3% and IEEE membership by 1.1%. She provided a breakdown by region, and noted a 10% decrease in Latin America.

She provided an informational item that Qing-Chang Zhong was approved as a Distinguished Lecturer by the ExCom in 2014, but information regarding his appointment was not available to provide to the BoG until now. His term will end on December 31, 2017 (subject to extension according to the rules of the Distinguished Lecturer program). She also reviewed the terms of other CSS Distinguished Lecturers. She indicated new appointments would be provided in the December 2015 BoG meeting.

She indicated that the Women in Control (WiC) lunch at CDC 2014 had 85 attendees and that participation in social media (Facebook, LinkedIn, mailing list) by WiC is also increasing. She indicated the ratio of reported female members remains at 5-6%.

She reported on student activities. She compared student membership in CSS with other societies. CSS has a statistically much lower number of students than other societies. She questioned how CSS might include more student members. She indicated that current activities are targeting this issue through better publicity of existing student-related activities such as student chapters. The main activity of the standing committee for student activities is travel support for CDC and MSC, and she indicated that there would be no more support from the United States National Science Foundation for conferences held outside the United States. This NSF policy will start with the CDC in 2015.

She reported that L. Bushnell has started a CSS website archive for photographs. She also indicated that there are plans to record several additional video lectures.

R. Middleton indicated that the IEEE has approved the best paper award for the TCNS. There were also some revisions to the Ruberti Prize. He indicated that the online award system has been launched. Since the system is implemented in Paperplaza, there are some terminology issues that are being worked through. He provided some statistics on the number of award recommendations.

D. Rivera indicated that he is in his second year of the Outreach Taskforce. He indicated that normally there are two nomination cycles per year, but due to budget constraints last year there was only one. This year they have the full budget and they have two submission cycles. There is continued interest in outreach projects, especially in terms of outreach to countries with lower representation. He reported on the selection committee members of the taskforce.

Report of the Vice President of Technical Activities

K. Morris reported that the CSS video contest last year is considered a success. Submissions were encouraged to this year's contest.

She indicated that she sent an email to various CSS members asking their opinion on the role and activities of the CSS Technical Committees (TCs). The response that she received was consistent in that people felt the TCs build and sustain a community, promote technical communication and interactions within and outside CSS, provide occasions for researchers in related fields to communicate with each other, make control community and more general international scientific community aware of the achievements in various fields of control, and are the reference point for anyone with an interest in the technical area. She indicated there is variable activity by different TCs. She indicated a need for guidelines for new TC chairs. One reason is that transitions from an inactive TC chair can leave the new chair without much support.

She also had polled about the role and relations with IFAC and CSS. She reviewed differences between the societies. The relationship is largely informal, generally through overlap in membership of various committees. There is co-operation on matters of mutual interest, such as Wikipedia, and the relationship is generally felt to be positive.

T. Samad presented information about “the Internet of Things (IoT)” as a new control systems area. He indicated that it is marketing speak for pervasive sensing monitoring and control. Y. Wardi asked if there were standards being developed or discussed. D. Rivera indicated the topic is so broad that many things could be considered under the umbrella. L. Bushnell asked if this could become an initiative in CSS to make it more visible in our society. A. Annaswamy asked if there is a control example. T. Samad indicated that Honeywell has a thermostat that when it sensed your car is nearby, then it starts to adjust your temperature setting, as an example. She asked what TC would be most related. T. Samad indicated that G. Papas, J. Stoustrup, and M. Egerstedt all do research in related areas. J. Stoustrup said connected buildings are an example important to the U. S. Department of Energy and connected vehicles is another application. The next steps are to communicate with TCs, especially the TC on Networks and Communications. Additional steps would be co-sponsorship of conferences and workshops and participation in IEEE IoT journal/magazine outlets.

Report of the Vice President of Finance Activities

Updates on the CSS Finance Activities were reviewed as part of finance motions, and no further updates were provided.

Report of the Vice President of Conference Activities

A. Annaswamy gave an update on the conference database that is being developed by Bob Judd, as Conference Operations Coordinator, that has extensive data that can be used by future general chairs. Moreover, she indicated there are parallel efforts for financial matters. The database will be available with password protections.

She reviewed the conferences that have TCS support and the venues of scheduled conferences.

Report of the Vice President of Publication Activities

E. Valcher left the room for discussions related to PaperCept due to a conflict of interest. F. Dabbene reported that for each issue of TAC and TCNS, the editorial office has to manually populate a table to report to IEEE, with dates for each paper. This is time consuming and prone to errors. In 2016 all CSS journals will undergo IEEE review: this will require preparing lengthy reports including statistics on accepted/rejected papers. IEEE will soon require all journals to upload author submitted files into their production process through a so-called “content loader”. PaperCept is currently developing a content loader to interface with IEEE. In the interim, PaperCept provided a system to create Excel files off-line using macros. This process allowed for the production of reports for 2014. Some changes in the paper workflow were implemented, allowing to more accurately communicate the statistics about the performance of CSS journals, providing a more accurate account of the actual length of the review process. PaperCept developed an automated conversion to PDF from source files (to meet IEEE compliance) for other societies and is now available for TAC/TCNS for free, and the automated process to transfer files to IEEE production process (i.e., the content loader) was already being developed for other societies and will be made available to CSS for free as well. Based on the statement of work already signed with PaperCept and approved by BoG, the Executive Committee approved the expense of \$2,500 for an urgent software update. E. Valcher returned to the meeting.

F. Dabbene reported that in January 2015 the Industrial Electronics Society (IES) presented a letter of intent to the IEEE Technical Activities Periodicals Committee to launch a new Transactions on Industrial CyberPhysical Systems (T-ICPS). IES contacted CSS to explore possible interest in co-sponsorship. He indicated that the initial reaction from the CSS was that the use of the word industrial in front of CPS was artificial and the scope was not properly laid out in the proposal. At the June TAB meeting E.Valcher attended the IEEE Periodicals Committee meeting and got a very different perception of the situation and of the initiative with respect to what the LOI and the Phase I proposal had provided. First of all, there were two people from the industry involved in the proposal presentation and interest in CPS at an industrial level is substantial. So, even if the proposal was not well phrased, there was some concrete need that the journal aimed at addressing. Secondly, there was significant encouragement from the IEEE Periodicals Committee in having the CSS as a technical or even financial sponsor. This possibility seemed even more appealing in light of the fact that other societies, like the RAS, have in turn decided to support the project.

A. Giua asked if there was overlap with Hybrid Systems, and he also asked why the word industrial is essential. F. Dabbene indicated that several control researchers have worked on industrial projects that are CPS focused. The IES is focused on getting industry involvement in the theory and applications. M. Egerstedt indicated that CSS has no appetite to start a new journal on CPS and this is a venue for another society to lead and for CSS to contribute. F. Doyle indicated that financially CSS could be protected against papers leaving its journals and being published in this outlet. E. Valcher asked for a straw

poll of who is in favor of financial co-sponsorship (at most 15%). There was unanimous support.

Other Business

W. Dixon informed the BoG that the next meeting will be on Monday, December 14th, at 12:00 P.M. at the Rihga Royal Hotel Osaka, in Osaka Japan.

E. Valcher asked if there was any additional new business or old business, and then adjourned the meeting.