Summary of Pre-workshop survey (NIME Publication Ecosystem Workshop)

This wall outlines the feedback from the online survey about the future NIME publication ecosystem, by topics. The workshop is organised by Alexander Refsum Jensenius, Andrew McPherson, Anna Xambó, Charles Martin, Jack Armitage, Niccolò Granieri, Rebecca Fiebrink, and Luiz Naveda. Workshop website: https://nime2020.bcu.ac.uk/nime-publication-ecosystem-workshop/

ANNA XAMBO SEDO   JUL 15, 2020 07:59PM

ECOSYSTEM VISION / DIVERSITY / NETWORK

What are the needs? Repository for open source instrument designs?
Instrument making tutorials (e.g. instructables)? Archive of performance and installation documentation? e.g. Vimeo channel? peer reviewed scientific video journal e.g. JoVE? Experimental data? Aggregator of related publications to the NIME proceedings? How to balance traditional vs experimental? Art + Science?

What type of workflow? Self-hosted open publishing/reviewing platform? (e.g. PubPub, Wiki) + continuous publication process (conference, journal)?

Diversity: Workshops, papers... good start but how to move it forward and be more inclusive?

Social network? NIME forum? Another mailing list?

Professional hub? NIMEHub? (network of code, schematics, papers, videos...). A single repo where to access all/most NIME contributions (esp. tech details, code, designs) through a standardised interface? Creation of a researcher portal / hub? (skillset based) Career development?

Funding? Creative and future-focused ways of paying the envisioned needed infrastructure?

Implementation? How to implement this vision in a realistic, sustainable way? How to promote low barrier to entry and low maintenance? What are the available resources? How to start?

JOURNAL

Is there a need? Internal study about viability? e.g. NIME data (see open data) but also other similar conferences e.g. ISMIR / TISMIR.

What criteria? High-impact factor? Low-entry vs high-entry

level?
Good publisher? Editorial board?
Traditional peer-review vs more open approach? Open review?
Regularity vs. sustainability?
Open access as the conference?
How to keep the costs low?
e.g. avoid open access fees, asking authors to do typesetting.

What relation with the proceedings? e.g. extended articles? Reviews? Special issues?

What style? Online vs printed?
Printed + website for rich-media / interactive content? Formal journal vs innovative / online rich-media journal? Both? Conventional vs unconventional? Open access?
Journal with short videos + supplementary materials archive (ACM style)? How to meet external metrics from e.g. academic organisations?

How to document creative works?
Online galleries? e.g. Instrument collections? Curation of concerts? Research Catalogue model (https://www.researchcatalogue.net) with multimedia documentation and/or interdisciplinary research?

Another option is to postpone starting a new journal and focus instead on improving indexing and visibility of the proceedings, while starting a multimedia archive.   **– MICHAELLYONS**

Or, 'Gold' access with very small author fee would also be acceptable.   **– MICHAELLYONS**

Most journals published with publishers currently have a 'hybrid' model ('Gold' + 'Green') meaning that authors must pay a fee (varies greatly) to make it open access (the 'Gold' is for the publisher). The 'Green' part means that authors can self-archive a version of their article even if they have not paid for open access, however there are varying restrictions on what form the pdf may take pre-print, post-print etc...) and when it may be released (embargo period). The 'Platinum' model is no-fee open access. I think we should aim for 'Platinum' open access as other models lead to uneven access.   **– MICHAELLYONS**

PROCEEDINGS

Indexation: How to solve indexation issues? Listing publications on ACM or Scopus for correct indexation? Losing authors because of this reason? Publish with DOI?

Rich media: Augmented experiences with videos and other media? How? e.g. short-papers based on artworks / tools e.g. see Leonardo.

Accessibility: Assure online web accessibility of content? User tests needed based on W3C accessibility?

Music / Installations / Workshops / Other: Inclusion of music and installations? e.g. see NIME 2019 Music Proceedings. Inclusion of workshops, non-poster demos, installations, and other new forms? e.g. themed panel discussion sessions with short position papers?

Impact music publications: How to improve the impact of music publications at NIME? Public event to the local citizens?

NIME conference template: ACM style excluding references to 6-page limit?

How to be more inclusive? Meritocracy vs divergence? How to accommodate all? e.g. pre-submission feedback process? (e.g. see pre-submission draft feedback at WAC 2019)

New tracks? Add a separate tool track? (short version that can complement a code repo).

Navigating the ACM keyword classifications when submitting a paper is quite off-putting if this is not part of your daily practice, e.g. if you are not an academic, but a freelance artist. It would be great if there could be something set up to make this aspect more accessible (by providing help, or creating a guide how to find fitting categories within the NIME context), rather than have to look up these classifications from the official descriptions.
— MARIJE BAALMAN

Is it possible to index the proceedings with Scopus? It's a service of Elsevier which means there is probably money involved, no? Re: ACM perhaps this will be possible again now that the licensing issue is fixed. Re: Impact of NIME music/performance. A curated video series might be helpful. I've always thought that the concerts should be freely open to the public for a small or no charge. Re: Inclusion - the SIGGRAPH conference might be a helpful model as a conference which has something for everyone. — MICHAELLYONS

GREEN, SUSTAINABLE CONFERENCE / COMMUNITY

Eco-Future: How to assure a more sustainable conference? How to limit the carbon footprint of NIME?

Model: Multiple hubs vs online vs hybrid? (see attachment: "Grounding the ICMC: by Richard Parncutt to be published as letter to the editor in the forthcoming CMJ issue).

Music Conferences (ICMCs) in 1988, '90, '91, and '97. Conferences were one of the best things about academic life, and the ICMC was one of the best. After all that work sitting alone behind a computer screen, I got to talk to other people with similar ideas, hear some weird and wonderful music, and travel to interesting places.

Back then, few of us realized that flying would become a big environmental problem. As academics and musicians, we were more aware of the role of intercultural communication in promoting world peace. And that was a good reason to fly. Many of us had been concerned about acid rain's killing of forests and about ozone depletion caused by chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), but both problems had been largely solved by international negotiation. Previously, in the late 1970s, I had studied physics at two universities in Australia. I don't remember anyone mentioning anything about anthropogenic climate change. That is surprising, given that scientists had been investigating and modelling the phenomenon for decades (history.aip.org/climate).

Global warming is one of a few leading global catastrophic risks, alongside nuclear war and pandemic. A meteorite collision could be more devastating but is less likely. The biggest global protests of 2019 were about climate, suggesting that it is currently humanity's biggest

Grounding the ICMC
PDF document
PADLET DRIVE

Nice title, especially with the multiple connotations of the term 'Grounding' — MICHAELLYONS

TOOLS / OPEN DATA / GOOD PRACTICE

The more the merrier vs less is more? Centralised vs distributed model? Holistic solution vs document with external links? Pros and cons? What media formats will be hosted natively? e.g. video repository for a greater future exposure. Online archiving of media in various formats? What platforms? e.g. GitHub, Zenodo, video (e.g. YouTube, Vimeo) and audio platforms,... Integration with a repository for software / code / media / data? Arxiv.org for interdisciplinary work? What resources are needed for a centralised vs distributed model?

Open data / Transparency: Always provide an open source / open hardware solution to promote accessibility? Transparency with submission / publication data? (see attachment: "Sixteen Years of Sound and Music Computing" by Mauro et al. 2020). Open source replicability of whole editing workflow offline? Online Accessibility (W3C) of documents? Transparency, how? e.g. use of the wiki on GitHub repo to describe building instructions? Transparency of third-party service reuse of author's data?

Archiving standards? How to keep archiving standards? e.g. usability, impact, smooth publication process...

This contribution provides an overview of the Sound and Music Computing conference and community over the course of its sixteen years. As a sequel to a previous corresponding contribution investigating the community ten years ago, here we analyze the proceedings of the past editions, as well as the changes in the organization of the conference itself. The analysis reveals the growth of the SMC community in terms of attendees and countries represented at the conference, highlights the changes in trends and topics, and provides insights on the directions of the conference. A reflection is made with regards to the SMC roadmap originally conceived in 2004. Motivated by similar initiatives in "sister" communities, this resource is made available to the community at http://smc.lim.di.unimi.it/.

1. INTRODUCTION

"Sound and Music Computing (SMC) research approaches the whole sound and music communication chain from a multidisciplinary point of view. By combining scientific, technological and artistic methodologies, it aims at understanding, modelling and generating sound and music through computational approaches" [1].

This is a deliberately broad definition, which is aimed at encompassing a wide range of topics. The name Sound and Music Computing was in fact coined by a group of scholars in the second half of the 1990's [2–4], in an effort to identify and promote the research field. One of the main achievements of this effort was the inclusion of SMC in the ACM Computing Classification System (1998).[1] By choosing this name, the proponents intended to go beyond the term "computer music", which was interpreted primarily from a musical perspective, and to define a discipline in Computer Science.

_____

[1] H. Information Systems → H.5 Information Interfaces and Presentation (e.g., HCI) → H.5.5 Sound and Music Computing. See https://www.acm.org/publications/computing-classification-system/1998

pating Conference and Summer School (hereafter SMC Conference for brevity) was meant to embody this vision. The main goal of this paper is to analyze the data available from the previous 16 editions of the event, and to reflect on how the field evolved in the course of the years. Even though the event is comprised of three complementary programs (the Summer School, the Music Program, and the Scientific Program), here we focus exclusively on the latter.

Similar contributions have been published in recent years for various conferences related to SMC, including the International Symposium on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR) [5–8], the International Conference on Digital Audio Effects (DAFX) [9, 10], and the International Conference on New Interfaces for Musical Expression (NIME) [11, 12]. One previous contribution was also focused on SMC [13], but examined a limited time-span (2004-2009). Ten years later, it seems appropriate to provide a more up-to-date picture.

2. HISTORY AND TIMELINE

The SMC Conference was born as a joint initiative of the AIMI [2] (Associazione Italiana di Informatica Musicale) and the AFIM [3] (Association Française d'Informatique Musicale). It was originally intended to replace the respective national conferences organized by the two associations, the CIM (Colloquium on Musical Informatics) and the JIM (Journées d'Informatique Musicale), although these were later rescheduled as independent events. The stated goal was to achieve an international dimension for the joint conference.

In June 2004, the EU-funded project "Sound to Sense – Sense to Sound" (S2S[2]) was started. The project consortium included some of the most active SMC research groups in Europe, and aimed at consolidating the research field. Among the outputs of the project, two major ones were an edited book that collected a wide account of state-of-the-art research in SMC [14], and a roadmap for SMC